

25.06.2026

Item No.69

Ct.No.35

dc.

Rejected

**IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS JURISDICTION**

C.R.M. (M) 878 of 2026

In Re : An Application for bail under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 corresponding to Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 filed in connection with Nalhati Police Station Case No. 218 of 2024 dated 02.05.2024 under Sections 302/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

And

In Re : **Bipul Mal**

... Petitioner.

Md. Kutubuddin

... For the Petitioner.

Mr. Gouranga Kumar Das, APP,
Mr. P. Karan Singh

... For the State.

Learned advocate appearing for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is similarly placed as other accused who has been granted bail on 24.03.2025 in CRM (DB) 169 of 2025. It has also been pointed out that the genesis of the case arose as a relationship existed between the deceased and the wife of the present petitioner. The petitioner along with his wife conspired and murdered the deceased. Learned advocate for the petitioner emphasises on the factum of detention of the present petitioner for 2 years 2 months and out of 21 witnesses cited by the prosecution, till date only three witnesses have been examined.

Learned advocate appearing for the State, on the other hand, opposes the prayer for bail and draws the attention of the Court to the materials appearing in the case diary.

I have perused the *post mortem* report which reflects the manner in which the deceased was stabbed to death at different parts of the body. The other accused was granted bail not only on the ground of delay, but because she is a lady. At this stage, I am not inclined to release the petitioner on bail. As such, the prayer for bail of the petitioner is **rejected**.

However, as a matter of last opportunity, the State is granted six months' time to complete at least examination of the vulnerable and important witnesses associated with the present case. It is also reiterated that no unnecessary adjournment be granted to any of the parties and trial of the case would continue in spite of any resolution of the local Bar.

Petitioner would renew his prayer for bail after the aforesaid time period is over.

Memo of Evidence submitted by the learned advocate appearing for the State be kept with the record.

The application for bail, being CRM (M) 878 of 2026, is, thus, disposed of.

Learned advocate appearing for the State would communicate this order to the learned Trial Court so that dates may be fixed accordingly for progressing with the trial of the case.

All concerned parties shall act on the server copy of this order duly downloaded from the official *website* of this Court.

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

(Tirthankar Ghosh, J.)