



**HIGH COURT OF TRIPURA
A G A R T A L A**

B.A. No.133 of 2026

Sri Sanjit Das on behalf of accused, Sri Partha Das

..... Petitioner (s)

- V e r s u s -

The State of Tripura

..... Respondent(s)

For the petitioner (s)	:	Mr. J. Bhattacharjee, Adv.
For the Respondent (s)	:	None

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S. DATTA PURKAYASTHA

ORDER

31.07.2026

The matter was heard at length on 17.07.2026.

Thereafter, the matter was listed on 24.07.2026 for further hearing. On that day, learned P.P. was out of station and learned Addl. P.P. prays for adjournment on his behalf.

Accordingly, the matter was listed on 30.07.2026 and on that day, learned P.P. again sought for time on the ground of sudden demise of father of learned Addl. P.P.

Prayer for adjournment was not accepted by this Court as on the previous occasion on the ground of absence of learned P.P, the adjournment was granted and he was earlier representing the State in this case. Thereafter, learned P.P. made his submission that the decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Tarsem Lal vs. Directorate of Enforcement, Jalandhar Zonal Office, Criminal Appeal No.2608 of 2024**, decided on 16.05.2024, as relied on by the petitioner's side was not applicable in this case, rather it was applicable in complaint cases.

Accordingly, I dictated the order in the open Court in presence of both the learned counsel, fixing the date today for pronouncement of the order, as according to decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Pila Pahan @ Peela Pahan and others vs. State of Jharkhand and another,**

Writ Petition (Crl.) No.169 of 2025, as soon as the bail application is heard, the order is required to be pronounced and uploaded on the same day and in the event, the order is reserved, it is required to be pronounced on the next day.

However, while typing out the said order, my stenographer committed mistake and typed the order 'As prayed for, list the matter **tomorrow (31.07.2026)**'. Consequently, in the cause list, the matter was again listed today for hearing but as already hearing was closed and the matter was fixed for pronouncement of order. A supplementary cause list is also published today for fixing the case under the heading of 'pronouncement of CAV judgment/final order'.

Today, accordingly, the order is prepared and pronounced in the open Court. However, after pronouncement of said order, learned counsel, Mr. J. Bhattacharjee submits that as the matter was listed in the hearing column, he actually came prepared with few other decisions of Hon'ble Supreme Court in support of his earlier submission under the impression that the case is listed today for further hearing.

As already the matter was heard at length from the side of Mr. J. Bhattacharjee, learned counsel earlier and the order is also pronounced, no further hearing has been/can be done again.

The judgment as pronounced be kept in the record and it be uploaded accordingly in the website.

JUDGE