

16.02.2026
SL No.10
Court No.29
(gc)

**CRR 4528 of 2025
CRAN 3 of 2025
CRAN 4 of 2026**

**Inmac Computers Limited & Ors.
Vs.
The State of West Bengal & Anr.**

Mr. Sandipan Ganguly, Sr. Adv.,
Mr. Phiroz Edulji, Sr. Adv.,
Mr. Saubhik Mitter,
Mr. Brajesh Jha,
Ms. Surabhi Banerjee,
Mr. Karan Dhudewala,
Mr. Neel Chakraborty,
Ms. Anushka Ghosh

....For the Petitioners.

Mr. Debasish Roy, Ld. P.P.,
Mr. Suman Dey,
Miss Nahid Ahmed

....For the State.

Mr. Shasank Deo Sudhi,
Ms. Preetu Chaudhary

....For the Opposite Party No.2.

Re: CRAN 4 of 2026

Affidavit-of-service filed on behalf of the petitioners is taken on record.

This is an application wherein the petitioners are aggrieved by the order dated 9th February, 2026 by which the Court below had issued warrant of arrest against the petitioners. It is submitted on behalf of the petitioners that on 25th September, 2025, the petitioners were granted bail by the Trial Court and the next date was fixed on 4th December, 2025 for appearance. On 4th December, 2025, at first, an order was written fixing 24th February, 2026 for appearance of accused on bail but that

portion was subsequently scratched by the Court below and next date was fixed on 29th January, 2026 for appearance of the accused persons. On 29th January, 2026, the petitioners were found absent and for which sureties were directed to produce the accused persons on the next date, i.e., on 9th February, 2026 and on that day, i.e., 9th February, 2026 when the petitioners were again found absent, the Court below issued warrant of arrest against the petitioners.

Being aggrieved by the said order, learned Counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners understanding was that the next date would be on 24th February, 2026 but without any notice, the Trial Court after scratching the earlier order has fixed 29th January, 2026 as the next date without notice which the petitioners were not aware and for which they could not take step on 9th February, 2026. Therefore, the issuance of warrant by the Court below without considering the said fact is bad in law and required to be stayed.

Learned Counsel for the opposite party no.2 submits that the Court below has not committed any mistake in issuing warrant of arrest against the petitioners since the petitioners were found absent on call on the respective dates. There is nothing illegality in the order impugned and, therefore, is not required to be intervened by this High Court.

I have considered the submissions made by both the parties. It appears from record that the petitioners herein have prayed for quashing the impugned proceeding being CRR 4528 of 2025 which is fixed tomorrow for hearing.

Having considered that the petitioners have made out an arguable case in respect of their non-appearance on the dates fixed, the impugned order dated 9th February, 2026 which pertains to issuance of warrant of arrest against the present petitioners is hereby stayed for a period of four weeks from date or until further order, whichever is earlier.

Accordingly, CRAN 4 of 2026 is disposed of.

(Dr. Ajoy Kumar Mukherjee, J.)