

02.02.2024
08
Ct. No. 29
S.D.
REJECTED

C.R.M.(A) 323 of 2024

In Re:- In Re:- An application for anticipatory bail under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure in connection with **Amherst** Police Station Case No. **248 of 2023** dated **03.11.2023** under Section **406/420/467/468/471/120B** of the Indian Penal Code.

And

In Re : Sandip Kumar Jaiswal

..... petitioner

Mr. Shyamal Mukhopadhyay
Ms. Priyanka Chatterjee
Ms. Sreeparna Ghosh

...for the petitioner

Mr. Sujan Chatterjee

...for the State

Ms. Sibangi Chattopadhyay
Mr. Bibaswan Mukherjee
Mr. Anit Debnath

..for the defacto-complainant

Petitioner prays for anticipatory bail.

Learned advocate appearing for the petitioner submits that, the petitioner was falsely implicated. The petitioner did not receive any money from the defacto-complainant. Signature of the petitioner on the money receipts was forged.

Learned advocate appearing for the State draws the attention of the Court to the materials in the case diary. He submits that, a sum of Rs.47 lakhs was made over to the petitioner for supply of goods. Neither the money was refunded, nor the goods supplied.

Learned advocate appearing for the defacto-complainant submits that, her client was duped into entering into the contract on the basis of forged letters.

Materials in the case diary suggest that the petitioner received the sum of Rs.47 lakhs for supply of goods.

Materials in the case diary do not disclose that the goods were supplied or the money refunded.

Complicity of the petitioner in the incident requires investigation.

Enlarging the petitioner on anticipatory bail would be inimical to such investigation.

Consequently, we are unable to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner and the prayer for bail of the petitioner is rejected.

The application being **CRM (A) 323 of 2024** is dismissed.

(Debangsu Basak, J.)

(Md. Shabbar Rashidi, J.)