

16.06.2026
Serial no. 30
[G.S.D]

CRM (M) 1340 of 2026

In re : An Application for Bail under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973/under Section 483 of the BNSS, 2023 in connection with ST No. 2(3) 2023, SC No. 10/2023 arising out of Duttapukur Police Station Case No. 627/2022 dated 27.06.2022 u/s 302/34 of the IPC and Sections 25/27 of the Arms Act.
-And-

In the matter of : Akash Nayek

	... Petitioner(s)
Mr. Souvik Mitter Mr. Anghsuman Chakraborty Mr. S. S. Saha Mr. Saikat G.	
	... for the Petitioner(s)
Mr. Rajendra Banerjee, Id. APP Mr. P. Karan Singh	
	... for the State-respondent(s)
Mr. Dhananjay Banerjee Mr. A. Dutta	
	... for the defacto – complainant(s)

The petitioner earlier approached this court and his prayer for bail was rejected. Lastly, on 25.11.2025, there was a direction passed by this court to complete at least 10 witnesses within a period of six months from the said date and the petitioner was granted liberty to approach this court in the 2nd week of May, 2026. The petitioner has approached this court accordingly.

Learned advocate for the petitioner submits that there is no iota of materials available in the evidence of 23 witnesses who were tendered by the prosecution in support of its case. Therefore, learned advocate prays that the

petitioner may be enlarged on bail on any stringent condition.

Mr. Banerjee, learned APP, submits that the prosecution intends to examine three more witnesses and the same could not be done in view of the Judicial Officers being engaged on other duties except judicial work.

Considering the above, as a matter of last chance, two months' more time (from the date of communication of this order) is granted to complete the evidence of rest of the three witnesses. If the same is not complete within the aforesaid time period, the petitioner would be at liberty to approach this court after the aforesaid time period is over.

Learned advocate for the defacto-complainant appears and submits that, in the meantime, one accused, namely, Tushar Kanti Mazumder approached before the Hon'ble Supreme Court, whose bail prayer was rejected in a Special Leave to Appeal [Crl.) No(s). 14899 of 2025]

Having considered the advanced stage of the case, I am not inclined to release the petitioner on bail at this stage.

Hence, the prayer for bail of the petitioner is **Rejected.**

Accordingly, CRM (M) 1340 of 2026 is **dismissed.**

Report submitted be kept with the record.

Parties to act on a server copy of this order duly collected from the official website of the Hon'ble High Court, Calcutta.

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

(Tirthankar Ghosh, J.)