

22.06.2026
Court No.35.
D/L.09.
Rakib
(Rejected)

CRM (M) 1308 of 2026

In Re: An Application for Bail under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973/Under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in connection with Lake Town Police Station case no. 143 of 2023 dated 13.07.2023 under Sections 302/120B/34 of the Indian Penal Code and 25/27 of Arms Act.

And

In the matter of : Tamal Paul @ Rahul Paul.

.....Petitioner.

Mr. Debasis Kar
Mr. Arka Tilak Bhadra
Ms. Suhana Parvin

.....for the Petitioner.

Mr. Dr. Pradip Banerjee, Ld. APP
Mr. Sagar Saha

.....for the State.

Inadvertently in the earlier order dated 17.06.2026 the Cause Title of the bail application has been wrongly transcribed. It has been typed as “**Mosaraf Laskar @ Raju**”, the same is incorrect and should be read as “**Tamal Paul @ Rahul Paul**”.

Department is directed to incorporate necessary corrections in the order dated 17.06.2026.

Learned advocate appearing for the petitioner submits that petitioner is in custody for three years and till date only 5 witnesses have been examined. Prosecution has relied upon 35 witnesses in order to prove its case. It has also been submitted that earlier direction of this Court has not been complied with.

Learned advocate appearing for the State submits that there are incriminating materials appearing against the present petitioner so far as his presence is concerned at the spot, thereby facilitating the sharp shooter by identifying the deceased. There is a witness who has deposed specifically and the said witnesses also identified the accused in T.I. Parade.

The present case is one which because of previous rivalry the deceased had to sustain bullet injury and as such succumbed to the same. The prosecution case relate to the petitioner being petitioner having engaged a sharp shooter on behalf of the principal accused with whom the deceased had previous enmity. The manner in which that there are cases where Article 21 of the Constitution of India is invoked but present is a case where there are materials collected and the conduct of the accused is such that he aided and abetted the principal accused to implement the design of murdering the deceased, Snehasish Roy.

Having considered the complicity of the present petitioner until and unless the relevant witnesses are examined before the trial Court, it would be difficult for this Court to check the veracity and in such a heinous offence release him on bail.

Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the petitioner in CRM (M) 1308 of 2026 is **rejected**.

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.)