

26.08.2025
Item no.5(DL)
Court No.42
AN
(Rejected)

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

C.R.M.(M) 1383 of 2025

In Re: An Application for Bail under Section 439 of Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 corresponding to Section 483 of the Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, in connection with Jamboni Police Station Case No. 138 of 2024 dated 08.11.2024 under Sections 70(2) Bharatiya Nyay Sanhita, 2023 and Sections 4 and 6 of the POCSO Act now pending before the learned Judge, Special Court under POCSO Act, Jhargram.

-And-

In the matter of : CCL Boy 1 & anr.

.... Petitioner

Mr. Rajendra Banerjee
Mr. Joy Chakraborty
Mr. Souvik Ganguly

...for the Petitioners.

Mr. B. K. Roy
Mr. Kunal Ganguly

...for the State.

1. Service report filed by the State is taken on record.
2. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the principal allegation is against the accused Lalmohan Mandi. There are no direct allegations against these petitioners who are child conflict in law (CCL). Further there is no such progress in the trial though charges against the petitioners were framed way back in the month of March, 2025. He seeks for enlargement of the petitioners on bail.
4. Opposing such prayer for bail, learned counsel representing the State submits that these petitioners are very

much involved in the gang-rape of the minor victim. He seeks for dismissal of the bail application.

5. Despite service none appears for on behalf of the *de facto* complainant.

6. Perused the case diary and the materials on record.

7. It is found from the statement of the victim girl that there is specific allegation against these petitioners of their involvement in the offence of gang rape which is also supported by the statement of other witnesses. The allegations are grave. Considering the *prima facie* incriminating materials as indicated above and the nature and gravity of the offence, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioners.

8. Accordingly, the bail prayer of the petitioners is rejected.

9. However, 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.

10. Prosecution is directed to produce the witnesses on the date fixed for examination.

11. Parties are directed to cooperate with the trial court during examination of the witnesses.

12. Parties are at liberty to communicate this order to the trial court accordingly.

13. **CRM(M) 1383 of 2025** stands dismissed.

(Bivas Pattanayak, J.)