19. 15.10.2026.
Court
No.33. (Pritam)
(Rejected)

IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS JURISDICTION

CRM (M) 2246 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 Uttarpara Police Station Case No.385/2024 dated 12.11.2024 under Sections 118(2)/109/61(2)/3(5) of the BNS, 2023 & Sections 25/27 of the Arms Act.

In the matter of: - **Ranjan Yadav.**

.....petitioner.

Mr. Akash Ganguly,
Mr. Sayan Mukherjee,
Mr. Amaan Deep Gupta.

.....for the petitioner.

Mr. Aniket Mitra,
Mr. Tapas Singha Roy.

...for the *de-facto* complainant.

Ms. Priyanka Chandra.

.....for the State.

1. The prayer seeking bail in respect of the present petitioner had been dismissed by the Co-ordinate bench of this court on 29th January, 2026 in CRM(M) 2219 of 2025.
2. The learned advocate representing the petitioner submits the petitioner to be in custody for 1 year and 11 months and only 1 out of 21 witnesses is in the process of being examined.
3. Considering the extent of custody period, the petitioner seeks for prayer of bail. The accused had been on bail granted by the Co-ordinate bench of this court.

4. The learned advocate representing the State submitted the present petitioner to have been the principal accused in firing a gunshot and opposed the prayer for grant of bail.
5. Though the weapon was recovered from the custody of the co-accused persons, the present petitioner had identified the same.
6. The learned advocate for the *de-facto* complainant opposed the prayer for bail. The learned advocate representing the State submitted to examine 19 out of 21 charge-sheet witnesses. The examination of PW-1 is still in process and has not been concluded.
7. Considering the complicity of the petitioner and the contemporaneous documents on record concerning the alleged offence of incriminating nature, the prayer is considered and rejected.
8. The learned advocate representing the petitioner may advice to renew the bail after recording of the examination of the vulnerable witnesses.
9. Accordingly, the application being CRM(M) No.2246 of 2026 is dismissed.

(Ananya Bandyopadhyay, J.)