

27.08.2026
Court No.35.
D/L. 977.
Kausik

CRM (M) 477 of 2026

In Re: An Application for Bail under Section 483 of the Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023/ Section 439 of the Code of
Criminal Procedure, 1973 in connection with Bagdaha Police
Station Case No. 1057/2024 dated 08.11.2024 under sections
319(2)/318(4)/336(2)/341(2)/339/61(2)/338/317(4)/317(5) of
the BNS, 2023.

And

In the matter of : Subrata Bala

.....Petitioner.

Mr. Sayan De
Mr. Kaustav Shome
Mr. Sayan Kanjilal

.....for the Petitioner.

Mr. Gurudas Mitra
Ms. Koel Mukherjee

....for the State.

Learned advocate appearing for the petitioner submits
that petitioner is innocent. There has been hardly any
transaction of money compared to the amount which has been
claimed by the prosecution as an offence which has been
committed.

Prosecution so far as the personal account of the
petitioner is concerned, has been able to only reflect around 15
lakhs of money being paid. So far as other accused persons are
concerned they have benefitted financial. Petitioner had no
control over the company. The main person is one Subrata
Mondal and the accusation of the petitioner presently is being

foisted with all the allegations leveled against the said Subrata Mondal. There were no incriminating materials recovered from the present petitioner and another director has been left out completely by the prosecution.

Mr. Mitra, learned advocate appearing for the State submits that the petitioner is thickly connected with the offence. So far as the amount of Deylimate Technology Private Limited is concerned, huge amounts have been transacted. Petitioner is a person responsible for the business of the company. As such, he cannot simply brush aside his complicity and claim his innocence.

I have taken into account the period of detention of the petitioner which is about 1 year 9 months. Out of the number of witnesses proposed to be examined by the prosecution only 12 witnesses till date has been examined. On the earlier occasion when petitioner's prayer for bail was advanced in CRM (M) 2139 of 2025 it was submitted at the relevant point of time by the State that State has reduced the number of witnesses from 39 to 25.

Be that as it may, the case is presently based on documents. There were some issues, in the meantime, for which the Trial Court could not function properly.

Having regard to the nature of the offence committed, as a matter of last chance, 6 months time is granted to the prosecution to complete rest of the witnesses. In case, in spite

of co-operation extended by the present petitioner, for reasons which is beyond the control of the Court or the prosecution, the case is further delayed, petitioner be released on bail on such terms and conditions as the Trial Court deems fit and proper for ensuring further appearance before the Trial court.

The trial of the case would continue in spite of any resolution of the local bar and efforts be made that, in case, a witness is present, the evidence of the witness be completed on the day itself until for reasons otherwise it requires another day's appearance of the witness concerned.

With the aforesaid observations presently, the application is **rejected**.

Learned Trial Court would adhere to the directions passed above.

Thus, CRM (M) 477 of 2026 is disposed of.

All parties shall act in terms of server copy of the order downloaded from the official website of this Court.

Urgent photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be supplied to the parties upon compliance with all requisite formalities.

(Tirthankar Ghosh, J.)