

24.07.2025
Item No.20.
Daily List
Court No.42
Mithun
(Rejected)

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

CRM (M) 1129 of 2025

In re : An Application for Bail under Section 483 of Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in connection with Spl Case
No.49/2025 arising out of Bidhannagar (North) Police Station
Case NO.43/2025 dated 17.03.2025 under Section 4 of the
Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, now pending
before the learned Judge, Special POCSO Court, Barasat, North
24 Parganas.

-And-

In the matter of : Rohan Kanrar

... ... Petitioner

Mr. Angshuman Chakraborty,
Mr. S.S. Saha

... ... For the Petitioner

Mr. Indrajit Roy

...for the *de facto* complainant

Ms. Faria Hossain,
Mr. Rahul Ganguly

... ...For the State

Service report filed by the State is taken on record.

Learned Advocate for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner has not been placed in T.I. Parade. The victim did not
sustain any injuries. The petitioner is in custody for about four
months and upon completion of investigation, charge-sheet has
been submitted in this case. He seeks for enlargement of the
petitioner on bail.

Opposing such prayer for bail, learned Advocate for the
State submits that the victim categorically implicates this
petitioner. The statement of other witnesses, particularly, the
co-workers who came for installation of A.C. machines in the

house of the *de facto* complainant (father of the victim) supports the statement of the victim. She seeks for dismissal of the bail application.

Similar submission is advanced on behalf of the *de facto* complainant. He also seeks for dismissal of the bail application.

Perused the case diary and the materials on record.

The victim, aged about 7 years, in her statement clearly implicates this petitioner. Absence of injury may not improbabalize the case of the prosecution. Considering 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.

However, the 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.

The application being **CRM(M) 1129 of 2025** stands dismissed.

(Bivas Pattanayak, J.)