

04.07.2025

Item No.43
Court No. 25
Sudipta
Rejected

IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS JURISDICTION
APPELLATE SIDE

CRM (DB) 1006 of 2025

In Re : *An application for bail under Section 483 of the Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023.*

-AND-

In Re : **Iunuchh Molla**

.....Petitioner

For the Petitioner :

Mr. Angshuman Chakraborty

Mr. S. S. Saha

.....Advocates

For the State :

Mr. Amit Gour, Sr. Govt. Counsel

Ms. Debarshi Brahma

.....Advocates

1. Learned counsel for the petitioner is seeking bail on the ground of parity as well as the period of incarceration. Learned counsel submits that it was political event where the supporters of co-accused Jahangir Mali were proceeding to the BDO Office to ensure their candidates are able to file nomination papers for the Panchayat Election. A group belonging to a rival political party confronted them which led to the free fight and resulting into the death of an opposite party worker, namely, Raju Naskar. Jahangir Mali was granted bail by this Court on 22nd February, 2024 in CRM (DB) 545 of 2024. Similarly, two other accused persons, namely, Mirajul Islam and Md. Injamamul Haque were granted bail vide order dated 6th February, 2025 in CRM (DB)

3561 of 2024. Learned counsel further submits that Md. Nawsad Siddique was granted pre-arrest bail by this Court on 23rd February, 2024 in CRM (A) 600 of 2024.

2. Learned counsel for the State has opposed the bail application on the ground that the role of the present petitioner is absolutely different from the persons who have been granted bail. Learned counsel further submits as per the statements under Section 164 Cr.P.C., the present petitioner along with co-accused Nantu Molla @ Nantu Molya were alleged to have thrown the bombs at the victim. Learned counsel for the State submits that bail application of Nantu Molla has been rejected by this Court on 8th August, 2024 and 27th February, 2025.
3. The Court has considered the submissions. While deciding the application for bail, the Court has to take into account the peculiar facts and circumstances attributed to the petitioner before the Court. The concept of parity cannot be made applicable in the strict sense. The allegation against the present petitioner is of throwing bomb on the rival group. I consider that allegation is too serious in nature.
4. In such circumstances, I am not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.
5. Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the petitioner is **rejected**.
6. CRM (DB) 1006 of 2025 is dismissed.

(**Dinesh Kumar Sharma, J.)**