

12/08/2025

D/L 25

Ct. No.28

S.Kundu

Rejected

C.R.M.(A) 2303 of 2025

In Re:- An application for anticipatory bail under section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023/under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. In connection with G.R (S) case no. 227 of 2025 pending before the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Calcutta arising out of Cyber police station (AFS/DD) case no. 12 of 2025 dated 26.2.2025 under sections 61(2)/319(2)/318(4)/336(2)/338/336(3)/340(2)/238 of the BNS.

In the matter of: Imran Qureshi @ Shanky Watson
... Petitioner

Mr. Sandipan Ganguly
Mr. Sourav Chatterjee
Ms. Marry Datta
Mr. B. Mukherjee
Mr. A. Debnath

...for the petitioner.

Mr. Debasish Roy
Mr. Suman De
Ms. D. Das

...for the State.

1. Learned senior counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits as follows. The petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. There is hardly any material to connect him with the alleged offences. In any event, most of the co-accused in this case have been granted bail. Nothing incriminating could be seized from the petitioner. At best, there is a statement of a co-accused which implicates the petitioner. But, the same is not admissible in evidence. In fact, there is no need for custodial interrogation as all the electronic documents have been seized. None of the alleged victims have yet

been examined, as had been submitted on behalf of the State earlier.

2. Learned Public Prosecutor representing the State denies the allegations, relies on the case diary and submits as follows. The petitioner is the kingpin in running various fake call centres and thereby duping Indian citizens as well as foreign nationals and cheating them. Sums have been seized, money trail has been established in this case. There are electronic records to show how persons were cheated. A number of bank accounts have been freezed. All these were available at the time of filing of the application for anticipatory bail by the petitioner. Subsequent to the filing of the application for anticipatory bail, statements of local persons have been obtained connecting to the petitioner to the different places where the fake call centres were being run. CDR analysis of call records have also been obtained showing that the present petitioner was regularly in touch with a co-accused. Application is pending for cancelling the bail granted to the other co-accused.
3. Considering the serious nature of allegations and the incriminating materials available in the case diary including the statements of witnesses, money trail as well as phone call records showing telephonic conversation between the petitioner and a co-accused, I do not consider this to be a fit case to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4. Accordingly, the application for anticipatory bail is rejected.

(Jay Sengupta, J.)