

18.09.2025

Court No.22

DL/Item No.-2

(pp)

CRR 3217 of 2025

In the matter of: **Ruhul Amin @ Sarifullah & Anr.**petitioners.

Mr. Bibaswan Bhattacharya,
Mr. Sanjib Kumar Das

....for the petitioners.

Mr. Kunal Ganguly

.....for the State.

1. The present application, being CRR 3217 of 2025, has been filed by the petitioners, namely Ruhul Amin and MosiburRahaman, seeking a relaxation of the conditions of bail imposed by the learned Chief Judge, City Sessions Court, Calcutta on 14th November, 2022, in Sessions Case No. 15 of 2020.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that they had previously moved the learned Trial Court for the same relief, but the prayer was refused. He challenges the said order of refusal, which was based on a police report indicating that the petitioners had not complied with their bail conditions.
3. Learned counsel for the State vehemently opposes the prayer, highlighting the petitioners' consistent non-compliance with the bail conditions. He points out that Ruhul Amin provided a false address to the investigating agency, and Mosibur Rahaman has failed to furnish his present place of stay. He emphasizes that the petitioners have not adhered to the condition of remaining within the municipal limits of Kolkata. The learned counsel for the State also refers to two previous

applications for similar relief (CRR 1374 of 2024 and CRR 3608 of 2024) which were dismissed or disposed of as not maintainable.

4. It has also been submitted by the learned counsel for the State that the trial is ongoing, with the examination of six out of forty prosecution witnesses already completed. It is assured that the trial will be concluded within a short span of time.
5. I have perused the report submitted by the Assistant Commissioner of Police, Kolkata, as referred to by the learned trial court. The report clearly indicates that Ruhul Amin provided a false address and Mosibur Rahaman has failed to provide his place of residence. The conduct of the petitioners, as noted by the learned trial court, is indeed "far from satisfactory."
6. The petitioners have failed to demonstrate any change in circumstances warranting a relaxation of the bail conditions. Their disregard for the conditions upon which they were granted liberty is a serious matter. This Court finds no compelling reason to interfere with the reasoned order of the learned trial court, which correctly denied the prayer for relaxation. The grounds for refusal are cogent and well-founded in the facts as presented.
7. Accordingly, the application is dismissed on merit.
8. However, it is clarified that the petitioners remain at liberty to approach the trial court again at a later stage, provided they demonstrate compliance with the conditions and an improved conduct.

9. There will be no order as to costs.
10. An urgent photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, shall be issued to the parties upon compliance with all necessary formalities.

(Uday Kumar, J.)