

10.07.2025
Item No.09.
Daily List
Court No.42
Mithun
(Rejected)

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

CRM (M) 638 of 2025

In Re: An application for bail under Section 439 of the Criminal Procedure Code, 1973 corresponding to Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in connection with C/Spl Case No.99 of 2022 arising out of Berhampore Police Station Case No.1624 of 2022 dated 04.12.2022 under Sections 376/370/372/373/120B of Indian Penal Code, 1860 and Sections 3/4/5/7 of Immoral Traffic (Prevention) Act, 1956 and Sections 4/8/12/17 of Protection of Child from Sexual Offences Act, 2012.

-And-

In the matter of : Ramkrishna Dutta

... .. Petitioner (in Jail)

Mr. Debanshu Ghorai,
Mr. Anisur Rahman

... .. For the Petitioner

Mr. Zothanpuui Varte,
Mr. Jonaki Saha

...for the *de facto* complainant.

Mr. Sonali Das,
Mrs. Manasi Roy

... ..For the State

Service report filed by the State is taken on record.

Learned Advocate for the petitioner submits that the petitioner worked as a sweeper in the premises where the incident has taken place. The petitioner is in no way connected with the alleged offence. None of the victims have identified the petitioner. Petitioner is in custody for last 2 years, without there being considerable progress in trial. He seeks for enlargement of the petitioner on bail.

Opposing such prayer for bail, learned Advocate for the State submits that this petitioner along with others were involved in trafficking of women. Although, the victim have not identified the petitioner by name but physically he has been identified in Court. She seeks for dismissal of the bail application.

Learned advocate on behalf of the *de facto* complainant submits that it is not possible for the victims to know the petitioner by name. However, the victims have identified them in Court. She also seeks for dismissal of the bail application.

Perused the case diary and materials on record.

The statement of the witnesses reveals of involvement of this petitioner in trafficking of women. The victims in their evidence have stated that they were forcibly put to prostitution by the accused persons. Though the victims have not identified the petitioner by name, however, in Court, the victims have indicated and pointed out the persons who are involved including the present petitioner. In light of the above materials and the nature and gravity of the offence, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail.

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

The learned Trial Court is directed to expedite the trial to the fullest extent and conclude the same 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 cooperate in the trial before the Trial Court.

The application being ***CRM(M) 638 of 2025*** stands dismissed.

(Bivas Pattanayak, J.)