

09.04.2026
Sl. No.61
Ct. 28
NB

C.R.M (A) 781 of 2026

In Re:- An application for anticipatory bail under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 corresponding to Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in connection with Patuli Women PS Case No.09/2025 dated 11.12.2025 under Sections 109/69/316(2) of the BNS, 2023.

And

In the matter of: Amit Kumar Goswami

... petitioner

Mr. Sandipan Ganguly Sr.Adv.,
Mr. Kunal Ganguly,
Ms. Priyanka Sarkar.
...for the petitioner.

Mr. Saibal Bapuli Id.APP.,
Mr. Arani Bhattacharyya.
...for the State.

Mr. Prattay Khan,
Ms. S. Bose,
Mr. Shounak Mondal,
Mr. Asad Ali,
Mr. N. Dey.
...for the de facto complainant.

Affidavit of service filed on behalf of the petitioner is taken on record.

Learned senior counsel representing the petitioner submits as follows. It is alleged that the petitioner and the alleged survivor had a relationship for quite some time. When the alleged victim requested the petitioner to marry her, he refused. It is also alleged that in October, 2024, there was an attempt made by the petitioner to suffocate her with a pillow. But the FIR was lodged only in December, 2025. Even so far as the acquaintance and the relationship between the two are concerned, it is alleged that such acquaintance developed since March, 2022 and the closer

relationship developed from August, 2023. There is an inordinate delay in lodging the FIR. Actually, there was a consequential relationship between the two adults. The two went to places together. When the relationship soured, the FIR was lodged.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the de facto complainant strongly opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail. The de facto complainant is a vlogger. The petitioner impersonated himself as a doctor, but actually was a physiotherapist. Later, the victim learnt that the petitioner was a married man. The petitioner exploited the victim on a false promise of marriage.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail. He refers to the statement of the victim recorded before the learned Magistrate, the medical report and the statements of neighbours.

Considering the above, the other materials available in the case diary and the fact that there was some kind of a relationship between the two adults for a particular length of time, I do not think that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required in this case and I am inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

Accordingly, in the event of arrest, the petitioner shall be released on bail upon furnishing a bond of Rs.10,000/- with two sureties of like amount each, one of whom must be local, to the satisfaction of Arresting Officer and subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, corresponding to Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita and on further condition that the petitioner shall cooperate with the investigation and shall not threaten or intimidate witnesses

or tamper with evidence in any manner whatsoever and the petitioner shall meet the Investigating Officer once a week till submission of report in final form.

The application for anticipatory bail is, thus, disposed of.

Urgent photostat certified copies of this order may be delivered to the learned Advocates for the parties, if applied for, upon compliance of all formalities.

(Jay Sengupta, J.)