

02.07.2025  
Item No.08.  
Daily List  
Court No.42  
Mithun  
(Rejected)

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

**CRM (M) 841 of 2025**

In re : An Application for bail under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 corresponding Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 in POCSO Case No.143 of 2017 arising out of Bijpur P.S. Case No.454/2017 dated 17-08-2017 under section 363/370/376(2)(I)/120b/109/354 IPC and 6 of POCSO Act, 2012

-And-

**In the matter of : Sandip Sardar**

... Petitioner

Mr. Soumya Nag,  
Mr. Rajdeep Sengupta

...for the petitioner

Mr. Santanu Talukdar

...for opposite party no.2

Ms. Sonali Das,  
Ms. Rajnandini Das

... ...For the State

Learned Advocate for the petitioner submits that there was previous love relation between the petitioner and the victim. As such, the allegation made in the complaint is not at all tenable. He further indicates that there is delay in progress of the trial. The petitioner is in custody for last 2 years. He seeks for enlargement of the petitioner on bail. He relies on several decisions of this Court in support of his contention including a decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court passed in ***Deshraj alias Musa -versus- State of Rajasthan & Another*** reported in **2024 SCC OnLine SC 2709**.

Learned Advocate for the State opposing such prayer submits that the victim has implicated this petitioner. She seeks for dismissal of the bail application.

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

Perused the case diary and materials on record.

The victim at the time of incident was 12 years of age. In her statement recorded under Section 164 Cr.P.C. before the Magistrate, the victim implicates this petitioner of his involvement in the alleged offence. In light of the above materials and the nature and gravity of the offence, I am not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

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

The decisions cited on behalf of the petitioner are factually distinguishable from the case at hand.

However, the 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.

Prosecution is directed to produce witnesses before the Trial Court on the schedule dates.

Parties are directed to cooperate in the trial before the Trial Court.

The application being **CRM(M) 841 of 2025** stands dismissed.

**(Bivas Pattanayak, J.)**