

31.07.2025
SI No.43
Mujahid
Ct No.25
(Allowed)

CRM (M) 889 of 2025

In Re: An application for bail under Section 483 of the B.N.S.S., 2023 filed on **25.06.2025** in connection with **Baguiati** Police Station Case No. **192/2025** dated **18.03.2025** under Sections **303(2)/316(2)/318(4)/319(2)/336(3)/338/340(2)/61(2)11** of the B.N.S., 2023.

And

In the matter of : **Arati Singh @ Arti Singh**

... Petitioner.

Mr. Mritunjay Chatterjee,
Mr. Manas Das,
Mrs. Suchismita Chakraborty

... for the petitioner.

Mr. Ranadeb Sengupta,
Mr. Sarekul Haque

... for the State.

1. The proceedings were instituted on the basis of a complaint made by the de facto complainant Vinita Singh on 18th March, 2025 allegedly that her mother Arati Singh, i.e., the present petitioner and uncle Satender orchestrated a fake income tax raid at their house.

2. Pursuant to that, on 18th March, 2025 at around 2.00 midnights, some persons came to the house of the complainant and impersonated themselves as Income Tax Department Officers and took away their mobile phones. The complainant has further alleged that this person despite showing the documents took away ornaments and other valuable articles including cash. It was alleged that they went to the present petitioner's room also, who

admittedly resides in the same house, but did not take anything from there and merely took signature on papers.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that other co-accused persons have already been released on bail. Learned counsel submits that except the statement made by the complainant and the disclosure of co-accused persons, there is no other evidence against the petitioner. Learned counsel submits that complainant is in fact step-daughter of the petitioner and she has the motive to implicate petitioner falsely.

4. Learned counsel for the State has very fairly submitted in its report which is taken on record, that as per call detail record, the petitioner and other persons committed the raid were not in contact. However, learned counsel submits that CISF personnel who took part in the rape had duly named the petitioner. Learned counsel also submits that co-accused Satender Kumar is still absconding. The petitioner is in custody since 130 days. The charge-sheet has already been filed. The probative values of witnesses are yet to be seen. At this stage, the court is only required to see the prima facie case.

5. In the facts and circumstances, the petitioner be admitted to court bail on furnishing a personal bond Rs.10,000/- with two sureties of the like amount each one of whom must be local to the satisfaction of learned CJM, Barasat and further condition that she shall not tamper with the prosecution evidence nor shall threaten, intimidate or tamper with the witnesses or to attend the trial regularly.

6. The application for bail is allowed.
7. All parties shall act on the basis of the server copy of the order downloaded from the official website of this Court.
8. Urgent Photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be supplied to the parties upon compliance with all requisite formalities.

(Dinesh Kumar Sharma, J.)