

**S.C. No. 73/2021**  
**S.T. No. 22(02)2022**  
**GR. 269/2021**

**CNR no-WBBK09000194 2021**

**State Vs. Sunil Murmu @ Hapan Murmu**

**In connection with Barikul P.S. Case No. 09 of 2021 dated 07.06.2021 U/S 302 of the IPC corresponding to GR case no. 269 of 2021**

**Order No. 61**  
**Dated 06.08.2025**

Today is fixed for hearing of petition, dated 04.08.2025 praying for bail of the accused **Sunil Murmu @ Hapan Murmu.**

Ld. Advocate for the accused moves the instant petition.

Ld. P.P. In-charge is present before the court.

It is submitted on behalf of both the parties that no application for bail of the accused was rejected by the Hon'ble High Court, Calcutta nor any prayer for bail of the accused is pending before the Hon'ble court or any other higher forum.

It is submitted that the accused has no connection with the alleged offence of this case at all. It is also submitted that the accused is in custody since the date of arrest. It is submitted that 17 witnesses are examined and there is no eye witness of the incident. It is also submitted that none of the witnesses stated anything against the accused of this case. It is also submitted that previously the prayer for bail of the accused was rejected but there is no development in the case against the accused and by detaining him, no purpose will be served.

In view of the above, Ld. Advocate submits that considering the period of detention, the accused should be enlarged on bail in any term and condition.

On the other hand Ld. P.P In-charge raises vehement objection against the prayer for bail of the accused submitting inter alia that the allegation against the accused is direct and there are so many incriminating materials against the accused persons in the CD. It is also submitted that the mother is the de facto complainant against the son and there are five vital witnesses which are required to be examined.

Ld. PP-in-charge also submits that the prayer for bail of the co-accused was previously rejected by the Hon'ble Court on repeated occasions and at present, a prayer for bail of the accused is pending before the Hon'ble Court.

In view of the above submission, Ld. PP-in-charge strongly submits that the prayer for bail of the accused should be rejected.

On perusal of the record, it is seen that the allegation against the accused is direct and it is very heinous in nature. It is also seen that there are strong incriminating materials in the CD against the accused persons.

It is also seen that there is also no change of circumstance also. Recording of evidence of the prosecution is going on. It is also the fact that the prayer for bail of the co-accused was rejected by the Hon'ble Court repeatedly and it is brought to the notice of the court that a prayer for bail of the co-accused is pending before the Hon'ble Court.

Therefore, in view of the above facts and circumstances of the case, materials in the record, submission of the respective parties, nature and gravity of the alleged offence, fact that the prayer for bail of the co-accuses is pending before the Court, fact that the prayer for bail of the co-accused was rejected by the Hon'ble Court, fact that the mother is the de facto complainant in the case and at the same time taking into account the incriminating materials in different pages of the CD, I do not find convincing reason to enlarge the accused on bail.

Hence, the prayer for bail of the accused **Sunil Murmu @ Hapan Murmu** stands rejected.

The instant petition is accordingly disposed of.

Return CD.

To date for production and evidence.

Dictated and Corrected by me

A.S.J  
Khatra, Bankura

Additional Sessions Judge,  
Khatra, Dist.- Bankura  
J.O. Code WB00638

