

24.11.2025
Sl. No.08
NB

CRM (A) 3093 of 2025

In Re:- An application for anticipatory bail under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 corresponding to Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in connection with Harishchandrapur PS Case No.315/2023 dated 12.04.2023 under Sections 406/409/420 of the Indian Penal Code.

And

In the matter of: Kiran Devi Agarwal @ Smt. Kiran Devi Agarwala
... petitioner

Mr. Mritunjoy Chatterjee,
Mr. Imadul Hoque,
Mr. S. Chatterjee.
...for the petitioner.

Mr. Antarikshya Basu,
Mr. Debarshi Brahma.
...for the State.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits as follows. The petitioner is not the prime accused in this case. The petitioner had resigned from the company in question way back in 2016. However, this fact was not uploaded in the website of the ROC. In 2022, the petitioner's side initiated a criminal proceeding against the other director for forging her signature and putting it in a purported agreement executed in 2021 with the Food and Supplies Department. In 2023, this FIR was lodged by the other side.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State strongly opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail. He submits that the petitioner and the other directors were very much there at the time of execution of agreement in 2021 and are still directors of the company. One of the accused standing on the same footing is in custody. It was agreed with the Food and Supplies Department that the petitioner would take the huge amount of paddy in question and convert the same into customized mill rice. Physical verification

showed that there were no such goods in their custody. They had misappropriated the entire goods that were given to them. In fact, the accused had apparently influenced one of the earlier Investigating Officers. The investigation have now been given to another Officer and a departmental proceeding is going on against the erstwhile Investigating Officer.

Considering the above and the other incriminating materials available in the case diary, I do not consider this to be a fit case for granting anticipatory bail to the present petitioner.

The application for anticipatory bail being **CRM (A) 3093 of 2025** is, thus, rejected.

Urgent photostat certified copies of this order may be delivered to the learned Advocates for the parties, if applied for, upon compliance of all formalities.

(Jay Sengupta, J.)