

17.04.2025  
Item No.08.  
Daily List  
Court No.39  
Mithun  
(Rejected)

**CRM (DB) 895 of 2025**

In re : An Application for bail under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973/ under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in connection with Kasba Police Station Case no. 244 of 2023 dated 21.06.2023 registered for investigation into offences punishable under Sections 120B/366A/370A/370/372/373 of the Indian Penal Code 1860 and under section 3/4/5/6 of the Immoral Traffic (Prevention) Act 1956 and under section 4/17/21 of the Protection of Children from Sexual Offence Act 2012.

-And-

**In the matter of : Seema Khatoon @ Seema Khatun @  
Simran**

... Petitioner

Mr. Arnab Chatterjee,  
Mr. Avik Ghosh

...for the petitioner

Mr. D.K. Singh,  
Ms. Saptamita Pramanick

...for victim no.1.

Ms. Jhuma Sen,  
Mr. Anirban Dey,  
Ms. Swastika Chatterjee,  
Ms. Arpita De

...for victim no.2.

Ms. Shaila Afreen,  
Ms. Jonaki Saha

... ...For the State

Service report filed by the State is taken on record. It is found that service has been effected.

Learned Advocate for the petitioner submits that the petitioner used to arrange dance programme, in which the victim girls used to participate. There are no incriminating materials against the petitioner. Petitioner is languishing custody for last

one year and 10 months. He seeks for enlargement of the petitioner on bail.

Learned Advocate for the State opposing the prayer for bail submits that both the victims had categorically stated of the involvement of the petitioner in the alleged offence. She seeks for dismissal of the bail application.

Ms. Jhuma Sen, learned Advocate appearing for one of the victim submits that the vulnerable witnesses are yet to be examined. This petitioner was arrested from the spot where the victim girls were taken and they were sexually exploited. She seeks for dismissal of the application.

Similar submission is also advanced by Mr. D.K. Singh appearing for another victim girl.

Perused the case diary and materials on record.

The statement of the victim girls show that they were taken to the hotel by the petitioner for prostitution which is also stated by the victim in her deposition in Court. Considering the above materials and gravity of the offence, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail.

Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the petitioner is rejected.

The application for bail being **CRM(DB) 895 of 2025** stands dismissed.

**(Bivas Pattanayak, J.)**

