

04.07.2022

Serial no. 11

[Dd]

(Anticipatory bail)

(Rejected)

CRM (A) 2944 of 2022

In re : An Application for **Anticipatory Bail** under Section **438** of the Code of Criminal Procedure in connection with **Chandrakona** Police Station Case No. **144** of **2021** dated **April 28, 2021** under Sections **341/323/325/307/34** of the Indian Penal Code.

-And-

In the matter of : **Raj Kumar Saha & Anr.**

... ..**Petitioners**

Ms. Sananda Bhattacharyya, Advocate

... .. For the Petitioners

Mr. Sudip Ghosh,

Mr. Bitasok Banerjee, Advocates

... ...For the State

Petitioners pray for anticipatory bail.

Learned advocate appearing for the petitioners submits that the petitioners were not absconding. One of the petitioners was in the police station to submit a bail bond for not wearing a mask during the pandemic. She submits that there is a money transaction between Kalipada Manna and the family of the de facto complainant. The petitioners were falsely implicated.

Learned advocate appearing for the State draws the attention of the Court to the injury report of the victim and his statements recorded under Section 161 of the Criminal Procedure Code.

The case diary contains statements of the injured recorded under Section 161 of the Criminal Procedure Code as well as his injury report. There are immediate post occurrence witnesses statements recorded under Section

161 of the Criminal Procedure Code, implicating the petitioners.

Considering the gravity of the offence and the involvement of the petitioners therein as transpiring from the materials in the case diary, we are not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

Prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners is **rejected**.

CRM (A) 2944 of 2022 is **dismissed**.

(Debangsu Basak, J.)

(Bibhas Ranjan De, J.)