

Cr. Misc. Case No. 415/2026
CNR No. WBHW0100 1116 2026
Present: Sri Mainak Dasgupta
Sessions Judge, In-charge, Howrah.
J.O. Code – WB01070

Order No.02 dated 09.03..2026.

The application u/S.482 BNSS arising out of Domjur P.S. Case No. 240 of 2025 dated 11.04.2025 u/Ss. 126(2)/115(2)/117(2)/74/109/303(2)/351(2)/3(5) of BNS filed by the accused/ petitioners namely, 1] Babu Mollah @ Joynal Abedin Mollah, 2] Raj Sardar @ Rajab Ali Sardar, 3] Rohit Sardar @ Ramjan Ali Sardar & 4] Saddam Sardar @ Saddam Hossain Sardar, is taken up for hearing.

Heard Ld. Advocate for the 04 accused/petitioners who submitted that the allegations raised against them are absolutely false and further submitted that the charge sheet had already been submitted against 12 accused persons including the present four petitioners. It was further submitted that all the rest eight accused persons named in the charge sheet were already granted bail. With such submissions, Ld Advocate for the accused/petitioners asserted the prayer for anticipatory bail.

Ld.P.P. also submitted that charge sheet has been submitted but further submitted that injury suffered by the victim are grievous in nature.

I have perused the TCR and CD.

Considered the submission made by the Ld. Advocate for the accused and the Ld Public Prosecutor.

REASONS

As regards pre arrest bail the Hon'ble Apex Court in Sadhna Chaudhary Vs. State of Rajasthan & Anr., reported in 2022 (237) AIC 205 (SC), has been pleased to hold as follows:-

"14. Law on the applicability or grant of anticipatory bail under section 438 Cr.P.C. may be briefly summarised as under: 14.1. In Shri Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia and Others v. State of Punjab, a Constitution Bench of this Court, Chief Justice Y.V. Chandrachud, speaking for the Court dealt with in detail on the considerations for grant of anticipatory bail. 14.2. In Siddharam Satlingappa Mhetre vs. State of Maharashtra and Others²; this Court relying upon the Constitution Bench judgment in Shri Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia laid down in paragraph 112 of the report the following factors and parameters to be considered while dealing with an application for anticipatory bail:

"(i) The nature and gravity of the accusation and the exact role of the accused must be properly comprehended before arrest is made;

(ii) The antecedents of the applicant including the fact as to whether the accused has previously undergone imprisonment on conviction by a court in respect of any cognizable offence;

(iii) The possibility of the applicant to flee from justice;

(iv) The possibility of the accused's likelihood to repeat similar or other offences;

(v) Where the accusations have been made only with the object of injuring or humiliating the applicant by arresting him or her;

(vi) Impact of grant of anticipatory bail particularly in cases of large magnitude affecting a very large number of people;

(vii) The courts must evaluate the entire available material against the accused very carefully. The court must also clearly comprehend the exact role of the accused in the case. The cases in which the accused is implicated with the help of Sections 34 and 149 of the Penal Code, 1860 the court should consider with even

greater care and caution because over implication in the cases is a matter of common knowledge and concern;

(viii) While considering the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail, a balance has to be struck between two factors, namely, no prejudice should be caused to the free, fair and full investigation and there should be prevention of harassment, humiliation and unjustified detention of the accused;

(ix) The court to consider reasonable apprehension of tampering of the witnesses or apprehension of threat to the complainant;

x) Frivolity in prosecution should always be considered and it is only the element of genuineness that shall have to be considered in the matter of grant of bail and in the event of there being some doubt as to the genuineness of the prosecution, in the normal course of events, the accused is entitled to an order of bail."

It appears that charge sheet has not been submitted against any person namely, Raj Sardar @ Rajab Ali Sardar, being the petitioner no.2. Hence, the prayer of Raj Sardar @ Rajab Ali Sardar stands rejected as infructuous.

As regards the petitioner nos.1, 3 & 4, it appears that such petitioners has been charge sheeted. Furthermore, it appears from the TCR that Ld.CJM, Howrah has not yet issued any W/A or taken any further process against such petitioners. It also appears that as the investigation has been completed, no fruitful purpose shall be served by refusing the prayer.

Considering all such, I find that in the instant case, the petitioner nos.1, 3 & 4 should be granted relief as prayed for.

ORDER

Considering all the facts and circumstances of the case, anticipatory bail is granted to the accused/ petitioners, namely, 1] Babu Mollah @ Joynal Abedin Mollah, 3] Rohit Sardar @ Ramjan Ali Sardar & 4] Saddam Sardar @ Saddam Hossain Sardar, subject to the following conditions:-

(i) In the event of arrest, the petitioners shall be released on bail upon furnishing a bond of Rs.3,000/- each with one surety of like amount each, to the satisfaction of the Ld. Chief Judicial Magistrate, Howrah and ;

(ii) the petitioner(s) shall make himself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;

(iii) the petitioner (s) shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;

(iv) the petitioners are directed to surrender before the jurisdictional Court within 7 working days from the date of this order.

LCR and CD be returned.

The criminal misc case is disposed of.

The order be uploaded in the CIS without delay.

Dictated & corrected by me

S. J.

Sessions Judge, In-charge, Howrah