

07.01.2026
Court No.28
Item No.12
ssi

CRM (A) 3769 of 2025

In Re: - An application for anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Suraksha Nagarik Sanhita in connection with Hare Street Police Station Case No.**339** dated **11.12.2022** under Sections **409/420/403/465/467/471/120B** of the Indian Penal Code.

And

In the matter of: **Pranveer Singh & others.**

....Applicants/Petitioners.

Mr. Apalak Basu
Mr. Nazir Ahmed

...for the petitioners

Mr. Joydeep Biswas
Ms. Rajnandini Das

..for the State

Mr. Kallol Mondal, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Sreyash Kumar Singh

...for the de facto

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners submits as follows. The petitioners are the wife and the sons of the principal accused who is in custody. The wife is a mere name lender and the other sons are also not concerned with the business of the principal accused. It was only after passage of nearly three years that the present petitioners were made accused in this case. In fact, similar other co-accused/officials of the concerned bank have been granted interim protection by this Court in a revisional application. The allegation is that a letter of credit was opened in a bank and was discounted before the goods could be sent. There is also a pre-litigation mediation proceeding instituted by the de facto complainant. But, the principal accused could not attend the same because he was in custody.

Learned senior counsel appearing on behalf of the de facto complainant strongly opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail. He submits that all the concerned documents were executed by the other partner and the sons also participated in the entire process. Goods were not delivered and money was re-routed to the accused.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State strongly opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail. He relies on the statements of the witnesses and copies of documents collected. The petitioner no.3 is a partner of the concern. The petitioner no.1 is the CEO. The petitioner no.2 is the General Manager Purchase. This would be evident from the website of the concern, which now, however, does not exist. The petitioner no.1 is a co-accused along with the principal accused in another case of similar nature in the State of Maharashtra.

It is true that the present petitioners were not specifically named in the FIR and were not even made accused in this case for a long time. However, the petitioner no.1 is a co-accused in a case of similar nature in the State of Maharashtra.

Considering the above, the other materials available in the case diary, the fact that the principal accused is still in custody and the petitioner no.3 is the female member of the household and considering the alleged roles ascribed to each of the present petitioners, while I am inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner nos. 2 and 3, the application for anticipatory bail of the petitioner no.1 is rejected.

Accordingly, the application for anticipatory bail of the petitioner nos. 2 and 3 (Lavish Raghav and Bhavna Raghav) is allowed.

In the event of arrest, the petitioner nos. 2 and 3 (Lavish Raghav and Bhavna Raghav) shall be released on bail upon furnishing a bond of Rs.10,000/- each 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 conditions that the petitioner no. 2 shall meet the Investigating Officer once a fortnight till submission of report in final form.

The application for anticipatory bail is, thus, disposed of.

(Jay Sengupta, J.)