

05.02.2025
15.
Ct. No. 28
PRITAM
[ALLOWED]

C. R. M. (A) 66 of 2025

In Re: An application for anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in connection with **Islampur** Police Station Case No. **1027** of **2024** dated **21.10.2024** under Sections **498A/420/406/468/471** of IPC, corresponding to G.R. Case No.3399 of 2024.

And

In Re: **Dipak Bhagat @ Deepak & Ors.**

... .. Petitioners.

Mr. Sandipan Ganguly, Sr. Advocate
Mr. Biswajit Manna.

.... for the petitioners.

Mr. Sourav Chatterjee, Sr. Advocate
Mr. Soumya Nag

.....for the *de-facto*.

Ms. Rituparna De Ghose,
Mr. Raju Mondal

.... for the State.

1. Petitioners are the in-laws of the *de-facto* complainant. She alleged her *stridhan* articles, including jewellery had been withheld.
2. In view of the submission, investigating agency was directed to undertake search and recovery of *stridhan* articles, if any.
3. Report is placed on record. Report shows *stridhan* articles have been returned to the *de-facto* complainant.
4. Learned senior counsel for the *de-facto* complainant contends all the jewellerys have not been returned. It is also submitted that his client was forced to sign blank cheques through which the amount credited in her name was withdrawn.

5. We have considered the materials on record. Petitioners are the in-laws of the *de-facto* complainant. Her husband died on January 2024. She relinquished her claim in the ancestral property and a sum of Rs.18 lakhs was settled as her claim. Materials have been placed before us to show that the said amount had been credited to her. However, it is contended the said amount was immediately withdrawn without her consent. It is nobody's case that *de-facto* complainant's signature was forged. Whether the withdrawal was with her consent or under coercion, it is to be decided at the appropriate stage of the proceeding. From the report, we note *stridhan* articles have been returned. It is argued before us that jewellery was not returned. But nothing is placed on record that *de-facto* complainant raised objection that jewellery though recovered had not been handed over to her. Given this situation, we are of the opinion custodial interrogation for progress of investigation is not necessary and petitioners may be granted anticipatory bail.

6. Accordingly, we direct that in the event of arrest, the petitioners viz., **Dipak Bhagat @ Deepak & Ors** be released on bail upon furnishing a bond of Rs.10,000/-, with two sureties of like amount each, to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer and also subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 482(2) of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023. They shall appear before the jurisdictional court and pray for regular bail within four weeks from date.

7. The application for anticipatory bail being **CRM (A) 66 of 2025** is, thus, disposed of.

(Subhendu Samanta, J.)

(Joymalya Bagchi, J.)