

24.02.2026  
Court No.28  
Item No.26  
ssi

**CRM (A) 423 of 2026**

In Re: - An application for anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Suraksha Nagarik Sanhita in connection with Haripal Police Station Case No. 813 of 2025 dated 09.12.2025 under Sections 103/3(5) of the BNS 2023.

And

In the matter of: **Srikumar Chowdhury @ Sukumar Chowdhury @ Chaudhury & another.**

.... Petitioners

Mr. Bitasok Banerjee  
Mr. Amanul Islam  
Mr. Sourav Mukherjee  
Mr. Raja Das

...for the petitioners

Mr. Debasis Kar

...for the de facto

Mr. Iqbal Kabir  
Ms. Ratna Ghosh

..for the State

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners submits as follows. The alleged victim went missing on 13.10.2025. His body was found on 16.10.2025. But, the wife lodged the FIR much later on 09.12.2025. The petitioners are co-workers of the alleged victim. They used to work in a chemical factory under a contractor. In fact, the contractor had lodged a GD entry on 14.10.2025. The post-mortem report stated that the victim died due to drowning and there was alcohol found in the stomach. There was no external injury found on the dead body. The petitioners have been falsely implicated in this case.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the de facto complainant opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail. He submits that drowning

after consumption of alcohol may or may not be a voluntary. Although the contractor lodged a G.D. entry on 14.10.2025, neither the present petitioners who were staying with the alleged victim nor the contractor intimated the wife about it.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State strongly opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail. He relies on statements of witnesses and the post mortem report. According to the statement of a witness, present at page 220 of the case diary, the victim had told him that he was to go out with the co-accused Sukumar to see a doctor in the evening. According to the statement of a witness present at page 221 of the case diary, he had seen the petitioner and the said co-accused Sukumar go out in the afternoon. But, in the evening at about 7 PM, only Sukumar came back, but the victim did not return. The present petitioners were co-workers who were staying together at the same place with the said victim.

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

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

The presence of the I.O. is noted and is dispensed with.

**(Jay Sengupta, J.)**