

25/02/2026
D/L - 12
Court No.28
S. Kundu
Allowed

C.R.M.(A) 4154 of 2025

In Re: An application for anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023. In connection with Karaya P.S case no. 297 of 2024 dated 23/12/2024 under sections 408/120B/420/465/467/468/471 of the IPC read with Sections 66/66B of the I.T. Act.

In the matter of: Smt Rupanjali Dey & Anr.

...Petitioners.

Mr. Kalyan Bandyopadhyay
Mr. Debanjan Chatterjee
Mr. Satadru Lahiri
Ms. Kakan Das
Ms. Rimpa Adhikary
Mr. S. Azam
Mr. D. Ghosh
Mr. T. Talukder

...for the petitioners.

Mr. Soumya Majumder
Mr. Rajdeep Majumder
Ms. Sulagna Mukherjee
Ms. Sujatna Mukherjee

...for the de-facto complainant.

Mr. Sanjoy Banerjee
Ms. Asif Dewan

...for the State.

1. Memo of evidence filed by the State is taken on record.
2. Learned senior counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners submits as follows. Earlier, the petitioner no. 1 had filed an FIR on 29/9/2024 alleging the sexual harassment by the father of the present de-facto complainant. A charge sheet has been submitted in that case. Subsequently, the present FIR was lodged against the petitioner no. 1 and her mother and others. The prime allegations are that the petitioner no. 1 favoured some companies in giving tenders and those companies

were managed by the relatives of the petitioner no. 1. The FIR was lodged on 23/12/2024. However, without prejudice, a settlement was arrived at between the de-facto complainant and the petitioners and others on 5/3/2025 all electronic items like laptops, etc. were returned and sum of Rs.3.5 Crores was paid by way of a settlement on 12/3/25. In spite of this, the de-facto complainant has vigorously pursued the case.

3. Learned senior counsel appearing for the de-facto complainant strongly opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail. He submits that the documents have been recovered subsequently which would show that forgery was committed in preparing board resolution. In spite of the purported settlement, the present petitioner no. 1 is pursuing the case of sexual harassment lodged by her. Any violation of the purported settlement by the petitioner no. 1 would have its own consequences.
4. Learned counsel appearing for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail. He relies on the case diary, statements of witnesses and other documents. He submits that the petitioners have made unjust enrichment by abusing the position of the petitioner no. 1 as a senior functionary of the company. A board resolution was also forged.
5. Considering the above, the other materials available in the case diary, the fact that a purported settlement was arrived at between the parties and the petitioners were

made to part with a sum of Rs. 3.5 Crores in favour of the de-facto complainant, albeit without prejudice, I do not think that custodial interrogation of the petitioners is required in this case and I am inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

6. In the event of arrest, the petitioners 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 further conditions that the petitioners shall cooperate with the investigation and shall not threaten or intimidate the witnesses. The petitioners shall not leave the country without the leave of the jurisdictional Court.
7. Accordingly, the application for anticipatory bail is allowed.
8. Urgent photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be given to the parties upon compliance with requisite formalities.

(Jay Sengupta, J.)