

19.01.2026
Ct. No. 30
S.L. No. 24
SM

CO 3982 of 2023
Dr. Asim Bag
Versus
Smt. Soma Halder Bag

Mr. Samrat Goswami (V/C)
Ms. Supriti Sarkhel
Mr. Shwetank S. Prasad
.....for the petitioner
Mr. Aniruddha Chatterjee, sr. adv.
Mr. Iftekar Munshi
.....for the opposite party

1. The Civil Revision has been preferred challenging an order dated 29.04.2023 passed by the learned Additional District Judge, Fast Track 5th Court, Barasat in MAT Suit No. 1884 of 2019.
2. Written notes filed by the petitioner be kept with the record.
3. On hearing the parties and on perusal of the impugned order it appears that the Trial Court duly considered an application filed by the petitioner calling for certain documents.
4. The Trial Court on considering the said prayer, though not made on a proper application held as follows:-

“This is a suit filed by the petitioner against her husband for dissolution of marriage on the ground of cruelty. The respondent has filed written statement denying the allegations and has taken the plea of illicit relation of the petitioner with one Dr. Rajesh. The instant petition has been filed for direction upon the

elder son of the parties namely Avik Bag for direction upon him for disclosing his bank loan particulars and the address of the bank guarantor. It appears that the petition has been filed by the learned lawyer of the respondent without the signature of the respondent which is neither verified nor supported by any affidavit. It is the burden of the respondent to prove his allegations and I do not find any justification of the prayer for direction upon the son for his bank guarantee particulars which is found not relevant to the issues of the suit and neither will that help the respondent to discharge his burden of proof and there is no obligation of the son to supply particulars of his bank guarantor. Moreover the petition without any verification or affidavit also cannot be entertained by the court. Thus, I do not find any merit in the said petition and it is liable to be rejected on that ground as also in the present form and is found to be a frivolous petition.”

5. Considering the said findings, this Court finds that the Trial Court passed a well reasoned order and the same being in accordance with law, requires no interference by this Court.
6. Civil Revision stands dismissed.
7. Trial Court to proceed expeditiously with the suit.

8. Photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be given to the parties on priority basis upon compliance of all formalities.

[Shampa Dutt (Paul). J]