09.10.2026

Sl. No. DL 14
Court No. 550
ALLOWED

Asraf, A.R.(Ct.)

In the High Court at Calcutta

Criminal Miscellaneous Jurisdiction

Case No.

CRM (M) 2297 of 2026

In Re : An application for bail under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 corresponding to Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 filed

in connection with

Ratua Police Station case no.532 of 2026 dated 14.05.2026 under Sections 316(2), 316(5), 318(4) and 61(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

-AND-

In the matter of :

SRITI MANDAL @ SMRITIKANA MANDAL

.....*Petitioner*

For the Petitioner :

Mr. Milon Mukherjee, Sr. Advocate
Mr. Mujibar Ali Naskar

...*Advocates*

For the State :

Mr. Kaushik Dey
Mr. Jnip Bose

...*Advocates*

1. Learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner being erstwhile Pradhan was not in any way involved in the commission of the alleged offence. Moreover, the investigation is complete and chargesheet has been submitted. The petitioner being a lady, there is no reason for keeping her in the custody any further. The audit report does not show that the present petitioner was involved in the commission of alleged offence.

2. Learned counsel for the State vehemently opposes the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submits that there are

sufficient incriminating materials against the petitioner and as such, the prayer for bail should be rejected. He admits that signature of the Pradhan is not required for sanctioning of loan from the co-operative society. However, he has drawn the attention of the Court to the statement of some witnesses wherein the present petitioner and others resisted and abused the depositors from withdrawing their money from the bank.

3. I have gone through the materials on record. It appears that the investigation of this case is complete and chargesheet has been submitted. The petitioner is a lady. Taking into consideration that the audit report does not specifically show that the present petitioner is involved in the commission of alleged offence and also the submission of the State that signature of the Pradhan is not required for sanctioning loan, I am inclined to allow the prayer for bail.

4. Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the petitioner is **allowed**.

5. As such, the petitioner shall furnish bond of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only), with two sureties of Rs.5,000/- (Rupees Five Thousand only) each, one of whom must be local to the satisfaction of the learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Chanchal, Malda subject to condition that the petitioner shall not intimidate witnesses and/or tamper with evidence in any manner whatsoever and also on further condition that the petitioner shall be physically present on each and every date before the learned Trial Court in seisin of the case and shall not leave the district of

Malda without prior permission of the concerned Trial Court.

6. In the event, the petitioner fails to comply with any of the conditions as mentioned hereinabove without justifiable cause, the learned Trial Court shall be at liberty to cancel her bail in accordance with law without further reference to this Court.

7. With the above observations, the instant application for bail is disposed of.

8. Case diary be returned to the learned advocate appearing for the State.

9. All parties shall act on the basis of server copy of this order duly downloaded from the official website of this Court.

10. Urgent photostat certified copies of this order, if applied for, be given to the parties upon compliance of all necessary formalities.

(Apurba Sinha Ray, J.)