

28.04.2025
Item no.16
Court No.39
ss
(Dismissed)

**IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS JURISDICTION**

C.R.M.(DB) 822 of 2025

In Re:- An application for bail under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 corresponding to Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in connection with Dum Dum Police Station Case No.230 of 2023 dated 12.05.2023 under Sections 366A/370/372A/372/373/120B of Indian Penal Code and under Sections 3/4/5/7/9/17 of Immoral Traffic (Prevention) Act read with Section 4 of the Protection of Child from Sexual Offences Act.

And

In Re : Samrat Roy & anr.

.... Petitioners

Mr. Souvik Ganguly

....for the petitioners

Ms. Sreyashee Biswas

Mr. Arani Bhattacharya

..... for the State

Ms. Anasuya Bhattacharya

Ms. Munmun Chakraborty

... for the *de facto* complainant

Learned Advocate for the petitioners submit that the persons who were alleged to be involved in the trafficking of the minors have been granted bail by the trial court vide its order dated 1st September, 2023. The said order was challenged before this Court in CRM(DB) 4675 of 2023 by way of an application for cancellation of bail. However, such prayer for cancellation of bail of the co-accused was turned down by this Court. The petitioners stand on the same footing with persons already granted bail. The petitioner is in custody for 1 year 10 months and 23 days. He seeks for enlargement of the petitioners on bail.

Opposing such prayer, learned Advocate for the State submits that the petitioner no.2 is the owner of the brothel wherefrom the minor victims were recovered. Both the petitioners have been arrested from the said brothel. The petitioners are involved in trafficking the minors for sexual exploitation. One of the accused who was granted bail by the trial court absconded, which has attributed to delay in commencement of the trial. She seeks for dismissal of the bail application.

Learned Advocate for the *de facto* complainant opposes such prayer for bail.

Perused the case diary and materials on record.

Both the petitioners were arrested from the place of occurrence. Six minor girls were recovered from the brothel. The petitioners are involved in running brothel where minor girls were trafficking for sexual exploitation. Thus present petitioners stand on different footing than the others who were granted bail. Considering the above materials and the nature and gravity of the offence, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioners.

Accordingly, the bail prayer is rejected.

Learned trial court is directed to expedite and conclude the trial at an early date without granting any unnecessary adjournment to either of the parties.

The application for bail being **CRM (DB) 822 of 2025** stands dismissed.

(Bivas Pattanayak, J.)