

31.01.2022

Sl. 55

Court No.29

suvayan

(Rejected)

C.R.M. (DB) 96 of 2022

In Re: - An application for bail under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure filed on 07.01.2022 in connection with **Pingla** P.S. Case No. **129** dated **02/05/2021** under Sections **341/302/379/34** of the Indian Penal Code.

And

In the matter of: Dilip Batul & Anr.

....petitioners.

Mr. Navanil De

Mr. Subhrajit Dey

...for the petitioners.

Mr. Sudip Ghosh

Mr. A. K. Dutta

...for the State.

Petitioners seek bail.

Learned Advocate appearing for the petitioners submit that the police filed charge-sheet, no specific role is attributed to the petitioners. He highlights the period of detention of the petitioners of 274 days.

Learned Advocate appearing for the State draws the attention of the Court the contents in the case diary. He submits that the defacto complainant was the son of the victim who sustained injury and that in his statement, the son of the victim, the defacto complainant, names of the petitioners as the assailants. He submits that apart from that there are independent witnesses attributing role of the petitioners to the incident.

Considering the gravity of the offence and the involvement of the petitioners therein, we are unable to grant bail to the petitioners.

Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the petitioners are rejected.

C.R.M. (DB) 96 of 2022 is dismissed.

(Debangsu Basak, J.)

(Bibhas Ranjan De, J.)