

12/02/2026
D/L - 19
Court No.28
S. Kundu
Allowed

C.R.M.(A) 74 of 2026

In Re: An application for anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023. In connection with Durgapur P.S case no. 376 of 2025 dated 12/9/2025 under sections 319(2)/318(4)/338/336(3)/61(2) of the BNS.

In the matter of: Indrapal Singh Hora @ Indrapal Sing & Anr.

...Petitioners.

Mr. Sourav Chatterjee, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Avik Ghatak
Mr. Fahad Imam
Mr. Akash Ghosh
Ms. S. Kar

...for the petitioners.

Ms. Sreyashee Biswas
Mr. Subham Gani

...for the State.

1. Learned senior counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners submits as follows. The petitioners are the developers of properties. In the early part of 2024, one Bidyut Ghosh, the principal accused approached the company and represented himself to be the sole heir of one Tapan Ghosh. Upon such representation and offer to sell properties, certain properties were purchased by the petitioners' concern from the said Bidyut Ghosh by paying consideration sums through banking channels. Such conveyances were done by 31.7.2024. Soon thereafter, the petitioners came to know that the said Bidyut Ghosh was a fraud and he had impersonated himself as a son of Tapan Ghosh and the original order was very much alive. Thereafter, the petitioners

negotiated with the said Tapan Ghosh and purchased seven plots of land from him at a consideration of money of Rs.80 lakhs. The conveyance was executed on 16.7.2025. After this, the present FIR dated 12.9.2025 was registered at the behest of the concerned ADSR. It appears from the body of the complaint that the ADSR acted on a complaint of the said Tapan Ghosh dated 28.3.2025. The petitioners were, thus, victims of the fraud committed by one Bidyut Ghosh. In fact, they have purchased some of the properties so dealt with earlier from the original owner.

2. Learned counsel appearing for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail. However, he submits that the petitioners purchased seven plots out of thirteen plots, which were dealt with in the above manner. The principal accused was arrested and thereafter granted bail.
3. Considering the above, the other materials available in the case diary, the alleged roles ascribed to the petitioners and the fact that the principal accused was arrested and was thereafter granted bail, 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.
4. 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 meet the I.O once a fortnight till submission of report in final form.

5. Accordingly, the application for anticipatory bail is allowed.
6. Urgent photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be given to the parties upon compliance with requisite formalities.

(Jay Sengupta, J.)