

11.12.2020.
78
as
(Rejected)

**C.R.M. 10234 of 2020
(Via Video Conference)**

In Re:- An application for anticipatory bail under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure in connection with Kalighat P.S. Case No.94 of 2020 dated 07.07.2020 under Sections 177/181/328/420/466/467/468/471/474/120B of the Indian Penal Code.

In the matter of : Sikha Biswas.

... Petitioner.

Mr. Asit Kr. Das.

...for the Petitioner.

Mr. Madhusudan Sur, Id. A.P.P.,
Mr. Dipankar Paramanick.

.....for the State.

Mr. Sourav Chatterjee,
Mr. Soumya Nag.

...for the de-facto complainant.

Heard the learned Advocates appearing for the parties.

It is submitted on behalf of the petitioner that there is a matrimonial dispute between the parties and she has been falsely implicated in the instant case.

Learned Advocate appearing for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail and submits that the petitioner had procured forged decree of divorce to show that she is a divorcee and had induced the de-facto complainant to marry her. She had indulged in similar fraud on earlier occasions too.

Statements of witnesses as well as documents seized in the course of investigation show that the petitioner had dishonestly claimed that she was a divorcee and induced the

de-facto complainant to marry her. She had indulged in similar crime on earlier occasions too.

In view of the nature of offence and the conduct of the petitioner, as aforesaid, we are of the opinion custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary for unraveling the extent of fraud and this is not a fit case to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner is rejected.

(Suvra Ghosh, J.)

(Joymalya Bagchi, J.)