

02.03.21 In re: An application for anticipatory bail under Section 438 of the
(S.R.) Code of Criminal Procedure filed in connection with **Salar** Police
Sl.143 Station Case **No.214 of 2020** dated **25.10.2020** under Sections
Ct.28 **341/323/354/509/34** of the Indian Penal Code and Section **12** of the
POCSO Act;

And

In re: Munna Sk. @ Jasimuddin Rahaman ... petitioner.

Ms. Minati Gomes ... for the petitioner.

Mr. Shiladitya Banerjee ...for the State.

The learned advocate appearing for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated. No overt act has been attributed to the petitioner and in view thereof, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not necessary.

The learned advocate appearing for the State opposes the petitioner's prayer and draws our attention to several documents in the case diary.

Having heard the learned advocates and considering the materials in the case diary, the statement of the victim girl as recorded under Section 164 of the Code and the extent of complicity of the petitioner in the alleged offence, we are not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. As such, the petitioner's prayer for anticipatory bail is refused.

Accordingly, the application for anticipatory bail being CRM No.10722 of 2020, is dismissed.

All parties shall act on the server copies of this order duly downloaded from the official website of this Court.

(Tirthankar Ghosh, J.)

(Tapabrata Chakraborty, J.)