

07.01.2026
Sl. No.11
NB

CRM (A) 3766 of 2025

In Re:- An application for anticipatory bail under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 corresponding to Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in connection with Belur PS Case No.185/2024 dated 28.09.2024 under Sections 420/406 of the Indian Penal Code.

And

In the matter of: Nilesh Sunil Sane

... petitioner

Mr. Mrityunjoy Chatterjee,
Mr. Manas Das,
Ms. Suchismita Chakraborty.
...for the petitioner.

Mr. Kaushik Kundu,
Mr. Debanshu Ghorai.
...for the State.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits as follows. The petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. They had entered into an agreement to supply E-vehicles to the de facto complainant in 2022. However, in 2024, the said unit was closed. In any event, disputes arose between the parties regarding payment of certain sums, on account of which the E-vehicles could not be supplied.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail. He refers to the statements of witnesses and other materials available in the case diary and submits that, upon enquiry at the alleged place of business of the petitioner, it was found that no such E-vehicle manufacturing unit existed at the said address. When the police authorities visited to the place of residence of the accused with the help of local police of Dhule City Police Station, it was found that the accused had absconded.

Considering the above and the other incriminating materials available in the case diary, I do not consider this to be a fit case for granting anticipatory bail.

The application for anticipatory bail is, thus, rejected.

Urgent photostat certified copies of this order may be delivered to the learned Advocates for the parties, if applied for, upon compliance of all formalities.

(Jay Sengupta, J.)