

13.04.2026  
Serial no. 5  
[G.S.D]

**CRM (M) 872 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 ST No. 50 of 2025 corresponding to Sessions Case No. 102 of 2025 arising out of GR Case No. 735/2024 corresponding to Bidhannagar Cyber Crime Police Station Case no. 139 dated June, 24, 2024 u/s 406/419/420/120B of the IPC  
-And-

**In the matter of : Abhishek Bansal @ Rahul @ RM**

... Petitioner(s)

Mr. Ayan Bhattacharjee, Sr Adv.  
Mr. Shounak Mondal

... for the Petitioner(s)

Mr. Kishore Dutta, Ld. AG  
Mr. Rudradipta Nandy, APP  
Md. Y. A. Ismail

... for the State-respondent(s)

Learned advocate for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody since November, 2024 and only eight witnesses out of the proposed 144 witnesses cited in the charge-sheet have been examined.

The limited prayer on which the bail has been sought for from this court is in respect of illness and treatment of the mother of the accused on two counts: *first*, so far as the battery of the ICD is concerned and, *secondly*, relating to operation of the *femur*.

Learned advocate for the petitioner submits that *presently* he intends to canvass the issue relating to immediate surgery required for the *femur*, as such, he prays

for bail on the grounds of treatment and surgery of his mother.

Mr. Dutta, learned Advocate General, appearing for the State opposes the prayer for bail and has drawn the attention of the court to the medical documents of the year May, 2024 till 21<sup>st</sup> March, 2026. The prosecution do not dispute the documents which have been enclosed along with the bail application.

However, the prosecution's case is that the petitioner was apprehended on November, 2024 but the treatment which has been referred to commenced on and from May, 2024. None of the medical documents relied upon would show that the present petitioner have ever participated during the first six months in the treatment of his mother for the purpose of *femur* fracture which has been the primary ground for seeking bail. Such factum is disputed by the learned advocate for the petitioner.

Learned Advocate General also added that there is an e-mail which has been responded to by the nursing home authorities wherein it has been stated that '*Current medical condition cannot be commented upon as the patient is not under our care since 29.03.2026*'. Such e-mail was received by the Cyber Crime Department on or about 11<sup>th</sup> April, 2026.

Responding to the same, learned advocate for the petitioner submits that the petitioner intends to monitor such treatment/surgery if it is taken place within the jurisdiction of Siliguri, West Bengal.

In view of the totality of the circumstances which has been canvassed before this court, I direct that the prayer for bail of the petitioner be rejected.

Hence, prayer for bail of the petitioner is **rejected**.

However, in case, the mother of the petitioner is admitted for surgery in a nursing home within the jurisdiction of Siliguri, in that case, if any application is preferred for releasing the petitioner on *Parole*, the Superintendent of Jail, for a limited period, as he/she deems fit and proper, would release the petitioner with proper escort. Prior to release, the jail authorities would inform the jurisdictional court *in seisin* of the case and subsequent to the petitioner being taken into custody, the same would also be informed to the learned jurisdictional court.

With the aforesaid observations, CRM (M) 872 of 2026 is disposed of.

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.)**

