

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

(FROM PRINCIPAL BENCH)

CRM (A)/770/2025

In Re: - An application for anticipatory bail under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023.

And

In the matter of: - **AKASH TIWARI**

...petitioner.

Mr. Brajesh Jha
Mr. Neel Chakraborty

...for the petitioner.

Mr. Tapas Kumar Sinha

...for the *de facto* complainant.

1. Learned Counsel for the *de facto* complainant has submitted that he was not heard on October 16, 2025 when the anticipatory bail order was passed although he was present on October 14, 2025 for objecting the anticipatory bail application.
2. Learned Counsel for the petitioner has submitted that on October 14, 2025, the display board was not working properly and that is why he missed the list. Subsequently, on his oral prayer the matter was again fixed on October 16, 2025. However, he failed to intimate such adjournment to learned Counsel for the *de facto* complainant.

3. It appears that on October 16, 2025, the anticipatory bail application was allowed after considering the objection of the State and also taking into consideration the materials available on record.
4. In view of the above, I am not inclined to modify the order dated October 16, 2025. However, the *de facto* complainant is given liberty to take appropriate steps in accordance with law.

(Apurba Sinha Ray, J.)