

25.07.2025
Item no.10
Court No.42
ss
(Dismissed)

**HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS JURISDICTION**

CRM (M) 600 of 2025

In re : An Application for bail under Section 439 of the Cr.P.C., 1973/ under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in connection with Special ST-46(05)22; Special Case No.99 of 2020 arising out of Basanti Police Station Case No.302 of 2020 dated 31.05.2020 under Sections 363/365/376(3)/376DA of Indian Penal Code read with Section 6 of POCSO Act pending before the learned Additional District Judge, 2nd Court, Alipore, South 24 Parganas.

-And-

In the matter of : Alamgir Laskar

... .. Petitioner

Mr. Sandip Dinda

... .. For the Petitioner

Mr. Arijit Ganguly,
Mr. Ashok Das

...For the State

Mr. Abhinav Rakshit

...For the *de facto* complainant

Service report filed on behalf of the State is taken on record.

Learned Advocate for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody for last 5 years. One of the co-accused has been granted bail by the learned trial court. The petitioner stands on the same footing. He seeks for enlargement of the petitioner on bail.

Learned Advocate for the State, opposing such prayer for bail, submits that the victim in her statement before the Magistrate as well as during her examination in Court has implicated this petitioner along with others with the allegation of

gang rape. The prosecution intends to examine 7 more witnesses, which would be concluded within 6 to 7 months. He seeks for dismissal of the bail application.

Learned Advocate representing the *de facto* complainant also opposes such prayer for bail and submits that the allegation is of gang rape. He seeks for dismissal of the bail application.

Perused the case diary and materials on record.

The victim in her statement before the Magistrate as well as in Court implicates this petitioner and others with the allegation of gang rape. Such allegation also appears to be grave one. Considering the above materials and bearing in mind nature and gravity of the offence, this Court finds that it is not fit case 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 to the fullest extent and conclude the trial at an early date without granting any unnecessary adjournment to either of the parties.

Prosecution is directed to produce witnesses before the Trial Court on the schedule dates fixed for examination of witnesses.

Parties are directed to co-operate in the trial before the Trial Court.

The application for bail being **CRM (M) 600 of 2025** stands dismissed.

(Bivas Pattanayak, J.)