

09.02.2026
Serial no. 182
[G.S.D]

CRM (M) 2393 of 2025

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 **Dasnagar Police Station Case No. 358 of 2015 dt. 30.09.2015 corresponding to Session Trial No. 54 of 2016 u/s 448/302/34 of the IPC and Sections 25/27 of the Arms Act.**

-And-

In the matter of : Binod Singh

... Petitioner(s)

Mr. Sandipan Ganguly, Sr Adv.,
Ms. Madhumita Basak
Ms. Sanjana Saha

... for the Petitioner(s)

Mr. Iqbal Kabir
Ms. Sreetama Das

... for the State-respondent(s)

Mr. Anand Keshari
Ms. Pubali Debnath
Ms. Dhriti Chanda
Ms. Sneha Bhattacharjee

... for the defacto – complainant(s)

Learned advocate for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody for ten years and twelve witnesses have been examined out of the 26 witnesses proposed to be examined by the prosecution.

It has also been submitted that earlier on many occasions, prosecution intended to conclude the trial within a year. However, the petitioner is languishing for a considerable period of time.

Learned Advocate for the state submits that he has been informed that four more witnesses are left to be examined by the prosecution.

Having considered that the petitioner is in custody for ten years, whatever may be the grounds of delay, the prosecution must put in extra efforts to conclude the trial.

State is granted four more months to conclude the prosecution witnesses on and from 17th February, 2026. The learned trial court would ensure that no unnecessary adjournment is granted to any of the parties and the trial of the case would continue inspite of any resolution of the local Bar. The learned trial court is directed to fix a schedule consisting of three dates in a month so that the prosecution and the defence will conclude the witnesses within the schedule concerned. State would also make arrangements for availability of *alamats* of the case on the date so fixed and no accommodation should be granted unnecessarily on trivial issues.

Learned advocate for the defacto-complainant opposes the prayer for bail and submits that the offence complained of is heinous offence. Learned advocate also sings in the same tune as the State that there are several antecedents of the present petitioner.

Having considered the totality of the circumstances, I direct that if, inspite of efforts, within a period of four months from the next date so fixed, the evidence of the prosecution witnesses is not complete, the learned trial court

would release the petitioner on bail on such terms and conditions as it deems fit and proper.

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

Accordingly, CRM(M) 2393 of 2025 is **dismissed.**

Pending application(s), if any, is also disposed of.

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.)