

30.03.2026  
Item No.1  
Ct. No. 34  
nb

**CRA 173 of 2014**

In the matter of: **Nemai Bauri.**

..... appellant.

Mr. Satadru Lahiri,  
Mr. Syed Wasim Faruque,,  
....For the appellant.  
Mr. Binay Panday,  
Mr. Subham Bhakat,  
.... For the State.

1. Photo copy of the report as directed to the prosecution is submitted be taken record.
2. This appeal was filed against the judgment and order of conviction dated January 31, 2014 passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge,(Re-designated) Court, Bankura in Sessions Case No.10(06) 2012/ Sessions Trial No.02(01) 2013 in connection with Saltora Police Station Case No.28 of 2012 dated 25.3.2012 under Sections 376/417 of the IPC whereby the appellant was directed to suffer rigorous imprisonment for five years and to pay fine of Rs.2,000/- in default to suffer rigorous imprisonment for 6(six) months and further directed to pay a sum of Rs.1,00,000/- to the victim for her sufferings physical and mental injury due to commission of rape upon her.
3. In terms of report submitted before this Court, the sentence served by the appellant is of four years six months and seventeen days and he was released on June 20, 2018 after

expiry of his fine sentence having earned 281 days remission. This report has been submitted by Superintendent Midnaore Central Correctional Home dated March 26, 2026 on the basis of report of Registrar.

4. Since nobody appeared to represent the appellant, the direction was given to the State Legal Services Authority to engage an advocate to represent the appellant and accordingly, Mr. Satadru Lahiri was engaged to represent the appellant.

5. In view of this report submitted before this Court, since the accused was released after expiry of having earned 281 days remission, there is nothing further to adjudicate the offence.

6. On careful perusal of the judgment against which the complaint was lodged it further reveals that the victim deposed before the Court that she knew the accused/appellant and committed such offence only after expressing that he loved the victim. Subsequently, he refused to marry the lady. Further, it transpires that the evidence was adduced on behalf of the prosecution and the certificate of the doctor was also submitted from which it was found that she was pregnant at that point of time. The learned Trial Court considered the facts and circumstances and evidence adduced before the Court and also after examining accused persons under Section 313 of the Code of Criminal Procedure passed such of order of conviction against him. Therefore, the prosecution also able to prove the case

beyond the shadow of reasonably doubt. Hence there is no reason to interfere with the said judgment.

7. In view of the above observation, the instant revisional application is disposed of.

8. All parties shall act on the server copies of this order duly downloaded from the official website of this Court.

**(CHAITALI CHATTERJEE (DAS), J.)**