IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA

CRIMINAL REVISIONAL JURISDICTION

Appellate Side

Present:

The Hon'ble Justice Ajay Kumar Gupta

C.R.R. No. 3501 of 2022

With

CRAN 3 of 2023 & CRAN 4 of 2023

Md. Rafikul Islam & Ors.

Versus

The State of West Bengal & Another

For the Petitioners	:	Mr. Ayan Bhattacharya, Ld. Sr. Adv. Mr. Pratip Mukherjee, Adv. Mr. Sk. Md. Ismail, Adv. Mr. Sk. Md. Jayed, Adv.
For the Opposite Party No. 2	:	Mr. Moyukh Mukherjee, Adv. Mr. Abhijit Singh, Adv. Ms. Sagnika Banerjee, Adv. Ms. Sarmistha Basak, Adv.
For the State	:	Mr. Kallol Mondal, Ld. P.P. Mr. Anamitra Banerjee, Adv.
Heard on	:	01.09.2026
Judgment on	:	15.10.2026
Uploaded on	:	15.10.2026

Ajay Kumar Gupta, J.:

1. The petitioners/accused persons preferred the instant application under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (in short, 'Cr.P.C.') praying for quashing of the proceedings being Nimta P.S. Case No. 885/2021 dated 27.11.2021 under Sections 419/420/498A/323/313/416/120B/506/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 pending before the Court of the Learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Barrackpore including the order dated 25.11.2021 passed in M.P. Case No. 2386/2021.

2. The facts leading to the filing of the instant application are that the opposite party no. 2/de facto complainant, filed an application under Section 156(3) Cr.P.C. before the learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Barrackpore, being Case No. 2386 of 2021. She alleged that accused no. 1/petitioner no. 1 herein, a Police Constable attached to Labpur Police Station, along with accused nos. 2 to 11, who are his family members, and accused no. 12, his associate, conjointly committed offences against her.

3. Allegedly around the end of 2016, she became acquainted with petitioner no. 1, Md. Rafikul Islam, who falsely introduced himself as "Rajib Sarkar" and in disguise of an issue related to purchase of a certain item from the shop where she was an employee, obtained her phone number and thereafter pursued her constantly. He

represented himself as a Hindu and a bachelor, and told her that he was a police constable posted at Belguma Police Line, Purulia, and later that he had been transferred to Hatkalua camp attached to Labpur Police Station. Though initially unwilling, he convinced her with his persistence, flowery words and promises, and subsequent threats of suicide, and she eventually fell in love with him. He proposed marriage and promised a happy married life, and she agreed to his proposal.

4. The complainant alleges that, during the courtship, they had been physically intimate with each other on various occasions and at various places on the promise of marriage, while continuing to represent himself as a Hindu bachelor. He used to visit her residence within the jurisdiction of Nimta P.S., where the said acts had taken place. Unaware of his true identity, she agreed to marry him. In or about May 2021, he married her in a temple at Digha, according to Hindu rites and applied vermilion on her forehead to make her believe that she had become his wife. Immediately after the ceremony, he took her to Hotel Cozy Inn, Digha. They continued to share physical relations after marriage. Eventually, they moved to a rented accommodation at Bardhaman to live as a married couple, as Petitioner no. 1 stated that it was close to his workplace. Despite her

repeated requests, he did not take her to his home or introduce her to his family.

5. One day she accepted a call on his phone from a woman who claimed to be his wife. On being confronted, he accepted the same, and she then learnt that his real name is Md. Rafikul Islam, that he is a Muslim by religion, and that he was already married and that, from the earlier wedlock, he has two daughters. When she asked him why he had done this, he grinned and gave no answer, from which she realised that the deception was intentional and that she had been cheated and used for his sexual gratification. Deeply distressed, she expressed her intention to meet his actual family and to return to her own family. He became infuriated, began assaulting her regularly with fists, blows and kicks, and forcibly confined her at the Bardhaman residence. After his identity came to light, his attitude changed, and he tortured her regularly to silence her. During that period, he also had sexual intercourse with her against her will despite her resistance. She continued to bear such torture on a regular basis.

6. In the meantime, she allegedly became pregnant, and kept insisting that he introduce her to his family and allow her to return to her home at Dum Dum. Upon learning of such pregnancy, he agreed to take her to Murshidabad. They reached his residence on 09.07.2021,

where the other accused persons were present. When he introduced her and disclosed her pregnancy, accused nos. 2 to 11, together with accused no. 1, without provocation, assaulted her with fists, blows, kicks and a lathi, and even tried to strangle her with a saree. She sustained multiple injuries and bled profusely. She was rescued by some passers-by and taken to Khargram Hospital, and was thereafter admitted to NRS Hospital, where she learnt that she had allegedly miscarried as a consequence of the attack.

7. After recovering, when she went to lodge a complaint, she was kept waiting for long hours at Labpur P.S., and her complaint was refused because accused no. 1 was allegedly attached to that station. Upon becoming aware of her efforts, accused no. 1 threatened her with dire consequences. She thereafter lodged a written complaint dated 22.11.2021 with the Officer-in-Charge, Nimta P.S., narrating the entire incident and requesting immediate action; however, no action was taken against him and the other accused persons.

8. Having no alternative, she moved the application under Section 156(3) Cr.P.C. before the learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Barrackpore, who took cognizance and forwarded the complaint to the O.C., Nimta P.S., for investigation. This resulted in the registration of Nimta P.S. Case No. 885/2021 dated 27.11.2021 under Sections 419/420/498A/323/313/416/120B/506/34 of the

Indian Penal Code against the petitioners. Aggrieved by the initiation of the said proceeding, the petitioners have filed this revisional application seeking the reliefs aforesaid. Hence, this application.

SUBMISSION ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONERS:

9. Learned senior counsel, Mr. Bhattacharya, appearing for the petitioners, submitted that the entire story of the de facto complainant is concocted, false and fabricated. The de facto complainant, being a gold digger, had initiated a friendly relationship with the petitioner no. 1 herein and, with the advent of time, knowing fully well that the petitioner no. 1 is a government servant and police personnel, grew closeness with him.

10. It is the specific case of the petitioners herein that the petitioner no. 1 was never aware of the fact that the de facto complainant herein was a married woman and is also the mother of a male child. Such fact was always concealed by her and only came to light when the petitioner no. 1 exercised due diligence after developing a suspicion regarding her whereabouts and behaviour. However, upon being confronted with such facts, the relationship between the petitioner no. 1 and the de facto complainant soured. Thereafter, the said complainant started to blackmail the petitioner no. 1 and extort money. As a consequence of failing to pay her, she threatened to lodge a false criminal case against the petitioner no. 1 and his family

members. Initially, the petitioner, considering his loss of reputation and the well-being of his aged family members, had succumbed to the pressure of the complainant and gave her money. However, when the petitioner ran out of cash and refused to pay any further, the de facto complainant lodged a false complaint arraigning the petitioner no. 1, along with his family.

11. It was further submitted that the de facto complainant herein has completely deceived petitioner no. 1, who had all along represented herself as an unmarried woman and completely in love with the petitioner no. 1. Furthermore, any physical intimacy between the parties was consensual.

12. It was further submitted that during his courtship with the opposite party no. 2 herein, she never became pregnant and, as such the statements made in the complaint are false and are only made to attract Section 313 of the Indian Penal Code. From the written complaint it would appear that no valid marriage between the parties has been solemnised; therefore, Section 498A of the Indian Penal Code is also not applicable against the petitioners herein.

13. It was further submitted that it is the de facto complainant who has committed fraud upon the petitioner no. 1 herein by suppressing the actual facts that she is married and is mother of a child. Furthermore, it is almost an unbelievable story that the de facto

complainant, knowing fully well that the petitioner no. 1 is a government servant and working as a police constable, could not hide his actual religion or name for five years even if the FIR story is taken as a gospel truth. Such allegations are frivolous and are merely an endeavour to attract sections 419 and 420 of the Indian Penal Code.

14. It was further submitted that the petitioner nos. 2 to 11 herein have never seen or met with the de-facto complainant herein and, as such, they are in no way connected with the instant criminal case and unaware of their affair or relationship. The complainant never visited the house of the petitioner no. 1, nor was tortured by them. The petitioners are innocent and not connected with the commission of offence as alleged or at all but they have been falsely implicated in the instant case. The petitioner nos. 2 to 11 on apprehension of their arrest in connection with the said case surrendered before the court of the Learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Barrackpore and filed an application for bail and were granted bail.

15. It was further submitted that the alleged incident of torture is an afterthought to ruin the life and career of the petitioner no. 1 herein. Furthermore, the medical reports furnished or relied upon by the complainant are of dates after the complaint has been lodged which clearly shows the discrepancies. The First Information Report is false and based on a concocted story and doesn't disclose commission of

any offence by the petitioner nos. 2 to 11 herein; their names should immediately be expunged or quashed from Nimta P.S. case no. 885/2021 for securing ends of justice; otherwise it would be a sheer abuse of process of law.

16. Learned senior counsel has relied upon the decisions in the case of ***Shivcharan Lal Verma and Anr. Vs. State of Madhya Pradesh***[1] particularly in paragraph no. 2; as well as in ***P. Sivakumar and Ors. Vs. State Rep. by the Deputy Superintendent of Police etc.***[2] particularly in paragraph nos. 5 and 7 in support of his contention that Section 498A would not be attracted if the marriage itself is not valid. The decision in the case of ***Haji Iqbal Alias Bala Through S.P.O.A. Vs. State of U.P. & Ors.***[3] particularly in paragraph no. 15 was relied upon to highlight the width of section 482 of the Cr.P.C.

17. Learned Counsel further relied upon the decision in the case of ***Rajnish Singh Alias Soni Vs. State of Uttar Pradesh & Anr.***[4] particularly in paragraph nos. 25, 29, 35 and 37 to bolster his submission that consensual intercourse among two adults is not an offence punishable under section 376 of the Indian Penal Code.

18. In the supplementary affidavit filed by the petitioner, it was further contended that a disciplinary proceeding, being Birbhum District

[1] (2007) 15 SCC 369;
[2] 2023 SCC OnLine SC 1737;
[3] (2024) 15 SCC 776;
[4] (2025) 4 SCC 197;

Police Force Case No. 06/22 dated 25.05.2022, was initiated against the petitioner no. 1. The charges were that, having availed leave for fifteen days from 21.01.2022, he failed to rejoin even after 19.02.2022, in violation of Rule 830 of the Police Regulations of Bengal, Vol. I, 1943. The charges also included the allegations of the opposite party no. 2, which form the subject matter of Nimta P.S. Case No. 885/2021. It was submitted that, in the course of the enquiry, the allegations of impersonation and of assault on the opposite party no. 2 could not be proved. Learned senior counsel contended that, the very allegations on which the criminal proceeding rests having failed in the departmental enquiry, the continuance of the criminal proceeding against the petitioners would be an abuse of the process of law and the same is therefore liable to be quashed to secure the ends of justice

19. Reliance in this context is placed on the decisions in ***Ashoo Surendranath Tewari Vs. Deputy Superintendent of Police, EOW, CBI and Anr.***[5] particularly in paragraph nos. 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15, as well as in ***Radheshyam Kejriwal Vs. State of W.B. & Anr.***[6] particularly in paragraph nos. 26, 31, 38 and 39 contending that when disciplinary proceedings are dropped and are not proved, criminal proceedings on the same cannot be allowed to

[5] (2020) 9 SCC 636;
[6] (2011) 3 SCC 581;

continue especially on the underlying principle of higher standard of proof in criminal cases.

20. Finally learned Counsel relied upon the decision in the case of ***Rajiv Thapar & Ors. Vs. Madan Lal Kapoor,***[7] particularly in paragraphs 25, 26 and 30 to support his submission that this High Court can exercise inherent power under Section 482 to quash the proceedings initiated by the de facto complainant based on false and concocted allegations suppressing and misrepresenting the actual facts.

SUBMISSION ON BEHALF OF THE OPPOSITE PARTY NO. 2:

21. Per contra, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the opposite party no. 2 strenuously raised objections against the submission of the learned Sr. Counsel for the Petitioner, and further argued that she was deceived and cheated by the petitioner no.1 by suppressing his actual religion and his name and has been used by the accused no. 1 for his sexual pleasure with bad intention to cheat and misuse continuously. The petitioner no. 1 suppressed his actual name and represented himself as Hindu by indicating his name as 'Rajib Sarkar'. He did not disclose his previous marriage and his two children either. It is also submitted that the marriage ceremony at the temple has no value in the eyes of law, as he is not Hindu by religion and no proper legal process was followed.

[7] (2013) 3 SCC 330.

22. The Learned counsel further submitted that Petitioner No. 1 was not only harassed sexually, but his other family members tortured her both physically and mentally by assaulting her with fists, blows, and lathi and other means like kicks. She further suffered and miscarried due to constant assault by the petitioner no. 1 and others. Due to such circumstances, she suffered from acute depression and fears for her life. It was a "love jihad" by the petitioner no.1. The case of the accused persons should not be stalled at this initial stage; otherwise, the Opposite party no. 2 will be deprived of justice. A full-fledged trial is required to be conducted to unearth the truth and punish the actual culprits.

23. Finally, it was submitted that departmental proceedings and criminal proceedings are two different facts and circumstances. The criminal proceedings must be proved with sufficient evidence beyond reasonable doubt, whereas departmental proceedings are decided on the balance of probabilities and does not need the same level of proof. Therefore, the judgments relied upon by the petitioners are not applicable in the present facts and circumstances of this case.

SUBMISSION ON BEHALF OF THE STATE:

24. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State produced the case diary and further submitted that the case is based on "love jihad", which should not be ignored and quashed at this stage. During

investigation, sufficient and clinching evidence was collected against the petitioners. Even after knowing the actual facts of suppression of religion and name of the petitioner no.1, he had intercourse with her forcibly and upon threat and without her consent. Other accused persons supported the petitioner No.1 for commission of such offence as alleged by the victim lady and also assaulted her.

25. In course of investigation, statements were recorded by the Investigating Officer under section 161 and 164 of the witnesses including, priest, neighbour, and de facto-complainant. From there, it was ascertained that the petitioner no.1 got married with the defacto-complainant in Mandir and put vermillion on her forehead as per Hindu rites and rituals to make her believe that she has become his wife and had sexual intercourse with her thereafter.

26. The learned PP further draws the attention of this court to the statement of the landlord of the tenanted premises, recorded under section 161 of the Cr.P.C., where they started residing as husband and wife in Burdwan after their marriage. He specifically stated that the petitioner no. 1 suppressed his identity and disclosed his name as 'Rajib Sarkar' and his wife as 'Riya Chakraborty'. He further stated that she became pregnant. The rent was fixed at Rs. 2700/- per month.

27. The victim also stated in her statement recorded under Section 164 of the Cr.P.C. about the alleged non-consensual sexual intercourse, after becoming aware of his real name, religion and his previous marriage and two daughters. She further stated that she became pregnant, and subsequently, she suffered a miscarriage due to severe assault on her abdomen.

28. Finally, it was submitted that during investigation, it was revealed by the doctor who treated her that there was slight bleeding in her vagina, which may have been due to the threat of alleged abortion and required confirmation via USG. However, there was no certain confirmation of pregnancy as she eventually did not show up for the same. However, the doctor confirmed she did not disclose any assault or injury; as such, Section 313 was dropped by the investigating agency at the time of filing the charge sheet. Subsequently, the charge sheet, being no. 389 of 2024 dated 30th September, 2024, was submitted under sections 419/420/498A/323/416/120B/506/34 of IPC, against the petitioners, when the prima facie case was established against them. As such, the case of the petitioners is liable to be dismissed, and the proceedings should be allowed to continue in order to uncover the truth and punish accordingly, if they are found guilty.

DISCUSSION AND FINDINGS BY THIS COURT:

29. Heard the arguments and submissions made by the learned counsels appearing for the respective parties and having gone through the materials on record as well as the case diary, this Court finds that prima facie, the petitioner no. 1 and the opposite party no. 2 shared a romantic relationship, and they got married at a temple at Digha in or about May 2021, and that they thereafter lived together at Bardhaman in a tenanted premises. What is in dispute is whether the petitioner no. 1 induced that relationship and her consent by deliberately misrepresenting his name, religion and marital status, and whether the later acts of assault, forcibly intercourse and intimidation were committed.

30. The petitioners have filed a supplementary affidavit annexing documents to show that the opposite party no. 2 was herself previously married and had suppressed her name and marital status. It is also contended that the petitioner no. 1, was a constable at Hatkalua Camp Moregram, and therefore, he could not have concealed his name and religion for about five years. These contentions raise a defence to be tested by evidence. In a proceeding under Section 482 Cr.P.C., the Court does not weigh the petitioners' documents against the prosecution case or hold an inquiry into the genuineness or falsification of the allegations. The material relied

upon does not meet the standard of being unimpeachable and of sterling quality, as required in the decision relied upon by the Petitioners in ***Rajiv Thapar v. Madan Lal Kapoor (Supra)*** to justify interference. The documents may be proved and relied on by the petitioners at trial after leading evidence after facing cross-examination.

31. As to Sections 416, 419 and 420 IPC, the allegation is that the petitioner no. 1 assumed a false identity and represented himself as an unmarried Hindu named "Rajib Sarkar", and that the opposite party no. 2's consent to the relationship and the ceremony was obtained on that footing. Whether consent was vitiated by a misconception of fact within Section 90 IPC, and whether the opposite party no. 2 knew the true position, cannot be decided without evidence. The decision in ***Rajnish Singh @ Soni v. State of U.P. (Supra)***, relied upon by the Petitioners, is concerned with the distinction between a consensual relationship and one induced by a false promise. The allegation here goes beyond a mere breach of promise and extends to the identity and status of the accused. Therefore, the aforesaid authority cannot be applied to quash the proceeding at the initial stage without a factual finding that consent was free and informed.

32. As to Section 498A IPC, the petitioners rely on ***Shivcharan Lal Verma (Supra)*** and ***P. Sivakumar (Supra)*** to say that the provision does not apply where the marriage is void. The Court notes that the opposite party no. 2 herself describes the ceremony as having no legal validity, and that the charge sheet is not confined to Section 498A. However, even if that offence was doubtful, the allegations of assault, wrongful confinement, sexual intercourse without consent and forcibly, intimidation and deception are distinct and independently disclose cognizable offences. A proceeding is not liable to be quashed in its entirety merely because one of the sections invoked may not ultimately be sustained. Whether Section 498A is attracted on these facts is a matter for the trial court at the stage of charge or trial, where it can be decided on the evidence and with the benefit of the authorities cited.

33. So far as the petitioner nos. 2 to 11 are concerned, they are close relatives and one of them is an associate of the petitioner no. 1. The allegation, even as recorded in the section 164 statement of the victim, is that on 09.07.2021, at the residence of the petitioner no. 1 at Murshidabad, they assaulted the opposite party no. 2 with fists, kicks and a lathi and attempted to strangle her with a saree on learning of her pregnancy. The petitioners' plea that they never met the complainant is a plea of denial. The allegations against these

petitioners cannot be dismissed as omnibus or inherently improbable at this stage. The injury report from the Khargram Rural Hospital, Murshidabad, dated 10.07.2021 suggests injury on the whole body of the victim/ Opposite Party no. 2. The fact that these petitioners were granted bail has no bearing on whether the proceeding is liable to be quashed.

34. Insofar as the petitioner no. 1 is concerned, there is sufficient material against him. The statements recorded under Section 161 of the landlord of the Bardhaman premises, neighbour and the priest disclose his alleged involvement in the offences. The landlord stated that the couple lived there as husband and wife under the name "Rajib Sarkar" and "Ria Chakraborty". That statement is directly relevant to the allegation of false identity. The statement recorded under section 164 Cr.P.C. of the opposite party no. 2 further aid their involvement in commission of offence by the petitioners.

35. The petitioners contended that, since the allegations of impersonation and of assault on the opposite party no. 2 were not proved in the disciplinary proceedings being Birbhum District Police Force Case No. 06/22, the criminal proceeding cannot be sustained. The Court has considered the contention and is unable to accept it at this stage, for the following reasons.

36. A departmental enquiry and a criminal prosecution as has been stated by learned counsel for the State, differ in object, standard of proof and forum, and a finding in the former does not bind the criminal court. A finding that the complainant failed to produce evidence before the authority is not necessarily a finding on merits that the allegations are false. The enquiry was also directed against the petitioner no. 1 alone and did not adjudicate on the allegations of 09.07.2021 against the petitioner nos. 2 to 11. In the instant case, the weight of that outcome is on the trial court, and the disciplinary proceeding does not by itself establish that the criminal case is an abuse of the process of law.

37. We should not forget the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Neeharika Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd. Vs. State of Maharashtra and Others***[8] wherein several principles were laid down to be followed by the Court while exercising its power under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. or under Article 226 of the Constitution of India; out of those principles, a few are as follows: -

> *"i) The power of quashing should be exercised sparingly with circumspection, as it has been observed, in the 'rarest of rare cases (not to be confused with the formation in the context of death penalty).*

[8] ***(2021) SCC Online SC 315***

ii) Criminal proceedings ought not to be scuttled at the initial stage;

iii) Extraordinary and inherent powers of the Court do not confer an arbitrary jurisdiction on the Court to act according to its whims or caprice;

iv) The power under Section 482 Cr.P.C. is very wide, but conferment of wide power requires the Court to be more cautious. It casts an onerous and more diligent duty on the Court;

v) While examining an FIR/complaint, quashing of which is sought, the Court cannot embark upon an enquiry as to the reliability or genuineness or otherwise of the allegations made in the FIR/complaint;

vi) The first information report is not an encyclopaedia which must disclose all facts and details relating to the offence reported. Therefore, when the investigation by the police is in progress, the court should not go into the merits of the allegations in the FIR. Police must be permitted to complete the investigation. It would be premature to pronounce the conclusion based on hazy facts that the complaint/FIR does not deserve to be investigated or that it amounts to abuse of process of law. After investigation, if the investigating officer finds that there is no substance in the application made by the complainant, the investigating officer may file an appropriate report/summary before the learned Magistrate which may

be considered by the learned Magistrate in accordance with the known procedure;

vii) When a prayer for quashing the FIR is made by the alleged accused and the Court when it exercises the power under Section 482 Cr.P.C., only has to consider whether the allegations in the FIR disclose commission of a cognizable offence or not. The Court is not required to consider on merits whether or not the merits of the allegations make out a cognizable offence and the Court has to permit the investigating agency/police to investigate the allegations in the FIR;"

38. In the present case, after culmination of the investigation, a charge sheet has been submitted against the petitioner under sections 419/420/498A/323/416/120B/506/34 of IPC, when prima facie case has been established against the petitioners.

39. The learned counsels for the opposite party no. 2 and the State have described this case as one of "love jihad". However, upon overall consideration of the statements recorded under Sections 161 and 164 Cr.P.C. and the allegations made by the opposite party no. 2 herself against the petitioners, this Court is of the opinion that none of the aforesaid allegations discloses any attempt by the petitioner no. 1 and/or the other petitioners to convert her to Islam, or any inducement, coercion or pressure to that end. The case set up is confined to the suppression of his name, religion and marital status.

The characterisation of the case as "love jihad" is therefore unsupported by the materials on record at this stage and has no bearing on this Court's assessment. There is no single central legislation or Act passed by the Parliament of India that defines or even recognizes "love jihad", let alone criminalise it. Furthermore, West Bengal does not have an active law specifically against the same or anti conversion legislation in effect. The allegation of suppression remains relevant to Sections 416, 419 and 420 IPC, namely, whether the petitioner no. 1 represented himself as an unmarried Hindu named "Rajib Sarkar" and whether the consent of the opposite party no. 2 was obtained on that footing. These are questions of fact for the trial court to decide on evidence.

40. Applying these principles, the Court is not persuaded that this is a case calling for the exercise of inherent powers. The allegations, read with the case diary and charge sheet, prima facie disclose the commission of cognizable offences. The defences taken, that the relationship was consensual, that the opposite party no. 2 herself suppressed facts, that the petitioners were falsely implicated by blackmail, and that the medical evidence does not support the allegations, all depend on appreciation of evidence. They are to be put to the test before the trial court, and this Court should not pre-empt that exercise. Interference at this stage would amount to a mini-trial.

41. In view of the above-mentioned facts and prima facie materials available in the case diary, this Court is of the opinion that the instant Criminal Revisional application is devoid of merits.

42. Accordingly, **CRR No. 3501 of 2022** is **dismissed**. **CRAN 3 of 2023** and **CRAN 4 of 2023** are also, thus, disposed of.

43. Let a copy of this Judgment be sent to the Learned Trial Court for information.

44. Case Diary, if any, is to be returned to the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State.

45. Interim order, if any, stands vacated.

46. Urgent photostat certified copy of this Judgment, if applied for, is to be given as expeditiously to the parties on compliance of all legal formalities.

(Ajay Kumar Gupta, J.)

P. Adak (P.A.)