

**Sessions Case No. 17 of 2025**  
**CNR-WBCS01-000202-2025**

Order No. 16 dated 25.09.2025:

The record is taken up for hearing bail petition filed on behalf of the the four accused persons being accused no. 1 to 4.

Today is fixed for production of accused no.1 to 4 and appearance of accused no.5 Rukesh Sahani who has been granted bail by Hon'ble Court vide order dated 12.09.2025 in C.R.M (M) 1326 of 2025.

Accused no. 1 to 4 are produced from custody and accused no.5 is present.

Bail prayer is made on the ground that these accused persons are in custody since they were arrested on 27.01.2025.

He further submitted that these accused persons are long in custody and after considering their prolong detention in the custody and after considering the solemn observation of the Hon'ble Court passed in order dated 12.09.2025 in C.R.M (M) 1326 of 2025 they must be enlarged on bail.

He prayed for bail subject to any strict terms and conditions but his prayer for bail is strongly opposed by the Ld. PP.

Ld. PP submits that the allegation is serious and grave and if this Court goes through the previous orders of this Court particularly order no.6 dated 07.05.2025 it will become palpably clear as to what is actually recovered from their joint possession and what is the actual gravity of the allegation.

He submits that in the previous order dated 07.05.2025 and 06.06.2025 it is clearly observed by this Court why bail was not granted and what could be the possible consequences if the accused persons are granted bail.

He submitted further that there has been no change in circumstance to think differently and the reason for which bail was rejected on 07.05.2025 and 06.06.2025 still persist.

He prayed for rejection of bail.

After considering either sides respective submission and after going through my previous order I hold that the apprehension and reason for which bail was rejected on earlier occasion by this Court still persist.

Also gone through the solemn order of the Hon'ble Court dated 12.09.2025 in C.R.M (M) 1326 of 2025 wherein bail was granted to accused Rukesh Sahani.

After going through the said solemn order it appears to me that the four accused persons who have prayed for bail are not standing in the same footing with enlarged accused Rukesh Sahani as claimed by the Ld. Defence Counsel.

In my considered view, there is still every possibility of trial being hampered and evidences being tampered and witnesses being influenced if these accused persons are granted bail at this moment.

It appears that there has been no lacuna on the part of prosecution to bring the witness on time and hence, there appears to be no instance of delay on the part of the prosecution as claimed by the Ld. Defence Counsel.

Accordingly, I hold that there is no change in circumstances from what I thought and what I observed on 07.05.2025 and 06.06.2025 when I rejected the bail prayer by passing a reasoned order.

The next date be fixed on **01.11.2025** for evidence/production/appearance.

Koustuv Mukhopadhyay  
(JO Code-WB 01059)  
Addl. Dist & Sessions Judge,  
1<sup>st</sup> Fast Track Court,  
Bichar Bhawan, Calcutta.