

Dd

**CRM (A) 1037 of 2022**

In re : An Application for **anticipatory bail** under Section **438** of the Code of Criminal Procedure in connection with **Pandua** Police Station Case No. **41** of **2022** dated **23.01.2022** under Sections **420/406** of the Indian Penal Code(G.R. No. **188** of **2022**)

**-And-**

In the matter of : **Dola Roy** ... ..**Petitioner**

Mr. Sudip Ghosh Chowdhury,  
Mr. Argha Das,  
Mr. Abhishek Bose, Advocates  
... .. For the Petitioner

Mr. Sudip Ghosh,  
Mr. Bitasok Banerji, Advocates  
... ..For the State

Mr. Sujan Chatterjee, advocate

... ..For the de facto complainant

Petitioner seeks anticipatory bail.

Learned advocate appearing for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was falsely implicated.

Learned advocate appearing for the State draws the attention of the Court to the contents in the case diary. He submits that there was an agreement between the de facto complainant, the petitioner and the co-accused with regard to an immovable property by virtue of which, the other co-accused and the petitioner received consideration from the de facto complainant. The co-accused and the petitioner who are husband and the wife in relation did not execute the title deed nor refunded the amount received from the de facto complainant in respect thereof.

Considering the gravity of the offence and the involvement of the petitioner therein, we are not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

Prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner is **rejected**.

CRM (A) 1037 of 2022 is **dismissed**.

**(Debangsu Basak, J.)**

**(Bibhas Ranjan De, J.)**