

16.02.2026
Serial no. 250
[G.S.D]

CRM (M) 2510 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 Burdwan PS Case No. 1665 of 2023 dt. 24.12.2023 u/s 302/34 of the IPC, 1860, subsequently, charge-sheet submitted under sections 302/120B of the IPC .

-And-

In the matter of : Shankar Ghosh @ Chotka

... Petitioner(s)

Mr. Uday Sankar Chattopadhyay

... for the Petitioner(s)

Mr. Ranadeb Sengupta
Mr. Saptarshi Chakraborty

... for the State-respondent(s)

Mr. Ranajit Ray
Mr. Ayanabha Raha

... for the defacto-complainant(s)

Learned advocate for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody for two years one months and, till date, only two witnesses have been examined out of the cited 36 witnesses in the charge-sheet and the Supplementary Charge-sheet.

It has also been submitted that the petitioner is similarly situated as the other accused who has been granted bail in CRM(M) 1556 of 2025.

Learned advocate for the State, on the other hand, opposes the prayer for bail and submit that the petitioner is not similarly situated as the other accused person who has been granted bail. Learned advocate also added that so far

as the present petitioner is concerned, the deceased named the present petitioner as the principal assailant to one of the witnesses, whose statement has been recorded under Section 164 of the Cr.P.C. There are other materials which are also appearing against the present petitioner which distinguishes the locus of the present petitioner from that of the other accused person who has been granted bail.

Learned advocate for the defacto-complainant also opposes the prayer for bail.

I have taken into account the totality of the circumstances but the police report which has been submitted is not to the satisfaction of this court.

Having regard to the overall circumstances and the heinousness of the offence, at this stage, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail.

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

Accordingly, CRM(M) 2510 of 2025 is **dismissed.**

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

Report submitted by the State 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.)

