

21.08.2025  
Item no.7(DL)  
Court No.42  
AN  
(Rejected)

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

**C.R.M.(M) 1370 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 POCSO Case No. 118 of 2024 arising out of Baishnabnagar Police Station Case No. 608 of 2024 dated 30.06.2024 under Sections 376AB of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 read with Section 6 of the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012 now pending before the learned Judge, Special Court under POCSO Act (Additional District and Sessions Judge, 2<sup>nd</sup> Court), Malda.

**-And-**

**In the matter of : Arjun Mandal**

.... Petitioner

Mr. Narattam Acharyya,  
Ms. Pranidhi Singh

...for the Petitioner.

Ms. Manisha Sharma  
Mr. Sourabh Nandy

...for the State.

1. Service report filed by the State is taken on record.
2. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that he is not the principal accused. The petitioner is in custody for 101 days. She seeks for enlargement of the petitioner on bail.
3. Opposing such prayer for bail, learned counsel representing the State submits that the petitioner forcibly closed the door from outside and abetted the crime committed by the principal accused over the victim aged about 11 years at the time of incident. She seeks for dismissal of the bail application.

4. Despite service none appears for on behalf of the *de facto* complainant/victim.

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

6. From the statement of the victim, it is found that that this petitioner closed the door forcibly from outside when the co-accused one Bidhan was committing the offence. Considering the above incriminating materials and bearing in mind the nature and gravity of the offence, the bail prayer of the petitioner is rejected.

7. However, learned trial court is directed to expedite the trial to the fullest extent and conclude the trial at an early date without granting any unnecessary adjournment to either of the parties.

8. Prosecution is directed to produce the witnesses on the date fixed.

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

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

11. CRM(M) 1370 of 2025 stands dismissed.

**(Bivas Pattanayak, J.)**