

9.09.2026

Sl. No.: 11.

Court No. 8

ASR

**Calcutta High Court
In The Circuit Bench at Jalpaiguri
Appellate Jurisdiction**

**CO/98/2026
PUBALI GANGULY
VS
AGNIV GANGULY**

Mr. Amartya Basu (VC)

Mr. Binayak Bandopadhyay

... For the Petitioner

Ms. Rima Sarkar

...for the opposite party

1. Both the learned counsel representing the petitioner and the opposite party submits that on 3rd September, 2026, the learned counsel representing the opposite party had submitted that there is no grave dispute between the husband and the wife and the husband is willing to have his wife along with him.
2. So in the second line of the paragraph No. 2 of the order dated 3rd September, 2026 instead of the word 'petitioner' the word **"opposite party"** is to be incorporated.
3. Let the order dated 3rd September, 2026 be modified to such extent and this be made a part of the order dated 3rd September, 2026.
4. The learned counsel representing the petitioner submits that there is no chance of co-habitation as such, the hearing of the Civil Revisional application is taken up.

5. At the midst of the hearing, the learned counsel representing the petitioner/wife submits that they intend to furnish some medical documents in respect of the health of the child and seeks an accommodation for two weeks.
6. Accordingly, the prayer is allowed.
7. Let supplementary affidavit be filed.
8. Accordingly, let the matter appear before the next available Circuit Bench as per the convenience of the Court.

(Supratim Bhattacharyya, J.)