

10.06.2026
Court No.28
Item No.48
ssi

CRM (A) 1391 of 2026

In Re: - An application for anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Suraksha Nagarik Sanhita in connection with Shyampur Police Station Case No. 591 of 2025 dated 28.10.2025 under Sections 126(2)/118(2)/ 109/351 (3)/3(5) of the BNS 2023.

And

In the matter of: **Sk. Maidul Islam**

.... Petitioner

Mr. Sandip Kundu

...for the petitioner

Mr. Pritam Roy

Ms. Triparna Roy

...for the State

Mr. Subhasish Pachhal

...for the de facto

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits as follows. This is a second application for anticipatory bail filed on the ground that charge sheet has been submitted without including the charge of theft, which was there in the FIR. He submits that two other co-accused have already been granted bail.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the de facto complainant strongly opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail. He submits that the charge of theft was indeed a minor one. The main allegations were of inflicting grievous injury. In fact, there is post-bail conduct on the part of some of the co-accused which may lead to cancellation of the bail granted to them.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State relies on the case diary and strongly opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail. He refers to the injury report of one of the victims present at page 37 of the case diary. The report shows a midline cut injury on a vital part of

the body, like the scalp, requiring four stitches for repair, along with other injuries like a lateral cut injury on the scalp, bleeding from nose, swelling and a lateral cut injury on the right hand and the like. There are statements of witnesses including that of an independent eye-witness present at page 8 of the case diary, which clearly implicate the present petitioner. The State has already filed an application for cancellation of bail in respect of two other co-accused.

Considering the above and the other incriminating materials available in the case diary, I do not consider this is to be a fit case for granting anticipatory bail.

Accordingly, the application for anticipatory bail is rejected.

Urgent photostat certified copy of this order be supplied to the parties, if applied for, as early as possible.

(Jay Sengupta, J.)