

AD 16
July 01, 2025
Ct. 28
SG

Allowed

CRM(A) 1126 of 2025

An application for anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in connection with Singur P.S. Case No.72 of 2025 dated 15.02.2025 under Sections 3(5)/316(2)/318(4)/351(1)/352 of the BNS, 2023.

And

In the matter of:

Swami Trilokyananda Puri alias
Swami Tailakananda
... petitioner

Mr. Jayanta Narayan Chatterjee, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Debashis Banerjee
Mr. Rakesh Jana
Mr. Supreem Naskar
... for the petitioner

Mr. Subhamoy Bhattacharya
Ms. Jonaki Saha
... for the State

Mr. Suman Chakraborty
... for the de facto complainant

Learned senior counsel representing the petitioner submits that the de facto complainant had donated a sum of Rs.1.6 crore to one “Adwaita Gyan Peeth”, a religious trust which is run by the present petitioner. This was for purchase of land in the name of the said institution. The land was purchased in 2022 and 2023. The deed shows that the same was executed on behalf of the purchaser by the petitioner and the PAN No. of the said “Adwaita Gyan Peeth” was provided. This fact was duly notified to the de facto complainant by e-mails. There were exchange of e-mails in

January, 2023 and thereafter. In one such e-mail, the petitioner thanked the informant for providing a donation to the tune of Rs.1.6 crore. There was no denial that came thereafter. It was in 2025 that the informant chose to register the present FIR raising a question as to why the land was not purchased in the name of the deceased husband of the de facto complainant. No prima facie case is made out against the petitioner as would be evident from a plain reading of the FIR.

Learned counsel for the de facto complainant strongly opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail and submits that the de facto complainant was duped by the petitioner and his associates.

Learned counsel for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail and relies on the report filed earlier and materials available in the case diary. He submits that there was exchange of e-mails between the parties as claimed.

Although there were e-mails exchanged in 2023 between the private parties and in one such e-mail, the petitioner had thanked the de facto complainant for providing a donation of a tune of such sum, no denial came on the part of the de facto complainant till registration of the FIR.

Considering the materials available in the case diary and the fact that the core dispute has a predominantly civil

flavour, I am inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

In the event of arrest, the petitioner 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 the Arresting Officer and also be subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 corresponding to Section 482(2) of the BNSS, 2023 and on the further conditions that the petitioner shall cooperate with the investigation, the petitioner shall meet the investigating officer once a fortnight till submission of report in final form and the petitioner shall not threaten or intimidate witnesses.

The application for anticipatory bail is, thus, allowed.

Urgent photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be supplied to the parties upon compliance of requisite formalities.

(Jay Sengupta, J.)