

In the Court of Sessions Judge, Murshidabad

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

Crl. Misc. Case No.2897/2026

Ref. : Raghunathganj P.S. Case No.696/2026 dated 03.06.2026
U/s.329(4)/118(1)/109(1)/303(2)/3(5) of BNS.

1. Tuel Sk. @ Moin Sekh
 2. Pintal Sk. @ Abdul Karim Sk.
 3. Mustak Sk. @ Mostak Sekh
 4. Erfan Sk. @ Irfan Sk.
 5. Akash Sk @ Ahamed Sk.
 6. Maruk Khan @ Marup Kha
 7. Imran Sk.
 8. Rahit Sk. @ Jagir Hossain
 9. Chandan Sk @ Rohan Sk.
 10. Alaudduddin Sk. @ Alauddin Sk Accused/petitioner(s).
- Vs.
- The State Opposite Party.

Order No.03 dated 18.07.2026

The application for anticipatory bail U/s.482 BNSS filed by the petitioners as named above is taken up for hearing.

Ld. Defence Counsel has submitted that no such application for bail on the selfsame cause of action has ever been filed before or rejected by the Hon'ble High Court, Calcutta and no such application for bail has ever been filed before or rejected by this Court, to which, the Ld. P.P. expressed his agreement.

Ld. P.P., Murshidabad has cited page **No.24, 27** of the C.D. i.e. the Injury reports. That apart, he also cited page **No.33** of the C.D.

Perused the F.I.R. and other materials in C.D.

Considered the said two Injury reports at page **No.24, 27** of the C.D. as cited by the Ld. P.P., Murshidabad.

That apart, two other Injury reports are available in the C.D. in respect of injured Osila Bibi and Papiya Yeasmin.

Considered the Injury report in respect of injured Mofiul Sk. as cited by the Ld. P.P., Murshidabad as available in the C.D.

Considered the nature of injury mentioned therein.

Considered page **No.33** as cited by the Ld. P.P., Murshidabad as available in the C.D. which is the statement of seriously injured Mofiul Sk whose injury is found at page **No.27** of the C.D.

In the backdrop of the said factual aspect, I have also considered the submission of the Ld. Defence Counsel who submits that there is specific allegation against the F.I.R. named accused No.1 and 2.

Ld. Defence Counsel has relied principally on the F.I.R.

It appears from the F.I.R. that there is allegation that one accused dealt blow and thereafter, other accused persons followed him to cause injuries to the brother of the defacto complainant and, similarly, the accused No.2 dealt a blow and, thereafter, the other accused persons followed him and assaulted the nephew of the defacto complainant.

Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and the materials gathered, I do not find it a fit case for granting anticipatory bail to the present accused petitioners.

Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail stands **rejected**.

The accused petitioners are directed to surrender before the Court and pray for regular bail.

The Crl. Misc. Case is thus disposed of.

Dictd. & Cortd.
by me.

S. J., Msd.

Sessions Judge, Murshidabad