

**28.02.2024**  
DL-37  
Court No.29  
(AD)  
(Rejected)

**C.R.M. (A) 546 of 2024**

In Re: - An application for anticipatory bail under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure in connection with **Chapra** Police Station Case No. **110 of 2021** dated **10.03.2021** under Sections **3/4/5/7** of the Immoral Traffic Prevention Act, 1956 and Sections **8/17** of the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012 (POCSO Case No.41 of 2023).

And

In the matter of: **Amanullah Mollah**

....petitioner.

Mr. Milon Mukherjee, Ld. Sr. Advocate  
Mr. Prabir Majumder

... for the petitioner.

Mr. Antarikhya Basu

... for the State.

Petitioner prays for anticipatory bail.

Learned Senior Advocate appearing for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is an Advocate by profession. He was falsely implicated. Petitioner granted lease of the immovable property to a person who is now dead. Provisions of the POCSO Act were added later in 2023. He draws the attention of the Court to the order dated November 18, 2021 passed in WPA 13163 of 2021. He submits that police filed charge sheet and, therefore, placing the petitioner in custody 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, one minor was recovered in a raid conducted at the property concerned. He draws the attention of the Court to the statements of the victims recorded under Section 161 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, statements of independent witnesses recorded under Section 161 thereof as also the certificate from the Gram Panchayat relating to the ownership of the property.

We perused the materials in the case diary.

We find that the property stands in the name of the petitioner. There are statements made by victims who claimed that the petitioner was instrumental in engaging them in the flesh trade. Independent witnesses also implicate the petitioner in such affairs.

Considering the gravity of the offences and the complicity of the petitioner therein as transpiring from the materials in the case diary, 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) 546 of 2024** is dismissed.

**(Debangsu Basak, J.)**

**(Md. Shabbar Rashidi, J.)**