

26.11.2025
Item No.2(DL)
Ct. No.3
srm
(Rejected)

**IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
Circuit Bench at Jalpaiguri
Criminal Miscellaneous Jurisdiction**

C.R.M. (A) 657 of 2025

In Re:- An application for anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in connection with Alipurduar P. S. Case No.184 of 2025 dated 26.05.2025 under Sections 336(3)/340(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

In the matter of : Abu Kaizar

... Petitioner.

Mr. Hillol Saha Podder

...for the Petitioner.

Mr. Aditi Shankar Chakraborty, APP
Mr. Kallol Nag

...for the State.

1. Learned Advocate for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has already been blacklisted on the reasons of furnishing forged and fabricated documents in the tender process. Be that as it may, petitioner all along cooperated with investigation. In compliance to the order of this Court the petitioner has joined investigation and has also furnished the requisite documents before the investigating agency. The tender has not been allotted to the petitioner and as such there is no loss of public money. He seeks for anticipatory bail in favour of the petitioner.
2. Opposing such prayer for anticipatory bail, learned Advocate for the State submits that the petitioner has forged the signatures of Block Development Officer, Suti-II Development Block in the letter of the work order for

construction of four units of additional classroom at Sajadpur Umarpur High School and work completion certificate furnished by the petitioner. He seeks for dismissal of the prayer for anticipatory bail. He files report of the Inspector-in-Charge, Alipurduar Police Station dated 26th November, 2025 which is taken on record.

3. Perused the case diary and materials on record.
4. It appears from the records that this petitioner has furnished documents during tender process, namely (i) work order for construction of four units of additional classroom at Sajadpur Umarpur High School and (ii) work completion certificate issued by the Block Development Officer, Suti-II Development Block which was subsequently found to be forged one. The report of the State filed this day show that upon verification from the office of the Block Development Officer, it was found that those documents have not been issued from the said office. Considering the above materials and the nature and gravity of the offence and also bearing in mind the conduct of the petitioner in furnishing some forged documents, I am not inclined to extend the benefit of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.
5. Thus, the prayer for anticipatory bail is rejected.
6. **CRM (A) 657 of 2025** stands dismissed.

(Bivas Pattanayak, J.)