

19
(Ct. No. 29)
06.05.2026
(Susanta)

CRR 1881 of 2026
Soumya Mukherjee
Vs.
The State of West Bengal & Anr.

Mr. Biswarup Chatterjee,
Mr. Pritam Sarkar,

...for the petitioner.

Petitioner has prayed for quashing of the G.R. Case No. 1706 of 2025 corresponding to Sessions Case No. 73 of 2026 presently pending before learned Additional District and Sessions Judge, Chandannagar.

Being aggrieved by the aforesaid proceeding, learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that even if the entire allegations made in the F.I.R are taken at their face value, they does not constitute any of the offences alleged in the F.I.R. The allegations of sexual intercourse on the false promise of marriage are inherently improbable, absurd and devoid of material particulars, inasmuch as there was never any subsisting promise of marriage nor any live in relationship nor there is any material to show inducement or deception on the part of the petitioner.

This proceeding has been initiated as a counterblast and retaliatory measure after the petitioner repeatedly refused to entertain the advances of the opposite party no. 2 and protested against irregularities relating to school administration and fund utilization. The allegations relating to monetary transactions and theft of ornaments are bald, omnibus and unsupported by any

documentary proof and are also inherently contradictory in view of the admitted fact that the petitioner obtained housing loan from a bank for construction of his dwelling house.

Therefore, further continuance of the impugned proceeding would be mere abuse of the process of the Court.

Having heard the learned Counsel for the petitioner, the application stands admitted.

Petitioner is directed to serve a copy of application upon the State through the office of the Public Prosecutor, High Court Calcutta and upon the opposite party no. 2 through speed post intimating next date of hearing and to file affidavit-of-service on the returnable date.

Let the matter be listed in the **Monthly List of July, 2026**.

The State is directed to produce the Case Diary on the date fixed.

Petitioner will be at liberty to pray for interim relief, if any, after serving copy to the opposite parties.

(**Dr. Ajoy Kumar Mukherjee, J.**)