

27.01.2026

Sl. No.14.

D/L.

Mithun.

Ct.No.29.

CRR/573/2025

With

IA No: CRAN 4 of 2025

Padmabati Shaw

Vs.

The State of West Bengal & Anr.

Mr. Sandipan Ganguly, Sr. Adv.,
Mrs. Manaswita Mukherjee

... for the petitioner

Mr. Ayan Bhattacharjee, Sr. Adv.,
Mr. Subhojyoti Dutta,
Mr. Joydeep Dey

...for opposite party no.2

Mr. Debasish Roy, Ld.P.P.,
Mr. Saryati Dutta,
Ms. Eshita Dutta

...for the State

Report submitted by S.I, Burtolla Police Station dated 21.01.2026
is taken on record.

In this application the allegation against the petitioner is under
Sections 406/420/120B of the Indian Penal Code which is pending
before Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Sealdah. After completion of
investigation police has submitted charge-sheet against the present
petitioner, Padmabati Shaw.

Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that during pendency
of the instant application, the parties have amicably settled their dispute
and, as such, both the petitioner and the opposite party no.2 does not
want to proceed further with the instant Application. Opposite party no.2
submits that the proceeding may be quashed in terms of amicable
settlement which has been reduced into writing through a Memorandum

of Understanding dated 24th December, 2025 and made part of the connected application being CRAN 4 of 2025.

Learned Counsel for the State submits that the IO has recorded statement of the *de facto* complainant Pradyut Kumar Shaw who has also stated that the matter has been amicably settled and he does not want to proceed further. In such circumstances, State does not want to stand in their way to settlement of private dispute.

Having considered the submissions made on behalf of opposite parties, it appears that the dispute is private in nature and good sense prevailed among the parties and they have come forward to settle the dispute amicably. The offences under Sections 420 & 406 are compoundable in nature.

In view of the aforesaid circumstances and in view of the fact that the complainant has decided not to adduce evidence against the petitioner, I find that the chance of conviction at the end of trial is bleak and as such, if the prayer for quashing is refused simply on the ground that one of the sections alleged against the petitioner is not compoundable, it may become counter-productive, for their mutual co-existence.

In view of above, CRR 573 of 2025 along with connected application being CRAN 4 of 2025 is allowed.

The impugned proceeding being GR Case No.2636 of 2021 presently pending before learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Sealdah is hereby quashed.

Parties to act on a server copy of this order duly collected from the official website of the Hon'ble High Court, Calcutta.

(Dr. Ajoy Kumar Mukherjee, J.)

