

06.11.2025
Court No.28
Item No.38
tbsr
Allowed

CRM (A) 3321 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 **Shyampukur** P.S. Case No.**79 of 2024** dated **03.08.2024** under Sections **420/467/468/471** of the Indian Penal Code.

And

In the matter of: **Ranjit Bera @ Ranjit Kumar Bera & Ors.**

....Petitioners.

Mr. Modhu Jana
Mr. Rahul Agarwala
Ms. Sumana Saha
Mr. Ujjal Rajak

....for the petitioners

Mr. Koushik Kundu
Mr. S. Ganguly

....for the State

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners submits as follows. The petitioners were the office bearers of the LIC. They are absolutely innocent and have been falsely implicated in this case. The principal accused had allegedly duped the de facto complainant by investing a large sum of money in an LIC insurance policy instead of in a fixed deposit. It is further alleged that the petitioners' signatures on the proposal form has been forged. The petitioners are in no way connected with the alleged offence. In fact, one of them has retired. The principal accused was arrested and was thereafter granted bail.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail. He submits that the present petitioners must have participated in a conspiracy with the principal accused.

According to a communication dated 08.09.2025 made by the Senior Manager of LIC, the names of the present petitioners had come up while searching for the missing original proposal papers. Although a copy of the proposal form is present in the case diary, the original has been misplaced and it is suspected that the present petitioners are behind this.

The letter dated 08.09.2025 simply says that the names of the three present petitioners had come up while the Senior Branch Manager was searching for the original files. It does not at all indicate the details of about how the present petitioners could be held responsible for misplacing of the said files.

Considering the materials available in the case diary, the alleged roles attributed to the present petitioners and the fact that the principal accused was arrested and was thereafter granted bail, I do not think that custodial interrogation of the petitioners is required in this case and I am inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

In the event of arrest, the petitioners 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 the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 corresponding to Section 482(2) of the BNSS, 2023 and on further condition that the petitioners shall fully cooperate with investigation, shall meet the Investigating Officer once a fortnight till submission of report in final form and shall not threaten or intimidate witnesses.

The application for anticipatory bail is, thus, allowed.

Urgent photostat certified copy of this order may be supplied to the parties expeditiously, if applied for.

(Jay Sengupta, J.)