

17.02.2026

Item No.11

Ct.No.35

dc.

Rejected

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

C.R.M. (M) 2054 of 2025

In Re : An Application for bail under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 filed in connection with New Town Police Station Case No. 314 of 2023 dated 06.10.2023 under Sections 364A/302/120B of the Indian Penal Code and charge framed under Sections 364A/302/120B/201/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

And

In Re : **Sushanta Ghosh @ Pappu**

... Petitioner.

Mr. Sabir Ahmed,
Mr. Manojit Debnath,
Mr. Dilwar Azad

... For the Petitioner.

Mr. Madhusudan Sur, APP,
Mr. Ashok Das

... For the State.

Mr. Kajal Mukherjee,
Mr. Bikash Chakraborty,
Ms. Pallabi Mondal,
Ms. Sejuti Roy,
Mr. Sudepto Kumar Basu

... For the *de facto* complainant.

Learned advocate appearing for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody for 2 years 4 months 10 days. The present application is for renewal of the prayer for bail. According to the learned advocate for the petitioner, the case is of circumstantial evidence and the pivotal issue on which the prosecution has implicated the present petitioner is based on CCTV footages which have no connection with the present petitioner, but a co-accused who has been implicated in connection with the case wherein it is seen that the said co-accused and the victim were coming out from a

liquor shop. It has also been submitted on behalf of the petitioner that after a long lapse of time, it has been shown by the investigating agency that DNA profiling in respect of hair of the present petitioner has matched with the materials collected from the place of occurrence.

Learned advocate appearing for the *de facto* complainant opposes the prayer for bail.

Learned advocate appearing for the State also opposes the prayer for bail.

Both the learned advocates for the *de facto* complainant and the State have submitted that presently seven witnesses have been examined and the prosecution as a whole intends to examine 50-55 witnesses.

The background of the case reflects that the deceased was a boy from Malda who came for preparation of NEET Examination and was admitted at a private institution named Physicswallah. The father of the deceased initially received a telephone call and thereafter a photograph in a mobile which reflected a sordid picture of the deceased and a ransom of Rs.30,00,000/- was demanded from the father of the deceased. There were threats also since information was sent to New Town Police Station. The other co-accused viz. Goutam Singh was contacted who attempted to derail the investigation claiming innocence of the fact. It was found that from the tenanted premises of the co-accused, the body of the deceased was recovered from a trolley-bag. It has also been found that the manner in which the face of the deceased was covered in the photograph, matched with the

manner in which the body was recovered particularly the face which was recovered.

Police authorities conducted the investigation and in course of investigation, the name of the petitioner also surfaced as also that of the co-accused. CCTV footages obviously is a part of the case, but presently I find that there are depositions which implicate the present petitioner which are already before the learned Trial Court. The incident happened at New Town, an adjacent place to Calcutta at the I.T. Hub wherein the deceased and his friend came from a district town to study. The gravity of the offence relates to demand of ransom by way of kidnapping the deceased initially and thereafter the body of the deceased being recovered after having been murdered in a trolley-bag.

Having considered the heinousness of the offence, petitioner's name allegedly coming in the chain of events and the gruesome manner in which the complainant's son was murdered, I am of the view that the heinousness do not call for release of bail of the present petitioner. Accordingly, at this stage, the prayer for bail of the petitioner is **rejected**.

State would take steps so that some priority is attached with the process of trial.

The application for bail, being CRM (M) 2054 of 2025, is, thus, dismissed.

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.)