

11.12.2025
Court No.28
Item No.29
ssi

CRM (A) 3472 of 2025

In Re: - An application for anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Suraksha Nagarik Sanhita in connection with Samserganj Police Station Case No. 209 of 2025 dated **13.04.2025** under Sections 318 (1)/316(2)/351(2) of the BNS.

And

In the matter of: **Hayat Md Roish Faraz @ Md Hayat Roish Feraz.**
....Applicant/Petitioner

Mr. Sourat Nandy

...for the petitioner

Ms. Rita Datta

..for the State

Report filed on behalf of the State is taken on record.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. He has no connection with the alleged truck or for that matter with the de facto complainant.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail. He submits that as per the complaint of 2019, the owner of the truck being the de facto complainant gave away the truck to the petitioner on rent. Subsequently, the petitioner tried to sell off the truck. There is a statement of the proposed buyer present at page 82 of the case diary that as the proposed buyer found some anomalies in the papers, the deal did not go through. However, the petitioner tried to convince him that the owner of the truck was his relative and an agreement was entered into with a signature of the de facto complainant, which is denied by the de facto complainant.

Considering the above and the other incriminating materials available in the case diary, I do not consider this is to be a fit case for granting anticipatory bail.

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

The personal appearance of the I.O. is noted and is dispensed with.

(Jay Sengupta, J.)