13.11.2026
Court No.35.
D/L. 9.
Kausik
(Rejected)

CRM (A) 3726 of 2026

In Re: An Application for Anticipatory Bail under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973/Under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in connection with Beniapukur Police Station Case No. 273 of 2026 dated 21.08.2026 under Sections 115(2)/126(2)/3(5)/303(2)/351(3)/74/76 of the BNS, 2023.

And

In the matter of : Asgar Ali @ Tina

.....Petitioner.

Mr. Kaushik Gupta
Mr. Debayan Sen
Mr. S. Chakraborty

.....for the Petitioner.

Ms. Farnaz Nasim

.....for the Defacto Complainant.

Ms. Piyali Chatterjee
Mr. Rishav Kumar Thakur

....for the State.

Learned Advocate appearing for the petitioner submits that there are long standing disputes between the informant as also the injured and the present petitioner and their associate.

Learned Advocate for the petitioner submits petitioner is on bail in other cases complained of by the State and all the cases which have been registered were engineered at the instance by the informant or their acquaintances.

Learned advocate for the defacto complainant opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail and emphasizes on the injuries sustained.

State has produced the case diary and also drawn the attention of the Court to the injury report.

I have taken into account the materials appearing in the case diary so far as the present petitioner is concerned, as also the injury sustained by the injured. The report submitted by the State reflects that there are 6 other cases against the present petitioner, most of the cases are of similar nature, but at different police station.

Having considered the antecedents of the petitioner and the parameters required in cases of granting anticipatory bail, I am of the opinion that this is not a fit case for granting anticipatory bail.

As such, CRM (A) 3726 of 2026 is **dismissed**.

Memo of Evidence submitted be kept with the record.

A copy of the Memo of Evidence be handed over to the learned advocate appearing for the petitioner.

Inadvertently in the order dated **12.10.2026** the number of the application in the cause title has been wrongly transcribed as **CRM (A) 3726 of 2025**. The same is incorrect and should be read as **CRM (A) 3726 of 2026**.

Let this be treated as part and parcel of the order dated 12.10.2026.

Department is directed to incorporate necessary corrections.

Learned Advocate appearing for the petitioner submits that his name was incorrectly incorporated in the order dated 12.10.2026 as Mr. Kaushik Roy. The correct name should be Mr. Kaushik Gupta. Department is directed to incorporate necessary corrections.

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.)