

15.05.2025
Item no.4
Court No.39
ss

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

CRM (M) 294 of 2025

In re : An Application for bail under Section 439 of the Criminal Procedure Code, 1973 or Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in connection with Hili Police Station Case No.82/2024, dated 03.06.2024 under sections 341/376AB/506 of the Indian Penal Code, read with Sections 6/12 of the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, (Corresponding Special (POCSO) Case No.54 of 2024) pending before the learned Additional District and Sessions Judge, 2nd Court, Balurghat, Dakhin Dinajpur. Charge sheet submitted being no.112 of 2024 dated 31.07.2025 under sections 6(1)/8/12 of the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012 read with Sections 376AB/506 of the Indian Penal Code.

-And-

In Re : Narayan Singh @ Naran
... Petitioner

Ms. Busra Khatun,
...for the petitioner

Mrs. Manisha Sharma,
Mrs. Eshita Dutta
...for the State

Service report along with status report filed by the State is taken on record.

Learned Advocate for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. There are no such injuries noted in the medical examination report to suffice the prosecution case. She seeks for enlargement of the petitioner on bail.

Learned Advocate for the State opposes such prayer for bail of the petitioner and submits that there are serious allegations against the petitioner of his involvement in the

alleged offence. The victim at the time of incident was 9 years old. She seeks for dismissal of the application for bail.

Despite service none appears on behalf of the *de facto* complainant.

Perused the case diary and materials on record.

The minor victim clearly implicates the petitioner of his involvement in the alleged offence. Absence of injuries may not improbabilise the case of the prosecution. In view of the above materials and the nature and gravity of the offence, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

Accordingly, the bail prayer of the petitioner is rejected.

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

The application for bail being **CRM(M) 294 of 2025** stands dismissed.

(Bivas Pattanayak, J.)