

06.04.2022
Serial no. 19
[Dd]
(Anticipatory bail
Rejected)

CRM(A) 1579 of 2022

In re : An Application for **Anticipatory Bail** under Section **438** of the Code of Criminal Procedure in connection with **Chanditala** Police Station Case No. **488** of **2021** dated **13.12.2021** under Sections **420/465/467/468/471/120B** of the Indian Penal Code.

-And-

In the matter of : **Krishnendu Das**

... ..**Petitioner**

Mr. Mahammad Mahmud,
Mr. Mahfuzus Salam Mollah, Advocates
... .. For the Petitioner

Mr. Sujan Chatterjee, Advocate
... ..For the State

Petitioner seeks anticipatory bail.

Learned advocate appearing for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is no way involved in the incident. The petitioner is not a party to the deeds claimed to be forged. The petitioner is not named in the first information report.

Learned advocate appearing for the State submits that the forged documents were recovered from the office belonging to the petitioner. The wife and son of the petitioner are the seizure list witnesses.

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) 1579 of 2022 is **dismissed**.

(Debangsu Basak, J.)

(Bibhas Ranjan De, J.)