

12.05.2026
Serial no. 10
[G.S.D]

CRM (R) 49 of 2026

In re : An Application for Bail under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973/under Section 483 of the BNSS, 2023 in connection with Kandi PS Case No. 470 of 2025 dated 26.09.2025 u/s 103(1) of BNS (GR No. 1891/25) and 27 Arms Act 1959 [Sessions Sl. No. 56 of 2026].

-And-

In the matter of : Raj Sk @ Mijarul Islam

	... Petitioner(s)
Mr. Pratip Kumar Chatterjee, Sr Adv. Ms. Maitrayee Chatterjee	
	... for the Petitioner(s)
Mr. Sagar Saha	
	... for the State-respondent(s)
Mr. Jishan Iqbal Hossain Ms. Minati Gomes	
	... for the defacto-complainant(s)

Learned Registrar (IT), High Court, Calcutta is directed to amend the case number as the same refers to as '**CRM (R) 49 of 2026**'. It should be read as '**CRM (M)**', as the case has been registered under Section 103(1) of the Arms Act.

The petitioner is in custody since 27th September, 2025 and charge-sheet has been submitted. Learned advocate for the petitioner, as such, submits that there is no scope of the trial being concluded in the near future as the prosecution has relied upon 34 witnesses and till date charges have not been framed by the learned trial court. Learned advocate further submits that unnecessarily the petitioner on the basis of suspicion has been implicated in

the case and is languishing in jail for a considerable period of time. As such, according to the learned advocate, the petitioner may be enlarged on bail.

Learned advocate for the defacto-complainant is present and opposes the prayer for bail.

Learned advocate for the State also opposes the prayer for bail on the ground that the petitioner is the sole accused and there are overwhelming materials appearing against him. Learned advocate states that it is the petitioner who fired at the deceased which resulted in the deceased's succumbing to injuries. Moreover, according to the learned advocate, finger print impression has already matched and it is only the statement of this accused, fire arms were recovered which were used in the commission of alleged offence.

Having considered the gravity and heinousness of the offence, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail.

Hence, the prayer for bail of the petitioner is **Rejected.**

Accordingly, the bail application is dismissed.

Memo of Evidence submitted be kept with the record.

Parties to act on a server copy of this order duly collected from the official website of the Hon'ble High Court, Calcutta.

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

(Tirthankar Ghosh, J.)