

In the Court of Sessions Judge, Murshidabad

Present : Shri Sanjeev Kumar Sharma (JO WB00706)
Sessions Judge, Murshidabad
(In-Charge)

Crl. Misc. Case No.821 of 2026

Ref. : Raghunathganj P.S. Case No. 1506/2025 dated 01.12.2025
U/s.69/117(2)/316(2)/318(2)/61(2) of BNS

1. Deepak Kumar Accused/petitioner(s).
Vs.
The State Opposite Party.

Order No.05 dated 16.04.2026

The application for anticipatory bail U/s.482 of BNSS, filed by the petitioner as named above is taken up for hearing.

Heard the Ld. lawyer for the accused petitioner and the Ld. P.P., Murshidabad.

Ld. Advocate for the present petitioner submits that the allegations U/S 69 of BNS are lie against the accused Dipankar Mondal and the accused petitioner did not cheat the complainant in any manner. He further submits that the petitioner is the brother-in-law of the accused Dipankar Mondal who used to send money to him to look after his wife who happens to be the sister of this accused petitioner.

It is also submitted by the Ld. Advocate for the petitioner that no such application for bail on the selfsame cause of action has ever been filed before or rejected by the Hon'ble High Court, Calcutta, to which, the Ld. P.P. expressed his agreement.

Ld. P.P., Murshidabad strongly opposes the bail prayer and submits that the accused Dipankar Mondal cheated the complainant of huge amount with the direct assistance of this accused petitioner. He draws the attention to the statement of the witnesses and submits that the accused petitioner is directly involved in the offence.

Perused the T.C.R and the case diary.

It appears from the materials on record including the statement of the victim recorded U/S 183 of BNSS that the accused Dipankar Mondal cheated the victim lady and sent huge amount to the bank account of the present accused petitioner. It further transpires that the petitioner evaded the investigation and did not turn up despite serving notice upon him.

Having regard to the facts and circumstances and the materials appearing on record and the transaction between the Dipankar Mondal and this accused petitioner, I do not find it is a fit case to grant anticipatory bail to the accused petitioner.

Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail stands **rejected**.

Return the T.C.R. and the C.D.

The Crl. Misc. Case is thus disposed of.

Dictd. & Cortd.
by me.

S. J., Msd. (I/C.)

Sessions Judge, Murshidabad
(In-Charge)