

Present : Susangeet Kumar Das,
Additional Sessions Judge, Fast Track Court, Bankura,
J.O. Code – WB00973

S.C. 34/2026.

Order No. 08,
Date 16-04-2026.

Today is fixed for hearing of bail application of accused Jagannath Murmu @ Saheb filed on 24-03-2026 and 02-04-2026 and production of accused persons through VC.

Both the accused persons are produced from J/C through VC.

At this stage a fresh bail application has been filed on behalf of accused Jagannath Murmu @ Saheb which is subsequently not-pressed as two bail petitions for this accused are already pending.

The bail petitions filed on behalf of accused Jagannath Murmu @ Saheb dated 24-03-2026 and 02-04-2026 are taken up for hearing. The contents of both the petitions are similar.

Heard the learned Advocate for the accused as well as the learned Public Prosecutor-in-charge for the State.

Perused the case record and case diary with utmost care.

At the outset, it is submitted on behalf of the accused that the accused is not FIR named and he is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case and he has been in custody for a considerable period. It is also submitted that investigation is over and that charge-sheet has already been submitted. There is no eye witness of the crime. It is further urged that continued detention would serve no fruitful purpose and that the accused is entitled to be enlarged on bail on any terms and conditions.

Per contra, the learned Public Prosecutor in-charge has vehemently opposed the prayer for bail, contending, inter alia, that this is a fit case for custody trial. The materials collected during investigation prima facie establish the complicity of the accused in the commission of the offence. It is further submitted that none of the witness has yet been examined, thereby giving rise to a reasonable apprehension that the accused, if released on bail, may influence or intimidate such witnesses. There is every possibility that the accused may flee.

Upon consideration of the submissions and upon perusal of the case record and case diary, this Court finds that though the investigation has culminated in submission of charge-sheet, the trial is yet to begin. Charge sheet has been submitted U/s. 103(1) of BNS against this particular accused Jagannath Murmu @ Saheb. The allegation is grave in nature. There is sufficient incriminating materials against the present accused person in the case diary pointing out towards the guilt of the accused. As per the confessional statement of the accused, material discoveries have been made during investigation. The trial has not yet been commenced. The material witnesses have not yet been examined. If at this stage, the accused is enlarged on bail, he might abscond and there is every possibility that he might tamper evidence or influence the witnesses.

It is a settled principle of law that while considering an application for bail, the Court must not only take into account the period of detention but also the nature of the accusation, the gravity of the offence and the likelihood of the accused tampering with evidence or influencing witnesses.

In the present case, having regard to all such aspects, this Court is of the considered opinion that this is not a fit case for granting bail at this stage.

Accordingly, the prayer for bail of accused Jagannath Murmu @ Saheb stands rejected.

Fix **04-07-2026** for production of both the accused persons through VC and consideration of charge.

Dictated and Corrected by me
Sd/-
Additional Sessions Judge
Fast Track Court, Bankura.

Sd/- S.K. Das,
Additional Sessions Judge
Fast Track Court, Bankura

