

16.04.2025

22
Court No. 39
jb.
jdt.

IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS JURISDICTION

C.R.M. (M) 19 of 2025

In Re : An Application under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973/under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 filed in connection with Deganga Police Station Case No. 973 of 2015 dated 29.10.2015 under Sections 363/365/373 of the Indian Penal Code, Section 5(a) of the Immoral Traffic Prevention Act and Section 6 of the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012.

And

In Re : **Mosaraf Laskar @ Raju**

... Petitioner.

Mr. Deepak Kr. Prahladka
Ms. Reshmi Khatun

... For the Petitioner.

Mr. Madhusudan Sur
Mr. Anindya Sundar Chatterjee

... For the State.

State files the service report in compliance to the previous order dated 10th April, 2025 which is taken on record. It is found that service has duly been effected upon the *de facto* complainant.

Learned advocate for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody since 7 years 8 months and trial has not progressed. He seeks for enlargement of the petitioner on bail.

Opposing such prayer for bail, learned advocate for the State submits that by order dated 3rd February, 2022

considering the gravity of the offence as well as the conduct of the petitioner in trying to mislead the Hon'ble Court, bail prayer was rejected and there was a direction for custodial trial of the petitioner. He seeks for dismissal of the application.

Perused the case diary and material on record.

It is found that there are materials showing involvement of the petitioner in inter-State trafficking of women for sexual exploitation. Further by order dated 3rd February, 2022 in CRM (DB) 302 of 2022 considering the gravity of the offence and the conduct of the petitioner in trying to mislead the Hon'ble Court the bail prayer was rejected and there was a direction for custodial trial of the petitioner. Bearing in mind the aforesaid, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

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

However, the learned trial Court is directed to expedite the trial and conclude the same at an early date.

The application for bail being **CRM (M) 19 of 2025** stands dismissed.

Urgent Photostat certified copy of the order, if applied for, be given to the parties on compliance of all necessary legal formalities.

(Bivas Pattanayak, J.)