

AD 46  
December 16, 2025  
Ct. 28  
SG

Allowed

CRM(A) 3789 of 2025

An application for anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in connection with Sainthia P.S. Case No.294 of 2025 dated 04.07.2025 under Sections 303(2)/112(2) of the BNS, 2023.

And

In the matter of:

*Nandadulal Roy*

*... petitioner*

Mr. Saryati Datta  
Mr. Chitrak Biswas

*... for the petitioner*

Mr. Partha Pratim Das  
Mr. Sharequl Haque

*... for the State*

Ms. Afreen Begum

*... for the de facto complainant*

Supplementary affidavit filed by the petitioner is taken on record.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is the father-in-law of the de facto complainant. The marriage between the couple took place in 2024. They separated soon thereafter. The de facto complainant suspected that some of her gold ornaments might have been pledged for obtaining bank loan. Thereafter, she kept all gold ornaments at her paternal home. The petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. The bank account of the petitioner does not show anything exceptional with regard to deposits of bulk sums of money.

Learned counsel for the de facto complainant strongly opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail and submits that initially some of gold ornaments belonging to the de facto complainant were pledged to the bank for obtaining loans. This prompted the de facto complainant to move all gold ornaments to her paternal home. After their separation, one day the de facto complainant's husband came to her paternal home and took away all the gold ornaments belonging to the de facto complainant, her mother and her grandmother. Thereafter a gold loan was obtained from the Bank of Baroda.

Learned counsel for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail, relies on the statements of witnesses, the bank statements and submits that there was some amount of money which was deposited into the joint bank account of the present petitioner during the relevant time.

It appears that the husband of the de facto complainant is the principal accused and he is not before this Court.

Considering the above, the other materials available in the case diary and the alleged role ascribed to the present petitioner, I do not think that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required in this case and I am inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

In the event of arrest, the petitioner shall be released on bail upon furnishing a bond of Rs.10,000/- (rupees ten thousand) 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 the further conditions that the petitioner shall cooperate with the 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.

Personal appearance of the investigating officer is noted and is dispensed with.

Urgent photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be supplied to the parties upon compliance of requisite formalities.

**(Jay Sengupta, J.)**