12. 13.11.2026
(D/L) CT. NO. 05
(ARPAN-A.R.CT.)

In The High Court at Calcutta

CONSTITUTIONAL WRIT JURISDICTION
(Appellate Side)

W.P.A. 28426 OF 2026

RAJIB ROY
VS.
THE STATE OF WEST BENGAL AND OTHERS

.....

Mr. Debarshi Brahma, Adv.
Mr. Subarna Bank, Adv.

... For Petitioner

Mr. Madhu Jana, Adv.
Mr. Rahul Agarwala, Adv.

... For State

Ms. Tanuka Basu, Adv.
Ms. Tripti Ghosh, Adv.

... For Respondent No.6

1. Affidavit-of-service filed on behalf of petitioner is taken on record.

2. Learned advocate representing petitioner alleges overt-action on the part of the concerned police authority and it is submitted that unnecessarily petitioner is being called by the Investigating Officer while investigating Narendrapur Police Station Case No.761 of 2025 dated 28th June, 2025. Petitioner prays for direction which will restrain the concerned police authority from harassing him.

3. State respondents and respondent no.6 are represented by learned advocates.

4. Learned advocate representing respondent no.6 submits that prior to transfer of vehicle from respondent no.7 to present petitioner, one complaint was lodged by respondent no.6 giving rise to Narendrapur Police Station Case No.761 of 2025 dated

28th June, 2025. It is further submitted that respondent no.6 never sold the vehicle to the present petitioner through respondent no.7 and sale proceeds were never received by the respondent no.6.

5. Learned advocate representing State respondents has filed a communication dated 8th October, 2026 of Inspector-in-Charge, Narendrapur Police Station and same is taken on record. Copies of the said communication are made over to the learned advocates representing petitioner and respondent no.6.

6. It is disclosed in the communication dated 8th October, 2026 that a complaint was lodged by respondent no.6 alleging illegal and fraudulent transfer of her vehicle by respondent no.7 to present petitioner, based on which aforesaid criminal prosecution was initiated. During course of investigation, it was found that in connection with resale of said vehicle to the petitioner Form-29 was filled up containing signature of respondent no.6 which is suspected to be forged as it was intimated by respondent no.6 to the Investigating Officer.

7. For ascertaining whether the signature of respondent no.6, which appears in Form-29, is correct or forged, original Form-29 needs to be obtained by the Investigating Officer for sending the same to the concerned authority for signature verification.

8. Since it is found that respondent no.6 has lodged a complaint against respondent no.7 for illegal sale of vehicle of respondent no.6 to the present petitioner, issue needs to be investigated.

9. In connection with aforesaid criminal prosecution, Investigating Officer shall be at liberty to interrogate present petitioner by issuing proper notice to him.

10. If it is found that original Form-29 is not lying with the petitioner, in that event, Investigating Officer shall also be at liberty to approach the concerned authority of Regional Transport Office for procuring the same in order to verify the signature of respondent no.6 containing therein.

11. With the aforesaid observation writ petition stands disposed of.

12. Parties to act on the server copy of this order duly downloaded from the official website of this court.

(SAUGATA BHATTACHARYYA, J.)