

24-09-2020
Subha
Item no.30
Bail rejected.

IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
Criminal Miscellaneous Jurisdiction

C.R.M. No. 6752 of 2020

Mamun Ali
-vs-
The State of West Bengal
With
CRAN No. 1 of 2020
(Via Video conference)

In Re: An application for anticipatory bail under **Section 438 CrPC** apprehending arrest in connection with Chanchal P.S. Case No.160 of 2020 dated February 9, 2020 under Sections 341/326/307/506 of the Indian Penal Code(G.R Case No. 345/2020).

Mr. Sagar Saha
...for the petitioner.

Mr. Madhusudan Sur
Mr. Aniket Mitra ... for the State.

The advocate-on-record for the petitioner undertakes to affirm and properly stamp the petition as per the rules within one month of resumption of normal functioning of the court. The petition is taken up through video-conference on the basis of such undertaking. Accordingly, CRAN No.1 of 2020 is disposed of.

The learned advocate for the petitioner submits that the petitioner had a relationship with the victim and as a result of this at the hit of the moment the unfortunate incident took place.

The learned advocate for the petitioner further submits that taking into account the nature of allegations, the custodial detention of the petitioner may not be required.

The learned advocate for the State produces the memorandum of evidence along injury report.

We have perused the injury report where the medical expert has observed regarding the permanent disfiguration of the face of the victim. Having appreciated the medical report and the other materials in the case diary, we are not inclined to extend the benefit of anticipatory bail to the present petitioner. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner is rejected.

The application for anticipatory bail being CRM 6752 of 2020 is disposed of.

[Tirthankar Ghosh, J]

[Sahidullah Munshi, J]

