

18.
Court
No.28

10.06.2024

(Tanmoy)

Rejected

IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS JURISDICTION

CRM (DB) 1514 of 2024

In Re: - An application for bail under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, in connection with **Taltala Police Station/DD Case No. 96** dated **19.07.2022**.

And
In the matter of: - **Prasenjit Singha Roy @ Prasenjit Singh Roy**
...petitioner.

Mr. Ayan Bhattacharjee, Adv.,
Mr. Shounak Mondal, Adv.,
Mr. Dibyendu Sinha, Adv.,
Mr. Suman Majumder, Adv.
...for the petitioner.

Mr. Saryati Datta, Adv.,
Ms. Rajnandini Das, Adv.
...for the State.

The petitioner prays for bail. He says that he is in custody for 358 days. He has no connection with the alleged incident of dacoity. Charge is yet to be framed. He should be granted bail.

Learned Counsel for the State vehemently opposes the prayer for bail. He points out from the material in the case diary that the petitioner was identified in the Test Identification (T.I.) parade by the person from whom the money was snatched. The petitioner is also involved in earlier cases of dacoity although he was granted bail in such cases. He is a habitual offender.

We have considered the rival contentions of the parties and the material in the case diary. Considering the gravity of the offence and the evidence on record, *prima facie* the involvement of the petitioner in the alleged crime cannot be ruled out.

Accordingly, we are not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at this stage. The prayer for bail is hereby rejected.

However, in view of the fact that the petitioner has been in custody for a substantial period, we request the learned Trial Court to expedite the trial and bring the same to its logical conclusion at the earliest and preferably within a period of one year from the date of communication of this order without granting unnecessary adjournment to either of the parties.

The application being CRM (DB) 1514 of 2024 is accordingly dismissed.

(Arijit Banerjee, J.)

(Apurba Sinha Ray, J.)