

05.12.2025
Court No.28
Item No.19
ssi

CRM (A) 3711 of 2025

In Re: - An application for anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Suraksha Nagarik Sanhita in connection with Tehatta Police Station Case No. 360 of 2023 dated **06.05.2023** under Sections 465/467/468/471/420 of the Indian Penal Code.

And

In the matter of: **Sahabul Mondal**

....Applicant/Petitioner

Mr. Soumyajit Das Mahapatra
Md. G. N. Imrohi

...for the petitioner

Mr. Kaushik Kundu
Mr. Tirupati Mukherjee

..for the State

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits as follows. The dispute is purely civil in nature. In fact, the de facto complainant had also filed a civil suit regarding this property dispute. Injunction has been granted in favour of the de facto complainant. The de facto complainant has alleged in this FIR that the petitioner had his property transferred and mutated in the petitioner's name by relying on a changed brief which do not pertains to the said property.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail. He relies on the report of BL & LRO dated 02.12.2025. He submits that being in collusion with other officials, the petitioner relied on a deed that pertains to some other property and the land of the de facto complainant was mutated in his name. Custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required to find out who else is involved in this racket.

Considering the serious nature of allegations and the incriminating materials available in the case diary, I do not consider this is to be a fit case for granting anticipatory bail.

Accordingly, the application for anticipatory bail of the petitioner is rejected.

The personal appearance of the I.O. is noted and is dispensed with.

(Jay Sengupta, J.)