

17/06/2026
D/L – 13
Court No.28
S. Kundu
Rejected

C.R.M.(A) 1352 of 2026

In Re: An application for anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023. In connection with Pursurah P.S case no. 55 of 2026 dated 16/03/2026 under sections 126(2)/115(2)/117(2)/76/118(2)/109(1)/352/351(3)/3(5) of the BNS.

In the matter of: Jahanara Begum @ Jahanara Begum Chowdhury & Ors.

...Petitioners.

Mr. Imran Ali
Ms. Ankita Bose

...for the petitioners.

Mr. Angshuman Chakraborty
Mr. S.S. Saha

...for the de-facto complainant.

Mr. Krishnendu Bhattacharyya
Mr. Sanjib Das

...for the State.

1. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners submits as follows. The petitioners have been falsely implicated in this case. Although there was a scuffle between two groups over an old dispute, as would be evident from the FIR, the main allegations were against the male members of the family.
2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the de-facto complainant strongly opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail. He submits that as many as seven persons were injured. Two of the victims received multiple fracture injuries, one of whom had to undergo jaw implant. Another victim suffered a skull fracture. Three other victims also received grievous injuries. All the present

petitioners assaulted the said victims, which resulted in such injuries.

3. Learned APP representing the State relies on the case diary and opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail. He refers to the FIR, the statements of victims and other eye-witnesses. He also refers to the injury reports, which show infliction of several injuries. The victims have categorically named the present petitioners as the assailants.
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 petitioners.
5. Accordingly, the application for anticipatory bail is rejected.
6. Presence of the Investigating Officer is noted and is dispensed with.

(Jay Sengupta, J.)