

Dd

07 27.11.2025

*IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
CIRCUIT BENCH AT JALPAIGURI*

*CO/179/2025
SUBIR PAUL
VS
RUMPA PAL (DEY)
IA NO: CAN/1/2025*

Mr. Deborshi Dhar,
Mr. Tanmay Mitra,
Mr. Chayan Moni Bhowal,
Mr. Somraj Paul, Advocates
... ... For the Petitioner

Mr. Mayank Roy, Advocate
... ... For the opposite party

1. CAN /1/2025 is an application for restoration.
2. Explanation sought to be advanced is that the learned advocate could not reach the Court when the matter was called on for hearing.
3. On the principle that litigant should not suffer due to the laches of an advocate, causes shown in the application for restoration are accepted as sufficient.
4. CAN/1/2025 is allowed. Revisional application is restored to its file and number.
5. By consent of the parties the revisional application is taken up for consideration.
6. Learned advocate appearing for the petitioner submits that, the petitioner will not seek any adjournment of the hearing of the suit in any manner or form. He files an affidavit to such effect, affirmed by the petitioner, in Court, which be taken on record.

7. The revisional application is directed against Order No. 27 dated June 23, 2025 which disallowed the prayer for extension of time for extension of time to file evidence-in-chief by the petitioner.
8. Petitioner applied for dissolution of marriage. His petition for extension of time to adduce evidence was disallowed.
9. In the facts of the present case, I am of the view that, interest of justice would be served by allowing the petitioner to file the evidence-in-chief before the learned trial Judge, on the next date fixed, i.e., December 15, 2025.
10. The affidavit affirmed by the petitioner of not praying for any adjournment at the trial, should be taken into consideration by the learned Trial Judge.
11. Learned Trial Judge is requested to dispose of the Matrimonial Suit No. 166 of 2014 as expeditiously as possible.
12. CO/179/2025 is disposed of without any order as to costs.

(Debangsu Basak, J.)