

09/02/2026
D/L - 212
Court No.28
S. Kundu

C.R.M.(M) 1136 of 2025

In Re: An application for cancellation of bail under Section 439(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

In the matter of: Samit Panja

...Petitioner.

Mr. Uday Sankar Chattopadhyay
Ms. Rajashree Tah
Ms. A. Datta

...for the petitioner.

1. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits as follows. The de-facto complainant had paid money to the private opposite party, who acted as the broker to arrange for a sale of a property. Neither was the money repaid nor was the property transferred despite brokerage having been paid to the private opposite party. The learned Sessions Court granted anticipatory bail to the petitioner without recording the proper reasons.
2. It appears from the order dated 23.9.2025 passed by the learned Sessions Judge, In-charge, Purba Bardhaman in Criminal Misc. Case no. 605 of 2025 that the order was passed after hearing both the accused and the State and after perusing the case diary.
3. The learned Court recorded that considering the materials available in the case diary, the nature of allegation, facts and circumstances and being convinced by the submissions of both sides, the learned Court was

of the view that custodial interrogation of the petitioner was not needed and accordingly, anticipatory bail was allowed.

4. The present petitioner is not even the intended seller, but only the broker who allegedly took a small sum as brokerage.
5. Considering the above and the reasoned order passed by the learned Sessions Court, I find no merit in the application for cancellation of anticipatory bail.
6. Accordingly, CRM (M) 1136 of 2025 is rejected.
7. However, there shall be no order as to costs.
8. Urgent photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be given to the parties upon compliance with requisite formalities.

(Jay Sengupta, J.)