

18.07.2025

Item No.22
Court No. 25
Sudipta

Allowed

CRM (A) 2100 of 2025

In Re: An application for Anticipatory Bail under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in connection with **Entally Police Station Case No. 134 of 2025 dated 27.05.2025** under Sections **126 (2) / 115 (2) / 351 (2) / 74 / 3(5) of BNS, 2023 read with Section 12 of the POCSO Act, 2012.**

And

In Re : **1. Saba Akram**
2. Shahista Taskil
3. Suparna Das @ Aysha Shaheb @ Shweta Das
4. Md. Naushad
5. Meenaj Siddique @ Minu Siddique
.....Petitioners

For the Petitioners :

Mr. Debasis Kar
Mr. Husen Mustafi
Mr. Arka Tilak Bhadra
.....Advocates

For the State :

Mr. Bidyut Kr. Roy
Mr. Nirupam Dhali
.....Advocates

For the State :

Mr. Md. Shahjahan Hossain
Ms. Sanjida Sultana
Mr. Prithwiraj Biswas
.....Advocates

1. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the father of the de facto complainant, late Shahbuddin Ahmed had two wives, namely, Suparna Das @ Aysha Shaheb @ Shweta Das i.e. petitioner No.3 and Sahin Siddique, mother of the victim. Learned counsel submits that in fact there is a dispute between two wives of late Shahbuddin Ahmed which led to

the registration of the present FIR. Learned counsel submits that as per the FIR and statement under Section 164 Cr.P.C., the offence under the POCSO Act is not attributed.

2. Learned counsel for the State has opposed the anticipatory bail application. Learned counsel submits that in the statement under Section 164 Cr.P.C. corresponding to Section 183 of BNSS, 2023, the victim has specifically made allegation against the petitioner No. 4 Md. Naushad. Learned counsel further submits that if the petitioners are admitted to bail they will further harass the victim and her mother.
3. Learned counsel for the de facto complainant has also opposed the anticipatory bail application stating that in fact the petitioners want to grab the shop left by late Shahbuddin Ahmed i.e. father of the victim and the present incident also took place when they came to dispossess the victim and her mother.
4. It is a matter of record that the petitioners have duly complied with the notice under Section 35 (3) of the BNSS.
5. Perusal of the FIR indicates that no role has been attributed to any particular accused. Though in the statement under Section 164 Cr.P.C. allegation has specifically been made against Md. Naushad.
6. Taking into account, in the event of arrest, the petitioners, namely, **Saba Akram, Shahista Taskil, Suparna Das @ Aysha Shaheb @ Shweta Das, Md. Naushad and Meenaj Siddique @ Minu Siddique** shall be released on anticipatory bail upon furnishing a personal bond of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees

Ten Thousand Only) each with two sureties of like amount each, one of whom must be local, to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer and also be subject to the condition that the petitioners shall not threaten, intimidate or tamper with the prosecution witnesses in any manner whatsoever and during the course of investigation the petitioners shall not enter the jurisdiction of Entally Police Station except for attending court or meeting the Investigating Officer.

7. The prayer for anticipatory bail is, thus, allowed.
8. CRM (A) 2100 of 2025 is disposed of.
9. Urgent Photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be given to the parties upon compliance of all necessary formalities.

(Dinesh Kumar Sharma, J.)