

IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA

(Via Video conference)

**05.12.2023.
01.
as**

**C.R.M. (A) 4682 of 2023
with
CRAN 1 of 2023.**

Rejected

In the matter of : **Yusuf Sk & Anr.**

... Petitioners.

Mr. P. Ganguly.
...for the Petitioners.

Mr. R. Sengupta.
...for the State.

1. Heard the learned Advocates for the parties.
2. A wrong order had been inadvertently transcribed by the Stenographer in the records of the case. On the face of it, the order is contrary to the record and inconsistent with the finding, namely, “custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary”, recorded in a similar case being CRM (A) 4699 of 2023.
3. Under such circumstances, order which was erroneously transcribed is recalled.
4. The correct order is set out hereinbelow:-
5. *Petitioners submit no narcotics was recovered from their possession. They have been falsely implicated in the case. They pray for anticipatory bail.*

6. *Learned lawyer for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail. He submits that the statement of co-accused from whom narcotics was recovered shows there were telephonic conversations with the petitioners. Money was also transacted through electronic channel. In view of the materials collected in the course of investigation, we are of the opinion custodial interrogation of the petitioners is necessary to test the veracity of the accusation.*

7. *Under such circumstances, we are not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.*

8. *Accordingly, the application for anticipatory bail is rejected.*

9. *The application being CRAN 1 of 2023 for recalling of the order dated 29.11.2023 is disposed of.*

(Gaurang Kanth, J.)

(Joymalya Bagchi, J.)