

Criminal Misc. Case No. 94 of 2026
CNR – WBCS01-000385-2026
Present: Sri Sudipta Kumar De
(J.O. CODE NO.WB-01136)
Chief Judge, City Sessions Court, Calcutta

Order No. 03 dated 19.06.2026

Today is fixed for hearing of an application u/s 482 of the BNSS, 2023 filed by accused/petitioner namely, **Minal Panchal** who apprehends her arrest in connection with **Burrabazar P.S.** case No. **35** dated **20.02.2026** u/s **318(4)/336(2)/336(3)/338/340(2)/61(2)** of the BNS, 2023.

Ld. Chief Public Prosecutor is present.

Ld. Advocate for the accused/petitioner is also present.

Ld. Advocate for the defacto complainant is present by filing fresh Vakalatnama. Let the same be kept with the record.

Investigating Officer is present with the case diary.

Now, the record is taken up for hearing.

Ld. Advocate for the accused/petitioner submits that this accused/petitioner is innocent and has been falsely and frivolously implicated in this case. He further submits that the matter of dispute between the parties are totally civil in nature and co-accused i.e. the husband of this accused/petitioner has been granted Ad-interim bail by the Ld. Trial Court considering the matter of dispute by and between the parties has been amicably settled. He further submits that this accused/petitioner is a female accused and has a fixed place of residence and there is no chance of her absconsion. So, he prays for anticipatory bail of this accused/petitioner.

It is submitted by Ld. advocate for the petitioner that no bail petition is pending/disposed of before/by any upper forum.

Ld. Chief Public Prosecutor vehemently opposes the anticipatory bail of this accused/petitioner and submits that this is a calculated case of document forgery, property grabbing and high-value financial cheating and she did not comply with the notice u/s 35(3) of the BNSS, 2023 and the vital documents have been suppressed and her custodial interrogation is needed for the purpose of investigation. So, he prays for rejection of anticipatory bail.

Ld. Advocate for the defacto complainant raised vehement objection and submits that this accused/petitioner is one of the tenants of the complainant and had entered into criminal conspiracy with Lenskart Solutions Limited and illegally transferred a significant portion of the ground floor tenancy without knowledge or consent of the complainant and they executed the same by manufacturing and fabricating some documents including rent receipts and business entity called Panchal Eyewear. He further submits that her custodial interrogation is required for the purpose of recovery. So, he prays for rejection of bail.

Heard both sides.

Perused the case record and the materials appearing in the case diary.

There is an allegation that the accused being one of the tenants of the complainant manufactured counterfeit partnership entity by manipulating rent receipts and those documents were submitted before the KMC to secure trade licence by illegally claiming themselves as owners of the premises and illegally collected huge amounts of more than Rs. 68 lakh.

Considering the nature of the allegations and other materials available in the case diary and since notice u/s 35(3) of the BNSS has not been complied with, this Court is of the view that it is not a fit case to grant anticipatory bail to the accused/petitioner.

Hence, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the accused/petitioner **Minal Panchal** is **rejected**.

The instant criminal misc. case is thus disposed of.

Case diary be returned at once.

Let a copy of this order along with the TCR be sent to the Court concerned.

Let a copy of this order be also sent to the Investigating Officer through Ld. Chief Public Prosecutor for information.

D/C. by me.

Sd/-

Chief Judge
City Sessions Court, Calcutta.

Sd/-

Chief Judge
City Sessions Court, Calcutta.