

18.03.2025
Item No.50
Ct. No. 26
CHC
Rejected

C.R.M.(A) 574 of 2025

In Re:- An application for anticipatory bail under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973/Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, in connection with **Dhantala** Police Station Case No. **803** of **2024** dated **03.12.2024** under Sections **409/420/34** of the Indian Penal Code, 1860.

And

In the matter of: Tapan Kumar Singha @ Singh

..... petitioner

Mr. Arindam Jana, Advocate
Mr. Shibaji Kumar Das, Advocate
....for the petitioner

Mr. Joydeep Roy, Advocate
Mr. Aritra Bhattacharya, Advocate
....for the State

1. Petitioner prays for anticipatory bail.
2. Learned advocate appearing for the petitioner submits that, petitioner is the Secretary of Cooperative Society. He submits that he is not involved in the so-called embezzlement of fund.
3. Learned advocate appearing for the State submits that, sum in excess of Rs.7 Crores was deposited in the account of the Cooperative Society from time to time. Such amount was ultimately disbursed to different accounts. 9 accounts were identified, which received benefits of such disbursements. Fund was meant for a designated purpose

and disbursed to persons who were not entitled to receive such funds. He draws the attention of the Court to the materials in the Case Diary including the bank accounts of the cooperative society.

4. Investigations are in progress.
5. There are allegations of embezzlement of funds of public nature.
6. Materials in the Case Diary demonstrate that, funds in excess of Rs.7 Crores came into the bank account of the Cooperative Society in which the petitioner is still the Secretary. Such funds stood disbursed to several accounts. Funds received by the Society was for a particular purpose and were required to be disbursed for such purpose. Disbursements details do not show that funds so received were disbursed for the earmarked purpose.
7. Enlarging the petitioner at this stage may be inimical to the ongoing investigations.
8. In such circumstances, we are not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.
9. This application for anticipatory bail is, thus, rejected.

(Debangsu Basak, J.)

(Smita Das De, J.)

