

17.02.2026

Item No.54

Ct.No.06

b.das

Reject

**IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
CIRCUIT BENCH AT JALPAIGURI
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS JURISDICTION**

C.R.M. (A) 89 of 2026

In Re : An application for anticipatory bail under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure read with Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in connection with Pundibari Police Station Case No. 991 of 2025 dated 04.12.2025 under Sections 85/ 115(2)/ 117(2) / 118(2)/351 (3)/3(5) of the BNS.

And

In Re : **Subhadip Ray**

... Petitioner

Mr. Sandip Guha Roy

Mr. Ananda Paul

... for the Petitioner

Mr. Tapan Bhattacharjee

Mr. S. S. Sikdar

... for the State

Heard learned counsels for the parties.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is the husband of the de facto complainant and has been falsely implicated after he filed a divorce suit against the de facto complainant.

Learned counsel for the State opposes the prayer.

It is a fact that an earlier complaint as well as the present complaint have been lodged by the de facto complainant after the petitioner filed a suit against her seeking divorce. But the injury reports prima facie suggest severe injuries being inflicted upon the de facto complainant. Investigation is in progress.

Considering the material available in the case diary, this Court is inclined to hold that this is not a fit case for granting anticipatory bail in favour of the petitioner.

Accordingly, prayer for anticipatory bail is rejected.

The application being CRM (A) 89 of 2026 is disposed of.

Case Diary be returned.

Urgent certified website copy of this order, if applied for, be supplied to the parties upon compliance with all requisite formalities.

(Suvra Ghosh, J.)