

30/03/2026
D/L – 31
Court No.28
S. Kundu
Rejected

C.R.M.(A) 513 of 2026

In Re: An application for anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023. In connection with Liluah P.S case no. 13 of 2026 dated 09/01/2026 under sections 336(2)/336(3)/338/340(2)/115(2)/351(2)/3(5) of the BNS.

In the matter of: Apurba Lal Chakraborty

...Petitioner.

Mr. Jyotirmoy Talukder
Mr. S. Seal

...for the petitioner.

Mr. Kaushik Chowdhury
Mr. D. Panda
Mr. Tridiv Dey

...for the de-facto complainant.

Mr. Joydeep Roy
Ms. Rajnandini Das

...for the State.

1. Report filed on behalf of the State is taken on record.
2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that he has been falsely implicated in this case. He is a victim of circumstances. The power of attorney in question through which the petitioner acted was a registered one.
3. Learned counsel appearing for the de-facto complainant strongly opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail. He submits that the de-facto complainant is the real owner of the property. He neither executed the power of attorney in favour of the petitioner nor sold the property in question.

4. Learned counsel appearing for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail. He submits that the petitioner impersonated another person to have the power of attorney registered. The PAN card used was not verified. Notices have been sent in this regard to the registry officials. Thereafter, by using such a fake power of attorney, the land was conveyed to a purported third party. The cheque which was mentioned as a part consideration in the deed referred to a branch of the SBI. The said branch did not even exist.
5. Considering the above and the other incriminating materials available in the case diary, I do not consider this to be a fit case to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.
6. Accordingly, the application for anticipatory bail is rejected.
7. The personal appearance of the Investigating Officer is noted and is dispensed with.

(Jay Sengupta, J.)