

13/02/2026
D/L – 30
Court No.28
S. Kundu
Rejected

C.R.M.(A) 165 of 2026

In Re: An application for anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023. In connection with Baguiati P.S case no. 585 dated 16/9/2025 under Sections 143(3)/143(4)/127(2)/3(5) of the BNS read with Sections 3/4/5/7 of the Immoral Traffic (Prevention) Act and Sections 8/12/17 of the POCSO Act.

In the matter of: Sri Amit Maity

...Petitioner.

Mr. Manas kr. Das
Mr. Prantick Ghosh
Mr. Aritra Kr. Thokdar
Mr. Probal Das

...for the petitioner.

Ms. Jhuma Sen
Ms. Arpita De
Ms. Rajashree Saha

...for the minor victim.

Mr. Aditya Bikram Mahata
Mr. Anirban Das

...for the de-facto complainant.

Mr. Imran Ali
Mr. S. Ganguly

...for the State.

1. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits as follows. The petitioner is not the owner of the Spa in question. The license agreement of the petitioner was terminated earlier.
2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the de-facto complainant opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail.
3. Learned counsel appearing for the State strongly opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail. He submits that the leave and license agreement stands in the name of the petitioner and that he was the one running the spa, and

under his supervision illegal activities and other offences were being committed under the Immoral Traffic (Prevention) Act, the BNS and the POCSO Act. Three girls were recovered from the spa, one of whom was a minor. He has also a criminal antecedent.

4. Considering the above and the other incriminating materials available in the case diary, I do not consider this to be a fit case to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.
5. Accordingly, the application for anticipatory bail is rejected.

(Jay Sengupta, J.)