

25.06.2026
Court No.28
Item No.36
tbsr
Reject

CRM (A) 1731 of 2026

In Re: - An application for anticipatory bail under Section 438 of the Criminal Procedure Code, 1973 corresponding to Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in connection with **Ghola** P.S. Case No. **393 of 2023** dated **02.09.2023** under Sections **195A/341/326B/307/506/34** of the Indian Penal Code.

And

In the matter of: Tanim Chowdhury

....Petitioner.

Mr. Sabyasachi Mukherjee

Mr. Ranabeer Halder

...for the petitioner.

Mr. Kaustav Lal Mukherjee

....for the State.

Mr. Moyukh Mukherjee

Ms. Sagnika Banerjee

Ms. Sarmistha Basak

....for the o.p.2

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits as follows. The petitioner is absolutely innocent and has been falsely implicated in this case. The whole dispute pertains to family issues between the de facto complainant and her husband. Earlier, this Court was pleased to grant anticipatory bail to an advocate who was allegedly involved in this case. The petitioner stands on the same footing as the said lawyer, who was granted such benefit.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the de facto complainant opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail and submits as follows. Initially, the wife filed a case against the husband, among other things, alleging acid attack. The husband was taken into custody and charge sheet was filed. Later on, the husband produced video footage and other photographs which showed that the whole false

story of the acid attack was carefully planned and staged by the wife along with the present petitioner and the others. The present petitioner and others are in the habit of foisting such fake stories in different cases. They take money and gold for doing so.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State relies on the case diary and opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail. He relies on the statements of witnesses recorded before the learned Magistrate. He also refers to the video footage in this regard.

It appears that when anticipatory bail was granted to the concerned lawyer, it was never argued by any of the parties that the lawyer was involved in staging a fake acid attack, or for that matter, that there was any video to that effect. The allegation was of false advice and deceit. The other reason for grant of the relief was that she was having a two months old infant.

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.

The application for anticipatory bail 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.)