05.10.2026
Item No.47
Ct.No.35
dc.
Rejected

IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS JURISDICTION

C.R.M. (M) 1386 of 2026

In Re : An Application for bail under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 corresponding to Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 filed in connection with STF Police Station Case No. 14 of 2023 dated 07.04.2023 under Sections 121/121A/122/123/120B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and Sections 16/17/18/18A/20 of the Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act and Sections 25(1AA)/25(1B)(a) of the Arms Act.

And

In Re : **Pratick Bhowmik**

... Petitioner.

Ms. Sampurna Ghosh,
Mr. Saptak Naskar,
Mr. D. N. Saha,
Mr. Debraj Porey

... For the Petitioner.

Mr. Krishnendu Bhattacharya, APP,
Ms. Tanusree Kar

... For the State.

Learned advocate appearing for the petitioner submits that petitioner was arrested on 18.11.2023 and since then he is in custody. Till date, only four witnesses have been examined and according to the petitioner, seizures were effected from a different location and as a mark of protest, petitioner refused to sign on the seizure list. There is no possibility of the trial concluding in near future as large number of witnesses have been relied upon by the prosecution and in other cases, petitioner has already been granted bail.

Learned advocate appearing for the State, on the other hand, opposes the prayer for bail, refers to the seizure list and the purpose for which the petitioner was arrested.

Learned advocate for the State submits that there are seven more vulnerable witnesses on whom the prosecution proposes to rely upon which have been relied for evidences against the present petitioner.

I have taken into account the overall materials appearing in the case diary including the charges for which the petitioner has been called upon to face the trial. Having considered that there were recoveries which are subject to cross-examination, I am not inclined to release the petitioner on bail at this stage. As such, the prayer for bail of the petitioner is **rejected**.

State is directed to expedite the process of trial particularly the seven witnesses on whom the prosecution intends to rely upon and complete their evidence by 15.03.2027.

Petitioner would renew his prayer for bail after the aforesaid time period is over.

Memo of Evidence submitted by the learned advocate appearing for the State be kept with the record.

The application for bail, being CRM (M) 1386 of 2026, is, thus, disposed of.

Learned advocate for the State is directed to communicate this order to the learned Trial Court.

All concerned parties shall act on the server copy of this order duly 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.)