23.06.2026
Court No.28
Item No.7
tbsr
Allowed

CRM (A) 1115 of 2026

In Re: - An application for anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in connection with **Jagatdal** P.S. Case No.**446 of 2025** dated **11.12.2025** under Sections **316(5)/318(4)/336(3)/340(2)** of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

And

In the matter of: Anindya Parbat

….Petitioner.

Mr. Milon Mukherjee, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Pradip Kumar Kundu
Md. Abdus Salam
Mr. Tamal Ghosh

…for the petitioner.

Mr. Krishnendu Bhattacharya, ld. APP
Mr. Koustav Lal Mukherjee

…..for the State.

Learned senior counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits as follows. The petitioner is an erstwhile branch Manager of the SBI. In April, 2025 he sanctioned loans to the tune of Rs. Two crores to about 58 customers. It is alleged that he failed to take collateral securities for the same. None of the 58 customers were fictitious. All have been repaying the loans. Now, the petitioner is facing a departmental proceeding. In the said departmental proceeding in an answer to a question about who entered the security particulars including security numbers, date of opening of NSC/KVP, initial deposit amount, maturity date and maturity amount of the said NSC credited policies in RLMS, the PW1, being the Branch Manager and the complainant therein categorically stated that the processing officer at the time of processing of the loan did so. There is no element of forgery whatsoever present in the instant case. The investigation is based on documents, most of which have already been collected.

Learned APP representing the State relies on the case diary and opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail. He relies on the statements of witnesses and copies of documents collected. He submits that the agent for all these loan applications had been in touch with the present petitioner. The agent received money for each such transaction. An SBI Branch Manager has the power to disburse loans up to Rs. 20 lakhs. The present petitioner has used this liberty to make illegal gains. He relies on the statements of two officers including the purported processing officer for the loans who stated that the petitioner misused the IDs and passwords of the said persons to put in relevant data.

It is a common practice and security requirement that bank officers are not to disclose their own ID and Password. It is indeed very surprising as to how the petitioner was able to use the ID and Password of other officers of the bank. Moreover, the investigation is based on documents, most of which have already been collected.

In view of the above and the other materials available in the case diary, I do not think that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required in this case and I am inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

In the event of arrest, the petitioner shall be released on bail upon furnishing a bond of Rs.10,000/- with two sureties of like amount each, one of whom must be local, to the satisfaction of the Arresting

Officer and also be subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 corresponding to Section 482(2) of the BNSS, 2023 and on further condition that the petitioner shall cooperate with investigation, shall meet the I.O. once a week till submission of report in final form and shall not threaten or intimidate witnesses.

The application for anticipatory bail is, thus, allowed.

Personal appearance of the Investigating Officer is noted and is dispensed with.

Urgent photostat certified copy of this order may be supplied to the parties expeditiously, if applied for.

(Jay Sengupta, J.)