

CRM No.714 of 2021
(Via video conference)

16.04.21
(S.R.)
Sl.17
Ct.28

In re: An application for anticipatory bail under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure filed in connection with Tarapith Police Station Case No.71 of 2020 dated 01.12.2020 under Sections 498A/307/34 of the Indian Penal Code read with Sections 3/4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act;

And

In re: Ranajit Das & Ors.

... petitioners.

Mr. Debabrata Acharyya

... for the petitioners.

Mr. Tanmoy Kr. Ghosh

Mr. Arindam Sen

...for the State.

Petitioner no.1 is the elder brother-in-law, petitioner no.2 is the wife of the elder brother-in-law, petitioner no.3 is the married sister-in-law, petitioner no.4 is the married sister-in-law, petitioner no.5 is brother-in-law and petitioner nos.6, 7 and 8 are wives of in-laws.

The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioner no.5 has been arrested during pendency of this application and as, against the petitioner no.5 this application is rejected. It is submitted that the other applicants are in no way connected and they have been falsely implicated in this case.

The learned counsel for the State, however, opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners and produces the statement of the victim girl recorded under Section 164 of the Criminal Procedure Code.

We have perused the case diary and the statement of the victim girl recorded under Section 164 of the Criminal Procedure code wherefrom we find that the husband and all the inmates of the matrimonial house have been implicated, namely, husband, Bhasur Nanad and Ja.

There are incriminating materials against the petitioner nos.1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7 and 8. We have also taken into consideration the gravity of the offence and the injury sustained by the victim. On such consideration, we are not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

(Tirthankar Ghosh, J.)

(Soumen Sen, J.)