

10.03.2026
Court No.28
Item No.8
ssi

CRM (A) 224 of 2026

In Re: - An application for anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Suraksha Nagarik Sanhita in connection with Hanskhali Police Station Case No. 847 of 2025 dated 26.10.2025 under Sections 126(2)/118(2)/117(2)/109(1)/3(5) of the BNS 2023 adding Section 103(1) of the BNS, 2023.

And

In the matter of: **Sanuyer Mondal & others.**

.... Petitioners

Mr. Rajdeep Mazumder, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Abir Ranjan Neogi
Mr. Moyukh Mukherjee
Mr. Karan Bapuli

...for the petitioners

Mr. Bitasok Banerjee
Mr. Tirupati Mukherjee

...for the State

Learned senior counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners submits as follows. The petitioner nos. 1, 2 and 3 are the sons of the principal accused and the petitioner no.4 is his wife. The brother of the principal accused succumbed to his injuries. However, the post-mortem report shows a single injury on the head. The FIR maker, being the wife of the victim, was not an eye-witness.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail. He refers to the post-mortem report, the inquest report and the statements of the witnesses, including the statements made by independent eye-witnesses before the police and an injured independent witness made before the learned Magistrate. All the statements have implicated the present petitioners as the assailants along with the principal accused.

The main injury was apparently quite deep and big.

It will be for the Courts to finally decide whether the cause of death was due to a single injury at a particular place or multiple injuries at such particular place.

Considering the above, the other incriminating materials available in the case diary and the alleged roles ascribed to the present petitioners, I do not consider this is to be a fit case for granting anticipatory bail.

Accordingly, the application for anticipatory bail of the petitioners is rejected.

(Jay Sengupta, J.)