

12.06.2026
Court No.35.
D/L.04.
Rakib

CRA (SB) 96 of 2026

In Re: An Application under Section 14-A (2) of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989.

And

In the matter of : Giridhari Mahato & Anr.

.....Appellants.

Mr. Ayan Basu
Mr. Sk Salim
Mr. Sumit Routh

.....for the Appellants.

Mr. Krishnendu Bhattacharya, Ld. APP
Ms. Triparna Roy

.....for the State.

Mr. Rishav Singh
Mr. Soumalya Dutta
Ms. Mehak Jaiswal

.....for the respondent no.2.

Learned advocate appearing for the appellants submits that the appellants were arrested on 04.07.2025 and since then they are in custody. Charge-sheet has already been submitted before the jurisdictional Court and the genesis of the case arose out of business dispute which has been given the colour of an offence under the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 for the purpose of putting the appellants and their family members behind the bar.

Learned advocate for the de-facto complainant/respondent no.2 is present and opposes the prayer for bail. It has been submitted that the accused persons conjointly attacked the members of the complainant's family, one of them namely, Raj Sahu sustained grievous injury and other two members also suffered injury. There was puncture at the vital part of the body. The

accused persons being dangerous, there is every possibility of repetition of the offence at the behest of the accused persons.

Learned advocate for the State submits that so far as the complicity of the appellant no.2 namely, Subham Mahato is concerned, the same would be transparent from the statement of the injured who was involved in inflicting the vital blow. So far as the appellant no.1 namely, Giridhari Mahato is concerned, he was present but appeared subsequently on being called by one of the accused persons.

I have taken into account the period of detention of the present appellants which is more than 11 months, the complicity of the appellants so far as the offence is concerned, and the fact that charge is yet to be framed. Having regard to the same, I am of the opinion that so far as the appellant no.2 is concerned, at this stage, I am not inclined to release him on bail. Accordingly, the prayer for bail of appellant no.2 namely, **Subham Mahato** is hereby **rejected**.

So far as the appellant no.1 namely, Giridhari Mahato is concerned, his prayer for bail is **allowed**.

As such, appellant no.1 namely, **Giridhari Mahato** shall be released on bail upon furnishing bond of Rs. 20,000/- (Rupees Twenty Thousand only), with two sureties of Rs. 10,000 (Rupees Ten Thousand only) each, one of whom must be local to the satisfaction of the learned Additional Sessions Judge, 1st Court, Purulia.

If on bail, the appellant no.1 shall be physically present on each and every date before the learned trial Court and shall not

enter the jurisdiction of the Jhalda Police Station till the charges are framed by the learned trial Court.

Additionally, the appellant no.1 shall once in every fortnight meet with the Officer-in-Charge of Jhalda Police Station and for the said purpose the appellant no.1 may be allowed to enter the jurisdiction of Jhalda Police Station.

With the aforesaid observations CRA (SB) 96 of 2026 is **disposed of.**

Memo of evidence filed by the State be kept with the record.

All parties shall act in terms of server copy of the order downloaded from the official website of this Court.

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

(Tirthankar Ghosh, J.)