

24/09/2025
D/L – 16
Court No.28
S. Kundu
Allowed

C.R.M.(A) 1153 of 2025

In Re: An application for anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023. In connection with Contai Police Station Case no. 732 of 2024 dated 19.11.2024 under Sections 406 of 420 of the IPC.

In the matter of: Sh. Rejeev Kumar

...Petitioner.

Mr. Shreeyash U. Lalit
Mr. Himanshu Vats
Mr. Ramendu Agarwal
Ms. Sonia Das

...for the petitioner.

Mr. Masud Mallick

...for the de-facto complainant.

Mr. Joydeep Biswas
Ms. Trisha Rakshit

...for the State.

1. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits as follows. Initially, the de-facto complainant wanted to become CNF agent with the petitioner's company for distribution of liquor. After some time, the de-facto complainant expressed his desire not to continue with the same and instead to act as dealer of one Sunlight Electronics for supplying electrical items. The amount paid by the de-facto complainant earlier to the petitioner was to be adjusted in respect of the subsequent arrangement. Although the goods were sent to the de-facto complainant which they supplied to the distributors, the money that was to be given was allegedly paid directly to the said Sunlight Electronics. The de-

facto complainant was thus allegedly cheated of the entire sum that they had given to the petitioner. This is purely civil dispute between the private parties. Similar copy-paste allegations have been made by other associates of the de-facto complainant. In relation to a connected matter, the petitioner was granted anticipatory bail by a Division Bench of this Court on 14.1.2025 in CRM (A) 3789 of 2024.

2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State relies on the Enquiry Report filed and as well as the case diary and opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail. She submits that the goods were actually supplied by the de-facto complainant to the dealers on behalf of the said Sunlight Electronics, but they were not paid anything.
3. Considering the nature of allegations which has a substantial civil flavour, the materials available in the case diary and the fact that the petitioner had cooperated with the investigation by responding the notices issued by the Investigating Officer, I do not think that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required in this case and I am inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.
4. In the event of arrest, the petitioner shall be released on bail upon furnishing a bond of Rs.10,000/- each 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 further conditions that the petitioner shall

cooperate with the investigation and shall not threaten or intimidate witnesses. The petitioner shall meet the Investigating Officer as and when required.

5. Accordingly, the application for anticipatory bail is allowed.
6. Urgent photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be given to the parties upon compliance with requisite formalities.

(Jay Sengupta, J.)