

**IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
Circuit Bench at Jalpaiguri**

28.02.2023.
46.
as
(Rejected).

C.R.M. (A) 154 of 2023

In Re:- An application for anticipatory bail under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure in connection with Kumargram P. S. Case No.66 of 2013 dated 23.02.2013 under Sections 406/409 of the Indian Penal Code.

In the matter of : Sri Chandan Das & Ors.
... Petitioners.

Mr. Kumar Shantanu,
Mr. Gautam Phukan.
...for the Petitioners.

Mr. Sudipta Kr. Mazumdar, Id. DSGI,
Mr. Ajoy Kr. Singhania,
Mr. Sourab Kar.
.....for the CBI.

Petitioners submit they have co-operated with investigation. They are already facing trial on similar accusation in other States. They pray for anticipatory bail.

Deputy Solicitor General opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail. He submits petitioners along with co-accuseds were involved in running a Ponzi scheme in various States. Criminal cases have been registered. They had absconded. Hence, he prays the prayer for anticipatory bail be rejected.

We have considered the materials on record. Allegations show petitioners along with co-accuseds were involved in

running a Ponzi scheme. Number of cases are pending against the petitioners in different States. Investigation of the present case was transferred to CBI by the Hon'ble Apex Court. Profile of the allegations do not relate to a case of cheating simplicitor. It discloses an organized crime activity which caused financial ruin to innumerable persons. Gravity of the offence and prima facie involvement of the petitioners therein do not persuade us to grant anticipatory bail to them.

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

(Subhendu Samanta, J.)

(Joymalya Bagchi, J.)