27 **30.10.2026**
Court
No.03. (NMD/D.Hira)

CRM (A) 3942 of 2026

In the matter of : **Mr. Jeeban Das**

.....petitioner.

Ms. Swarnali Saha,
Ms. Rupsa Sreemani,
Mr. Hritam Banerjee.

... for the petitioner.

Mr. Subrata Mukherjee,
Mr. Sourendra Betal,
Ms. Casurina Chatterjee.

... for the State

1. The petitioner has filed the present application under Section 482 of the B.N.S.S. 2023 praying for anticipatory bail.
2. Learned advocate appearing for the petitioner submits that the defacto complainant was contacted by a representative from a trading company “Master Trust” and was told that it would assist him in making profitable trades. The defacto complainant was added to a group where several individuals discussed their trading success for over a month. The defacto complainant was also instructed to subscribe to an IPO for amount of Rs. 13,50,000/-. At that time he had a total of Rs. 5,00,000/- in his account. Accordingly he was directed to pay of Rs. 7,00,000/- to unfreeze his account. The defacto complainant has further alleged that the aforesaid Master Trust arranged a loan of Rs. 3,00,000/- for him and he was assured that after making the full payment, he will get profit of 100% within a week. Despite returning the loan amount of Rs. 3,00,000/- on January 6, 2025, he only saw 16% profit

instead of the promised 100%. When he sold his shares and attempted to withdraw his funds, he was informed that he had violated the company regulations and a fine of Rs. 10,00,000/ was imposed on him, which he paid. Thereafter, the defacto complainant applied for withdrawal on January 07, 2025. However, he was later told to pay an additional sum of Rs. 8,00,000/- as 30% tax for fund release. The defacto complainant has alleged that he has paid approximately Rs. 24,00,000/- on the direction of the aforesaid company, Master Trust. One of the transactions by which the defacto complainant paid money on the directions of the said Master Trust was in respect of a sum of Rs. 3,000/- paid to the petitioner.

3. The learned advocate representing the petitioner submits that he has nothing to do with the aforesaid company, Master Trust. The aforesaid sum of Rs. 3,000/- was received by him from the defacto complainant in view of sale of a bitcoin by the petitioner to the defacto complainant. Learned advocate representing the petitioner further submits that the petitioner has not been named in the FIR and has been falsely implicated in the matter. The petitioner has no knowledge of the allegations referred to in the complaint filed by the defacto complainant. The petitioner apprehends that he may be arrested. Accordingly, he has filed the present application praying for anticipatory bail.

4. Learned advocate representing the State hands over a Memo of Evidence. The same is taken on record.

5. Learned advocate representing the State submits that the defacto complainant has been defrauded in respect of transactions aggregating approximately Rs. 24,00,000/-. He submits that although the sum received by the petitioner is a small sum of Rs. 3,000/-, there is a larger scam involved in the matter and the police are investigating the same. He submits that the investigation is still in progress. He submits that on at least three occasions, the petitioner has been served with notices under Section 35(3) of the BNSS 2023, but the petitioner has never appeared before the police authorities.

6. The petitioner has only written one letter to the police authorities to explain his stance in respect of the fraudulent transactions. He submits that the petitioner is deliberately avoiding appearing before the police authorities and is not cooperating with the police authorities. He thus opposes the petitioner's prayer for anticipatory bail. In reply, learned advocate representing the petitioner submits that the petitioner has only received one notice under Section 35(3) of the BNSS 2023. However, she fairly and candidly admits that the petitioner has never appeared before the police authorities till date.

7. I have considered the submissions made by the learned advocates representing the parties as well as the materials on record. *Prima facie,* it appears to me that the defacto complainant is a victim of a financial scam and/or fraud. One of the transactions complained of by the defacto complaint involves the petitioner. Whether such a transaction was a genuine transaction or not will have to be

determined. It is evident that the petitioner has not been cooperating with the police authorities. The submission that the petitioner is a college student and he is young is neither here nor there.

8. It is also evident from the records of the case that by an order dated October 12, 2026, the petitioner's application for anticipatory bail has been rejected by the learned Sessions Judge in-charge, North 24 Parganas.

9. In view of the fact that this matter pertains to a financial fraud and in view of the fact that the petitioner has not been cooperating with the police authorities, I am not inclined to allow this application.

10. Accordingly, this application, being **CRM (A) 3942 of 2026,** is **dismissed**.

11. All the observations contained in this order are *prima facie* in nature and will not influence the investigation and/or the trial of the matter in any manner whatsoever.

12. Urgent Photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be given to the parties upon compliance with all requisite formalities.

(Rishad Medora, J.)