

04.08.2026

Item No.16

Ct.No.35

dc.

Rejected

IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS JURISDICTION

C.R.M. (A) 2170 of 2026

In Re : An Application for anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 filed in connection with Baguiati Police Station Case No. 387 of 2026 dated 27.06.2026 under Sections 126(2)/329(4)/127(2)/316(2)/316(5)/308(2)/308(3)/308(4)/308(5)/111/74/76/79/351(2)/61(2)/3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

And

In Re : **Prosenjit Nag**

... Petitioner.

Mr. Sandipan Ganguly, Sr. Adv.,
Mr. Soumya Nag

... For the Petitioner.

Mr. Kallol Mondal, Ld. PP,
Mr. Brajesh Jha, Ld. APP,
Mr. Abhijit Singh

... For the State.

Mr. Tirthya Acharya,
Mr. Bikram Banerjee,
Mr. Rajdeep Majumer

... For the *de facto* complainant.

Learned senior advocate appearing for the petitioner submits that immediately after the results of the election, petitioner has been foisted with two criminal cases. Earlier, petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by this Court. In close proximity of time, another case was registered on 27.06.2026. Petitioner being a local representative at the relevant point of time protested against the illegal act and activities of the *de facto* complainant as well as the illegal construction which he had raised. To that effect, learned senior advocate for the petitioner relies upon communication being made in the year 2025. It has been submitted because

of such vendetta, the *de facto* complainant is wreaking vengeance by way of instituting criminal case at his behest and others.

Learned advocate appearing for the *de facto* complainant opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail.

Learned Public Prosecutor appearing for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail and submits that there are electronic evidence to support that at the relevant point of time, petitioner with his associates broke open the door and entered the house of the *de facto* complainant thereby outraging the modesty of the women folk as also extorted money on different issues from the *de facto* complainant.

I have taken into account the accusations made in the present case and without entering into the genuinity of such allegations and *prima facie*, the materials appearing in the case diary, I am of the opinion that this is not a fit case for granting anticipatory bail to the present petitioner. As such, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner is **rejected**.

Memo of Evidence submitted by the learned advocate appearing for the State be kept with the record.

The application for anticipatory bail, being CRM (A) 2170 of 2026, is, thus, dismissed.

All concerned parties shall act on the server copy of this order duly downloaded from the official *website* of this Court.

Urgent photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be supplied to the parties upon compliance with all requisite formalities.

(Tirthankar Ghosh, J.)