

07.12.2020
Sl. No.58
akd
[ALLOWED]

C. R. M. 9831 of 2020 [via video conferencing]

In Re: An application for anticipatory bail under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure filed on 25.11.2020 in connection with Pingla Police Station Case No. 356 of 2019 dated 24.11.2019 under Sections 417/306/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

And

In Re: **Arun Samanta**

... .. Petitioner

Mr. Pravas Bhattacharya .. Advocate

... .. for the petitioner

Mr. S. S. Imam .. Advocate

Mr. Subrata Roy .. Advocate

... .. for the State

It is submitted on behalf of the petitioner that there was a love affair between the victim girl and the petitioner and he has been falsely implicated in the instant case.

Learned advocate appearing for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail and submits that the marriage between the victim girl and the petitioner could not fructify due to demands of dowry.

We have considered the materials on record including the statements of the relations of the deceased. It appears that the relations of the petitioner had objected to the marriage. As a result marriage could not fructify. Keeping in mind the extent of complicity of the petitioner in the alleged crime, we are inclined in granting anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

Accordingly, we direct that in the event of arrest, the accused/petitioner, namely **Arun Samanta**, be released on bail upon furnishing a bond of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten thousand only), with two sureties of like amount each, to the satisfaction of the arresting officer and also be subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973.

The application for anticipatory bail is, thus, disposed of.

(Suvra Ghosh, J.)

(Joymalya Bagchi, J.)