

13.01.2026

Item No.11

Ct.No.3

dc.

Rejected

IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
CIRCUIT BENCH AT JALPAIGURI

C.R.M. (A) 937 of 2025

In Re : An Application for anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023/Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 filed in connection with Mateli Police Station Case No. 35 of 2025 dated 01.03.2025 under Sections 103/3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

And

In Re : **Pappu Prasad**

... Petitioner.

Mr. Sourav Ganguly,
Ms. Srishti Sarker,
Ms. Rishita Chakraborty

... For the Petitioner.

Mr. A. S. Chakraborty, APP,
Dr. Arjun Chowdhury

... For the State.

Learned advocate appearing for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent of the charges and has been falsely implicated in connection with the instant case because of the accusation that the vehicle was seen at the stage of commission of the alleged crime. It has been emphasized that CCTV footages do not reflect the presence of the vehicle.

Learned advocate appearing for the State has produced the case diary.

The materials appearing in the case diary, *prima facie*, reflect that the registration number of the vehicle surfaced in

course of the investigation. The RTO was informed and consequently it was found that the petitioner happens to be the owner of the said vehicle which was allegedly used for commission of the offence. Having considered the gravity of the offence, I am of the view that this is not a fit case for extending the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. As such, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner is **rejected**.

The application for anticipatory bail, being CRM (A) 937 of 2025, is, thus, dismissed.

All concerned 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 with all requisite formalities.

(Tirthankar Ghosh, J.)