

**HIGH COURT OF TRIPURA  
AGARTALA**

A.B. 22/2025

Sri Sujit Das

-----Applicant(s)

Versus

The State of Tripura

-----Respondent(s)

---

For Applicant(s) : Mr. DC Saha, Advocate

For Respondent(s) : Mr. R. Datta, PP

---

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARINDAM LODH**  
**Order**

**19/03/2025**

In terms of order dated 18.03.2025, the complainant alongwith the victim and the accused person are present before this court.

Heard Mr. DC Saha, learned counsel appearing for the applicant. Also heard Mr. R. Saha, learned Additional PP appearing for respondent-State.

This is an application filed under section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 for granting anticipatory bail to the applicant in connection with West Agartala Women PS case No. 55 of 2024, registered under Sections 74, 35(2), 64(2)(f), 65(1) of the BNS, 2023 and Section 4,12 of the POCSO Act.

As per the prosecution story, mother of the victim lodged a written complaint with the Officer-in-Charge of West Agartala Women police station alleging *inter alia* that on 14.11.2024 when her daughter was sleeping with her younger brother in the house of the applicant, at about 0430 hours, the applicant after attending orchestra returned to his house and, after returning, he had outraged the modesty of her minor daughter when she was sleeping and when the victim protested the applicant had threatened her to kill if she disclose the matter to anybody.

Mr. DC Saha, learned counsel appearing for the applicant, has submitted that the applicant has been falsely implicated with the instant case and he is apprehending police arrest in connection with the instant case. Mr. Saha, learned counsel has further submitted that the applicant is totally innocent. Mr. Saha, has also submitted that there is a long standing dispute between the complainant and the applicant-accused regarding land and property.

Mr. R. Saha, learned Additional PP has produce the case diary and has opposed the bail prayer.

I have meticulously gone through the case diary. I have also gone through the Family Settlement Agreement arrived at between the complainant and the applicant-accused as available in the case record.

From the said Agreement, it is evidently clear that the matter was extensively considered by the local residents around the houses of both the complainant and the applicant-accused. On such consideration, it is clearly stated that the 2<sup>nd</sup> party to the Settlement i.e. the applicant could not show any kind of unfair behavior or beating or any threat to the 1<sup>st</sup> party and his younger brother. It is admitted in the said Settlement Agreement that Smt. Uma Das, who is the 1<sup>st</sup> party to the said Agreement had disclosed in a meeting that she was going to lodge a complaint with the West Agartala Women police station to punish the 2<sup>nd</sup> Party i.e. the applicant herein in any way for causing trouble in the family property.

*Prima facie*, I have sufficient reason to suspect the integrity of the complainant against the accused-applicant.

Keeping in mind the precious rights of life and liberty of a citizen of India as enshrined under Article 21 of the Constitution of India, I am inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the applicant, namely, **Sujit Das**, imposing some conditions.

Accordingly, it is ordered that, in the event of arrest, the applicant, namely, **Sujit Das**, may be released on **bail** on executing a bond of **Rs. 50,000/-** with **one surety** of the like amount to the satisfaction of the arresting authority.

However, the applicant shall co-operate with the Investigating Officer during the process of investigation to unearth the actual truth and he will appear before the Investigating Officer as and when called for. Further, the applicant shall appear before the Investigating Officer twice in a week till **30.04.2025**. Thereafter, this direction of imposition of condition will automatically be relaxed.

With above observations and directions, the instant anticipatory bail application stands allowed and thus disposed.

Return back the case diary.

Personal appearance of the complainant alongwith the victim and the accused person is dispensed with.

**JUDGE**