IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
CRIMINAL REVISIONAL JURISDICTION
APELLATE SIDE

The Hon'ble **JUSTICE SUVRA GHOSH**

CRM (R) 44 of 2026

Harish Bagla
v/s
Enforcement Directorate

For the Petitioner: Mr. Jatin Sehgal
Mr. Raymon Singh
Ms. Devya Soni
Mr. Viren Bansal
Mr. Ayan Poddar
Mr. Soumen Mohanty
Mr. P. Mitra

For the Enforcement Directorate: Mr. Adil Rashid

Hearing Concluded on: 10.09.2026

Judgment delivered on: 23-09-2026

SUVRA GHOSH, J. :-

1. On 22 March, 2024, The Serious Fraud Investigation Office, Ministry of Corporate Affairs, Government of India filed a Company case being 4 of 2024 against the petitioner and others under Section 447/129/166/448/177 read with Section 178(8) of the Companies Act, 2013 and Section 211(7)/628 of the Companies Act, 1956 wherein charge sheet has been submitted. The petitioner has not been arrested in connection with the said case. Treating Section 447 of the Companies Act,

2013 as a predicate offence, the Directorate of Enforcement (hereinafter referred to as the E.D.) registered ECIR no. KLZO-I/23/24 on 18th November, 2024. Search and seizure were conducted at the petitioner's residence from 8:30 A.M. to 10:15 P.M. on 26th August, 2025 wherein statement of the petitioner was recorded under Section 17 of the Prevention of Money Laundering Act (for short the PMLA). The petitioner was arrested on the same day at 10:30 P.M. and "grounds of arrest" and "reasons to believe" were furnished to the petitioner on the same date. Statement of the petitioner was recorded under Section 50 of the PMLA on five occasions from 28th August, 2025 to 26th September, 2025. The E.D. has filed prosecution complaint against the petitioner and 25 other accused persons on 23rd October, 2025 upon completion of investigation. The petitioner is in custody since 26th August, 2025 and prays for bail.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has canvassed his argument as hereunder:-

3. The mandatory safeguards of Section 19 of the PMLA have not been complied with at the time of arrest of the petitioner. Therefore the conditions laid down under Section 45 of the Act are not attracted. There was no "material in possession" with the E.D. prior to arrest of the petitioner, on the basis of which "reasons to believe" could be formed about the petitioner's guilt. The petitioner co-operated in the search and seizure conducted at his residence and various documents, electronic devices, cash, etc., were seized therefrom. The petitioner was arrested soon thereafter and the E.D. has failed to identify what the material was, when it came into the officer's possession or how it establishes the guilt of

the petitioner. The statements under Section 50 of the Act were recorded after his arrest and also, all the documents relied upon by the E.D. were collected/seized after his arrest. In absence of “material in possession”, the “reasons to believe” lacks foundational facts and the arrest falls foul of the pre-conditions of Section 19(1). Such non-compliance enures to the benefit of the petitioner. Power to arrest under Section 19(1) is not for the purpose of investigation and can be exercised only when the material available with the arresting officer enables him to form an opinion by recording reasons in writing that the arrestee is guilty. Though the petitioner nominated his wife for the purpose of providing intimation of his arrest, the same was not done in compliance with Section 48 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (hereinafter referred to as the BNSS). Section 19(2) of the Act was also not complied with by the E.D. The remanding Court has not recorded compliance with Section 19 of the Act and thus the remand order is liable to be set aside.

4. The petitioner is in custody for more than a year and has not been interrogated after 26th September, 2025. Investigation qua the petitioner is complete. The prosecution complaint contains 157 documents running into approximately 19,000 pages. Cognizance of the complaint is yet to be taken. There is no likelihood of trial commencing in near future. The pre-cognizance notice was challenged before this Court in CRR 1491 of 2026 and by an order passed on 6th April, 2026, this Court has granted an interim stay of the trial Court proceedings. The case is based on documentary evidence. The predicate offence is also at the stage of

Section 207 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. Detention of the petitioner is violative of Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

5. No independent investigation has been done by the E.D. prior to arrest of the petitioner. The prosecution complaint alleges that the total loan sanctioned to the petitioner and his companies from 2011 onwards was approximately 195 crores out of which an approximate amount of Rs. 144 crores was disbursed. Several banks and the official liquidator of Amrit Feeds Limited recovered about 91 crores which includes attachment of movable/immovable assets. Also, offence under Section 447 of the Companies Act (predicate offence) is prima facie not made out as Section 447 came into force on 12th September, 2013 whereas the loans disbursed to the petitioner were from 2011. The predicate offence relates to accounting entries and interpretation of various sections of the Companies Act, 2013.

6. The petitioner has deep roots in the society and is not at flight risk. He is suffering from various ailments including 60% blockage in his left anterior descending artery putting him at a high medical risk. He prays for bail.

7. Learned counsel has placed reliance on the following authorities in support of his contention.

    1. Yogesh Dua v/s. Directorate of Enforcement reported in 2026 Supreme Court Cases OnLine Cal 134;
    2. V. Senthil Balaji v/s. State reported in (2024) 3 Supreme Court Cases 51;
    3. Dilbag Singh @ Dilbag Sandhu v/s. Union of India in CRM-M-2191-2024;

4. Directorate of Enforcement v/s. Dilbag Singh in SLP (Crl.) No. 4044 of 2024;
5. Prabir Purkayastha v/s. State (NCT of Delhi) reported in (2024) 8 Supreme Court Cases 254;
6. Deepak Appasaheb Deshmukh v/s. Directorate of Enforcement reported in 2024 Supreme Court Cases OnLine Bom 6142;
7. Arvind Kejriwal v/s. Directorate of Enforcement reported in (2025) 2 Supreme Court Cases 248;
8. Priyavrat Mandhana v/s. Directorate of Enforcement reported in 2024 Supreme Court Cases OnLine Bom 4233;
9. Arvind Dham v/s. Directorate of Enforcement reported in 2026 Supreme Court Cases OnLine SC 30;
10. Dinesh Gupta v/s. Directorate of Enforcement reported in 2026 Supreme Court Cases OnLine Del 4328;
11. Prasanna Kumar Roy v/s. Directorate of Enforcement in C.R.M. (R) 148 of 2025;
12. Mansur Ali v/s. State of West Bengal in CRA (DB)/360/2025;
13. Gagan v/s. State (NCT of Delhi) reported in 2025 Supreme Court Cases OnLine Del 1299;
14. Kaushik Rameshchandra Thakkar v/s. State of Maharashtra reported in 2025 Supreme Court Cases OnLine Bom 1493;
15. Vihaan Kumar v/s. Union of India reported in (2025) 5 Supreme Court Cases 799;
16. Kasireddy Upender Reddy v/s. State of A.P. & Ors. reported in 2025 Supreme Court Cases OnLine SC 122;

17. Balwant Singh v/s. Directorate of Enforcement in CRWP-9783-2024;
18. Pankaj Bansal v/s. Union of India & Ors. reported in (2024) 7 Supreme Court Cases 576;
19. Sk. Jinnar Ali @ Jinnar Ali v/s. Enforcement Directorate in C.R.M. (R) 06 of 2026;
20. Shashank Chopda v/s. Directorate of Enforcement reported in 2026 Supreme Court Cases OnLine Chh 10535;
21. Vikas Bansal v/s. Directorate of Enforcement reported in 2026 Supreme Court Cases OnLine HP 1756;
22. Prateek Kanakia v/s. Directorate of Enforcement reported in 2026 Supreme Court Cases OnLine Bom 1490;
23. Deepak Singh v/s. Directorate of Enforcement in Writ Petition No. 15130 of 2026 (GM-RES);
24. Ram Kishor Arora v/s. Enforcement Directorate reported in (2024) 7 Supreme Court Cases 599 and
25. Vijay Madanlal Choudhary v/s. Union of India reported in 2022 Supreme Court Cases OnLine SC 929.

8. Vehemently opposing the prayer, learned counsel for the E.D. has submitted as follows:-

9. The petitioner being the Managing Director of Amrit Feeds Limited is the main conspirator who siphoned loans taken by the company from various banks and diverted the same to various shell companies controlled by him, his relatives and employees. The promoters, directors and employees of Amrit Feeds Limited, in collusion with each other, under the control of

Harish Bagla and his wife Archana Bagla are involved in deliberate acts of siphoning loan funds availed of by the company which were invested in group companies and also for purchase of immovable properties in the names of the petitioner and companies under his control. The loans meant for working capital and term loans were diverted to shell companies controlled by the petitioner, thereby generating huge proceeds of crime. The company was incorporated on 22nd July, 1994 as a public company under the Companies Act, 1956 with an object to manufacture poultry feeds and animal feeds. The company had manufacturing units across multiple states in the country and availed of credit facilities in the form of term loan as well as cash credit/working capital facilities for its operations from banks during the period 2010-2011 to 2014-2015. The loan amount disbursed to the companies by the banks was 195.46 crores. The company defaulted in repayment of the amount to the banks for which the accounts of the company were declared as Non Performing Assets (NPA) in 2015-2016 and 2016-2017. Suspecting fraudulent activity, the banks submitted Fraud Monitoring Reports to the Reserve Bank of India. Analysis of financial statements of the shell companies related to Amrit Feeds Limited shows that there was no business/operation in these companies and they did not have any income from the operations. Their only source of income was either operating revenue or interest income. The directors and shareholders of the companies were either directors or relatives of directors or employees of Amrit Feeds Limited.

10. Search conducted in course of investigation led to recovery of documents relating to immovable properties, pan cards, digital signatures certificates, seal and cheques of bank accounts of several companies, firms and persons, cash and jewellery.
11. The petitioner was arrested on 26th August, 2025 and Section 19 of the PMLA was complied with. The petitioner has failed to satisfy the conditions specified under Section 45 of the PMLA and is not entitled to bail.
12. Learned counsel has placed reliance on the following authorities in support of his contention.
    1. Mihir Rajesh Shah v/s. State of Maharashtra and Another reported in (2026) 1 Supreme Court Cases 500;
    2. Sonu Kumar Thakur v/s. Enforcement Directorate in C.R.M. (R) 122 of 2025;
    3. Radhika Agarwal v/s. Union of India & Others reported in (2025) 6 Supreme Court Cases 545;
    4. State of Gujarat v/s. Mohanlal Jitamalji Porwal, reported in (1987) 2 Supreme Court Cases 364;
    5. Y.S. Jagan Mohan Reddy v/s. CBI reported in (2013) 7 Supreme Court Cases 439;
    6. Nimmagadda Prasad v/s. Central Bureau of Investigation reported in (2013) 7 Supreme Court Cases 466;
    7. Pradeep Nirankarnath Sharma v/s. Directorate of Enforcement & Another reported in 2025 INSC 349;

8. Tarun Kumar v/s. Enforcement Directorate reported in 2023 Supreme Court Cases OnLine SC 1486;
9. Satyender Kumar Jain v/s. Directorate of Enforcement reported in 2024 INSC 217;
10. Rohit Tandon v/s. Directorate of Enforcement reported in (2018) 11 Supreme Court Cases 46,
11. Amanatullah Khan v/s. Enforcement Directorate reported in 2024 Supreme Court Cases OnLine Del 1658;
12. V. Senthil Balaji v/s. State reported in 2023 Supreme Court Cases OnLine SC 934;
13. P. Chidambaram v/s. Directorate of Enforcement reported in (2019) 9 Supreme Court Cases 24;
14. Arvind Kejriwal v/s. Directorate of Enforcement reported in 2024 Supreme Court Cases OnLine SC 1703;
15. Vijay Madanlal Choudhary v/s. Union of India reported in 2022 Supreme Court Cases OnLine SC 929;
16. Union of India through the Assistant Director v/s. Kanhaiya Prasad reported in 2025 Supreme Court Cases OnLine 306;
17. Gautam Kundu v/s. Directorate of Enforcement reported in (2015) 16 Supreme Court Cases 1;
18. Ram Niwas Surjakhera alias Ram Niwas v/s. Directorate of Enforcement in CRM-M-55190-2025;
19. Pavana Dibbur v/s. Enforcement Directorate reported in 2023 Supreme Court Cases OnLine SC 1586;

20. Directorate of Enforcement v/s. Aditya Tripathi reported in 2023 Supreme Court Cases OnLine SC 619;
21. Dr. Manik Bhattacharya v/s. Ramesh Malik & Ors. reported in 2022 Supreme Court Cases OnLine SC 1465;
22. Vijayraj Surana v/s. Enforcement Directorate reported in 2024 Supreme Court Cases OnLine Mad 8404;
23. Enforcement Directorate v/s. Ashok Anand in Crl.RC.No. 1262 of 2024;
24. Y. Balaji v/s. Karthik Desari reported in 2023 Supreme Court Cases OnLine SC 645;
25. Directorate of Enforcement v/s. Padmanabhan Kishore reported in 2022 Supreme Court Cases OnLine SC 1490;
26. Aswini Kumar Ghose v/s. Arabinda Bose reported in (1952) 2 Supreme Court Cases 237;
27. Hardeep Singh v/s. State of Punjab reported in (2014) 2 SCR 1; and
28. Doypack Systems (P) Ltd. v/s. Union of India reported in (1988) 2 Supreme Court Cases 299.

13. I have considered the rival contention of the parties and material on record.

14. It is trite law as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the authorities in Arvind Kejriwal (supra), Pankaj Bansal (supra), Prabir Purakayastha (supra) and Vijay Madanlal Choudhary (supra) in dealing with the power of arrest granted to the E.D. vis-a-vis compliance of

Section 19 of the PMLA that the three conditions which are required to be fulfilled prior to arrest of a person under the said Act are as follows:-

i. The officer must have material in his possession;

ii. On the basis of such material, the authorised officer should form and record in writing "reasons to believe" that the person to be arrested is guilty of an offence punishable under the PMLA;

iii. The person arrested, as soon as may be, must be informed of the grounds of arrest.

15. The power vested in the authorised officer under Section 19(1) of the Act is not for the purpose of investigation and can be exercised only when the designated officer is able to form an opinion by recording reasons in writing that the arrestee is guilty.

16. In the words of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Radhika Agarwal (supra), *"So far as the arrest is made under the Prevention of Money Laundering Act, 2002 is concerned, in Vijay Madanlal Choudhary v. Union* of *India, also the three-Judge Bench* of *this court has held, inter alia, that the safeguards provided in the PMLA and the pre conditions to be fulfilled by the authorized officer before effecting arrest as contained in section 19* of *the said Act are stringent and* of *higher standard. Those safeguards ensure that the authorized officers do not act arbitrary, but make them accountable for their judgment about the necessity to arrest any person as being involved in the commission* of *offence* of *money laundering even before filing* of *the complaint before the Special Court under the Act.*

However, when the legality of *such an arrest made under Special Acts like PMLA, UAPA, Foreign Exchange, Customs Act, GST Acts, etc., is challenged, the court should be extremely loath in exercising its power* of *judicial review. In such cases, the exercise* of *the power should be confined only to see whether the statutory and constitutional safeguards are properly complied with or not, namely, to ascertain whether the officer was an authorized officer under the Act, whether the reason to believe that the person was guilty* of *the offence under the Act, was based on the "material" in possession* of *the authorized officer or not, and whether the arrestee was informed about the grounds* of *arrest as soon as may be after the arrest was made. Sufficiency or adequacy* of *material on the basis* of *which the belief is formed by the officer, or the correctness* of *the facts on the basis* of *which such belief is formed to arrest the person, could not be a matter* of *judicial review.*

It hardly needs to be reiterated that the power of *judicial review over the subjective satisfaction or opinion* of *the statutory authority would have different facets depending on the facts and circumstances* of *each case. The criteria or parameters* of *judicial review over the subjective satisfaction applicable in service related cases, cannot be made applicable to the cases* of *arrest made under the Special Acts. The scrutiny on the subjective opinion or satisfaction* of *the authorized officer to arrest the person could not be a matter* of *judicial review, in as much as when the arrest is made by the authorized officer on he having been satisfied about the alleged commission* of *the offences under the Special Act, the matter would be at a very nascent stage* of *the investigation or inquiry. The very use* of *the* *phrase "reasons to believe" implies that the officer should have formed a prima facie opinion or belief on the basis* of *the material in his possession that the person is guilty or has committed the offence under the relevant Special Act. Sufficiency or adequacy* of *the material on the basis* of *which such belief is formed by the authorized officer, would not be a matter* of *scrutiny by the courts at such a nascent stage* of *inquiry or investigation. Though, the power* of *judicial review keeps a check and balance on the functioning* of *the public authorities and is exercised for better and more efficient and informed exercise* of *their powers, such power has to be exercised very cautiously keeping in mind that such exercise* of *power* of *judicial review may not lead to judicial overreach, undermining the powers* of *the statutory authorities. To sum up, the powers* of *judicial review may not be exercised unless there is manifest arbitrariness or gross violation or non-compliance* of *the statutory safeguards provided under the Special Acts, required to be followed by the authorized officers when an arrest is made* of *a person prima facie guilty* of *or having committed offence under the special Act."*

17. It is also trite that "grounds of arrest" and "reasons to believe" are distinguishable, "reasons to believe" being generic in nature and applicable to any person arrested on charge of an offence whereas grounds of arrest being personal to the accused and disclosing the basic facts on which he is being arrested in order to enable him to defend himself against custodial remand and to seek bail.

18. It is not in dispute that the memo of arrest, grounds of arrest and reasons to believe were made over to the petitioner at the time of his arrest. The

Hon'ble Supreme Court, in the authority in Vihaan Kumar (supra) has emphasized on providing the grounds of arrest not only to the arrestee but also to his family members and relatives so that necessary arrangements are made to secure the release of the person arrested at the earliest possible opportunity so as to make the mandate of Article 22(1) of the Constitution meaningful and effective.

19. In the present case, the "grounds of arrest' was provided to the petitioner immediately after his arrest. At the time of personal search of the petitioner on the same day, nothing was recovered from him. Therefore it can be inferred that the "grounds of arrest" was handed over by the petitioner to his relatives who were present at the relevant time. Therefore the principle laid down in Vihaan Kumar (supra) and the mandate of Section 22(1) of the Constitution of India have been satisfied.

20. In the authority in Vijay Madanlal Choudhary (supra), the Hon'ble Supreme Court has observed that "the authority of the Authorised Officer under the 2002 Act to prosecute any person for offence of money-laundering gets triggered only if there exists proceeds of crime within the meaning of Section 2(1)(u) of the 2002 Act and further it is involved in any process or activity. Not even in a case of existence of undisclosed income and irrespective of its volume, the definition of "proceeds of crime" under Section 2(1)(u) will get attracted unless the property has been derived or obtained as a result of criminal activity relating to a scheduled offence...... Even though, the 2002 Act is a complete Code in itself, it is only in respect of matters connected with offence of money-laundering and for that, existence of proceeds of crime within the meaning of Section 2(1)(u)

of the Act is quintessential. Absent existence of proceeds of crime, as aforesaid, the authorities under the 2002 Act cannot step in or initiate any prosecution.”

21. In the present case, charge sheet has been submitted in the predicate offence. The petitioner was not arrested in connection with the said offence since the investigating agency did not require his custodial interrogation during investigation. The ECIR was registered on 18th November, 2024 and search and seizure were conducted at the petitioner’s residence on 26th August, 2025. But that does not necessarily mean that no investigation was conducted by the E.D. during the said period independently. As held by the Hon’ble Supreme Court in Vijay Madanlal Choudhary (supra), the offence under Section 3 of the 2002 Act is dependent on illegal gain of property as a result of criminal activity relating to a scheduled offence. It is concerning the process or activity connected with such property which constitutes the offence of money laundering. The authorities under the 2002 Act cannot prosecute any person on notional basis or on the assumption that a scheduled offence has been committed, unless it is so registered with the jurisdictional police or before the competent forum.

22. Herein, the ECIR was a fall out of the company case filed against the petitioner. Independent investigation held by the E.D. on the basis of such ECIR prior to search and seizure conducted at the petitioner’s residence cannot be ruled out. The material collected in course of such search can very well be in addition to the material collected earlier in course of investigation. Such material collected against the petitioner led the

authorised officer to form "reasons to believe" that the petitioner was guilty of the offence punishable under the PMLA and record the same in writing. The subjective satisfaction of the authorised officer may not be a matter of judicial review since the officer formed a prima facie opinion/belief on the basis of the material in his possession with regard to the guilt of the petitioner. Sufficiency or adequacy of such material cannot be a matter of judicial review. The material was forwarded to the adjudicating authority within a reasonable time which has been defined by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in various judgments as length of time as may fairly, properly and reasonably be allowed or required, having regard to the nature of the act or duty and to the attending circumstances. Therefore it can be concluded that the mandate laid down under Section 19 of the PMLA has been complied with by the arresting officer.

23. It has been observed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in several authorities including Y.S. Jaganmohan Reddy (supra), Rohit Tandon (supra) and Tarun Kumar (supra) that economic offences constitute a class apart and need to be visited with a different approach in the matter of bail. Such offences having deep-rooted conspiracies and involving huge loss of public funds need to be viewed seriously and considered as grave offences affecting the economy of the country as a whole and thereby posing serious threat to financial health of the country.

24. It is trite law that the twin conditions specified under Section 45 of the PMLA are mandatory and need to be complied with. The provision laid down under Section 24 of the Act also cannot be ignored. Once the E.D. establishes the three foundational facts, the onus shifts on the accused

under Section 24 of the PMLA to rebut the legal presumption that the proceeds of crime are not involved in money laundering, by production of evidence which is within his personal knowledge. The three foundational facts are as follows:-

i. That a criminal activity relating to a scheduled offence has been committed;

ii. That the property in question has been derived or obtained, directly or indirectly, by any person as a result of such criminal activity; and

iii. That the person concerned is directly or indirectly involved in any process or activity connected with the said property which constitutes proceeds of crime.

25. The allegation against the petitioner is primarily based on the investigation which is a fall out of the company case. The statement of the petitioner under Section 50 of the PMLA was recorded after his arrest, lastly on 26th September, 2025 and not thereafter. It is trite law that a statement recorded under Section 50 of the PMLA when the accused is in custody is inadmissible against the maker as he cannot be construed as a person operating with a free mind. Such statement cannot be treated as substantive piece of evidence and can at best lend corroboration to the material available against him in course of investigation.

26. It is also pertinent to note that arrest of the petitioner was not found necessary till completion of investigation of the company case. The ECIR was drawn up on 18th November, 2024 and the E.D. still did not find the

arrest necessary. It was only on 26th August, 2025 that the petitioner was arrested. Dealing with a similar issue, the Hon'ble Supreme Court, in the authority in Deepak Singh (supra), has observed that if the material then available did not warrant arrest, the mere registration of a new ECIR cannot transmute old allegations into a new found necessity for arrest. Liberty cannot fluctuate due to changing procedural labels. The necessity to arrest must arise from new circumstances, new material or new conduct; it cannot spring from the ashes of allegations that have remained unchanged.

27. The petitioner is in custody for more than a year. Investigation qua the petitioner is complete. His further custodial interrogation may not be necessary. He has not been interrogated after 26th September, 2025. The predicate offence is at the stage of Section 207 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. With regard to the prosecution complaint, the pre-cognizance notice has been challenged before this Court in a revisional application being CRR 1491 of 2026 and this Court has granted an interim stay of the trial Court proceedings. Therefore chances of commencement of trial either of the predicate offence or the case under the PMLA are bleak.

28. The case is based on documentary evidence which are in custody of the E.D. The E.D. has relied upon voluminous documents. Trial will take considerable time to conclude.

29. The Hon'ble Supreme Court has time and again held that prolonged incarceration before being pronounced guilty of an offence cannot turn into punitive detention and in such a case, Article 21 applies irrespective of the seriousness of the crime. Economic offences, by their very nature,

may differ in degree and fact and cannot be treated as homogeneous class warranting a blanket denial of bail. The right to life and personal liberty enshrined under Article 21 of the Constitution is overarching and sacrosanct. A constitutional Court cannot be restrained from granting bail to an accused on account of restrictive statutory provisions in a penal statute if it finds that the right of the accused under Article 21 of the Constitution has been infringed. Howsoever stringent a statute may be, a Constitutional Court should lean in favour of constitutionalism and the rule of law of which liberty is an intrinsic part.

30. In view of the circumstances stated hereinabove and the observation of the Hon'ble Supreme Court with regard to the right of speedy trial under Article 21 of the Constitution of India as well as prolonged incarceration of the accused, this Court is inclined to release the petitioner on bail subject to stringent conditions.

31. Accordingly, prayer for bail is allowed.

32. The petitioner be released on bail upon furnishing bond of Rs. 10,00,000/- (Rupees Ten lakhs) with adequate sureties, half of whom should be local, subject to the following conditions:-

    i. The petitioner shall surrender his passport before the learned trial Court at once, if not already surrendered in connection with any other case.
    ii. He shall not leave the territorial jurisdiction of the learned trial Court without leave of the trial Court.

iii. He shall furnish the address where he shall presently reside before the learned trial Court, the E.D. and the Inspector-in-charge/Officer-in-charge of the police station under whose jurisdiction he shall presently reside.

iv. He shall appear before the learned trial Court on every date of hearing fixed before the learned Court.

v. He shall not tamper with evidence or intimidate witnesses in any manner whatsoever.

vi. He shall not indulge in any criminal activity and shall not communicate with or come in contact with the witnesses.

vii. He shall provide his mobile phone number before the learned trial Court and shall not change the same without prior intimation to the Court.

33. In the event the petitioner violates any of the bail conditions stated above, the learned trial Court shall be at liberty to cancel his bail in accordance with law without further reference to this Court.

34. It is made clear that the observation made in this judgment is for the limited purpose of deciding the bail application and shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

35. The learned trial Court shall deal with the matter independently in accordance with law without being influenced by any observation which may have been made in this judgment.

36. C.R.M. (R) 44 of 2026 is accordingly disposed of.

37. All parties shall act on the server copy of this judgment duly downloaded from the official website of this Court.

38. Urgent certified website copies of this judgment, if applied for, be supplied to the parties expeditiously on compliance with the usual formalities.

(Suvra Ghosh, J)