

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

24.11.2025
Item No. 18 (DL)
AN

(REJECTED)

C.R.M. (A) 748 of 2025

In Re:- An application for anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in connection with Mekhliganj P.S. Case No. 196 of 2025 dated 24.06.2025 under Section 318(4) / 316(2) / 336(3) / 340(2) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 corresponding to G.R. Case No. 372 of 2025 pending before the Court of the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Coochbehar.

In the matter of : **Ashoke Roy**

... Petitioner.

Mr. Debasish Mukhopadhyay
Ms. Srishti Sarkar
Ms. Payel Chanda

...for the Petitioner.

Mr. Ujjwal Luksom
Ms. Namrata Das

...for the State.

Mr. Sandip Guha Roy
Mr. Ananda Paul

...for *de facto* complainant

1. Learned advocate for the petitioner submits that the complainant was never forced by the petitioner to part with the money. The complainant of her own accord, has transferred the amount in favour of the petitioner. The co-accused has been granted bail. He seeks for grant of anticipatory bail in favour of the petitioner.

2. On the contrary, opposing such prayer for anticipatory bail, learned advocate for the State submits that on the false pretext of providing job in the Government Offices, the petitioner has taken money from the complainant. The investigation is under progress. The allegations are squarely against this petitioner. He seeks for dismissal of the application for anticipatory bail.
3. Learned advocate for the de facto complainant submits that the petitioner is the kingpin in the alleged offence and duped the complainant and others in the garb of providing job in the Government Offices. He also seeks for dismissal of the prayer for anticipatory bail.
4. Perused the case diary and the materials on record.
5. It is found from the statement of the witnesses that there are serious allegations against this petitioner of taking money from different persons including the complainant in the garb of providing job in Government Offices. In view of the above and bearing in mind the nature and gravity of offence, I am not inclined to grant the prayer for anticipatory bail in favour of the petitioner.
6. Thus, the prayer for anticipatory bail is rejected.
7. The application being **CRM(A) 748 of 2025** stands dismissed.

(Bivas Pattanayak, J.)

