

PREFACE

Form A

IN THE COURT OF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE (1 st CLASS), BONGAON, NORTH 24 PARGANAS	
<i>Present: -</i> Dr. Sourav Subba, W.B.J.S. Judicial Magistrate, (1st Class), Bongaon, North 24 Parganas JO Code (UID No)-WB01041 Date of the Judgment: 02.06.2026 G. R Case No. 2594 of 2018 T. R No. 826 of 2022 CNR No. WBNP 07-005230-2022 [Bongaon P. S. Case No. 590 of 2018 dated 09.08.2018 punishable under Sec. 341/323/325/34 of the <i>Indian Penal Code, 1860 (Act No. 45 of 1860)</i>]	
COMPLAINANT	State of West Bengal
REPRESENTED BY	Md. Alfazur Rahaman, Ld. A.P.P.
ACCUSED	1) Haradhan @ Aradhan Paul, S/O- Lt. Dhiren Paul, Male, Age- Years; 2) Sukumar Paul, S/O Sannyashi Paul, Male, Age- Years; and 3) Bina Paul WO Haradhan Paul @ Aradhan Paul, Female, Age- Years, all are the residents of Vill.- Ghatbour, P. O & P. S. Bongaon, Dist. North 24 Parganas
REPRESENTED BY	Mr. Debasish Biswas

FORM B

Date of Offence	08.08.2018
Date of FIR	09.08.2018
Date of Charge sheet	08.10.2018
Date of Framing of Charges	11.08.2023
Date of commencement of Evidence	14.05.2026
Date on which Judgment is reserved	N/A
Date of the Judgment	02.06.2026
Date of the Sentencing Order, if any	N/A

Accused details: -

Rank of Accused	Name of the Accused	Date of arrest	Date of release on Bail	Offences charged with	Whether acquitted or convicted	Sentence imposed	Period of Detention Undergone during Trial for purpose of Sec. 428, Cr.P.C.
A-1	Haradhan @ Aradhan Paul	N/A	22.11.2018	under Sec. 341/323/325/34 of the <i>Indian Penal Code, 1860</i>	Acquitted	N/A	N/A
A-2	Sukumar Paul	N/A	22.11.2018	under Sec. 341/323/325/34 of the <i>Indian Penal Code, 1860</i>	Acquitted	N/A	N/A
A-3	Bina Paul	N/A	22.11.2018	under Sec. 341/323/325/34 of the <i>Indian Penal Code, 1860</i>	Acquitted	N/A	N/A

Form C

LIST OF PROSECUTION / DEFENCE / COURT WITNESSES

A. Prosecution Witnesses: -

RANK	NAME	NATURE OF EVIDENCE (EYE WITNESS, POLICE WITNESS, EXPERT WITNESS, MEDICAL WITNESS, PANCH WITNESS, OTHER WITNESS)
PW-1	Laxmi Paul	(De-facto complainant cum victim)
PW-2	Chiranjeet Paul	(Grandson)
PW-3		
PW-4		

B. Defense Witnesses, if any: -

RAN	NAME	NATURE OF EVIDENCE
-----	------	--------------------

K		(EYE WITNESS, POLICE WITNESS, EXPERT WITNESS, MEDICAL WITNESS, PANCH WITNESS, OTHER WITNESS)
DW 1		
DW 2		

C. Court Witnesses, if any: -

RANK	NAME	NATURE OF EVIDENCE (EYE WITNESS, POLICE WITNESS, EXPERT WITNESS, MEDICAL WITNESS, PANCH WITNESS, OTHER WITNESS)
CW 1		
CW 2		

LIST OF PROSECUTION / DEFENCE / COURT EXHIBITS

A. Prosecution:

Sr. No.	Exhibit Number	Description
1.	Exhibit No. P-1/PW-1	Sign. Of PW-1 in written F.I.R.
2,	Exhibit P-2/PW-2	

B. Defense:

Sr. No.	Exhibit Number	Description
1	Exhibit D-1 /DW1	
2	Exhibit D-2 / DW2	

C. Court Exhibits: -

Sr. No.	Exhibit Number	Description
1	Exhibit C-1 /CW1	
2	Exhibit C-2 / CW2	

D. Material Objects: -

Sr. No.	Material Object Number	Description
1	MO 1	
2	MO 2	

JUDGMENT

BRIEF FACTS OF THE CASE: -

1. Facts of the prosecution case in brief is that on 09.08.2018 at about 10:15 hrs. one Smt. Laxmi Paul, W/O Lt. Dhiren Paul, resident of Vill.- Ghatbour, P. O. & P. S. Bongaon, Dist. North 24 Parganas came to Bongaon police station and thereby lodged a written F.I.R. against accused persons namely, 1) Haradhan @ Aradhan Paul, S/O- Lt. Dhiren Paul, Male, Age- Years; 2) Sukumar Paul, S/O Sannyashi Paul, Male, Age- Years; and 3) Bina Paul WO Haradhan Paul @ Aradhan Paul, Female, Age- Years, all are the residents of Vill.- Ghatbour, P. O & P. S. Bongaon, Dist. North 24 Parganas to the effect that on 08.08.2018 at about 20:25 hrs. all the accused persons wrongfully restrained her and her father and thereby abused them in filthy languages due to previous grudges. When she raised objection, all the accused persons assaulted him with fists and blows and his father with a *lathi* as a result of which he also received grievous injury in his head. On hue and cry local people came to the spot and the accused persons fled away. Later on, the victim was admitted in local hospital.

REGISTRATION OF CASE & INVESTIGATION: -

2. On the basis of said written F.I.R., Bongaon P. S. Case No. 590 of 2018 dated 09.08.2018 punishable under Sec. 341/323/325/34 of the *Indian Penal Code, 1860 (Act No. 45 of 1860)* was registered/started. Accordingly, the then Officer-in-charge (O/C) of said P. S. also endorsed Mr.Biswajit Ghosh, Sub-Inspector (S. I.) of West

Bengal police and posted in said P. S. as an Investigation Officer (I.O.) of this case and he started the investigation into the case.

3. In the meantime, all the accused persons voluntarily surrendered before the court of Ld. Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Bongaon and thereby were enlarged on bail on 22.11.2018 by the order of the Ld. Court.

4. During investigation the concerned I.O. visited the P.O (Place of occurrence) and prepared an index and rough sketch map, collected injury reports and other relevant materials, recorded statements of available witnesses and F.I.R named accused persons under Sec. 161 of the *Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973*. During investigation it was also found that the above-named accused persons are behind the said incident and accordingly a *prima facie* case under Sec. 341/323/325/34 of the *Indian Penal Code, 1860* has also been well established against the accused persons. Accordingly, Charge Sheet has also been filed against the accused persons by the concerned I. O. of Bongaon P. S. vide Charge Sheet No. 820/2018 dated 08.10.2018 before the court of Ld. Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Bongaon on 22.11.2018. Accordingly, cognizance in the offences was also taken by the Ld. Court.

SUPPLY OF COPY OF POLICE REPORT & OTHER DOCUMENTS: -

5. The copies of police report along with other relevant documents or relevant extract thereof forwarded to the Magistrate with the police report under Sec. 173 of the *Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973* were furnished to the accused persons, free of cost in compliance with the provision of Sec. 207 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. Ultimately, case record was transferred to this court for disposal.

FRAMING OF CHARGE: -

6. That after appearance of the both accused persons before this court the charge was framed against them on 11.08.2023 under Sec. 341/323/325/34 of the *Indian Penal Code, 1860*. The contents of charge were read over and explained to the accused persons in *Bengali* language to which they each pleaded not guilty by saying “*Aami Nirdosh*” and claimed to be tried. Hence, the trial initiated.

EVIDENCE: -

7. The prosecution's evidence was started on and from 14.05.2026. During course of trial the prosecution adduced in total only 2 witnesses, who were examined-in-chief and cross-examined. The prosecution also produced 1 documentary evidence before the court to prove their case.

(A) THE ORAL EVIDENCE: -

8. The oral evidence adduced by the prosecution in the instant case are as follows: -

- (i) Laxmi Paul (De-facto complainant cum victim) as PW-1; &
- (ii) Chiranjeet Paul (Grandson) as PW-2.

(B) THE DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE: -

9. The prosecution also produced 1 documentary evidence before the court to prove their case which is as:-

- (i) Sign. Of PW-1 in written F.I.R.Exhibit No. P-1/PW-1.

EXAMINATION OF ACCUSED PERSONS UNDER SEC. 313 OF THE CODE OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE: -

10. On closure of prosecution evidence, the accused persons were also examined by the court on 02.06.2026 under Sec. 313 of the Cr. P. C. The questions were read over and explained to them in the language convenient for them to understand to which they pleaded innocence throughout and declined to give any evidence on their behalf.

DEFENSE CASE: -

11. The defense case is simply denial of the case of prosecution. Thus, it is the specific defense of the accused persons that they never committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution.

ARGUMENT: -

12. Accordingly, heard argument from both the Ld. Advocate for defense and Ld. Assistant Public Prosecutor for the state of West Bengal on 02.06.2026.

13. According to my above-mentioned discussions the following points have been raised for determination: -

POINTS FOR DETERMINATION: -

(i) Whether the accused persons have wrongfully restrained the de-facto complainant and thereby have committed an offence in this case punishable under Sec. 341/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 as alleged by the prosecution or not?

(ii) Whether the accused persons have voluntarily caused hurt to the de-facto complainant and thereby have committed an offence in this case punishable under Sec. 323/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 as alleged by the prosecution or not?

(iii) Whether the accused persons have voluntarily caused grievous hurt to the mother-in-law of de-facto complainant and thereby have committed an offence in this case punishable under Sec. 325/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 as alleged by the prosecution or not?

(iv) Whether the prosecution has been able to prove its case beyond a reasonable doubt or not?

DECISION WITH REASON: -

14. Before determination of these points or discussing the instant case on merit and its fate with the appreciation of appropriate evidences I here feel necessary to mention the relevant and substantial provisions of penal law as contained in the *Indian Penal Code, 1860* wherein the present accused persons in the instant case are booked into by the prosecution. These punitive provisions are as follows:-

Sec. 341. Punishment for wrongful restraint. -

Whoever wrongfully restrains any person shall be punished with simple imprisonment for a term which may extend to one month, or with fine which may extend to five hundred rupees, or with both.

Sec. 323. Punishment for voluntarily causing hurt. -

Whoever, except in the case provided for by section 334, voluntarily causes hurt, shall be punished with imprisonment of either description for a term which may extend to one year, or with fine which may extend to one thousand rupees, or with both.

Sec. 325. Punishment for voluntarily causing grievous hurt.-

Whoever, except in the case provided for by section 335, voluntarily

causes grievous hurt, shall be punished with imprisonment of either description for a term which may extend to seven years, and shall also be liable to fine.

Sec. 34. Acts done by several persons in furtherance of common intention. -

When a criminal act is done by several persons in furtherance of the common intention of all, each of such persons is liable for that act in the same manner as if it were done by him alone.

15. Now, I would like to discuss and determine in detail the above mentioned four points or merit of the instant case on the basis of the oral and documentary evidence as adduced and produced by the prosecution.

(a) Point No. (i)

(i) Whether the accused persons have wrongfully restrained the de-facto complainant in this case and thereby have committed an offence punishable under Sec. 341/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 as alleged by the prosecution or not?

16. As mentioned above the prosecution in the instant case in total adduced only 2 oral evidence who were examined-in-chief and cross-examined and also produce 1 documentary evidence before the court.

(a) Arguments submitted by Ld. A.P.P.: -

17. I also heard the arguments as submitted by both the Ld. Advocates for defense and Ld. Assistant Public Prosecutor for the state. The Ld. A.P.P argued and submitted before the court that it is ostensibly clear and conclusively proved from the content of both the oral and documentary evidences as adduced and produced by the prosecution that the accused persons have committed offences as alleged by the prosecution in the case. Therefore, here the accused persons at this stage cannot escape from their criminal liability in the instant case for the offence committed by them. So, this is the fit case to be convicted under Sec. 341/323/325/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860.

(b) Arguments submitted by Ld. defense counsel: -

18. During the course of argument, the Ld. Advocate for the defense also argued

and submitted before the court that in the instant case the accused persons have been falsely implicated in the Charge under Sec. 341/323/325/34 of the *Indian Penal Code, 1860*, by the prosecution. He furthermore submitted before the court that in the instant case same being a criminal case, the total and absolute manner of burden of proving the *factum* of offence during whole judicial proceeding lies upon the prosecution. Besides then these, here the independent witnesses were though adduced by the prosecution but did not support the case of the prosecution. So, here the case of the prosecution fails in this respect. Hence, the criminal liability of the accused persons here does not arise in this case. Lastly, he submitted and prayed before the court for the acquittal of the accused persons in the instant case from the allegation as alleged by the prosecution and he furthermore submitted before the court to consider this matter as the court may deem it fit and proper.

(c) Court's observation: -

19. Thus, I heard the arguments as submitted by both the Ld. Advocate for the defense and Ld. A.P.P for the prosecution at length and also perused the oral and documentary evidences as adduced and produced by the prosecution. Here, the defense did not adduce their witnesses nor produced any documentary evidence. So, whatever the fate of the case would be on the basis of the oral and documentary evidences as adduced and produced from the side of the prosecution. However, here I would like to draw a lineal differentiation or defer from the submission as made by the Ld. defense counsel regarding the burden of proving a criminal case or *onus probandi* in absolute manner lies upon the prosecution. At present, there is a gradual decrease/change over the theory of proving a criminal case in absolute manner by the prosecution. Therefore, in modern times, such a theory no longer exists and proving of a criminal case by the prosecution beyond a reasonable doubt also depends upon the facts and circumstances of each of the cases as per the observation made by our Hon'ble Supreme Court in several cases. In this regard at this stage, I recall a beautiful and landmark judgment pronounced by the Hon'ble Apex Court which was duly reported in the case of ***State of West Bengal Vs. Orilal Jaiswal and Anr. (1994) 1 SCC 73: (AIR 1994 SC 1418)***. In the said solemn judgment the Hon'ble Court has observed as under:

"We are not oblivious that in a criminal trial the degree of proof is stricter than what is required in the civil proceedings. In a criminal trial however, intriguing may be facts and circumstances of the case, the charges made against the accused must be proved beyond all reasonable doubts and the requirement of proof cannot lie in the realm of surmises and conjectures. The requirement of proof beyond reasonable doubt does not stand altered..... Although, the court's conscience must be satisfied that the accused is not held guilty when

there are reasonable doubts about the complicity of the accused in respect of the offences alleged, it should be borne in mind that there is no absolute standard for proof in a criminal trial and the question whether the charges made against the accused have been proved beyond all reasonable doubts must depend upon the facts and circumstances of the case and the quality of the evidences adduced in the case and the materials placed on record. Lord Denning in Bater v. Bater (1950) 2 All ER 458, 459 has observed that the doubt must be of a reasonable man and the standard adopted must be a standard adopted by a reasonable and just man for coming to a conclusion considering the particular subject-matter." (Para 14)

20. Therefore, to determine the instant point or fate of the case I hereby would also like to visit oral and documentary evidence as adduced and produced by the prosecution.

21. In this respect I perused the deposition made by the prosecution witnesses. Perusing the deposition, it appears to me that out of total 8 Charge sheeted witnesses, only 2 were adduced by the prosecution. Here, the *de-facto* complainant cum victim in the case was adduced as PW-1 and an her husband as PW-2. However, both of them did not support and corroborate the case of the prosecution. They both could not say the exact date, month and year and *factum* and manner of commission of offences. Therefore, they both did not say anything about the *factum* of wrongful restrained in the case. The offence of wrongful restrain can only be proved by oral evidence and not by any documentary evidence and which are lacking in the case. Here despite repeated summons remaining charge sheeted witnesses did not turn up before the court including the I.O and main victim in the case. The case is old which was filed in the year 2012 and which is more than 10 years. Bongaon is near to Indo-Bangladesh boarder and a highly sensitive and crime prone area occurring several kinds and nature of crimes every day. This is increasing tendency and not decreasing. On the other hand, my court is single court of Judicial Magistrate for entire sub-division and already overburdened with more than 14 thousand pending cases. The Constitution of India in its Art. 39-A r/w Art. 21 enshrines the very object and purpose of equal justice and free legal aid to common litigants which also includes speedy delivery of justice at door steps. In such premise, if I do not take abrupt initiatives for reducing the number of pending cases more particularly cases of 10 years and old without compromising with the merits of the case, I think sooner or later there will be a serious problem in coming future and it may collapse over its own weight. Hence, ultimately for the speedy justice and disposal of unsurmountable numbers of backlog of cases pending before my court and before the subordinate judiciary in the state of West Bengal in general and considering the guidelines given by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **Raj Deo Sharma vs. State of Bihar**, AIR 1998 SC 3281; 1998 AIR SCW 3208 and

also as per submission made by the Ld. A.P.P that he does not want to adduce further witnesses in the case, the prosecution evidence was closed.

22. In the case of *Nizamuddin Ansari v. State of Jharkhand*, AIR Online 2019 Jha. 1300 the Hon'ble Jharkhand High Court while assessing the presence of commission of offence under Sec. 341 of I.P.C. was pleased to hold that in the case of wrongful restraint informant must take name of accused as member of the unlawful assembly and in case of prosecution failing to establish participation of accused in the alleged occurrence, accused is entitled to benefit of doubt.

23. Accordingly, I hold the considered view that the contention and allegation of the prosecution that the accused persons have wrongfully restrained the *de-facto* complainant in this case and thereby have committed an offence punishable under Sec. 341/34 of the *Indian Penal Code, 1860* as alleged by the prosecution has not been proved by the prosecution.

(b) Point No. (ii):-

(ii) Whether the accused persons have voluntarily caused hurt to the de-facto complainant and thereby have committed an offence in this case punishable under Sec. 323/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 as alleged by the prosecution or not?

24. Now, for the point No. (ii) *i. e.* whether the accused persons have voluntarily caused hurt to the *de-facto* complainant in this case and thereby have committed an offence punishable under Sec. 323/34 of the *Indian Penal Code, 1860* as alleged by the prosecution or not? Here, as because issue No. (i) *i.e.* commission of offence of wrongful restrained by the accused persons in the case is not proved by the prosecution. Thus, offence of voluntarily causing hurt under Sec. 323 of I.P.C. to her by the accused persons in the case also does not leg to stand. Besides than these, there is also absence of any sufficient oral and documentary evidence regarding the commission of this offence in the case. Accordingly, this point also fails here and so not proved by the prosecution.

25. In respect to allegation of prosecution under Sec. 323 of I.P.C. in the instant case I would like to discuss a judicial decision given by our Hon'ble High Court at Calcutta in the case of *Madhusudan Teli v. State of West Bengal*, 2019 Cr. L.J. 298 which is exactly fit with instant fact and case. In the said case the Hon'ble Court while hearing the matter in appeal was pleased to set aside the order of conviction by the trial court of appellant under Sec. 323 of I.P.C. The divisional bench of the Hon'ble Court has observe as-

“With regard to the incident of assault and sustaining injuries on the person of the de-facto complainant, his wife and parents due to assault by appellant, we find from the record that not a single injury report/medical paper was produced nor any doctor was examined by the prosecution though reportedly all of them sustained bleeding injuries on their head due assault with a 'sabal' and reportedly received treatment in the hospital. The story of assault and sustaining bleeding injury..... do not find corroboration by any medical evidence, not even by any independent witness of the village.....

Therefore, considering the entire facts and circumstances and the evidence on record together with the discussions and observations made hereinabove, we have no hesitation to come to the conclusion that prosecution has failed to prove the commission of offence by the appellant beyond reasonable doubt and as such the conviction of the appellant cannot be sustained.” (Paras 23, 25, 28)

(c) Point No. (iii): -

(iii) Whether the accused persons have voluntarily caused grievous hurt to the wife of de-facto complainant and thereby have committed an offence in this case punishable under Sec. 325/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 as alleged by the prosecution or not?

26. Again, for the point No. (iii) i. e. whether the accused persons have voluntarily caused grievous hurt to the wife of *de-facto* complainant in this case and thereby have committed an offence punishable under Sec. 325/34 of the *Indian Penal Code, 1860* as alleged by the prosecution or not? Here also, as because issue No. (i) i.e. commission of offence of wrongful restrained by the accused persons in the case is not proved by the prosecution. Thus, offence of voluntarily causing grievous hurt under Sec. 325 of I.P.C. to her husband by the accused persons in the case also does not leg to stand. Thus, voluntarily causing grievous hurt to the husband of *de-facto* complainant by the accused persons in the case also does not leg to stand. Here, neither the doctor was adduced as a witness nor was the medical documents or injury report produced before the court. Therefore, the nature of alleged injury inflicted is not known to the court, whether it was a simple or grievous injury or not at all. Thus, there is also absence of any sufficient oral and documentary evidence regarding the commission of this offence in the case. Accordingly, this point also fails here and so not proved by the prosecution.

(d) Point No. (iv): -

(iv) Whether the prosecution has been able to prove its case beyond a reasonable doubt or not?

27. Lastly, here, as because all the above points No. (i), (ii) & (iii) regarding the commission of above alleged offences by the accused persons have not been proved by the prosecution in the case. Therefore, it is also hereby conclusively proved that the prosecution has not been able to prove its case in the instant case beyond a reasonable doubt.

28. The Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of ***Babu Singh v. State of Punjab, 1964(1) Cri. L.J. 566*** while determining the standard of proof to be proved by the prosecution in any criminal case has laid down some fundamental principles of measurement which is still a guiding factor at present day despite elapse of many years of pronouncement of said landmark judgment. The Hon'ble Court laid down as:

"In a criminal trial, the presumption of innocence is a principle of cardinal importance and so, the guilt of the accused must in every case be proved beyond a reasonable doubt. Probabilities however strong and suspicion however grave can never take the place of proof." (Para 21)

29. Similarly, in an aged old case of ***Saraswati Prasad v. Rex, AIR, 1949 Allahabad 412*** the Hon'ble Allahabad High Court has observed as:

"It is true that the burden of establishing any special issue raised by the accused rests upon him, but there is always the burden of the general issue as to the guilt of accused person which always rests upon the prosecution. When the burden of the issue is on the prosecution the case must be proved beyond a reasonable doubt; when, however, the burden of an issue is upon the accused, he is not in general called on to prove it beyond a reasonable doubt, or in default to incur a verdict of guilty; it is sufficient if he succeeds in proving a prima facie case, for then the burden of such issue is shifted to the prosecution which has still to discharge its original and major onus that never shifts, that is, that of establishing on the whole case, the guilt of the accused beyond a reasonable doubt: A.I.R.(20) 1933 Cal. 800, Rel. on." (Para 6)

30. Hence, considering all the aspects and circumstances of the case and also considering aforesaid discussions and judicial decisions it appears that in the instant case the prosecution has miserably been failed to prove its case beyond a reasonable doubt against the accused persons. In result the prosecution case fails and the accused persons are entitled to get an acquittal.

31. Hence it is,

O R D E R E D

That the accused persons namely, 1) Haradhan @ Aradhan Paul, S/O- Lt. Dhiren Paul, Male, Age- Years; 2) Sukumar Paul, S/O Sannyashi Paul, Male, Age- Years; and 3) Bina Paul WO Haradhan Paul @ Aradhan Paul, Female, Age- Years, all are the residents of Vill.- Ghatbour, P. O & P. S. Bongaon, Dist. North 24 Parganas are found ***not guilty*** in this case for the offences punishable under Sec. 341/323/325/34 of the *Indian Penal Code, 1860* and they are hereby ***acquitted*** under Sec. 248(1) of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

32. The accused persons are set free from the charge and they are also released from their bail bonds.

33. The concerned surety/sureties is/are also discharged from his/their liability.

34. The surety amount be exhausted and inform Surety accordingly.

35. The case is disposed of in contested form.

36. Note in the Germane Register/Trial Register.

37. Let the soft copy of this judgment be uploaded in the CIS within 48 hours from this day as per Rule 186A of the Cr. R. O. of the Hon'ble High Court at Calcutta.

38. The victim/victims in the case is/are in liberty to prefer an appeal before the Ld. Appellate Court as per provision of Sec. 372 of the Cr. P. C. against the order of acquittal of the accused person/persons. If necessary, victim/victims can also avail the free legal aid/assistance through the legal services authorities concerned to prefer and prosecute such appeal.

39. Let, a copy of this judgment be sent to DLSA, North 24 Parganas and D. M. North 24 Parganas at once in compliance with the direction of the Hon'ble High Court at Calcutta vide Hon'ble Court's order dated 29.03.2022 in c/w CRA 266 of 2020 with CRAN 1 of 2020.

B.C- II to do needful.

Typed by me

Judicial Magistrate, (1st Class),
Bongaon, North 24 Parganas
JO Code (UID No)-WB01041

(Dr. SOURAV SUBBA)
Judicial Magistrate, (1st Class),
Bongaon, North 24 Parganas
JO Code (UID No)-WB01041