

28.04.2026

Sl. No.04.

D/L.

Mithun.

Ct.No.29.

CRR/1469/2026
with
IA No: CRAN/1/2026

Sandip Ghosh

Vs.

The State of West Bengal & Anr.

Mr. Satadru Lahiri,
Mr. Safdar Azam,

...for the petitioner

Mr. Soumyajit Das Mahapatra,
Mr. Upasana Banerjee
Ms. P. Dey

...for opposite party no.2

Mr. Joydeep Biswas,
Ms. Trisha Rakshit

...for the State

Report submitted by Officer-in-Charge, Polba Police Station dated
28.04.2026 is taken on record.

Affidavit-of-service filed by the petitioner is also taken on record.

In this application the petitioner has prayed for quashing of the
proceeding being G.R. Case No.3963 of 2025 presently pending before
learned Judicial Magistrate, 3rd Court, Hooghly.

Petitioner is the husband who was roped by the *de facto*
complainant/opposite party under Section 85 of the BNS read with
Section 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act.

Upon completion of investigation, police submitted charge sheet
and learned Magistrate has taken cognizance of the offence on
07.01.2026.

It is submitted that during pendency of the impugned proceeding,
the *de facto* complainant and the petitioner have amicably settled their
dispute and the complainant/opposite party no.2 has decided not to
support the imputation levelled against the petitioner.

Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the opposite party no.2 on instruction submits that the opposite party no.2 also prays for quashing of the impugned proceeding.

Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the State submitted a report wherein they have also recorded the statement of the alleged victim Lopamudra Das who has stated that she is not willing to continue with the impugned proceeding any further since both of them have mutually decided to dissolve the marital tie. Learned Counsel for the State further submits that since the dispute is private in nature and the parties have amicably settled for their future mutual peaceful co-existence, the State does not want to stand in their way.

Having heard learned Counsel for the petitioner and both the opposite parties, it appears that in view of amicable settlement arrived at by and between the parties, the *de facto* complainant does not want to support the imputation levelled in the complaint and, as such, there is hardly any chance of conviction even if the trial is continued only on the ground that the offence is non-compoundable. Therefore, I find that to secure the ends of justice and for mutual co-existence of the parties if the prayer for quashment made by both the parties is not allowed, it may become counterproductive.

In such view of the matter, CRR 1469 of 2026 is allowed.

The impugned proceeding being G.R. Case No.3963 of 2025 presently pending before learned Judicial Magistrate, 3rd Court, Hooghly 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.)