

26.05.2026
(D/L 47)
Ct. No.7
Vacation Bench
Rejected
(S.M) (B.K.N)

**IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS JURISDICTION**

CRM (A) 1514 of 2026

In Re:- An application for anticipatory bail under section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in connection with Chakdah Police Station Case No. 121 of 2026 dated 28th January, 2026 under Sections 64(1)/353(2)/351(3)/3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 read with Sections 4/12/15 of the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012 corresponding to Serial No. 136 of 2026 presently pending in the Court of the Learned Additional Sessions Judge, Kalyani, District-Nadia being the Learned Judge, Special Court, POCSO Act, Kalyani, District-Nadia.

In the matter of : **Rahul Sahaji**

... Petitioner

Mr. Shibaji Kumar Das

... for the petitioner

Mr. Pradip Banerjee,
Mr. Bankim Pal

... for the State

1. Mr. Das, learned Advocate representing the petitioner, submits that the principal allegation is directed against one Susanta Bar. He further submits that another accused person, namely Toton Dutta, who allegedly took certain photographs, has already been released on bail. He contends that no specific overt act has been attributed to the present petitioner and, in such circumstances, it would not be just to compel him to languish in judicial custody.
2. Mr. Banerjee, learned Advocate appearing for the State, produces the case diary and opposes the prayer for bail on the

basis of the materials available therein. He submits that sufficient incriminating materials are available in the case diary against the present accused person. He further submits that the necessity of custodial interrogation of the present petitioner cannot be ruled out.

3. Heard the learned advocate for the respective parties. Perused the materials on record including the case diary.
4. Prima facie, certain incriminating materials are available in the case diary. Considering this aspect, as also the allegations levelled against the present accused person and the complicity of the present petitioner in the alleged offence, I am of the view that it would not be proper to hold that custodial interrogation of the present petitioner is not necessary. Accordingly, the prayer for pre-arrest bail made by the petitioner cannot be entertained.
5. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail is rejected.
6. CRM(A) 1514 of 2026 is dismissed.

(Partha Sarathi Chatterjee, J.)