

M.L Case no 8 of 2025
CNR – WBCS01-000381-2025
Present: Sri Sukumar Ray
Chief Judge, City Sessions Court, Calcutta
J.O. CODE NO.-WB00590.

Order no. 23 dated 22.09.2025

1. Today is fixed for for hearing bail petition dated 10.09.2025 filed on behalf of this accused person Abhishek Bansal @ Rahul @ Ram @ Rahul Mishra together with written objection filed by the prosecution/Enforcement Directorate.
2. Ld. Special Public Prosecutor for Enforcement Directorate and Ld. Advocate for this accused person are present.
3. Now the bail petition of accused Abhishek Bansal @ Rahul @ Ram @ Rahul Mishra is taken up for hearing.
4. The bail petition is moved.
5. Ld. Advocate for the accused/petitioner prays for bail of this accused/petitioner on the following grounds :
 - (a) he is a Chartered Accountant by profession;
 - (b) he is in custody since 10th July 2025;
 - (c) the prosecution has already filed prosecution complaint;
 - (d) there is no material to suggest that he has derived or enjoyed any proceeds of crime;
 - (e) the trial is unlikely to conclude in the near future;
 - (f) he is innocent and has been falsely roped in based on uncorroborated statements of co-accused persons;
 - (g) he has been falsely implicated in the present case; and
 - (h) he has a fixed place of residence and there is no chance of his absconsion.
6. Ld. Special Public prosecutor for Enforcement Directorate vehemently opposes the bail prayer of this accused/petitioner on the following grounds:
 - i) this accused/petitioner is directly involved in the alleged offence of money laundering;
 - ii) he has played vital role in the generation, placement, layering and integration of the proceeds of crime derived from illegal betting and gambling activities;
 - iii) there is substantial risk that if the accused be released on bail, will interfere with the investigation, influence witnesses, terrorize victims and further dissipate the proceeds of crime.
7. I have carefully perused the complaint and the materials appearing in the case diary.

8. Section 45 of the PML Act imposes two conditions for grant of bail to an accused of an offence punishable for an offence under the PML Act. These two conditions are that :
 - i) the prosecution must be given an opportunity to oppose the application for bail and
 - ii) the Court must be satisfy that there are reasonable grounds for believing that the accused person is not guilty of such offence and that he is not liable to commit any offence while on bail. As well settled, these two conditions are mandatory in nature and they need to be complied with by the accused person is released on bail.
9. At the outset, it needs to be mentioned that the object of the PML Act is to prevent money laundering which has posed a serious threat not only to the financial system of the country but also to its integrity and sovereignty. The offence of money laundering is very serious offence which is committed by an individual with a deliberate desire and the motive to enhance his gains, disregarding the interest of the nation and the society as a whole and such offence by no stage of imagination can be regarded as an offence of trivial in nature. The stringent provisions have been made in the Act to combat the menace of money laundering.
10. The PML Act has been enacted to deal with the subject of money laundering activities having transnational impact on financial system including sovereignty and integrity of the country. The offence of money laundering has been regarded as aggravated form of crime world over and the offenders involved in the activity connected with the proceeds of crime are treated as separate class from ordinary criminals.
11. On careful perusal of the materials appearing in the case diary, it prima facie appears that bank account analysis shows turn over of more than Rs. 92 crores in accounts operated in the name of this accused/petitioner and in the name of his firm M/s Bansal Abhishek & Co. which is disproportionate to his income and these transactions are directly linked with dummy firms and mule accounts, proving his deep involvement and benefit from the proceeds of crime and he was acting as pivotal role in the generation, placement, layering and integration of the proceeds of crime derived from illegal betting and gambling activities.
12. It further appears from the statement of the accused that he was the person who funded the opening of multiple mule bank accounts, arranged SIM cards linked to these accounts and maintained liaison with bank officials to facilitate the creation of factious proprietorship and partnership firms for laundering the proceeds of

crime and he was the brain behind the entire mule account network used for laundering the proceeds of crime and digital evidences were recovered from him.

13. It further appears that he has been using and changing his name multiple time to conceal his identity and evade detection, which demonstrates his deliberate attempts to mislead investigating authorities and avoid legal consequences.
14. Money laundering is an aggravated form of crime that has serious consequences and should not be treated like ordinary offences. It is no more res integra that offence of money laundering is an independent offence regarding the process or activity connected with the proceeds of crime, which had been derived or obtained as a result of criminal activity relating to or in relation to a scheduled offence. Hence, involvement in any one of such process or activity connected with the proceeds of crime would constitute offence of money laundering. In this regard, I borrow my wisdom from the observation of the Hon'ble Apex Court in **Union of India vs Kanhaiya Prasad** reported in **AIR 2025 Supreme Court 1028**.
15. Going by the nature, gravity and enormity of the alleged offence and materials on record, apprehension of tampering of evidence and intimidation/influencing of witnesses in the event of accused/petitioner being liberated on bail does not appear to be misplaced.
16. In view of the facts and circumstances of the case and the role played by the accused person in the alleged offence in question, I do not find any just cause to allow the prayer for bail for the accused/petitioner.
17. Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the accused/petitioner namely, **Abhishek Bansal @ Rahul @ Ram @ Rahul Mishra** stands **rejected**.
18. Todate i.e. on 27.10.2025 for production of the accused person.
19. Return the case diary.
20. Let a copy of this order be sent to the Investigating Officer of this case through Ld. Special Public Prosecutor for Enforcement Directorate for information.

Dictated & corrected by me

Sd/-

Chief Judge,
City Sessions Court, Calcutta.

Sd/-

Chief Judge,
City Sessions Court, Calcutta.