CALCUTTA HIGH COURT
IN THE CIRCUIT BENCH AT JALPAIGURI

26.11.2026
Ct No.5
Item No.38
Chanchal
Rejected

CRM (M) 268 of 2026

In Re:- An application for Bail under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in connection with STF Siliguri Police Station Case No. 01 of 2025 dated 18.06.2025 under Sections 179/180/61(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

And

In Re: Azam Qureshi.

.....Petitioner

Mr. Saikat Chatterjee, Adv.,
Ms. Purbasha Sarkar, Adv.,
Mr. Tathagata Chakraborty Adv.

...for the petitioner

Mr. Avrojyoti Das, A.P.P.
Mr. Gobinda Ghosh, Adv.,
Mr. Rajdeep Das, Adv.

...for the State.

1. The Learned Advocate representing the petitioner urges the detention of the petitioner for one year 5 months and 8 days though the charge-sheet has been submitted on 11th September, 2025, the charges have been framed, the trial has not yet been commenced. The present petitioner had been the carrier of the counterfeit notes from whom there had been a recovery of Rs. 99,000/-. The possibility of completion of the trial being remote, the Learned Advocate representing the petitioner sought for grant of bail.
2. The Learned Advocate representing the State submitted the petitioner in connivance with the co accused persons was directly in contact with the principal accused being “Kaka” of Majumpur,

Kaliachak, Malda and the CDR in the case diary reflected a communication with the principal accused appearing at Page 74 of the certified copy of the case diary. The co accused persons including the present petitioner do not belong to the jurisdiction of the Trial Court and there is every possibility of absconsion on the part of the petitioner if released on bail.

3. The Learned Advocate representing the State further relied on the decision of a Coordinate Bench of High Court of Delhi in Appeal No. 1490 of 2021(**Tabrez Ahmed Vs. State NCT of Delhi**) whereby the repercussion of circulation of fake currency note upon the society and its ill effects consequently affecting the financial stability and economic disintegration of India had been emphasized. Since there is a racket allegedly operating with *prima facie* active involvement of the petitioner and the co-accused persons as transpired from the case records absconsion on the part of the petitioner will frustrate the process of trial and accordingly, this Court is not inclined to release the present petitioner on bail.
4. Accordingly, CRM(M) 268 of 2026 is dismissed. P SEP
5. The Learned Trial Court is to expedite the process of recording the evidence of 8 witnesses with the sincere assistance of the prosecution as submitted by the Learned Advocate representing the State in producing the charge-sheeted witnesses before the Court without granting any adjournments to either of the parties, disregarding the cease work, called by the local bar, if any.

6. The learned Registrar Circuit Bench, Jalpaiguri is directed to communicate this order to the concerned Trial Court for immediate compliance.

(Ananya Bandyopadhyay, J.)