14.10.2026
ct 33
sl no. 27
cm

C.R.M.(M) No. 2271 of 2026

In Re : In Re : An application for bail under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in connection with Bidhannagar Cyber Police Station Case No.28 of 2025 dated 19.03.2025 Sections 318(4)/319(2)/338/336(3)/61(2) of BNS, 2023 & Under Sections 66(c)/ 66(d) of the I.T. Act.

And

In Re : Rahul Kumar Jain

..... petitioner

Mr. Pawan Kumar Gupta
Mr. Rajiv Kr. Chowdhury

..... for the petitioner

Mr. L. Vishal Kumar
Mr. Sanjib Das

..... for the State

1. The learned advocate representing petitioner submitted the petitioner to have not been named in the first round of investigation. However, he had been implicated in the supplementary charge sheet filed on 18th May, 2026. The learned advocate representing the petitioner further submitted that the present petitioner had not been involved in the commission of the alleged offence which would be evident from the documents in the case diary as far as the first round of investigation is concerned. The petitioner is in custody for 8 months and since the charge-sheet has been filed with any further scope of causing claimed on the basis of magistrate triable cases. The prayer for bail be allowed.

2. The learned advocate representing the State opposed the prayer for grant of bail stressing the present petitioner to have been principal accused, to have master minded the entire course of the offence and indicated to statements

recorded under Section 180 BNSS appearing at page 149 of the case diary, further, narrating that the present petitioner along with co-accused used to operate bank accounts and issue fake hotel booking papers creating fake websites drawing attention of the common people and thereafter defrauded them.

3. The Coordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 2nd September, 2026 in CRM(M) 1754 of 2026 had rejected the bail application of another co-accused. The charges are yet to be framed. Since there had been a conglomerate of persons involved in the commission of the alleged offence with strong net work system, the prayer for bail of the petitioner is considered and rejected.
4. The memo of evidence filed by the State be taken on record.
5. Accordingly, the application being CRM(M) 2271 of 2026 is dismissed.

(Ananya Bandyopadhyay, J.)