02. 14.10.2026.
Court
No.33. (Pritam)
(Rejected)

IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS JURISDICTION

CRM (M) 1988 of 2026

In Re: An application for Bail under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 corresponding to Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in connection with Kasba Police Station Case No.474/2024 dated 15.11.2024 under Sections 109/3(5)/61(8) of the BNS, 2023 and under Section 25/27 of the Arms Act.

In the matter of: - **Md. Phool Babu**

.....petitioner.

Mr. P. K. Datta
Mr. Santanu Deb Roy
Mr. Manabendra Nath Bandyopadhyay

.....for the petitioner.

Mr. Sayak Chakraborty
Mr. Ushm Garodia
Mr. Suman Agarwal

...for the State.

1. The Learned Advocate representing the petitioner submitted the petitioner to have been in custody since 22nd of November, 2024. Charge-sheet was initially submitted on 13th of January, 2025 and the supplementary charge-sheet had been submitted ultimately on 30.08.2025 whereby from the statement of co-accused, the present petitioner had been falsely implicated and considering the period of detention, prayed for grant of bail. It was further submitted that the co-accused persons have already been granted bail.
2. The Learned Advocate representing the State indicated to a voice message recording communication between the present

petitioner and co-accused namely Gulzar whereby contract money to murder the victim had been received in Bihar and the gang members were asked to execute the plan immediately. It was further submitted that the co-accused, granted bail by the Co-Ordinate Bench of this Court, had not been similarly circumstanced with the present petitioner.

3. It was further submitted that the CDR, SDR and the contemporaneous documents implicated the present petitioner to have been actively involved in the commission of the alleged offence. Considering the contents of the charge-sheet as aforesaid, the call record details and the contemporaneous documents including digital materials and the statements recorded under Sections 180 and 183 of the BNSS and that the prayer for bail of the present petitioner to have been rejected by the Co-Ordinate Bench of this Court vide Order dated September 18, 2025, the prayer for bail is rejected.
4. Accordingly, the application being CRM(M) No. 1988 of 2026 is dismissed.

(Ananya Bandyopadhyay, J.)