

21.11.2025
Sl. No.59
NB

CRM (A) 3519 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 Chakdah PS Case No.352/2025 dated 17.04.2025 under Sections 274/275/318(4) of the BNS, 2023 read with Sections 51/56 of the Food Safety & Standards Act, 2006 & Section 26 of the WBFS Act, 1950.

And

In the matter of: Dinesh Saw ... petitioner

Mr. Shibaji Kr. Das,
Mr. Dipendu Sarkar.
...for the petitioner.

Ms. Shaila Afreen,
Mr. Tirupati Mukherjee.
...for the State.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits as follows. The alleged incriminating articles were recovered from the premises of a co-accused. The petitioner complied with a notice issued by the Investigating Officer.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State strongly opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail. She submits that this is a case of food adulteration. She refers to the reports, especially the one contained at page 176 of the case diary. She also submits that the business was being run by the petitioner and the other co-accused. Even, no fire licence was taken for doing the manufacturing.

Considering the 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) 3519 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.)