

14.05.2026
SL No.24
Court No.5
S.Gayen

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

C.R.M.(A) 279 of 2026

In Re: An application for anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in connection with Kuchlibari Police Station Case No. 08 of 2026 dated 22.01.2026 under Sections 85/109/3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

-And-

In the matter of: **Rajib Roy**

...Petitioner

Mr. Rajesh Kumar Sharma
Mr. Mithun Prasad

...for the Petitioner

1. This instant application has been filed with a prayer for anticipatory bail.
2. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the wife has made a false complaint against the petitioner and his family members. He submits that the father, mother and brother of the petitioner have already been granted anticipatory bail by the learned Sessions Court but rejected the prayer of the petitioner. He submits that as per the allegation in the FIR that the petitioner has assaulted his wife and the wife has sustained injury. He submits that as per the injury report the wife was having the simple injury and he prays for grant of anticipatory bail.
3. The Investigating Officer is present with the case diary. The Investigating Officer submits that the mother, father and the brother of the petitioner were granted bail as there was no necessity for their custodial detention but the bail application of the petitioner was rejected as the custodial interrogation is

required. The Investigating Officer submits that as and when they tried to arrest the petitioner, the petitioner absconded and he is not available either in the village or in the house.

4. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the Investigating Officer and perused the case diary. This Court finds that it is the specific allegation against the petitioner that the petitioner has assaulted his wife with iron rod causing injury and as per the injury report, this Court finds that though the injury was simple but there was an injury on the head as well as neck of the victim. Considering the above, this Court finds that the custodial interrogation is required in the present case.
5. Thus, the application for anticipatory bail being **C.R.M. (A) 279** of **2026** stands dismissed.

(Krishna Rao, J.)