

19.08.2026
Item No. 06
Ct. No. 39
AN
(ALLOWED)

C.R.M.(A) 2006 of 2026

In Re:- An application for anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 filed in connection with Contai Women Police Station Case No. 0038 of 2025 dated 23.06.2025 under Sections 109 / 115(2) / 117(2) / 118(2) / 126(2) / 3(5) / 303(2) / 305 / 351(2) / 76 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 corresponding to G.R. Case No. 1518 of 2025 now pending before the learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Contai.

In the matter of : **Putul Sahoo @ Bishnupriya Sahoo & ors.**
... Petitioners.

Mr. Soumya Nag
Mr. Pritam Roy
Mr. Karan Prasad
Mr. Rajdeep Sengupta
Ms. Triparna Roy

...for the Petitioners.

Mr. Soumya Raja

...for the State.

1. Memo of evidence, furnished by the I/C., Contai Women Police Station, District, Purba Medinipur, filed in Court today, is taken on record.
2. Learned advocate appearing for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent. They are the employees of Contai Municipality, and went to visit a land lying and situated at Dag Nos. 473, 473/1598 and 380, Khatian No. 546, Mouza - Kumarpur, Police Station Contai for the demolition of an unauthorised construction as per the order passed by the Chairman, Contai Municipality, on behalf of the Board of Councilors, Contai Municipality. It

is further submitted that when the Petitioners visited the spot for demolition, they were attacked by the de facto complainant, along with a few other residents present thereat. This led the Chairman, Contai Municipality, to lodge a complaint on 29th November, 2024, resulting in registration of Contai P.S. Case No. 769 of 2024 dated 29th November, 2024 under Sections 221/121(1)/132/115(2)/117(2)/3(5) of the BNS, 2023. Due to such complaint, a counter-blast case was registered against the present petitioners along with the others after almost 7 months, even though they are fully innocent and performed their duties in accordance with law. Ld. Advocate, therefore, prays for anticipatory bail for the petitioners on any terms and conditions.

3. On the other hand, learned advocate representing the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners and submits that the complaint was not registered by the police concerned; as such, the de facto complainant filed an application under Section 156(3) of CrPC, and a case was registered against them. Therefore, such delay occurred.
4. The C.D. is produced.
5. Having heard the learned advocates for the respective parties and upon perusal of the materials available on record, including the case diary, this court is of the opinion that this is a fit case for allowing the petitioners'

anticipatory bail as no custodial interrogation/detention of the petitioners is necessary. Hence, prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners is considered and **allowed.**

6. Accordingly, in the event of arrest, the petitioners shall be released on bail to the satisfaction of the arresting officer on the terms and conditions as he deems fit and proper and also subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Criminal Procedure Code corresponding to Section 482(2) of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023.
7. In the event the petitioners fail to comply with the conditions as imposed by this Court, the prosecution shall be at liberty to pray for cancellation of the anticipatory bail granted by this Court in accordance with law.
8. **C.R.M. (A) No. 2006 of 2026** stands **disposed of.**
9. All concerned parties shall act on the server copy of this order duly downloaded from the official website of this Court.
10. The concerned Department is directed to supply urgent certified Photostat copy of this order to the parties, if applied for, upon compliance of all necessary formalities.

(Ajay Kumar Gupta, J.)

