

15.10.2026
Court No.35.
D/L. 8.
Kausik
(Allowed)

CRM (A) 2605 of 2026

In Re: An Application for Anticipatory Bail under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973/Under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in connection with Chandannagar Police Station Case No. 107 of 2026 dated July 4, 2026 under Sections 318(4)/316(5)/308(5)/61(2)/3(5) of the BNS, 2023.

And

In the matter of : Indranil Sen

.....Petitioner.

Mr. Jishnu Saha, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Ayan Poddar
Mr. Soham Dutta
Mr. Shounak Mondal

.....for the Petitioner.

Mr. Rajdeep Majumder, Ld. AAG
Mr. Kallol Mondal, Ld. PP
Mr. Aditya Tiwari, Ld. JGA
Mr. Sayan Mukherjee
Mr. Sunil Gupta

....for the State.

Learned advocate appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that even if the accusations made in the FIR are accepted to be correct, the informant do not accuse the petitioner demanding anything from him directly. On the other hand, it reflects that there were two persons namely, Munna Agarwal and one Saibal Roy with whom the informant had issues and if the accusations are accepted to be correct, in

such an event, the money was paid to the said accused persons.

Learned Additional Advocate General appearing for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail and submits that two of the accused persons were arrested and their statements would reflect relating to the complicity of the present petitioner in the alleged offence.

State has drawn the attention of the Court to the statements of the accused persons while they were in custody. Additionally, a statement has been placed before the Court where there is a movement of Rs. 15.85 lakhs to Third Line Creation which the State claims were the regular bidders of the Information and Cultural Affairs Ministry of West Bengal.

I have taken into account the materials appearing in the case diary and primarily I find that the name of the petitioner has surfaced from the statement of the accused. There are no materials till date to connect movement of money from any of the accused persons and the case is of extortion.

So far as Third Line Creation is concerned, the same is an independent partnership firm and no document has been placed to show that there has been, in this case, movement of money from Third Line Creation to the account of Indranil Sen.

Petitioner was definitely a Minister at the relevant point of time and people's representative of the locality from where the case emerged.

Prima facie, I am of the view that the petitioner's name was dropped for commission of the alleged offence so far as the materials till date collected. Accordingly, I am of the opinion that custodial detention of the present petitioner is not warranted in connection with the instant case.

As such prayer for anticipatory bail is allowed.

As such, I direct that in the event of arrest, the petitioner, namely, **Indranil Sen** be released on bail subject to the satisfaction of the investigating officer/arresting officer of the case and also subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Cr.P.C. and/or under Section 482(2) of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023.

As the investigation of the case is in process, petitioner shall report to the investigating officer as and when required.

Accordingly, CRM (A) 2605 of 2026 is **allowed**.

Memo of Evidence submitted be kept with the record.

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.)