

02.03.2021
Item No.13
Ct.No.28
Subha
rejected

C.R.M. 10490 of 2020
(Via Video Conference)

Md. Abu Soyem
-vs-
The State of West Bengal

In Re: An application for bail under Section 439 Cr.P.C in connection with Onda P. S. Case No. 89 of 2014 dated May 14, 2014 under Sections 468/409/420/120B/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

Mr. Imtiaz Ahmed
Mr. Mofakkerul Islam
Mr. Ghazala Firdaus
Ms. Smita Saha
Mr. Supriya Majumder
Mr. Sk. Saidullah
Mr. Md. Muntakhab
Ms. Arunima Mukhopadhaya
Mr. Debopam Roy

... For the Petitioner.

Mr. Sudip Ghosh
Mr. Apurba Kumar Datta

... For the State.

Mr. Ahmed, learned advocate appearing for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was arrested on or about 04.08.2020 and since then he was in custody.

According to the learned advocate for the petitioner, the petitioner has only been named as a Director of the company and he was not intricated in the day-to-day activities of the company.

Further, the petitioner has been released on bail in connection with Onda Police Station Case No. 89 of 2014 dated

15.05.2014 under Sections 468/409/420/406/120B/34 by a co-ordinate Bench of this court.

Mr. Ghosh, learned advocate appearing for the State opposes the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submits that the petitioner was evading the process of law as the charge-sheet has been submitted in the year 2015 and the petitioner has been arrested very recently in the month of August, 2020 and since then he was in custody.

We have perused the materials on record available in the case diary and also assessed the nature of allegations, the sum and substance of evidence with the object of paying higher interest which is shortly termed as 'ponzi scheme'.

Having regard to the manner in which the banking activities have been carried out without permission of the appropriate authorities and the fact that the petitioner has been evading the process of law, we are of the opinion that this is not a fit case for granting bail to the present petitioner.

Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the present petitioner is, thus, rejected.

With the aforesaid observations, the application for bail being CRM 10490 of 2020, is, accordingly, disposed of.

All parties shall act on the server copies of this order duly downloaded from the official website of this Court.

(Tirthankar Ghosh, J.)

(Tapabrata Chakraborty, J.)