

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

25.11.2025
14(DL)
Ct. No.3
srm
(Rejected)

C.R.M. (A) 778 of 2025

In Re:- An application for anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in connection with Birpara P. S. Case No.133 of 2025 dated 13.08.2025 under Sections 316(2)/318(4)/338/336(3)/340(2)/3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita.

In the matter of : Rajib Tudu

... Petitioner.

Mr. Debajit Kundu

...for the Petitioner.

Mr. Aditi Shankar Chakraborty, APP
Mr. Tapan Bhattacharjee,
Mr. Dhima Sil

...for the State.

1. Learned Advocate for the petitioner submits that there are no such specific allegations against the petitioner. The petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. The alleged amount withdrawn from the PF account of the complainant has actually been transferred to the account of the wife of the complainant. Thus, the petitioner is in no way involved in this case. He seeks for anticipatory bail in favour of the petitioner.
2. Opposing such prayer for anticipatory bail, learned Advocate for the State submits that this petitioner making false representation before the PF authority has withdrawn a sum of Rs.5,57,337/- from the account of the complainant showing the complainant as a dead

person. He seeks for dismissal of the prayer for anticipatory bail.

3. Perused the case diary and materials on record.
4. It is found from the statement of the witnesses that there are specific allegations against this petitioner of his involvement in transfer of amount from the PF account of the complainant, showing the complainant as dead, to the account of one Kabita Gowala. The bank statement shows that an amount of Rs.2,70,113/- was transferred to the account of Kabita Gowala on 14th October, 2024 and an amount of Rs.2,87,061/- on 19th October, 2024 from the Employees' Provident Fund account. Considering the above materials and bearing in mind the nature and gravity of the offence, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.
5. Thus, the prayer for anticipatory bail is rejected.
6. **CRM (A) 778 of 2025** stands dismissed.

(Bivas Pattanayak, J.)