

23/06/2026
D/L – 20
Court No.28
S. Kundu
Rejected

C.R.M.(A) 1345 of 2026

In Re: An application for anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023. In connection with Hasnabad P.S case no. 42 of 2026 dated 21/01/2026 under sections 85/316(2)/89/64/115(2)/117(2)/109/3(5) of the BNS and Sections 3/4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act.

In the matter of: XXX

...Petitioner.

Mr. Angshuman Chakraborty
Mr. S.S. Saha

...for the petitioner.

Mr. Krishnendu Bhattacharyya
Mr. Pritam Roy

...for the State.

1. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits as follows. The petitioner is the husband of the married sister-in-law of the victim. The marriage between the victim and her husband had taken place four years ago. Suddenly, an allegation has been levelled against the members of petitioner's household about torture due to dowry demand and attempt to murder. An allegation of attempt to rape was also made against the present petitioner. There is a delay of about three days in lodging the FIR. The petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case.
2. Learned counsel appearing for the State relies on the case diary and opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail. He relies on the statements of the alleged victim recorded before the learned Magistrate, the statements of other

witnesses including the independent neighbours, which implicate the present petitioner. He also refers to the medical paper regarding abortion as well as the medical report for the assault done by the mother-in-law and others after she complained of an attempt to rape committed by the present petitioner. As per the statement of the alleged victim, on one occasion the petitioner grabbed her from behind and tried to commit rape. After she complained to the inmates of the house about this, the mother-in-law threw hot oil/water on her body and the other accused assaulted her. Reliance is placed on the injury report.

3. 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.
4. Accordingly, the application for anticipatory bail is rejected.
5. The presence of the Investigating Officer is noted and is dispensed with.
6. Urgent photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be given to the parties upon compliance with requisite formalities.

(Jay Sengupta, J.)