

30.04.2025
Item No. 01
Ct. No. 4
(AN)

**THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
CIRCUIT BENCH AT JALPAIGURI**

CRM (R) 20 of 2025

In Re:- An application for bail under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in connection with C.R. Case No. 406/2024(592/2024) arising out P.O.R. No. 02/JPW of 2024-2025 dated 22.05.2024 under Sections 9, 39, 49(B) of Wild Life Protection Act, 1972.

In the matter of : **Dipankar Mondal**

... Petitioner

Mr. Satyam Sarkar

... for the petitioner

Mr. Aditi Shankar Chakraborty, ld. APP

Mr. Aniruddha Biswas

... for the State

1. Learned advocate representing the petitioner viz. Dipankar Mondal submits that this petitioner is on a better footing than the principal accused as because this petitioner was the driver of the vehicle wherefrom the skin of one leopard has been seized.
2. He further submits that the principal accused from whom it has been seized has been granted bail vide order dated 09.04.2025.
3. Considering the role of this petitioner, learned advocate prays for granting bail.

4. Learned advocate representing the State vehemently opposes the prayer for bail and submits that another case apart from this one is pending against this petitioner under the N.D.P.S. Act.
5. He further submits that there are only four charge sheeted witnesses out of whom one has already been examined and discharged as such only three are remaining to adduce evidence.
6. On going through the case diary including the document which is an inter-departmental document which has been handed over by the learned advocate representing the State, it transpires that against this petitioner a proceeding under the N.D.P.S. Act is also going on and it also transpires that there are only four charge sheeted witnesses out of whom one has already been examined as such only three are remaining to adduce evidence.
7. Considering the fact that apart from this offence in respect of which the trial has already commenced, another case which is under the N.D.P.S. Act is also pending against this petitioner. So it is apparent that the petitioner is a habitual offender.
8. Also considering the fact that only three witnesses are remaining to adduce evidence as such this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner. As such the prayer for bail is **rejected**.

9. CRM(R) 20 of 2025 is **dismissed**.

(Supratim Bhattacharya, J.)