

25.02.2026  
Item No.15  
Ct. No. 34  
nb

**CRR 1968 of 2025**  
**With**  
**CRAN 3 of 2025**  
**+**  
**CRAN 4 of 2025**

In the matter of: **Sri Anirban Bala.**

..... Petitioner.

Mr. Pawan Kr. Gupta,  
Mr. Subrato Saho,  
Mr. Vijay Verma,  
Ms. Sofia Nesar,  
Mr. Santanu Sett,  
Mr. Abhik Biswas,

....For the Petitioner.

Mr. Bratin Kuma Dey,  
Mr. Subhankar Banerjee,

..... For the O.P. No.2.

Mr. Debasish Roy, Id. P.P.,  
Mr. Avishek Sinha,  
Mr. Debanshu Ghorai,

..... For the State

**In Re. CRAN 3 of 2025**  
**&**  
**CRAN 4 of 2025**

1. This application has been filed for extension of the interim order passed by the Coordinate Bench on 30<sup>th</sup> May, 2025 and was subsequently extended on 26<sup>th</sup> August, 2025, which was in force till 25.11.2025.
2. Learned advocate appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that out of three accused persons one is still in custody and the trial is

on the verge of completion but, the petitioner had to come before this Court against an order passed by the learned Court on 24.04.2025 rejecting the prayer on behalf of the present petitioner, imposing cost of Rs.10, 000/-.

3. Learned advocate on behalf of the opposite party filed an application being, CAN 4 of 2025 for vacating the interim order, as granted earlier.

4. Considering the facts that one accused person is still in custody the revisional application is taken up for hearing.

5. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the opposite party as well as on behalf of the State submits that the trial is on the verge of completion and 18 witnesses have already been examined and the cross-examination of the 19<sup>th</sup> witnesses being the I.O is fixed on 26<sup>th</sup> February, 2026.

6. The challenge has been made by the petitioner in respect of the order passed by the learned court in respect of the petition filed by the petitioner before the learned Trial Court on 24<sup>th</sup> April, 2025 alleging that the learned Trial Court recorded the testimony of the P.W.19 adduced during his examination-in-chief at paragraph 75 to 79 as his deposition which were not actually deposed by the I.O. before the court which is absolutely not feasible and is illegal.

7. It is contended by the learned advocate that the said application was filed on the very date when the evidence was adduced by the witnesses without any delay and since one of the accused is in custody the petitioner never intended to cause delay.

Being aggrieved thereby this said revisional application has been filed.

8. Having heard learned counsel for the parties it is seen that the Learned Trial Court after considering the petition and each and every line of the evidence that was adduced before the Court and was recorded by the learned Trial Court was of the opinion that the petition was nothing but only cause delay of the trial.

9. Admittedly the trial is almost on the verge of completion and the date is fixed for cross-examination of the I.O. The petitioner never felt aggrieved during the entire period when 18 witnesses were examined. The evidence of the I.O is primarily based upon the case diary.

10. Therefore, the grievances as ventilated do not inspire confidence for stay of the entire proceeding, at this stage. However, the cost imposed by the learned Court appears to be excessive. Hence, the same is modified to the extent of Rs.3, 000/-.

11. With this above observation, this revisional application stands disposed of.

12. Connected application, if any, is also disposed of.

13. The learned Trial Court is directed to proceed with this case on the next date fixed. The petitioner is to comply with the direction by depositing the aforesaid cost and file receipt before the learned Trial Court.

14. The petitioner is given liberty to communicate the gist of this order to the learned Trial Court below for necessary action and compliance.

15. All parties shall act on the server copies of this order duly downloaded from the official website of this Court.

**(CHAITALI CHATTERJEE (DAS), J.)**