

16.07.2021

(Via Video Conference)

Court No. 28
Item No. PB - 07
nandy

CRM 370 of 2021

(bail - rejected)

In Re: An application for **Bail** under Section **439** of the Code of Criminal Procedure filed on 11.01.2021 in connection with Alipore Police Station Case No. 142 of 2019 dated 29.11.2019 under Sections 120B/409/420/467/468/471 of the Indian Penal Code and Sections 7(a)(b)(c)/7A/8/11/12/13(1)(a)/13(b) of the Prevention of Corruption Act. (Special Case No. 4 of 2020)

and

In the matter of: **Aniruddha Ghosh**

..... Petitioner

Mr. Milon Mukherjee, Senior Advocate

Mr. Dattatreya Dutta, Advocate

Mr. Mangaljit Mukherjee, Advocate

Ms. Sananda Bhattacharya, Advocate

..... for the Petitioner

Mr. Sibangi Chattopadhyay, Advocate

..... for the de facto complainant

Mr. Neiguive Ahmed, Learned A.P.P.

Mr. Md. Anwar Hossain, Advocate

Ms. Amita Gaur, Advocate

..... for the State

The petitioner has filed the instant application for bail in connection with Alipore Police Station Case No. 142 of 2019 dated 29.11.2019 under Sections 120B/409/420/467/468/471 of the Indian Penal Code and Sections 7(a)(b)(c)/7A/8/11/12/13(1)(a)/ 13(b) of the Prevention of Corruption Act.

The petitioner claims parity as the other accused had already been enlarged on bail. The earlier application being CRM 6446 of 2020 filed by the petitioner was rejected on September 25, 2020. The aforesaid rejection was made despite the fact that chargesheet was already filed by the Investigating Officer. The allegation against the petitioner is that he was responsible for awarding tender for supply of goods to the district judgeship by floating fictitious companies and procuring the order and awarded the tenders to the other companies for illegal gratification.

A responsible officer of the judgship having involved and indulged in such illegal and wrongful act cannot be dealt with so lightly. It is a degree of ramification on the society itself losing the confidence and sanctity on the judicial system. The person who was benefited with the orders with the help of the petitioner is still absconding though represented by the Counsel at all stages of the proceedings in the trial Court.

We do not think that there has been any changed circumstances warranting a different decision to be taken in this application.

As such, the prayer for bail is **rejected**.

The application being **CRM 370 of 2021** accordingly **dismissed**.

(Harish Tandon, J.)

(Subhasis Dasgupta, J.)