

24/11/2025
D/L – 40
Court No.28
S. Kundu
Rejected

C.R.M.(A) 3548 of 2025

In Re: An application for anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023. In connection with Basirhat Cyber Crime P.S case no. 5 of 2022 dated 10.5.2022 under sections 419/420/120B of the IPC.

In the matter of: Subhajit Mandal

...Petitioner.

Mr. Debasis Kar

...for the petitioner.

Mr. Adil Badr

Ms. Sana Naaz

...for the State.

1. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits as follows. The petitioner is only the nephew of the principal accused. He runs a Xerox shop. He is in no way connected with the alleged offence.
2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail. He submits that the *modus operandi* used in this case is very complicated. First, a fake website was created by using the broadband connection taken in the name of one Jayanta Mandal. Inquiry revealed that there was no one existing by the name of Jayanta Mandal. Actually, two connections were given, one in the house of the petitioner and the other in the house of the petitioner's uncle. The one which was given in the house of the petitioner's uncle was used to create fake website. Franchises were offered. Huge sums of money were taken, but not returned. The money was

paid into five various bank accounts involving five phone numbers. The KYC of one Sahid Ali was taken, but the SIM was issued to one Sutapa Dafadar. Her picture in the records is that of a 60 years old lady while her date of birth is shown as 3.6.2000. This was also a fraudulent act. The SIM was actually received by one Amiya. The said Amiya gave statement that the petitioner and his uncle were the main perpetrators. Some amounts were taken into the bank account of a dead person. From there money was taken out by different means.

3. Considering the above and the other incriminating materials available in the case diary, I do not consider this to be a fit case to grant case anticipatory bail to the petitioner.
4. Accordingly, the application for anticipatory bail is rejected.
5. Urgent photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be given to the parties upon compliance with requisite formalities.

(Jay Sengupta, J.)