

25.03.2026

Item No.32

Ct.No.35

dc.

partly allowed

**IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS JURISDICTION**

**C.R.M. (M) 161 of 2026**

In Re : An Application for bail under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 filed in connection with Domkal Police Station Case No. 651 of 2025 dated 30.07.2025 under Sections 80(2)/85/70(1)/103(1)/61(2)/238(a)/66 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (G.R. No. 5036 of 2025).

And

In Re : **Sagora Bibi @ Sagara Bibi and another**  
... Petitioners.

Mr. Partha Sarathi Mondal,  
Mr. Kingsuk Mondal  
... For the Petitioners.

Mr. Arindam Sen,  
Mr. Santanu Deb Roy  
... For the State.

Mr. Jissan Iqbal Hossain ... For the *de facto* complainant.

Learned advocate appearing for the petitioners prays for bail on behalf of the petitioner no.1 being the sister-in-law and the petitioner no.2 who is the father-in-law of the deceased.

Learned advocate appearing for the *de facto* complainant opposes the prayer for bail.

Learned advocate appearing for the State also opposes the prayer for bail and draws the attention of the Court to the *post mortem* report.

Having regard to the materials which are appearing in the case diary so far as the petitioner no.1 is concerned, I am of the view that since the petitioner no.1 is the married

sister-in-law, her further detention may not be warranted in the facts of the present case. As such, the prayer for bail of the petitioner no.1 is **allowed**.

Accordingly, the petitioner No.1 viz., **Sagora Bibi @ Sagara Bibi** shall be released on bail upon furnishing bond of Rs.20,000/-, with two sureties of Rs.10,000/- each, one of whom must be local, to the satisfaction of the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Murshidabad at Berhampore.

If on bail, the petitioner No.1 shall be physically present on each and every date so fixed by the learned Trial Court and shall not leave the jurisdiction of the district of Murshidabad without prior permission of the learned Trial Court.

However, there are materials which are *prima facie* appearing against the petitioner no.2 which do require presently the custodial detention for the purposes of progress of the case. Having considered the same, at this stage, I am not inclined to release the petitioner no.2 on bail. As such, the prayer for bail of the petitioner No. 2 viz. **Amiruddin Ansary @ Amiruddin Ansari** is **rejected**.

Report submitted by the learned advocate appearing for the State be kept with the record.

The application for bail, being CRM (M) 161 of 2026, is, thus, disposed of.

All concerned parties shall act on the server copy of this order duly downloaded from the official *website* of this Court.

Urgent photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be supplied to the parties upon compliance with all requisite formalities.

**(Tirthankar Ghosh, J.)**