

16.02.2026
Serial no. 29
[G.S.D]

CRM (M) 233 of 2026

In re : An Application for Bail under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973/under Section 483 of the BNSS, 2023 in connection with Sessions Trial No. 05(12) 2024 arisen out of Baguiati PS Case No. 254 of 2024 dated 28.04.2024 u/s 341/323/325/326/354/307/302/427/448/506/120B of the IPC .
-And-

In the matter of : Dipankar Das & ors.

... Petitioner(s)

Mr. Ayan Bhattacharjee, Sr Adv.
Mr. Dattatreya Dutta
Mr. Monjit Bhattacharjee
Mr. S. Roy

... for the Petitioner(s)

Mr. Anand Keshari
Mr. Suparna Chatterjee

... for the State-respondent(s)

Mr. Jyoti Prakash Chatterjee

... for the defacto-complainant(s)

Mr. Bhattacharjee, learned Senior Advocate for the petitioner, submits that the petitioner is in custody for one year nine months and out of the 39 witnesses proposed to be examined, only 10 witnesses have been examined.

Learned advocate further submits that so far as the evidence of the vulnerable witnesses is concerned, the same is over and there are hardly any materials so far as these petitioners are concerned. In fact, according to the learned advocate, some of the witnesses on whom the prosecution has relied upon do dislodge the prosecution’s version.

Learned advocate for the State submits that they would reduce the number of the witnesses to another ten or eleven witnesses and asserts they would put in efforts to conclude the evidence at the earliest.

Learned advocate for the defacto-complainant opposes the prayer for bail and submits that his family is still receiving threats.

Be that as it may, having considered that the evidence of the case is in full swing, at this stage, I do not intend to enter into the arena of appreciation of evidence regarding truth and/or falsity of the same.

However, State is directed to take steps according to the report submitted before this court.

The learned trial court would fix a schedule consisting of three dates in a month so that the trial is taken to its logical conclusion at the earliest. No unnecessary adjournment be granted to any of the parties and the trial of the case would continue inspite of any resolution of the local Bar. The learned trial court would ensure that if a witness is present in court without any reasonable cause, the said witness without being completed should not be returned.

Having considered the overall circumstances of the case, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail.

Hence, the prayer for bail of the petitioner is **Rejected.**

Accordingly, CRM(M) 233 of 2026 is **dismissed**.

Pending application(s), if any, is also disposed of.

Parties to act on a server copy of this order duly collected from the official website of the Hon'ble High Court, Calcutta.

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

(Tirthankar Ghosh, J.)