

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

21.11.2025
11(DL)
Ct. No.3
srm
(Rejected)

C.R.M. (A) 697 of 2025

In Re:- An application for anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in connection with G.R. Case No.223 of 2025 arising out of Sitalkuchi P. S. Case No.58 of 2025 dated 15.02.2025 under Sections 329(3)/118(1)/118(2)/109/35) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita pending before the learned Sessions Judge, Coochbehar.

In the matter of : Ukil Barman & Ors.

... Petitioners.

Dr. Arjun Chowdhury,
Mr. Bappaditya Roy

...for the Petitioners.

Mr. Nilay Chakraborty, APP
Mr. Saikat Chatterjee

...for the State.

1. Learned Advocate for the petitioners submit that the dispute and allegation pertains to case and counter-case. In the alleged incident the members of both sides sustained injuries. The petitioner No.3, Chandrajit Barman sustained head injury and had to be hospitalized for better treatment. The co-accused have been granted anticipatory bail as well as regular bail by the learned Sessions Judge, Coochbehar. He seeks for anticipatory bail in favour of the petitioners.
2. Opposing such prayer for anticipatory bail, learned Additional Public Prosecutor submits that in the said incident six persons sustained grievous injuries and there

are serious allegations against the petitioners of attacking the victims *en masse*. He seeks for dismissal of the prayer for anticipatory bail.

3. Perused the case diary and materials on record.
4. It is found from the injury reports that the victims sustained cut injuries as well as lacerated cut injury in different parts of the body including occipital regions and forearm. All the injuries are grievous in nature. The injured persons have been referred for admission to higher medical centre. The statement of the victims shows the involvement of these petitioners in assaulting the victims. Considering the nature of the injuries sustained by the victims and the magnitude of the offence which resulted in injury to six persons I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.
5. Thus, the prayer for anticipatory bail is rejected.
6. **CRM (A) 697 of 2025** stands dismissed.
7. Interim order, if any, stands vacated.

(Bivas Pattanayak, J.)