

3. We have considered the materials on record. Petitioner was named in the FIR. However, in the initial charge-sheet he was not named as an accused.

4. Further investigation commenced on prayer of the *de facto* complainant. During further investigation statements of witnesses were recorded before learned Magistrate. These statements implicate the petitioner in the offence. Submission of the petitioner that the belated statements are an afterthought, however, appears to be unmerited as digital records i.e. longitude and latitude report in respect of his mobile phone corroborate petitioner's presence at the place of occurrence.

5. Keeping in mind the aforesaid incriminating materials and gravity of the offence involving murder we are not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. Accordingly, prayer for anticipatory bail is rejected.

(Shampa Dutt (Paul), J.)

(Joymalya Bagchi, J.)