2.
27-11-2026
(ct. no.34)
(rejected)
Debajyoti

IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA

Criminal Miscellaneous Jurisdiction

Appellate Side

CRM(A) 3910 of 2026

In the matter of : An application for anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita/under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure in connection with Electronics Complex Police Station Case No.280 of 2026 dated 13-08-2026 under Sections 318(4)/316(2)/316(5)/338/340(2)/ 351(2)/111/61(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita.

-And-

In the matter of : Ashish Rungta ... Petitioner

Mr. Kishore Datta, Sr. Adv.,
Mr. Soumya Majumdar, Sr. Adv.,
Mr. Sabir Ahmed, Adv.,
Mr. Kallol Saha, Adv.,
Mr. Akash Ghosh, Adv.,
Mr. Subhas Jana, Adv.,
Mr. Quazi Ezaz Ahmed, Adv.
... For the Petitioner.

Mr. Kallol Mondal, learned Public Prosecutor,
Mr. Gouranga Kumar Das, learned APP,
Mr. Indradip Das, Adv.,
Ms. Tanushree Kar, Adv.
... For the State.

Mr. Debasish Roy, Sr. Adv.,
Mr. Ankit Agarwala, Adv.,
Ms. Alotriya Mukherjee, Adv.
... For the defacto complainant.

1. Apprehending arrest in connection with G.R. No.1176 of 2026 arising out of Electronics Complex Police Station Case No.280 of 2026 dated 13-08-2026 under Sections 318(4)/316(2)/316(5)/338/340(2)/ 351(2)/111/61(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, the

present application has been filed for granting anticipatory bail.

2. It is submitted by Mr. Kishore Datta, learned Senior Advocate, representing the petitioner, that this application is filed for the first time before this Court. The petitioner is a Director of Bhaskar Properties Private Limited and is nowhere connected with the instant complaint. No specific allegation has been levelled against him in the complaint lodged before the Officer-in-Charge, Electronics Complex Police Station by the defacto complainant. The present petitioner has complied with the notice issued under Section 179 BNSS and cooperated with the investigating authority and on the second time when the notice was issued, he specifically gave a reply intimating that due to absence on the part of the Investigating Officer, he had to return. It is further pointed out that the notice was issued on 11-10-2026 giving 2-3 days' time to comply with such notice. But in the meantime, the Investigating Officer moved before the Court and had a Warrant of Arrest issued against the petitioner. The third notice has been issued subsequent to the order passed issuing Warrant of Arrest.

3. It is further submitted that the entire allegation levelled against the present petitioner is not tenable in the eye of law and, accordingly, the learned Senior Advocate prays for anticipatory bail in favour of the present petitioner.

4. On behalf of the prosecution, strong objection has been raised. It is submitted that a subsequent complaint on October 10, 2026 has been lodged where certain further allegations have been levelled against the present petitioner. More so, there are other criminal antecedents and allegations against the present petitioner. A huge

amount is involved in this case and the investigation is at nascent stage. Therefore, granting of anticipatory bail would frustrate the purpose of investigation.

5. On behalf of the defacto complainant, it is submitted that there is money trail between the companies and it is the petitioner who has perpetrated the entire fraud and is connected with the other companies who are involved in this case. More so, the records would prima facie disclose that the petitioner has full involvement in this case and, therefore, the learned counsel prays for dismissal of the application.

6. Having heard the learned advocates for the parties and on careful scrutiny of the materials on record and the Case Diary, prima facie, it appears that initially the complaint lodged pertains to non-repayment of dues within a stipulated time and the total amount of Rs.21,70,85,982/- along with interest is due and payable. There was a forged Bank Guarantee as furnished by the accused persons which includes the present petitioner which was issued on Indian Overseas Bank dated 22-07-2025 of an amount of Rs.10,87,79,469/- for obtaining mining lease to the Government. In addition, it is found the allegation levelled to hatching a criminal conspiracy to fraudulently take control of Shreesatya Sponge and Power Private Limited through manipulation of corporate records. Lastly, he has absconded and the tower locatin found him presently at Nepal. During investigation, money trails reveals there are enough involvement of the petitioner. Hence, it is no longer limited to mere breach of terms. In addition, the allegation levelled appears to be serious in nature.

7. After careful consideration of the entire facts and circumstances of the case and further considering that

huge amount has been involved in this case and further that the investigation is at nascent stage, this Court is not inclined to warrant the benefit under Section 482 of the BNSS in favour of the petitioner. The prayer stands rejected.

8. The application for anticipatory bail is, thus, **dismissed**.

9. All parties shall act on the server copies of this order duly downloaded from the official *website* of this Court.

10. Criminal Section is directed to supply certified copies of this order to the parties, if applied for, upon compliance of all necessary formalities.

[Chaitali Chatterjee (Das), J.]