

06/04/2026
D/L – 92
Court No.28
S. Kundu
Rejected

C.R.M.(A) 692 of 2026

In Re: An application for anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023. In connection with Raniganj P.S case no. 138 of 2025 dated 15/05/2025 under sections 115(2)/117(2)/118(2)/126(2)/3(5)/351(2) of the BNS.

In the matter of: Kranti Singh @ Vanu Pratap Singh @ Bhanu Pratap Singh

...Petitioner.

Mr. Avik Ghatak
Mr. Fahad Imam
Mr. S. Kar

...for the petitioner.

Mr. Krishan Ray
Ms. Isita Kundu

...for the de-facto complainant.

Ms. Baisali Basu
Ms. Soukteya Ganguly

...for the State.

1. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits as follows. The petitioner is not the principal accused in this case. Earlier, the application for anticipatory bail of the principal accused was rejected by this Court. At that time, there was a charge of attempt to murder present in the FIR. However, charge sheet has now been submitted without including the said provision. Another co-accused has been granted bail by the learned Sessions Court and another co-accused has been granted anticipatory bail by the Vacation Bench of this Court.
2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the de-facto complainant opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail. He submits that the victim was brutally assaulted by more

than one accused and sustained multiple injuries. Upon protest petition filed by the de-facto complainant, further investigation has been directed by the learned Magistrate.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail. She refers to the statements of the victim and other eye-witnesses implicating the petitioner. She also refers to the injury report present at page 42 of the case diary, which shows that there was trauma on the face and the head of the victim due to physical assault. The CT scan of the brain shows there was a thin subdural hemorrhage along the posterior interhemispheric region and the right tentorial leaflet.
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.)