

07.05.2025
Court No.39
Item No.14
Ab
(Dismissed)

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

CRM (M) 327 of 2025

In Re:- An application for bail under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (corresponding to Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023) filed on 29.04.2025 in connection with Dhantala Police Station Case No. 158 of 2025 dated 12.03.2025 under Section 4 of the Protection of Children for Sexual Offences Act and under Section 351(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023;

And

In the matter of : **Diganta Halder.**

...Petitioner.

**Mr. Md. Babul Hussain,
Ms. Sadia Zarren,
Ms. Paushali Pal.**

...For the Petitioner.

**Ms. Sujata Das,
Ms. Debadrita Mondal.**

. ..For the State.

Sk. Sahil Ahmed.

... for the de facto complainant.

The affidavit of service filed on behalf of the petitioner is taken on record.

Learned Advocate for the petitioner submits that the victim and the petitioner had a love affair and there are no such forcible acts of the petitioner. The victim is more than 18 years of age. He seeks enlargement of the petitioner on bail.

Learned Advocate for the State opposes such prayer and submits that there are serious allegations against the petitioner as is appearing from the statement of the victim. The victim at the time of incident was less than 18 years of age.

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

Peruse the case diary and the materials on record.

The victim implicates the petitioner in her statement before the Magistrate of his involvement in the alleged offence. There are also allegations of circulation of obscene videos of the victim in the social media platform. Considering such materials and the gravity of the offence, I am not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

Accordingly, the bail prayer is rejected.

The application for bail being CRM (M) 327 of 2025 is, thus, dismissed.

(Bivas Pattanayak, J.)