

**CIS-34/2023**  
**ST-02(10)2023**  
**SC-06(08)2023**  
**(J.O.Code-WB00875)**

**Order No. 40**  
**Dated: 06.12.2024.**

Today is fixed for production, appearance, further evidence of PW-1 (CSW-2) and CSW-4.

Three accused persons namely Mithun Naskar, Tarun Naskar and Badal Naskar are produced from J/C and they are represented by their Ld. Counsel.

Four accused persons namely Ratan Naskar, Sujan Naskar, Sannyasi Naskar and Panchanan Mondal are present by filing hazira.

Rest one accused person namely Lakkhi Naskar is present by filing hazira.

Ld. PP in charge namely Sri Dulal Chandra Dolai files hazira for the State along with hazira of Champa Naskar and Saraswati Naskar.

PW-1 (CSW-2) is further examined in chief and cross examined in part for accused Lakkhi Naskar and three others and deferred on filing petition by Ld. Defence Counsel.

During her further examination in chief the five signatures of Champa Naskar in her statement u/s 164 Cr.PC are marked as **Exbt. P-1 (PW-1) collectively.**

Witness Saraswati Naskar be released without examination.

Fix 25.02.2025 for production, appearance, further cross examination of PW-1 (CSW-2).

Prosecution to intimate the next date to PW-1.

At this stage this Court on perusal of order no. 30 knocks Ld. PP in charge regarding the ground of adjournment petition filed by him on 05.12.2024. It is found that on that date the adjournment petition filed by him at later hours of the bail contains vague ground of adjournment. On being asked Ld. PP in charge submits that he intended to mean that as he was busy and was to appear before another Court, so was his prayer for adjournment after part examination in chief of witness. But the adjournment petition filed on that date goes to reflect some other ground which is totally contradictory with the submission of Ld. PP in charge. In stead of writing the ground of adjournment as disclosed by him today, he has written that as the schedule of this Court is packed, so it necessitated him to file the adjournment petition. Such type of tactics adopted by Ld. PP in charge in this case is very shocking and unfortunate as well. As such it is expected that the ground of adjournment which is verbally stated in open Court should be written in the petition and not otherwise and Ld. PP in charge is intimated accordingly.

Dict. & Corr. by me

Additional Sessions Judge, 1st Court  
Kakdwip, South 24 Parganas.

Additional Sessions Judge, 1st Court  
Kakdwip, South 24 Parganas.