

13.11.2025
Sl. No.19
NB

CRM (A) 3304 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 Narayanpur PS Case No.108 of 2025 dated 06.05.2025 under Sections 316(2)/318(4)/319(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

And

In the matter of: Krishnendu Das

... petitioner

Mr. Souma Subhra Ray,
Mr. Aniruddha Bandopadhyay,
Ms. Neelam Kumari,
Ms. Archana Baghel.
...for the petitioner.

Mr. Rana Mukherjee,
Mr. Mirza Firoj Ahmed Begg,
Ms. Rita Patra.
...for the de facto complainant.

Ms. Rituparna De Ghose,
Ms. Manasi Roy.
...for the State.

Report filed on behalf of the State is taken on record.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits as follows. The petitioner's wife had earlier lodged an FIR against the de facto complainant and others on 21.11.2024. As a counterblast, the present FIR was lodged on 06.05.2025. The petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case due to the earlier case initiated against the adverse side.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the de facto complainant opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail. He had relied on WhatsApp chat showing that the petitioner had falsely represented himself to be a relative famous individuals and sent a WhatsApp message to the petitioner that some amounts have to be paid to the Customs Department for getting some cars.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State relies on the case diary and opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail. She submits that investigation was done on the copies of cheques and the WhatsApp chat referred to. It appears that WhatsApp message was sent from the phone number registered in the name of the wife of the petitioner. In fact, the case diary contains statements of other victims as well.

Considering the above and 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) 3304 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.)