

03.02.21 In re: An application for bail under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure
(S.R.) filed in connection with **Pingla** Police Station **Case No.72 of 2015** dated **07.05.2015**
Sl.173 under Sections **285/286/326/302/34** of the Indian Penal Code and Sections **4/5** of
Ct.28 Explosive Substance Act read with Section **9B** of Indian Explosive Act and Section **26**
of Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act and Sections
11C/11L/11J/12/26/33C of the West Bengal Fire and Emergency Services Act;

And

In re: Suraj Sk.

... petitioner.

Mr. Mrityunjay Chatterjee

Mr. Ranjit Singh

... for the petitioner.

Mr. Sudip Ghosh

Mr. Bitasak Banerjee

...for the State.

Learned advocate for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody for more than five and half years and the evidence of the case is slowly progressing as such, they may be released on bail. Additionally, learned advocate submits that out of sixty-nine witnesses only thirteen witnesses have been examined.

Mr. Ghosh, learned advocate for the State submits a report of the investigating officer. Let such report be kept with the record.

The record reveals that eighty witnesses have already been examined and only two witnesses, i.e. the expert and investigating officer of the case, are left for examination by the concerned Trial Court.

In view of the advanced stage of trial, we are of the opinion that it would not be fit and proper for releasing the petitioner on bail at this stage.

Accordingly, the application for bail being CRM No.9879 of 2020 is, thus, rejected.

(Tirthankar Ghosh, J.)

(Tapabrata Chakraborty, J.)