

09.9.2025
Court No.4
Item No.12
Rejected
Samarpita

**CALCUTTA HIGH COURT
IN THE CIRCUIT BENCH AT JALPAIGURI
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS JURISDICTION**

CRM (M) 268 of 2025

In Re: An application under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in connection with **Sitalkuchi Police Station Case No.464 of 2024, dated- 05.10.2024** under Sections 103(10)/ 238 / 61(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 corresponding to Sessions Case No.15 of 2025

In the matter of: **Uttam Singha**

....Petitioner.

Mr. Subhasish Misra,
Mr. Satyajit Paul

... for the petitioner

Mr. Aditi Shankar Chakraborty, Ld. A.P.P.
Mr. Kallol Nag
.. for the State

1. It is said by the learned Advocate for the petitioner that he is absolutely innocent and has been falsely arraigned with the crime. This accused-petitioner is in custody since for a considerable period of time and in the meantime the investigation process has been ended up by submitting charge-sheet by the prosecuting agency.
2. It is further contended by the learned Advocate for the petitioner that there is no witness to the incident and there is no material in the record, for which it can be said that

this accused-petitioner is involved with the offence alleged. It is said that the investigation process is over and as such there is no requirement of further detention of this accused-petitioner behind the bar for the sake of custodial interrogation.

3. Learned Advocate for the State raises objection by submitting that the offence involved in this case is heinous in nature and there are sufficient incriminating materials in the record which show about *prima facie* involvement of this accused-petitioner with the alleged offence. It is conceded by the learned Advocate for the State that after completion of investigation, the charge-sheet has already been submitted by the investigating agency on 2.1.2025. It is further submitted that if at this stage the accused-petitioner is enlarged on bail, then there is every possibility of hampering of the progress of the trial. So, it is said that the bail petition filed by the accused-petitioner may be rejected.
4. The record reveals that the instant case was set in motion on the basis of a complaint lodged by the defacto complainant, wherein it was alleged that the victim had met with an unnatural death. In connection with the said complaint, investigation was undertaken by the police, and

the materials collected by the investigating agency disclose prima facie involvement of the present accused-petitioner in the commission of the alleged offence. Moreover, it is seen from the record that the investigating agency, upon completion of investigation, has already submitted the charge-sheet before the competent Court. A perusal of the charge-sheet, along with the materials annexed thereto, prima facie discloses the involvement of the present accused-petitioner with the commission of the alleged offence. Having regard to the gravity of the accusations, the seriousness of the crime, this Court is of the view that the prayer for bail cannot be acceded to at this stage.

5. Accordingly, CRM (M) 268 of 2025 is hereby **rejected**.
6. Urgent Photostat Certified Copy of this order, if applied for, be supplied to the parties upon compliance with all requisite formalities.

(Prasenjit Biswas, J.)