

67. 07.03.2025
Court
No.29 (Pritam)
(Rejected)

IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS JURISDICTION

CRM (DB) 298 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 **Kalyani Cyber Crime** Police Station Case No.**38/2024** dated **07.09.2024** under Sections **417/419/420/467/468/506/120B** of the IPC, 1860.

And

In the matter of: - **Mayank Didwania.**

.....petitioner.

Mr. Sabir Ahamed,
Mr. Niladri Sekhar Ghosh

...for the petitioner.

Ms. Sayanti Santra,
Ms. Debolina Das

....for the State.

Dictated by Prasenjit Biswas, J.

1. It is said by the petitioner that he was arrested on 03.10.2024 and since then he is in custody. His name was transpired from the statement of the co-accused person and he was not named in the First Information Report. Investigation process is over. All the allegations as made against him is absolutely baseless and vague. So, there is no need for further detention of this accused petitioner behind the bar.
2. Learned Advocate for the State raises objection by submitting that there are sufficient incriminating materials in the case diary which indicate about prima facie involvement of this accused

petitioner with the alleged offence. This accused petitioner and his associate offered the *de facto* complainant by saying that they would arrange students' loans for the complainant and her friends from the bank and provide a new SIM card as told by one of the accused Soumit Halder. It is alleged that new SIM card was provided to the *de-facto* complainant which stands in the name of the said accused Soumit. The accused persons somehow managed to get the photos of the complaint, passbook and ATM card. Thereafter, this accused petitioner along with other accused persons allegedly transferred money from the account of the *de facto* complainant. So, it is said that if at this stage this accused petitioner is granted bail then there is every chance of tampering of evidences. Accordingly, it is prayed that this accused petitioner may not be enlarged on bail

3. Perused the materials on record. There are sufficient incriminating materials in the case diary which show about *prima facie* involvement of this accused petitioner with the alleged offence. This accused petitioner being the member of a racket allegedly siphoned huge amount of money from the bank account of the general public. The investigation process is still going on. Considering the nature of allegations and *prima facie* materials against this accused petitioner we are not inclined to allow the prayer for bail.
4. The prayer for bail is, thus, **rejected**.

5. Needless to say that all the observations made in this hearing are only for the purpose of disposing this bail for bail application and shall have absolutely no bearing on the trial.
6. CRM (DB) 298 of 2025 is disposed of.

(Arijit Banerjee, J.)

(Prasenjit Biswas, J.)