

Criminal Misc. Case No. 1366 of 2026

Present: Sukumar Ray

J.O. CODE NO.WB00590.

Sessions Judge, North 24-Parganas

Order No. 03 dated 08.06.2026

1. In this criminal Misc. case under section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 the accused/petitioner namely, **Rahul Kumar Jain** in connection with G.R no.310 of 2025 arising out of Bidhannagar Cyber Crime Police Station case No.28 of 2025 dated 19.03.2025 under section 318(4)/319(2)/338/336(3)/61(2) of B.N.S & Section 66(c)/66(d) of I.T. Act has come up with a prayer for grant of bail.

2. At the very outset, Ld. Advocate for the accused/petitioner submits that no application for bail has either been rejected by the Hon'ble High Court at Calcutta or is pending for disposal before the Hon'ble Court.

3. Ld. Advocate draws my attention to the paragraph no. 11 of the application under section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023.

4. Ld. Special Public prosecutor submits that there is no indication in the case diary which goes to suggest that prayer for bail for the accused/petitioner has either been rejected by the Hon'ble High Court or is pending before the Hon'ble Court for disposal.

5. The learned Advocate for the accused/petitioner submits that the petitioner is not named in the F.I.R and that seizure list dated 19.02.2026 shows that only mobile phone was seized and chargesheet has been submitted against one co-accused, Javed and that the petitioner has been detained in custody since 20.02.2026 I.e for a considerable period of time and that the entire amount was credited into the account of Javed, but not of the petitioner and that the petitioner is a local person who will not abscond. So he prays for mercy of this Court.

6. Ld. Public Prosecutor in charge opposes the prayer for bail.

7. I have carefully perused the F.I.R. and the materials appearing in the case record particularly the statements of the witnesses recorded under sections 180 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita.

8. Petitioner who has earlier not been successful in his endeavour to get an order of bail has tried again when on his behalf it is submitted that as the chargesheet has been filed, there is no necessity for the petitioner to be detained in custody.

09. Long detention of the petitioner is the principal ground on which the petitioner has prayed for an order of bail. But in my opinion only the same would be difficult to be considered as sufficient in this case for allowing bail to the petitioner since C.D shows involvement of the petitioner in the alleged offence. At this stage, granting of bail would create prejudice to the process of investigation.

10. The allegations are serious in nature involving fraudulent activities involving financial implications. At this stage, upon hearing both sides and upon perusal of the C.D, this Court is of the view that it will not be proper to grant bail to the petitioner and his bail prayer stands refused.

11. Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the accused/petitioner **Rahul Kumar Jain** stands rejected.

12. Case diary be returned at once.

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

14. Misc. case is disposed of.

15. Let a copy of the order be also sent to the I.O through Ld. Public Prosecutor for information.

Dictated & Corrected by me.

Sessions Judge,

North 24 Parganas, Barasat

Sessions Judge, North 24 Parganas, Barasat