

20.04.2023

27

Ct. No. 29

CHC

Rejected

C.R.M.(A) 1680 of 2023

In Re:- An application for anticipatory bail under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure in connection with **Dakshineswar** Police Station Case No. **124** of **2022** dated **13.07.2022** under Section **467** of the Indian Penal Code, 1860.

And

In the matter of : Rima Ghosh & ors.

..... petitioners

Mr. Shibaji Kumar Das,

Ms. Rupsa Sreemani

....for the petitioners

Mr. Swapan Banerjee,

Mr. Suman De

....for the State

Mr. Subhasish Pachhal

....for the de facto complainant

Four petitioners seek anticipatory bail claiming that they were being falsely implicated by a lady advocate.

State and the de facto complainant are represented.

Learned advocate appearing for the de facto complainant refers to the materials in the case diary including the opinion of the questioned document examining bureau. He submits that several signatures appearing in the mass petition were found to be forged by the questioned document examination bureau.

Apparently, mass petition was filed which contained forged signatures.

It is the claim of the petitioners that they did not file the mass petition.

Materials in the case diary suggests otherwise.

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

CRM (A) 1680 of 2023 is rejected.

(Debangsu Basak, J.)

(Md. Shabbar Rashidi, J.)