

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

21.11.2025
Item No. 09 (DL)
AN

(REJECTED)

C.R.M. (A) 672 of 2025

In Re:- An application for anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in connection with Haldibari P.S. Case No. 180 of 2024 dated 11.11.2024 under Section 126(2)/140(3)/3(5) of the Indian Bharatiya Nyay Sanhita, 2023 corresponding to POCSO Case No. 14 of 2017 subsequently Charge Sheet has been submitted vide charge sheet no. 01 of 2025 dated 14.01.2025 for alleged offence punishable under Section 126(2)/140(3)/3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 adding Section 4/17 of POCSO Act pending before the Court of the learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Mekhliganj.

In the matter of : **Palash Deb Singha @ Bachan**
... Petitioner.

Mr. Debasish Mukherjee
Ms. Madhursri Dutta
...for the Petitioner.

Mr. Nilay Chakraborty, Id. APP
Mr. Tapan Bhattacharjee
...for the State.

1. Service report filed by the State is taken on record.
2. Learned advocate for the petitioner submits that the victim and the petitioner had previous love affairs and the victim left her house out of her own accord. There is no such incriminating materials against the petitioner. The co-accused are on bail. He seeks for grant of anticipatory bail in favour of the petitioner.

3. On the contrary, opposing such prayer for anticipatory bail, learned advocate for the State submits that there are specific allegations against this petitioner. He seeks for dismissal of the application for anticipatory bail of the petitioner.
4. Despite service none appears for *de facto* complainant.
5. Perused the case diary and the materials on record.
6. The victim in her statement recorded under Section 164 of the Code of Criminal Procedure implicates this petitioner of his involvement in the alleged offence. Considering the above and the nature and gravity of the offence, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail in favour of the petitioner.
7. Thus, the prayer for anticipatory bail is rejected.
8. The application being **CRM(A) 672 of 2025** stands dismissed.

(Bivas Pattanayak, J.)