

Sessions Case – 163 of 2025 (CIS-163/25)

S.T. No.-81/December/2025

C.N.R. No. - WBBB05-000743-2025

01

03-12-2025

Today is fixed for consideration of charge and production of accused persons.

All accused persons namely, 1. Alden Baski, 2. Rajen Tudu @ Motu, 3. Akshay Mirdha, 4. Amit Tudu, 5. Sanatan Mariya @ Bagi Mariya and 6. Raju Mirdha are produced from J/C. They are taken into custody and remanded to J/C till next date.

Ld. P.P. in-charge files hazira.

Fresh executed vokalatnama has been filed on behalf of defacto complainant.

Accused persons 1. Alden Baski, 2. Rajen Tudu @ Motu, 3. Akshay Mirdha, 4. Amit Tudu file one application u/s 250 of BNSS.

The above petition is taken up for hearing.

Heard both sides at length. I have thoroughly gone through case record and CD. Perused the petition under consideration carefully. I have also considered the submission of both sides. It appears that points raised in the instant application for discharging above accused persons at this stage are matter of trial. The questions raised by Ld. Defence counsel can only be unearth after having evidence. Material in CD shows that there is sufficient incriminating substance against above accused persons for framing of charge under the Sections mentioned in the charge-sheet. Therefore, for fair trial, I feel not inclined to discharge above four accused persons at this stage of this case. The petition is devoid of merit and is liable to be rejected.

Hence, it is,

ORDERED

that the application filed by above four accused persons u/s 250 of BNSS is considered and rejected on contest but without any order as to costs.

Today one bail application is filed on behalf of accused person Raju Mirdha.

Now bail application is taken up for disposal.

Ld. Defence Counsel submits that accused person is entangled in this case though he has no nexus with the offence demonstrated in this case. Therefore, he may be enlarged on bail.

On the other hand, Ld. State counsel has vehemently opposed the bail application pointing out gravity of offence and stage of this case where charge is going to be framed against accused persons.

Having heard both sides and considering gravity of offence involved in this case and materials available against this accused person, I feel not inclined to enlarge accused person on bail. Thus, bail petition filed on behalf of accused person Raju Mridha is rejected. He is remanded to J/C till next date.

Date has been fixed for consideration of charge. Therefore, record is taken up for consideration of charge.

Heard both sides. Perused the record and C.D. Considered. A prima facie case u/s 103(1)/61(2)/3(05) of BNS has been made out against the accused persons. Therefore,

charge against the accused persons is framed for the offence punishable 103(1)/61(2)/3(05) of BNS. The contents of the charge so framed are read over and explained to the accused persons in their vernacular to which they pleaded not guilty by saying “আমি নির্দোষ” and claimed to be tried.

Fix : 05-01-2026 – for evidence of C.S.W -1,
06-01-2026 – for evidence of C.S.W- 2,
07-01-2026 – for evidence of C.S.W- 3,
08-01-2026 – for evidence of C.S.W-4.

Issue summons accordingly.

D/C

Sd/-
Sandip Kumar Kundu
Addl. Sessions Judge,
F.T.C., Rampurhat

Sd/-
Sandip Kumar Kundu
Addl. Sessions Judge,
F.T.C., Rampurhat.
J.O. Code – WB00988