

12.09.2022
Sl.19
Court No.29
(AD)
(Rejected)

C.R.M. (A) 4356 of 2022

In Re: - An application for anticipatory bail under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure in connection with **Chinsurah** Police Station Case No.**157 of 2022** dated **02/04/2022** under Sections **447/379/34** of the Indian Penal Code.

And

In the matter of: **Manoj Kumar Shaw & Ors.**

....petitioners.

Mr. Debasis Kar

...for the petitioners.

Mr. Shiladitya Banerjee

...for the State.

Mr. Ashok Kumar Bhattacharya

Mr. Abhijit Bhadra

Ms. Aparupa Bhattacharya

... for the de facto complainant.

Petitioners pray for anticipatory bail.

Learned Advocate appearing for the petitioners submits that there was a settlement between the parties. The disputes are civil in nature. The petitioners were falsely implicated.

Learned Advocate appearing for the State draws the attention of the Court to the materials in the case diary. He submits that after the death of the husband of the de facto complainant, the petitioners went to the shop run by the husband of the de facto complainant, locked it up and removed all the articles. The shop was a jewellery shop.

The de facto complainant is represented.

There are materials in the case diary suggesting that the petitioners interfered with the running business of the de facto complainant, took away the materials and did not return the appropriate materials.

The materials in the case diary do not rule out the requirement of custodial interrogation of the petitioners.

In such circumstances, we are unable to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

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

C.R.M. (A) 4356 of 2022 is dismissed.

(Debangsu Basak, J.)

(Md. Shabbar Rashidi, J.)