

04.02.2026
Ct. No. 28
Sl. No.16
akd
[Rejected]

C. R. M. (A) 4306 of 2025

In Re: An application for anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 filed on 15.12.2025 in connection with Special Case No. 01 of 2025 (corresponding to R.C. Case No. 07 of 2024) under Sections 120B/409/420/467/468/471 of the Indian Penal Code read with Sections 7/13(2)/13(1)(a) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 arising out of Tala Police Station Case No. 62 of 2024 dated 19.08.2024.

And

In Re: ***Akhtar Ali***

... .. Petitioner

Mr. Ujjwal Ray
Mr. Bikramjit Dutta
Mr. Amrit Sinha
Ms. Kausiki Bose

... .. for the petitioner

Mr. Rajdeep Majumder .. Id. Dy. Solicitor General of India
Mr. Amajit De
Ms. Arushi Rathore

... .. for the CBI

1. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits as follows. The petitioner was a whistle blower who had tried to expose the criminals engaged in illegal activities in respect of supply of materials to the R.G. Kar Medical College & Hospital. For doing so, he had to be at the receiving end of several unjust State actions. However, he admits that on a few occasions, he had to take accommodations from certain other persons, mostly for medical treatment of relatives. On one occasion, a gift was given by an associate. The petitioner has been complying with the notices issued by the CBI.

2. Learned senior counsel appearing on behalf of the Central Bureau of Investigation (CBI) strongly opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail and submits as follows. The petitioner was holding the post of Deputy Superintendent (Non-Medical) at the medical college at

the relevant time. He was taking care of the tender process. He used to take money for giving tenders to certain vendors. At least there is money trail for three particular occasions when he received sums of money from vendors. The petitioner stands on a similar footing as that of the principal accused, Dr. Sandip Ghosh, who had done such criminal acts at a subsequent stage when he came to power. The said other co-accused is in custody for about 1½ years. There are statements of witnesses including that of his P.A., which directly point to the guilt of the present petitioner. Incidentally, the case that leads to exposure of illegalities committed by the co-accused Dr. Sandip Ghosh was started by some other person. It is submitted that it was only after the petitioner fell out with the co-accused that he started to make complaints against the co-accused/principal accused.

3. 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.

4. The application for anticipatory bail is, thus, rejected.

5. Urgent Photostat certified copies of this order, if applied for, be supplied to the parties upon compliance of all formalities.

(Jay Sengupta, J.)