

30.06.2026
Item No.4
Court No.37
CHC

In The High Court at Calcutta
Special Civil Jurisdiction
Appellate Side

CPAN 1621 of 2025
In C. Case No.1146/2023
IA NO: CAN/1/2025

Kaushik Shaw
Vs.
Smt. Sulagna Mukherjee

Mr. Srijib Chakraborty, Advocate
Mr. Washim Akthir Dafadar, Advocate
...for the petitioner

Mr. Angshuman Chakraborty, Advocate
Mr. Shashanka Shekhar Saha, Advocate
....for the alleged contemnor

1. Petitioner complains of violation of order dated December 10, 2024 passed in Complaint Case No.1146 of 2023 by the Chief Judicial Magistrate, at Alipore.
2. By the order dated December 10, 2024, the learned Judge, directed the respondent herein to comply with the order dated July 31, 2020 passed by the learned Metropolitan Magistrate (Traffic Court VI), Bengaluru.
3. By the order dated July 31, 2020, learned Metropolitan Magistrate (Traffic Court VI), Bengaluru regulated the modalities of the child visits between the husband and wife.
4. There are matrimonial disputes between the petitioner and the respondent. There is a child born out of the wedlock of the petitioner and the respondent. The

child is presently in Kolkata in the custody of the respondent.

5. It is contended on behalf of the respondent that, order dated July 31, 2020 passed by the learned Metropolitan Magistrate (Traffic Court VI), Bengaluru was modified by the Karnataka High Court.
6. Be that as it may, we are informed today that, there is a subsequent order dated June 11, 2026 passed by the learned Additional District and Sessions Judge, Fast Track 8th Court, Alipore, South 24 Parganas in Act VIII Case No.154 of 2023.
7. The order dated June 11, 2026 is elaborate and it regulates the visitation rights of the petitioner vis-à-vis the child.
8. The petitioner before us obtained the subsequent order dated June 11, 2026 in the proceeding filed by him.
9. In view of the subsequent order dated June 11, 2026 which was obtained by the petitioner in a proceeding filed by him and in view of the fact that the subsequent order is elaborate and regulates the visitation rights of the petitioner, we are not minded to interfere any further in this contempt petition.
10. We are not minded to invoke the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 or Article 215 of the Constitution of India, in view of the subsequent development as noted above.

We however, make no comment with regard to the conduct of the parties.

11. **CPAN/1621/2025** along with connected application are **disposed of** without any order as to costs.
12. Parties are at liberty to avail their remedies before the appropriate forum.

(Debangsu Basak, J.)

(Md. Shabbar Rashidi, J.)