

ITEM NO.42

COURT NO.3

SECTION II-B

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (Crl.) No(s). 18064/2026

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 27-08-2026 in WPA No. 20410/2026 passed by the High Court at Calcutta]

ALL INDIA TRINAMOOL CONGRESS & ANR.

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

THE STATE OF WEST BENGAL & ORS.

Respondent(s)

IA No. 290525/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT

Date : 01-10-2026 This matter was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.M. SUNDRESH

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRASANNA B. VARALE

For Petitioner(s) Dr. Abhishek Manu Singhvi, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Shoeb Alam, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Nipun Saxena, Adv.
Mr. Agnish Basu, Adv.
Ms. Vidhi Pankaj Thaker- 3668, AOR
Mr. Anirudh Gotety, Adv.
Mr. Vipul Vedant, Adv.
Mr. Aditya Roy, Adv.
Mr. Gourav Bose, Adv.
Ms. Anisha Soni, Adv.
Mr. Dev Nagar, Adv.
Mr. Vinayak Rao, Adv.
Mr. B. D. Rao Kundan, Adv.
Mr. Mohd. Hanzala, Adv.

For Respondent(s) Mr. Tushar Mehta, Ld. SG
Mr. Rajdeep Majumdar, AAG
Mr. Nishant Awana, Adv.
Mr. Amogh Pandey, Adv.

Mr. K. Parmeshwar, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Aman Jha, AOR
Mr. N. Sai Kaushal, Adv.
Ms. Ananya Shamsbery, Adv.
Mr. Srijan Sahu, Adv.

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

We have heard the learned Senior Counsel appearing for the petitioners, the learned Solicitor General appearing for the respondent-State and Mr. K. Parmeshwar, learned Senior Counsel appearing for the private respondent(s).

Against the refusal of the interim order sought for by the petitioners before the High Court, the present Special Leave Petition has been filed.

Learned Senior Counsel appearing for the petitioners would contend that the order passed by the High Court requires interference, as it has wrongly taken into consideration the earlier order passed, which pertains to a different set of bank accounts. It is his further submission that in the present proceedings, the petitioners seek appropriate orders for their expenses other than the ones for their day to day administration, including election expenses.

Learned Solicitor General, appearing for the respondent-State, would submit that the present case involves a new set of allegations which is inclusive of huge deposit having been made and the alleged involvement of the Government land(s), being sold after its illegal transfer.

Mr. K. Parmeshwar, learned Senior counsel appearing for the private respondent(s), would submit that vide order dated 17.09.2026, the Election Commission has frozen the symbol of the petitioner(s) and, therefore, the larger issue that has to be decided is as to who is actually entitled for the amount in the bank accounts. Releasing any amount in favour of the petitioners, without adjudication, would cause substantial prejudice to the other party in the *lis* before the Election Commission.

We are of the considered view that expressing anything on the merits of this case will have a substantial bearing on the writ petition pending before the High Court. The arguments made before us are meant to be taken up and decided in the main matter by the High Court.

Keeping that in mind, we refrain from going into the merits, particularly, when we are dealing with an interim order passed in a pending writ petition.

Accordingly, we are not inclined to exercise our jurisdiction under Article 136 of the Constitution of India, 1950, except for requesting the High Court to expedite the hearing in the pending writ petition.

The Special Leave Petition stands disposed of,
accordingly.

Pending application(s), if any, shall also
stand disposed of.

(ASHA SUNDRIYAL)
DEPUTY REGISTRAR

(POONAM VAID)
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR