

C.R.M. (A) 5175 of 2023

In the matter of: Amrit Kumar

Mr. Avik Ghatak
Ms. Arfeen Begum

... for the petitioner

Mr. Angshuman Chakraborty

... for the State

Petitioner prays for anticipatory bail.

Learned advocate appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that the allegation of earlier marriage is unfounded. The petitioner is married to the de facto complainant.

Learned advocate for the State draws my attention to the Court to the materials in the case diary. He submits that there are children born out of the first wedlock. Subsequently, the petitioner without obtaining divorce of the first marriage, entered into marriage with the de facto complainant. Petitioner obtained dowry from the de facto complainant.

We considered the materials in the case diary.

The de facto complainant recorded a statement under Section 164 of Cr.P.C where she stated that she was misled entering into the marriage by the petitioner.

Apparently, there is a first marriage of the petitioner. Petitioner conducted the second marriage during the subsistence of the first marriage.

Complicity of the petitioner in the incident requires investigation. Enlarging the petitioner on anticipatory bail at the stage will be inimical to such investigation.

Considering this we are not grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

The application for anticipatory bail is thus rejected.

(Debangsu Basak, J.)

(Md. Shabbar Rashidi, J.)