

05.01.2023
Sl.9
Court No.29
(AD)
(Rejected)

C.R.M. (A) 4 of 2023

In Re: - An application for anticipatory bail under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure in connection with **Suri Women** Police Station Case No.14 of 2022 dated 17.03.2022 under Sections **498A/323/307/406/506/34** of the Indian Penal Code.
And

In the matter of: **Mustakim Mallick @ Mantu**

....petitioner.

Mr. Sanjib Kumar Dan
Mr. Saryati Datta

... for the petitioner.

Mr. Amajit Ganguly
Mr. Anindya Sundar Chatterjee

...for the State.

Petitioner prays for anticipatory bail.

Learned Advocate appearing for the petitioner submits that the husband of the de facto complainant was arrested. The police filed charge sheet and, therefore, the requirement of custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required.

Learned Advocate appearing for the State draws the attention of the Court to the materials in the case diary. He submits that there was an attempt to strangle the de facto complainant. Kerosene was also poured on the de facto complainant. He refers to the statements of the neighbours recorded under Section 161 of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

There are materials in the case diary implicating the petitioner in the incident.

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

Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner is rejected.

C.R.M. (A) 4 of 2023 is dismissed.

(Debangsu Basak, J.)

(Md. Shabbar Rashidi, J.)