

17.06.2026

Sl. No.29

NB

CRM (A) 1454 of 2026

In Re:- An application for anticipatory bail under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 corresponding to Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in connection with Taldangra PS Case No.03/2026 dated 02.01.2026 under Sections 79/356(3) of the BNS, 2023 adding sections 15/16 of POCSO Act.

And

In the matter of: Arnab Chatterjee

... petitioner

Mr. Santanu Talukdar,
Mr. Priyankar Ganguly,
Mr. S. M. Imtiaj,
Ms. Shalini Bairagi,
Mr. Amaan Deep Gupta,
Ms. Pipasa Chakraborty.
...for the petitioner.

Mr. Sunil Gupta
...for the State.

Mr. Arup Kundu,,
Mr. Shreyashee Mitra.
...for the de facto complainant.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits as follows. No prima facie case is made out against the present petitioner as would be evident from a plain reading of the FIR. No sexual exploitation of the minor victim was done by anyone.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the de facto complainant strongly opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail. He submits that the 16 year old victim girl was tricked into sharing her intimate photographs, which were thereafter circulated by the petitioner and another.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State relies on the case diary and opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail. He refers to

the statement of the victim recorded before the learned Magistrate, the statements of other witnesses and the phone call details.

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

The application for anticipatory bail of the petitioner is, thus, rejected.

Urgent photostat certified copies of this order may be delivered to the learned Advocates for the parties, if applied for, upon compliance of all formalities.

(Jay Sengupta, J.)