

CALCUTTA HIGH COURT
IN THE CIRCUIT BENCH AT JALPAIGURI

29.06.2026
Ct No.5
Item No.11
Ranita/S.K.

CRM (A) 350 of 2026

In Re:- An application for anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023.

And

In Re: **Tilak Sonar**

..... Petitioner

Mr. Sayan De
Mr. Kaustav Shome
Mr. Rimik Chakraborty
Ms. Bidotma Tirkey

....For the Petitioner

Mr. Avrojoyti Das, Id. APP
Mr. Uday Bhattacharjee

.....For the State

Ms. Suman Sehanabis

...for de facto complainant

1. The petitioner is charged with the offences under Sections 85/117(2)/318(4)/338/336(3)/61(2) of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023.
2. Mr. De, learned advocate for the petitioner has handed over to the Court an order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court dated June 24, 2026 in Appeal (Crl) No(s).11697/2026, which has been passed with respect to the other accused persons in the

case. The Supreme Court has granted limited protection to the accused persons in that case.

3. Mr. De, learned advocate for the petitioner has also relied on an exhaustive list of dates in support of his submissions that so far as offences charged against the present petitioner, he has no implication therein or role to play in the same and his innocence has been pleaded.
4. Ms. Suman Sehanabis, learned advocate appears for the de facto complainant and raises strong objection as to the prayer of the petitioner by submitting that in spite of the de facto complainant being eligible by virtue of her post and capacity for taking account of the proper running of the school in question, she has been deprived illegally and unauthorisedly by the petitioner to do the same.
5. Submission on behalf of the de facto complainant has been supported by the state.
6. Perused the C.D and other materials produced before this Court.
7. It appears that the de facto complainant and the petitioner are the husband and wife though separated for a long period of time. A divorce case between them is pending before the competent Court.
8. So far as allegation in this case is concerned, against the present petitioner and the materials on case diary, the Court is not convinced that custodial interrogation of the petitioner

would be required for the purpose of investigation in this case.

9. For the reason as stated above, the bail prayer of the present petitioner is allowed.
10. Hence it is ordered that in the event of arrest the petitioner shall find bail bond of Rs.10,000/- with two sureties of equal amount, one of whom must be local to the satisfaction of the Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Siliguri, subject to the condition that the petitioner shall duly comply with the provisions under Section 482(2) of the BNSS, 2023 and duly cooperate in the investigation. He shall not intimidate witnesses or tamper with the evidence in any manner whatsoever.
11. C.D be returned.

(Rai Chattopadhyay, J.)