

IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
Circuit Bench at Jalpaiguri
Criminal Miscellaneous Jurisdiction

17.11.2025
33 (DL)
AN
(Rejected)

C.R.M. (A) 659 of 2025

In Re:- An application for anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in connection with Phansidewa P.S. Case No. 248 of 2024 corresponding to G.R. Case No. 2282 of 2024 dated 01.07.2024 under Sections 341/326/307/120B/34 and adding Section 302 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 pending before the learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Siliguri.

In the matter of : **Munna Soren @ Mona Soren & anr.**
... Petitioner.

Mr. Subham Ghosh
Mr. Mayank Roy

...for the Petitioner.

Mr. Kallol Acharjee
Mr. Aniruddha Biswas

...for the State.

1. Learned advocate for the petitioner submits that there is no such specific allegation against the petitioners. Upon arrest Co-accused persons have been granted bail by the learned trial court. Charge sheet has been submitted upon completion of investigation. He seeks for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.
2. On the contrary, opposing such prayer for anticipatory bail, learned advocate for the State submits that there are specific allegations against the petitioners of assaulting the victim resulting in serious injuries. The victim ultimately succumbed to her injuries and died. He seeks for dismissal of the application for anticipatory bail.

3. Perused the case diary and the materials on record.
4. The statement of the witnesses recorded under Section 161 of the Code of Criminal Procedure shows specific allegations against the petitioners of assaulting the victim alongwith others. The post mortem report reveals that the victim sustained 14 injuries. As per the post mortem report the cause of death was due to effect of head injury which is ante mortem in nature. Charge sheet has already been submitted under Sections 341/326/307/120B/34 and adding Section 302 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 against the petitioners and three others. Considering materials on record and nature and gravity of the offence, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.
5. Thus, the prayer for anticipatory bail is rejected.
6. **CRM(A) 659 of 2025** stands dismissed.

(Bivas Pattanayak, J.)