

D/L7
03.07.2026
Bpg.
Allowed

C.R.M. (M) 2744 of 2025

In Re: An application for bail under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 filed in connection with Chhatna Police Station Case No.02 of 2025 dated 08.01.2025 under Sections 316(2)/318(2)/318(4)/338/336(3)/339/340(2)/61(2)/3(5)/111(3)/111(4) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023;

Tapan Boral
Versus
The State of West Bengal

Mr. Imtiaz Ahmed
Mrs. Ghazala Firdaus
Mr. Hasan Shams
Mr. Sk. Saidullah
Mr. Mithun Mondal
Mr. Md. Arsalan
Mr. Chinangsuk Nandy.
...for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajendra Banerjee
Mr. Somnath Bera.
...for the State.

Learned advocate appearing for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody for 1 year 4 months. So far as the role of the petitioner is concerned it can be only stated that the petitioner acted on the dictate of one Amit Das for whom he was a driver.

Learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the State opposes the prayer for bail and submits that a racket was operating, thereby duping many persons. In the present case also a sum of Rs.9,20,000/- fake demand draft was handed over. So far as

the present petitioner is concerned, the present petitioner interacted with Biswajit Rakshit, as such, he cannot be said to be innocent of the charges.

I have taken into account the prosecution case and the role of the present petitioner which is different from that of Amit Das or other accused persons who have been implicated in connection with the instant case. Having considered the time which may require putting the trial to its conclusion, I am of the view that the petitioner be released on bail.

Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the petitioner is allowed. The petitioner, namely, Tapan Boral shall be released on bail upon furnishing bond of Rs.20,000/- (Rupees Twenty Thousand only) with two sureties of Rs.10,000/- each, one of whom must be local to the satisfaction of the learned CJM, Bankura. If on bail, the petitioner shall be physically present on each and every date before the learned trial court and shall not leave the district of Bankura without prior permission of the learned trial court.

It has been complained on behalf of the State that unnecessarily the trial is being stretched.

Having regard to the same, I direct the learned trial court not to grant any unnecessary adjournment and direct the trial of the case to continue in spite of any resolution of local bar.

With the aforesaid observations, CRM(M)2744 of 2025 is allowed.

Memo of Evidence submitted by the State be kept with the record.

All 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 of all requisite formalities.

(Tirthankar Ghosh, J.)