

24.06.2026  
Court No.28  
Item No.14,15  
ssi

**CRM (A) 1474 of 2026**

In Re: - An application for anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita 2023 in connection with Baguiati Police Station Case No. 207 of 2026 dated 12.05.2026 under Sections 216/ 236/ 316(2) /318(4) /336(3) /338/ 340(2)/ 111(3)/ 111(4)/111(6)/111(7)/61(2) of the BNS 2023.

And

In the matter of: **Smt. Aditi Munshi**

.... Petitioner.

**CRM (A) 1487 of 2026**

In Re: - An application for anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita 2023 in connection with Baguiati Police Station Case No. 207 of 2026 dated 12.05.2026 under Sections 216/ 236/ 316(2) /318(4) /336(3) /338/ 340(2)/ 111(3)/ 111(4)/111(6)/111(7)/61(2) of the BNS 2023.

And

In the matter of: **Debraj Chakraborty**

.... Petitioner.

Mr. Bikash Ranjan Bhattacharya, Sr. Adv.  
Mr. Uday Sankar Chatterjee  
Mr. Jyoti Prakash Chatterjee  
Mr. Akashdeep Mukherjee  
Mr. Soumyadeep Nag  
Ms. Nasrin Nahar

...for the petitioner(s)  
(in both the matters)

Mr. Rajdeep Mazumdere, Sr. Adv., Ld. AAG.  
Mr. Moyukh Mukherjee  
Mr. Pritam Roy

...for the State  
(in both the matters)

Mr. Kumar Jyoti Tewari, Sr. Adv.  
Ms. Rajlakshmi Ghatak  
Mr. Bikramjit Dutta  
Mr. Amrit Sinha  
Mr. Aniruddha Tewari  
Mr. Kausiki Bose

...for the de facto complainant  
(in both the matters)

Learned senior counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners in the two applications submits as follows. The petitioner in the first application is a former MLA of Rajarhat-Gopalpur Constituency. The petitioner in the other application is her husband who is presently a Councilor of the Bidhannagar Municipal Corporation. Soon after the results of the Assembly Election came out, the present FIR was registered, although the complaint was filed by the winning candidate of the said constituency prior to the election. It is being alleged that the petitioners had acquired properties from undisclosed income and disposed of bulk of such properties immediately before an affidavit was to be filed before the Election Commission. It is not illegal to transfer property. There is no case made out for organized crime because there is no allegation that there was any extortion or land grabbing. If the issue is about penalizing someone for not disclosing income, the Income Tax Authorities would be at liberty to take appropriate actions. If there are registered documents regarding transfer of properties, without cancelling the same, it will be futile to make allegations imputing criminal intent. The petitioners are being targeted due to political reasons. The petitioner in the first application is having a child who is four months old. There is hardly any allegation against her.

Learned Additional Advocate General representing the State files a memo of evidence, which is taken on record. He relies on the case diary and opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail. In the course of investigation, charges of land grabbing and extortion were added. The petitioners had amassed properties worth huge sums, number of times more than their disclosed sources of income. They had made

false statements before authorities. In order to avoid disclosure of such facts before the public, on a particular day, several properties were disposed of, some by way of a benami transaction, some by way of gifts and some by undervaluing the properties. The aim was to give a cleaner affidavit of assets for the elections. There are unexplained assets worth more than 100 crore, which have come to light. Huge investments were made in the proprietorship concern of the petitioner Debraj Chakraborty namely, DC Global. Reliance is placed on the statement of victims present at pages 246 and 247 of the case diary. This is regarding land grabbing. By applying force, the petitioner Debraj Chakraborty and his men and agents made the victim part with a property in their favour, the market value of which was Rs. 60 lakh. But the effective consideration sum was given as 10 lakh. The method was ingenious. In some cases, instead of directly conveying the property, development agreements were entered into with the owner giving away the property for exploitation only by getting such reduced sum compared to the market value. He also places reliance on pages 253, 255, 257 and 259 regarding victims like labour contractors who had to stop their work because they could not give protection moneys at increased rates. The statement at page 228 shows that the witness was forced to give sums of Rs. 50 lakh each twice. Thereafter, the petitioner Debraj Chakraborty asked him to increase the rate to Rs. 75 lakh, which prompted him to close his business. Reference is also placed to another statement at page 249 where the person extorted was paid Rs. 15 lakh while the market value for the property was Rs. 62.05 lakh. Resultantly, 19 properties were registered in the name of the accused Debraj Chakraborty and

three in the name of the accused Aditi Munshi. As submitted earlier, immediately before the elections, they wanted to create a cleaner affidavit of assets. So, they briskly sold some properties by way of colourable instruments. For instance, a land comprising of five acres in Kalimpong was conveyed to a family friend at a consideration of Rs. 19 lakh. Investigation is going on. The Investigating Agency is considering adding provisions of the Prevention of Corruption Act in this case. Custodial interrogation of the petitioners is required for the sake of effective investigation. There is also a chance that the petitioners might influence witnesses.

Learned senior counsel appearing on behalf of the de facto complainant strongly opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail. He relies on the FIR and the charts of properties belonging to the two petitioners. According to him, although the petitioners were having income of Rs. 40 lakh and odd and Rs. 66 lakh and odd for the last five years, they amassed properties which were worth nearly Rs. 100 crores. In the last few years, the two had purchased cars worth Rs. 84 lakh. This is a clear case of indulging in organized crime.

Considering the above, the other incriminating materials available in the case diary and the fact that the petitioner Aditi Munshi is a lady having to take care of a four month old infant, while I am inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner in CRM (A) 1474 of 2026 namely, Aditi Munshi, the application for anticipatory bail of the petitioner in CRM (A) 1487 of 2026 namely, Debraj Chakraborty is rejected.

In the event of arrest, the petitioner in CRM (A) 1474 of 2026 (Aditi Munshi) shall be released on bail upon furnishing a bond of

Rs.10,000/- with two sureties of like amount each, one of whom must be local, to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer and also be subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 corresponding to Section 482(2) of the BNSS, 2023 and on further conditions that the petitioner (Aditi Munshi) shall co-operate with the investigation and shall not threaten or intimidate witnesses. The petitioner shall deposit her passport, if any, with the jurisdictional Court forthwith and shall not go abroad without the leave of the jurisdictional Court. The petitioner (Smt. Aditi Munshi) shall stay outside the jurisdiction of Baguiati Police Station till the completion of investigation and shall not influence and/or get in touch with the witnesses of this case. The petitioner (Smt. Aditi Munshi) shall intimate her mobile phone number and residential address to the jurisdictional Court as well as the Investigating Officer.

The applications for anticipatory bail are, thus, disposed of.

Urgent photostat certified copy of this order be supplied to the parties, if applied for, as early as possible.

**(Jay Sengupta, J.)**