

25.03.2026
Serial no. 51
[G.S.D]

CRM (M) 274 of 2026

In re : An Application for Bail under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973/under Section 483 of the BNSS, 2023 in connection with Sessions Case No. 100 of 2025 arising out of Bagdah Police Station Case No. 1057 of 2024 dt. 08.11.2024 u/s 319(2), 318(4), 336(2), 341(2), 339, 61(2), 338, 317(4) & 317(5) of the BNS, 2023.

-And-

In the matter of : Debabrata Mondal

... Petitioner(s)

Mr. Pawan Kumr Gupta
Ms. Chandni Chowdhury
Mr. Mukul Biswas

... for the Petitioner(s)

Mr. Ranabir Roy Chowdhury
Ms. Rajashree Tah

... for the State-respondent(s)

Learned advocate for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody since 08.11.2024 and there is hardly any seizure from the possession of the present petitioner to detain him further.

It has also been submitted that no USDT and Binance account surfaced in course of the investigation so far as the present petitioner is concerned.

Learned advocate, again, submits that the grounds of arrest having not been supplied to the petitioner and the petitioner is covered by a judgment reported in (2025) 5 SCC 799 [*Vihaan Kumar v. State of Haryana*].

Learned advocate also relying upon the judgment of *Mihir Rajesh Shah v. State of Maharashtra & Anr.* submits that the petitioner is entitled to be released on bail. The

attention of the court is drawn to paragraph 66 of the said judgment.

Learned advocate for the State opposes the prayer for bail and submits that 13 witnesses out of the 39 witnesses proposed to be examined by the prosecution has already been completed.

The offence complained of consists of more than Rs.350 crore, out of which it has been found that Rs.2 crore 93 lakh has been traced to the account of the company of which the petitioner happens to be the Director.

Having considered the pace at which trial is progressing and the gravity of the offence, I am of the view that it would be difficult to distinguish the conspiracy amongst all the accused persons in view of the money trail having been traced to a company where the petitioner is associated.

So far as the other points which has been canvassed by the petitioner relating to the grounds of arrest having not been supplied, I am of the opinion that in paragraph 68 of the judgment [*Mihir Rajesh Shah v. State of Maharashtra & Anr.*,] the word '*Henceforth*' implies that after the judgment was delivered by the Hon'ble Apex Court on November 6, 2025.

In view of the observations made above, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail.

Hence, the prayer for bail of the petitioner is
Rejected.

Accordingly, CRM(M) 274 of 2026 is **dismissed.**

Parties to act on a server copy of this order duly collected from the official website of the Hon'ble High Court, Calcutta.

Urgent Photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be supplied to the parties subject to compliance with all requisite formalities.

(Tirthankar Ghosh, J.)