

In the Court of Sessions Judge, Murshidabad

Present : Sri Partha Pratim Chakraborty (JO-WB01240),
Sessions Judge, Murshidabad

Crl. Misc. Case No.2840 of 2026

Ref. : Nowda P.S. Case No.156/2026 dated 07.05.2026
U/s.305(B)/317(2)/345(3)/336(3)/340(2)/313/317(4)/318/319(2)/3(5) of BNS.

1. Tanmay Dey Accused/petitioner(s).
Vs.
The State Opposite Party.

Order No.03 dated 08.06.2026

The application for bail U/s.483 BNSS filed by the petitioner as named above is taken up for hearing this day on the strength of a put up petition filed by learned counsel on behalf of the accused petitioner.

Heard the Ld. lawyer for the accused petitioner and the Ld. P.P., Murshidabad.

Ld. Advocate for the accused petitioner submits that before the Ld. CJM, Murshidabad, the insurance company submitted one petition praying for calling for the report in respect of the subject vehicle and according to the learned counsel, the said petition explicitly establishes the facts that it is the said vehicle which was insured by the insurance company and it appears that same chassis number and other particulars also completely resembles with the particular subject vehicle allegedly tampered. Learned counsel added that this fact comes to suggest that the alleged story of tampering in numbering of chassis number and particulars of the vehicle has been fabricated for false implication of the accused petitioner. Learned counsel also submits that there is no specific complaint from any corner in respect of this subject vehicle was ever stolen by anyone and thereafter its number and description was tampered with. Learned counsel further submitted that this accused person was subsequently arrested and not named in FIR and during his P.C. period nothing has been recovered except his own vehicles. Learned counsel further submitted that the present accused petitioner is in custody since 14.05.2026 and considering the period of his detention, he may be granted bail.

It is also submitted by the Ld. Advocate for the petitioner that no such application for bail on the selfsame cause of action has ever been filed before or rejected by the Hon'ble Court, Calcutta to which, the Ld. P.P. expressed his agreement.

Ld. P.P., Murshidabad has raised objection to the prayer for bail by citing the materials available at page no. 164, 216 and the seizure list dated 07.05.2026.

Perused the FIR and other materials in the C.D.

Considered the nature of allegation and the seizure list dated 07.05.2026.

Also considered the statement available at page no. 135 and others including the document available at page no. 222 in C.D.

Considering the nature of the alleged offence, it appears that investigation is going on, so given the facts and circumstances, it appears to me that this is not a fit case to enlarge the present accused petitioner on bail.

Accordingly, the prayer for bail stands **rejected** at this stage.

The Crl. Misc. Case is thus disposed of.

Dictd. & Cortd.

by me.

S. J., Msd.

Sessions Judge, Murshidabad