

**CALCUTTA HIGH COURT**  
*In the Circuit Bench at Jalpaiguri*  
Criminal Miscellaneous Jurisdiction

Before:

**The Hon'ble Mr. Justice Jay Sengupta**

**C.R.R. 18 of 2024**

Sri Anil Chandra Barman  
Vs.  
The State of West Bengal

For the Petitioner : Ms. Suman Sehanabis (Mandal)  
Mr. Salok Sah  
Ms. Anwesh Chakraborty

For the State : Mr. Aditi Shankar Chakraborty  
Mr. Subhasish Misra

Last heard on : 18.03.2026

Judgement delivered on : 18.03.2026

**Jay Sengupta, J. :**

This is an application praying for expeditious disposal of a proceeding in which charge-sheet was submitted under Sections 147/148/149/324 and 302 of the Penal Code.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is one of the 80 persons made accused in this case. The FIR was registered being Dinhata Police Station Case No.26 of 1987 dated July 15, 1987. A charge-sheet was submitted against the accused on 10.12.1990. On 19.07.2019, this Court passed an order directing the jurisdictional court to commit the

matter to the Sessions Court. On some pretext or the other, the matter got dragged and the case was not committed to the Sessions Court. It appears that some of the accused remained absconding and warrant of arrest had to be issued against them. For this, the present petitioner cannot suffer. He is not even getting pension after retirement because of pendency of this case.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State submits that it would be for the interest of justice that the criminal proceeding be expedited.

It is, indeed, a very unfortunate case where although the FIR was lodged in 1987 and a charge-sheet was submitted far back in 1990, the matter could not even be committed to the Sessions Court. This is despite the fact that in 2019, there was a specific direction passed by this Court to do the needful in this regard.

In view of the above and in the interest of justice, learned jurisdictional court is directed to conclude the proceeding regarding commitment of the case to the Sessions Court, preferably within a period of six weeks from the date of communication of this order, after complying with necessary formalities and if necessary, splitting up the proceedings as against the appearing accused. The Sessions Court would thereafter take necessary steps to expedite the proceeding and conclude it in accordance with law and as expeditiously as possible without granting any unnecessary adjournment to any of the parties.

With these observations and directions, the revisional application is disposed of.

Urgent photostat certified copy of this order may be supplied to the parties expeditiously, if applied for.

**(Jay Sengupta, J.)**