

01.08.2025.
Court No. 13
Item No. 1
sp

WPCRC 123 of 2025
In
W.P.A. No. 18426 of 2021

Sandhya Mistri
Versus
Shri Santanu Mondal, Inspector-in-charge, Tamluk
Police Station & Anr.

Mr. Satadal Sovan Halder.

...For the applicant.

Mr. Sirsanya Bandopadhyay, Id. Sr. Standing Counsel
Mr. Akash Dutta.

..for the alleged contemnors.

1. The alleged contemnors are present in Court.\
2. Mr. Sirsanya Bandopadhyay, learned counsel appearing for the alleged contemnors submits that initially a different contempt application apparently bearing signature of the learned advocate for the applicant Mr. Satadal Sovan Halder containing 13 paragraphs was served on the office of the S.P., Purba Medinipur. Comparing the said signature with that of the contempt application in the records of this Court, this Court finds that the same is forged. The actual contempt application in the records of this Court contains 19 paragraphs and comprises 27 pages. 16 pages out of which is the text of the application and the rest are annexures.
3. This Court is of the view that the matter requires appropriate investigation as to who has forged the

signature of Mr. Satadal Sovan Halder, his clerk and that of the petitioner.

4. Let an FIR be registered by the Hare Street Police Station through its outpost at the High Court and an appropriate report be submitted before this Court on the adjourned date.

5. In so far as the principal application is concerned, two affidavits have been received from the Officers-in-Charge, Tamluk Police Station. The first of which is by the erstwhile I/C, Santanu Mondal who has since been transferred. The second affidavit is filed by the current I/C, Subhash Chandra Ghosh. It appears that the applicant and her son were duly notified of the costs of police picketing and the costs have been deposited.

6. At the request of the S.P., Purba Medinipur, the Additional District Magistrate, L.R. of the District has deputed a land surveyor and the plot of the petitioner has been demarcated.

7. The Tamluk Police Station shall also keep vigil in the said premises so that no untoward incident takes place.

8. In view of the above, this Court finds no contempt has been committed by the alleged contemnors.

9. The personal presence of the alleged contemnors is dispensed with. Rule, if any, shall stand discharged.

10. However, the contempt application is kept pending to receive the report from the Hare Street Police Station as directed hereinabove.

11. List the matter on 3rd September, 2025.
12. All parties are directed to act on a server copy of this order duly downloaded from the official website of this Court.

(Rajasekhar Mantha, J.)