

13.11.2025
Court No.28
Item No.17
ssi

CRM (A) 3280 of 2025

In Re: - An application for anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Suraksha Nagarik Sanhita in connection with Purulia Sadar Women Police Station Case No. 1 of 2025 dated **13.01.2025** under Sections 77/351 of the BNS, 2023 and Section 6 of the POCSO Act.

And

In the matter of: **Shayon Ghosh @ Sayan Ghosh**

....Applicant/Petitioner

Mr. Sandip Chakraborty
Mr. Moyukh Mukherjee
Mr. Abhijit Singh
Mr. Koustav Das
Ms. Sagnika Banerjee

...for the petitioner

Ms. Zareea Nasema Khan
Mr. Tirupati Mukherjee

..for the State

Mr. Nazar Chowdhury
Mr. Sourav Mondol
Mr. Swarnadutty Singha
Md. Mohsin Laskar
Ms. Priyanka Saha

...for the de facto

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits as follows. There was a prolonged love affair between the petitioner and the victim. After it turned sour, the de facto complainant lodged a belated complaint at the time when she was 18 years old. Even as per the complaint, the last incident took place on 13.04.2024. False allegations have been made that videos were taken and the de facto complainant was blackmailed and thereafter threatened. In no time, proclamation was issued. Moreover, an anticipatory bail is not totally barred in a case where an application of proclamation is issued.

Learned counsel for the de facto complainant opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail. He submits that not only was the victim

threatened at gunpoint, but also with some videos that could be made viral. Even at subsequent stages, threats and intimidations were given, which prompted the de facto complainant to file a further First Information Report. As would be reflected from the order dated 20.08.2025 passed by the Sessions Judge, the Sindri Police Station at Dhanbad did not submit status report regarding execution of warrant of arrest.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail. She relies on the statements of the victim recorded before the learned Magistrate and the other materials available in the case diary including the medical report. Subsequently, threats have been given for which GD entries and an FIR were lodged. A proclamation has been issued.

Considering the incriminating materials available in the case diary including the statements of the victim recorded before the learned Magistrate and the fact that proclamation has been issued against the petitioner, I do not consider that this is to be a fit case for granting anticipatory bail.

Accordingly, the application for anticipatory bail of the petitioner is rejected.

(Jay Sengupta, J.)