

16.09.2025.
23.
Ct.No.7.
as

C.R.R. 3306 of 2025

In the matter of : ***Mamta Hansda.***
.... Petitioner.

Mr. Navanil De,
Mr. Srinjan Ghosh.
...for the Petitioner.

1. This revisional application has been preferred seeking quashing of Special Case No. 62 of 2020 arising out of Bidhannagar (North) Police Station Case No. 291 of 2015 dated 16.11.2015 under Section 409 of the Indian Penal Code, corresponding to G.R. Case No. 1014 of 2015.
2. Mr. De, learned Advocate appearing for the petitioner, submits that initially the petitioner preferred a revisional application before this Court seeking quashing of the proceeding along with the quashing of the order issuing the warrant of proclamation and attachment against the petitioner. He submits that at that time, the petitioner did not make any prayer for quashing of the proceeding itself but questioned whether the order for issuance of the warrant of proclamation and attachment was justified.
3. He submits that the Court ultimately set aside that order issuing the warrant of proclamation and attachment against the petitioner. Subsequently, the petitioner surrendered before the Court and was enlarged on bail.

4. He further submits that the petitioner then filed an application under Section 227 of the Code of Criminal Procedure seeking discharge from the case; however, that application was rejected. Now, in this revisional application, he has challenged the legality of the order rejecting his application under Section 227 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, together with a prayer for quashing of the proceeding.

5. He submits that a complaint was lodged by the bank authority on 31.08.2015, stating that an amount of Rs. 11,37,000/- was found short in physical cash compared to the closing book balance. Based on that complaint, the case was initiated against the petitioner and the cashier of the bank. He submits that there was a delay of two months in lodging the FIR, and that delay has not been properly explained. He further submits that no specific allegation has been leveled against the petitioner in the complaint. He contends that, in view of these developments, continuation of the proceedings against the petitioner would amount to an abuse of the due process of law.

6. Having heard the learned Advocate appearing for the petitioner and upon perusal of the materials on record placed before me, I am of the view that, before taking any decision on this application, an opportunity of hearing should be afforded to the opposite parties.

7. In view thereof, the petitioner is directed to serve a copy of this application, along with all annexures thereto, upon the opposite parties, together with a notice intimating that the matter shall be taken up for hearing on 7th November 2025, and to file an affidavit of service on the returnable date.

8. List the matter for further consideration on 7th November, 2025.

(Partha Sarathi Chatterjee, J.)