

**Sessions Case no. 14 of 2026**  
CNR-WBCS01-000144-2026  
**Present: Shrutirupa Ghosh (Majee)**  
**Chief Judge, in-charge,**  
**Addl. Dist & Sessions Judge,**  
**Fast Track Court No. 2,**  
**City Sessions Court, Calcutta**  
**JO Code No. WB00821**

**Order no. 04 dated 02.03.2026**

1. Ld. PO has been retained on duty in the courts during the upcoming process of Special Intensive Revision (S.I.R.) by the Hon'ble Court, Calcutta in view of the order dated 20.02.2026 passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in Writ petition(s) Civil Number(s)1089 of 2025 with W.P. (C) Number-126/2026, W.P. (C) Number-129/2026(PIL-W), W.P. (C) Number-737/2025(PIL-W), W.P. (C) Number-1074/2025 (PIL-W), W.P.(C) Number-1088/2025 (PIL-W), W.P.(C) Number-1216/2025(PIL-W), W.P.(C) Number-159/2026(PIL-W), W.P.(C)Number-119/2026 (PIL-W). I am in-charge.
2. Today is fixed for hearing of bail application dated 06.03.2026 filed on behalf of accused persons, namely, Ganesh Das, Kartick Das, Manju Das and Payel Das, and written objection, if any, in the meantime.
3. Ld. Advocate for the accused , namely, Ganesh Das, Kartick Das, Manju Das and Payel Das, are present.
4. Ld. Public Prosecutors representing the State are present.
5. Investigating Officer is present along with the case diary.
6. Now, the record is taken up for hearing of the bail application preferred by the accused persons.
7. Ld. Advocate for the accused persons has submitted that they are totally innocent and falsely implicated in this case and charge sheet has already been submitted in this case. She further submitted that the accused persons have been languishing behind the bar for 118 days and statement of the victim recorded u/s 164 of the Cr.P.C. and postmortem report raises doubt regarding the involvement of the accused persons in the alleged incident and even the accused-husband himself had taken the victim to the hospital after the alleged incident. She also submits that the accused persons have fixed place of residence and there is no chance of their absconsion. So, she prays for bail of the accused persons on any condition.
8. On the contrary, Ld. Public Prosecutor representing the State raises vehement objection against the bail application preferred by the accused persons. She submits that the allegation against the accused persons are heinous and serious in nature and it does not raise the presumption that the accused persons are innocent. She further submits that the charge has not been framed against the accused persons and at this stage, if they are liberated on bail, there are every possiblity of their absconsion and tampering of evidence.
9. Heard both sides.
10. I have carefully perused the case record, the case diary and the materials appearing therein.
11. It appears that the charge sheet has been submitted in this case and the allegation of murder of victim writs large all over the record.
12. Considering the nature and gravity of allegation against the accused persons and materials in the case diary, I do not find any just cause to allow the bail prayer of the accused persons at this stage.

13. Accordingly, the bail application preferred by the accused persons stands rejected.
14. Case diary be returned.
15. Todate, i.e., **20.03.2026**, for production of the accused persons and further order.
16. Let a copy of this order be sent to the Investigating Officer through the Ld. Public Prosecutor for information.

Dictated & corrected by me,

Sd/-  
Chief Judge I/C  
City Sessions Court, Calcutta.

Sd/-  
Chief Judge I/C  
City Sessions Court, Calcutta.