

14.08.2026
Sl. No. 28
Ct. No. 446
SG
[ALLOWED]

C. R. M. (A) 2165 of 2026

In Re: An application for anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in connection with Asansol (North) Police Station Case No. 445/2025 dated 03.09.2025 under Sections 318(4)/338/336(3)/340(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (G.R. Case No. 2493 of 2025).

And

In Re: **Pradip Dasgupta.**

... ... Petitioner

Mr. Sourav Chatterjee, Sr. Adv.
Ms. Sibangi Chattopadhyay,
Mr. Mayukh Majumder,
Ms. Indrani Das,
Mr. Sourav Mondal.

... ... for the petitioner

Mr. Amit Roy.

... ... for the State

1. Mr. Chatterjee, learned Senior Advocate appearing for the petitioner, submits that the petitioner is a contractor and used to undertake work assigned by both the WBSEDCL and the Railways. Subsequently, following an allegation that he had submitted certain credential documents before the Railway authority containing the forged signature of an officer of the WBSEDCL, the documents were sent to the concerned office of the WBSEDCL. After verification of the documents, the present case was initiated against the petitioner. He further submits that, even after the alleged incident, a work order was issued by the WBSEDCL in favour of the petitioner. He further submits that neither the WBSEDCL nor the Railway authority suffered any wrongful loss due to the alleged act of forgery. He also submits that the

said credential documents cannot be stated to be valuable security as defined under Section 2(31) of the BNS.

2. He submits that, if it is alleged that any person has used a forged document, Section 340(2) of the BNS, corresponding to Section 471 of the IPC, would be attracted, which is a bailable offence. He further submits that the Railway authorities have already encashed the bank guarantee furnished by the petitioner and that the WBSEDCL has also placed the petitioner on its holiday list. According to him, the petitioner has, therefore, already suffered substantial consequences on account of the alleged acts. He further submits that the petitioner's mother is an octogenarian suffering from cancer and that there is no one other than the petitioner to look after her. In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances, he prays that the petitioner be granted the benefit of anticipatory bail.

3. Mr. Roy, learned Advocate appearing for the State produces the case diary and opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the present petitioner based on the materials available on record.

4. Heard the learned Advocates appearing for the respective parties and perused the materials on record.

5. In the present case, the allegation against the petitioner is that certain documents were submitted by him, in his capacity as the proprietor of M/s. S.S. Enterprise, before the concerned Railway authorities for the purpose of obtaining a work order or work orders. Upon verification, however, it was found that such documents had never been issued by the WBSEDCL in favour of the petitioner. It is significant to note that the Railway authorities did not lodge any complaint in respect of the alleged submission of such documents, nor was any work

order issued on the basis thereof. The learned Advocate appearing for the State has also not controverted the contention advanced on behalf of the petitioner that neither of the said authorities has suffered any wrongful loss on account of the alleged acts of the petitioner. More importantly, the entire prosecution case, at this stage, rests substantially on documentary evidence, which is already available to the investigating agency.

6. Therefore, noting these facts, I am of the view that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner in the present case is not necessary and petitioner can be granted anticipatory bail.

7. In view of the above, the prayer for anticipatory bail is allowed.

8. Accordingly, I direct that in the event of arrest, the petitioner viz., **Pradip Dasgupta** be released on bail upon furnishing a bond of Rs.20,000/-, with two sureties of like amount each, one of which must be local, to the satisfaction of the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Asansol, Paschim Bardhaman and also subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 482(2) of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 and on further condition petitioner while on bail shall not leave the jurisdiction of the concerned police station without permission of the concerned Investigating Officer.

9. The application for anticipatory bail is, thus, disposed of.

(Partha Sarathi Chatterjee, J.)