

23/06/2026
D/L – 35
Court No.28
S. Kundu
Rejected

C.R.M.(A) 1593 of 2026

In Re: An application for anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023. In connection with Baranagar P.S case no. 7 of 2026 dated 07/01/2026 under sections 316(2) of the BNS.

In the matter of: Sudip Mondal

...Petitioner.

Mr. S.K. Das

...for the petitioner.

Mr. Ayan Bhattacharyya

Mr. Debojyoti Das

Mr. Sudarshan Roy

Mr. Niladree Mukherjee

...for the de-facto complainant.

Mr. Koustav Lal Mukherjee

...for the State.

1. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits as follows. The petitioner used to have a business in Dubai. At present, he has come back from there. He is not connected with the present case in any manner whatsoever. In fact, it has been alleged by the de-facto complainant that gold was sent to one Sugandh Jewelers through a logistic service and thereafter, it got misappropriated.
2. Learned senior counsel appearing for the de-facto complainant strongly opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail. He submits that the gold was sent by the petitioner to another concern by the name of the Sugandh Jewelers through a courier company. From the said Sugandh Jewelers, it was the petitioner who received the gold as

per direction of the de-facto complainant for selling it. However, instead of dealing with the entire 3 kgs. of gold, he kept 1 kg. for himself and transacted with the rest of the gold as per direction.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State relies on the case diary and opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail. He refers to the statements of witnesses and the other materials available in the case diary including a Whatsapp chat between KDS Jewelers and the de-facto complainant. He also relies on the video footage contained in a pen drive showing the petitioner taking delivery of the gold from the said concern in Dubai.
4. 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.
5. Accordingly, the application for anticipatory bail is rejected.
6. The presence of the Investigating Officer is noted and is dispensed with.
7. Urgent photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be given to the parties upon compliance with requisite formalities.

(Jay Sengupta, J.)