

11.11.2021
Serial no. 32
Dd

(Through Video Conference)

CRM 7208 of 2021

In re : An Application for **anticipatory bail** under Section **438** of the Code of Criminal Procedure in connection with **Khatra Women** Police Station Case No. **08** of **2021** dated **09.08.2021** under Sections **498A/323/307** of the Indian Penal Code & **3/4 Dowry Prohibition Act.**

-And-

In the matter of : **Sukanta Mahanti, alias Sukanta Mahanty**
... ..**Petitioner**

Mr. Bivayan Bhattacharjee,
Mr. Amal Kumar Saha,
Mr. Iresh Paul, Advocates
... .. For the Petitioner

Mr. Bidyut Kr. Dey,
Ms. Sima Biswas, Advocates
... ...For the State

Petitioner seeks anticipatory bail.

Learned advocate appearing for the petitioner submits that the other co-accused was granted anticipatory bail by the order dated October 8, 2021. He submits that an observation was made in such order that the allegations are general in nature against all the accused persons.

Learned advocate appearing for the State draws the attention of the Court to the contents of the case diary. According to the learned advocate for the State, observations made in the order dated October 8, 2021 should be read in the context of the accused applying for bail in such matter.

There is some force in the contention of the learned advocate appearing for the State. The order dated October 8, 2021 should be understood in the context of the accused

applying for anticipatory bail in such petition. The petitioner was not a party to that application.

Considering the materials in the case diary and considering the fact that the petitioner is the husband against whom the criminal complaint inter alia, under Section 498A of the Indian Penal Code and Sections 3/ 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act was made, we are not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

CRM 7208 of 2021 is, accordingly, **dismissed**.

(Debangsu Basak, J.)

(Ananda Kumar Mukherjee, J.)