

29. 12.03.2025
Court
No.29 (Pritam)
(Allowed)

**IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS JURISDICTION**

CRM (DB) 242 of 2025

In Re: - An application for bail under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 / Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, arising out of **Tamluk** Police Station Case No.**480/2023** dated **06.05.2023** under Sections **420/406/467** of the IPC, 1860.

And

In the matter of: - **Parbati Bijuli Maity @ Parbati Maity.**
...petitioner.

Mr. Arnab Chatterjee,
Ms. Dhanasree Biswas,
Ms. Poulami Bose

...for the petitioner.

Mr. Munshi Ashiq Elahi,
Mr. Md. Sahidullah Mridha,
Mr. Rohit Mahato

...for the *de-facto*.

Mr. Rudradipta Nandy, Ld. A.P.P.,
Mr. Ruhul Ganguly

...for the State.

Dictated by Arijit Banerjee, J.

1. The petitioner says that after her prayer for anticipatory bail was rejected by this Court, she surrendered before the learned trial court. On the very same date, bail was granted to her. Her husband, a co-accused, is on bail.
2. Subsequently, however, the Investigating Officer prayed for cancellation of the petitioner's bail on the ground that she had suppressed that her prayer for anticipatory bail had been

rejected by the High Court. On that ground, the learned trial court cancelled her bail.

3. The petitioner challenged such cancellation order by way of a Criminal Revision before the High Court. The High Court directed her to surrender before the jurisdictional court. She did so on January 10, 2025. Her bail prayer was rejected and she has been in custody since that date.
4. Learned State counsel and learned advocate for the *de-facto* complainant oppose the prayer for bail. They say that the petitioner took Rs.20 lakhs from the *de-facto* complainant by promising a job in a primary school. A fake appointment letter was handed over to the *de-facto* complainant. Later, the same was detected to be a fake letter. The money has not been recovered.
5. We have considered the fact and circumstances of the case. Investigation is complete and charge-sheet has been filed. The evidence in the present case would largely be documentary in nature. The prosecution would have collected such evidence by now.
6. Therefore and also considering that the petitioner is a lady, we do not see any justification of detaining the petitioner in judicial custody any further.
7. Accordingly, we **allow** the petitioner's prayer for bail.
8. Accordingly, we direct that the petitioner, namely, **Parbati Bijuli Maity @ Parbati Maity** shall be released on bail upon furnishing a bond of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand), with

two sureties of like amount each, one of whom must be local, to the satisfaction of learned C.J.M., *Purba Medinipur*. The petitioner shall appear before the trial Court on each and every date of substantive hearing subject to the provisions of Section 317 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 / Section 355 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 and shall not intimidate the witnesses and/or tamper with evidence in any manner whatsoever. The petitioner shall not enter the territorial jurisdiction of *Tamluk* Police Station except for the purpose of attending court proceedings, until further orders.

9. In the event the petitioner fails to comply with any of the conditions stipulated above, the trial Court shall be at liberty to cancel the bail in accordance with law without further reference to this court.
10. The application for bail being CRM (DB) 242 of 2025 is, thus, disposed of.
11. All parties shall act on the server copies of this order duly downloaded from the official *website* of this Court.
12. Criminal Section is directed to supply certified copies of this order to the parties, if applied for, upon compliance of all necessary formalities.

(Arijit Banerjee, J.)

(Om Narayan Rai, J.)