

28.08.2026
Ct. No. 446
Sl. No.6
akd
[Rejected]

C. R. M. (A) 2245 of 2026

In Re: An application for anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 filed on 10.07.2026 in connection with Asansol North Police Station Case No. 238 of 2026 dated 02.06.2026 under Sections 318(4)/316(4)/336(3)/338 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023. (G.R. Case No. 1527 of 2026)

And

In Re: ***Satyapriya Sadhu***

... .. Petitioner

Mr. Apurba Kumar Datta

... .. for the petitioner

Mrs. Madhumita Sadhukhan

... .. for the State

1. This is an application for anticipatory bail filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, in connection with Asansol North Police Station Case No. 238 of 2026, dated 02.06.2026, under Sections 318(4)/316(4)/336(3)/338 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

2. Mr. Dutta, learned Advocate appearing for the petitioner submits that the present petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case. Investigation is in progress. He further submits that the petitioner has deep roots in society and there is no chance of tampering evidence. In such circumstances, according to him, custodial interrogation of the present petitioner is not necessary and the petitioner may be granted pre-arrest bail.

3. Mrs. Sadhukhan, learned Advocate appearing for the State/respondents, produces the Memo of Evidence as well as the case diary and vehemently opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the

petitioner. The Memo of Evidence filed in Court today is taken on record.

4. Heard the learned Advocates appearing for both the parties and perused the case diary as well as the other materials on record including the Memo of Evidence.

5. Materials on record indicate that the present petitioner was employed with Zipzap Logistics Private Limited. He collected money from several customers but did not deposit the same with Flipkart (Instakart) Services Private Limited. In this manner, he has misappropriated and/or embezzled an amount of Rs.13,40,000/-. Considering the gravity of the offence and the role attributed to the present petitioner, I am of the opinion that in the present case, it would not be apposite to grant him pre-arrest bail.

6. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner stands rejected.

7. The application for anticipatory bail is, thus, disposed of.

(Partha Sarathi Chatterjee, J.)