

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF MANIPUR**

**AT IMPHAL**

**AB No. 47 of 2022**

1. Smt. Ningthoujam Prema Devi, aged about 61 years, W/o Ningthoujam Deben Singh of Khangabok Khullakpam Leikai, P.O. & P.S.: Thoubal District, Manipur-795138.
2. Ningthoujam Arkey Singh, aged about 30 years old, S/o Ningthoujam Deben Singh of Khangabok Khulakpam Leikai, P.O. & P.S.: Thoubal District, Manipur-795138.
3. Moirangthem Herojit Singh aged about 37 years old, S/o M. Naba Singh of Khangabok Khulakpam Leikai, P.O. & P.S.: Thoubal District, Manipur-795138.
4. Moirangthem Machal Devi aged about 35 years old, W/o Moirangthem Herojit Singh of Khangabok Khulakpam Leikai, P.O. & P.S. :Thoubal District, Manipur-795138.
5. Laishram Brojeshwori @ Mache Devi aged about 38 years old, W/o (Late) L. Sanjit Singh of Khangabok Moirang Palli Leikai at present residing at Khangabok Khullakpam Leikai, P.O. & P.S. : Thoubal District, Manipur-795138.

***..... Petitioner/s***

***- Versus -***

1. The Officer-in-Charge, Thoubal Police Station, Manipur having its Office at Thoubal Police Station, P.O. & P.S. Thoubal, Thoubal District, Manipur-795138.

***.....Official Respondent***

2. Shri Saikhom Kunjabihari Singh aged about 40 years S/o Late S. Kondum Singh of Khangabok Khullakpam Leikai, P.O. & P.S. Thoubal, Thoubal District, Manipur-795138.

***.....Private Respondent/Complainant***

***with***

**AB No. 30 of 2022**

1. Smt. Ningthoujam Prema Devi, aged about 61 years, W/o Late Ningthoujam Deben Singh of Khangabok Khulakpam Palli Leikai, P.O. & P.S. : Thoubal District, Manipur-795138.

2. Smt. Thokchom Jamuna Devi, aged about 55 years, D/o Thokchom Chaoni Singh of Khangabok Khulakpam Palli Leikai, P.O. & P.S.: Thoubal District, Manipur-795138

.....Petitioner

-VS-

The Officer-in-Charge, Vigilance & Anti-Corruption Police Station, Manipur having its Office at Lamphelpat D.C., Imphal West Complex, P.O. & P.S. Lamphelpat, Imphal West District, Manipur-795004

.....Respondent

*with*

**AB No. 84 of 2019**

Smt. Ningthoujam Prema Devi, aged about 61 years, W/o Late Ningthoujam Deben Singh of Khangabok Khulakpam Palli Leikai, P.O. & P.S. : Thoubal District, Manipur-795138.

....Petitioner

-VS-

1. The State of Manipur represented by the Principal Secretary (Home), Govt. of Manipur, Old Secretariat (South Block), P.O. & P.S. Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur-795001.
2. The Director General of Police, Babupara Manipur Police Complex, P.O. & P.S. Imphal, Imphal West District, Manipur-795001.
3. The Superintendent of Police, Thoubal, Thoubal Police Station Complex, P.O. & P.S. Thoubal, Thoubal District, Manipur-795138.
4. The Officer-in-Charge, Thoubal Police Station, Thoubal, Thoubal Police Station Complex, P.O. & P.S. Thoubal, Thoubal District, Manipur-795138

.....Official Respondents

5. Shri Kunjabihari Singh, S/o (L) Kondum of Khangabok Khullakpam Leikai (Palli), P.O. & P.S. Thoubal, Thoubal District, Manipur-795138.

....Private Respondent/Complainant

**B E F O R E**  
**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A. GUNESHWAR SHARMA**

|                            |    |                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
|----------------------------|----|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| For the petitioner         | :: | Mr. N. Jotendro, Sr. Advocate<br>assisted by Mr. Murtaza Ahmed,<br>Advocate.                                                                                                                                |
| For the respondents        | :: | Mr. Y. Ashang, PP for the State in all<br>the matters and Mr. Diko for the<br>respondent No. 2 in AB No. 47 of<br>2022 and Mr. Ph. Sanajaoba,<br>Advocate for the respondent No. 5 in<br>AB No. 84 of 2019. |
| Date of hearing            | :: | 29.03.2023                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| Date of Judgment and Order | :: | 12.04.2023                                                                                                                                                                                                  |

**JUDGMENT AND ORDER (CAV)**

**[1]** The above 3 (three) bail applications are considered together as arising out of the same property dispute. These cases arise out of the property dispute between the petitioners and the private respondent.

**[2]** In AB No. 47 of 2022, it is alleged that private respondent, namely S. Kunjabihari Singh, lodged a complaint dated 27.04.2022 and alleging that on the same day, the petitioner herein made criminal trespass into his homestead land by holding a spade and attempted to kill his brother and wife and also threatened with his service gun on the previous dates. After 3 months i.e. on 29.07.2022, the Officer-in-Charge, Thoubal Police registered a case being FIR No. 127(7)2022 TBL PS U/S 447/307/34 IPC against the accused person. The accused Nos. 1 to 4 approached the Court of Ld. Special Sessions Judge, Thoubal by an

application under Section 438 Cr.P.C in Cril.Misc.(B)Case No. 68 of 2022 and vide order dated 10.08.2022, interim protection was given to them with a direction to co-operate with the investigating authority. The accused No. 5 also approached the Ld. Sessions Judge, Thoubal by way of similar application being Cril.Misc.(AB) Case No. 71 of 2022 and vide order dated 14.09.2022, interim protection was given to her also. Vide separate orders dated 14.09.2022 in Cril.Misc.(AB) Case No. 68 of 2022 and 71 of 2022, the Ld. Sessions Judge, rejected the bail application and vacated the interim orders on the grounds that the accused had committed a serious offence punishable under Section 447/307/341 IPC and they did not appear before the investigating authority to record their statements. Being aggrieved by this order, the 5 accused persons filed the present application being AB No. 47 of 2022 before this Court.

**[2.1]** Vide order dated 23.09.2022, this Court issued notice and directed the State respondents not to arrest the petitioners and interim order has been extended from time to time. It is the case of the petitioners/accused that on 27.04.2022, the complainant/private respondent No. 2, namely S. Kunjabihari Singh along with his wife had destroyed the kutchra fencing made of bamboo at the southern side of the homestead land recorded in the name of petitioner No. 5, Smt. L. Brojeshwori @ Mache Devi and was threatened to be killed by the complainant herein by using his license gun. A written report was filed before the OC, Thoubal PS but no case was registered on the complaint dated 30.04.2022. It is stated that the FIR was registered after 3 months to

harass the petitioner herein while no case was registered against the complainant with respect to the complaint lodged by the petitioner No. 5 herein. It is also stated that there are civil litigations between the parties with respect to the land properties and the petitioner No. 1 herein has been granted interim bail. The petitioner No. 1 herein has already been granted interim bail by this Court vide order dated 20.12.2019 in AB No. 84 of 2019 and vide order dated 12.07.2022 in AB No. 30 of 2022, in 2 (two) FIRs lodged by the complainant herein and Vigilance and Anti-corruption Police station. It is also stated that the petitioner never trespassed into the land of the complainant but they were erecting their fencing when the petitioners were trying to bind their fencing to his original same, the complainant with the gun threatened and beaten the petitioner more particularly, the petitioner No. 1 and shot gun near her leg. It was stated that the whole incident was captured vividly in video footage and photographs of the complainant holding gun in his hand was also annexed along with the petition.

**[2.2]** The complainant/respondent No. 2 filed written objection to the bail application. It is stated that the incident was caused by the petitioner against the respondent No. 2 regarding the land dispute pending before the civil Court. It is also stated that the photographs purportedly taken on 27.04.2022 with respondent No. 2/complainant holding gun was also filed in Criminal Complaint Case No. 6 of 2020 filed by the petitioner No. 1 before the Ld. Chief Judicial Magistrate, Thoubal and the same counsel had filed the same complaint. It is stated that in his own

photograph taken prior to 2020. It is stated that there are separate criminal case pending against the petitioner. It is prayed that that the bail may be rejected.

**[2.3]** The State respondent also filed written objection to the bail application and stated that on careful examination during the investigation, the incident has been confirmed. There are other FIRs pending against the petitioners and their anticipatory bail applications were rejected by the Ld. Sessions Judge, Thoubal, as they did not turn up before the I.O. and did not co-operate with the investigation. It is stated that bail application may be rejected.

**[3]** AB No. 30 of 2022 is arising out of the FIR No. 9(11)2021 VGL. PS U/Ss 120-B r/w 420 IPC & 13(2) r/w 13(1)(d) of PC Act 1988 where the petitioners along with her daughter and 2 (two) officials of the Revenue Department were made accused for cheating, criminal conspiracy and misconduct and this case arises out of the complaint filed by Shri Saikhom Kunjabihari Singh with the Chief Minister, Manipur. The complaint dated 22.02.2020 submitted by the complainant Shri Saikhom Kunjabihari Singh in 'Meeyamgi Numit (People's Day)' organised by the Chief Minister the matter was referred to DC, Thoubal for investigation by the Vigilance. Accordingly, the above FIR was registered.

**[3.1]** The complainant stated that with respect to the homestead land under patta No. 33/1464 (New) of Khangabok, Thoubal Teshil covered by C.S. Dag No. 4582 measuring an area of 0.4371 hectares was purchased by him from one Laishram Birendra Singh by executing a

Registered Sale Deed. Thereafter, sold out one piece of land to Ningthoujam Prema Devi measuring an area of 0.2509 hectare out of 0.4371 by executing a Registered Sale Deed in the year 2010 and then, again sold out another piece to one Laishram Mache @ Brojeshori Devi measuring an area of 0.0607 by executing a Registered Sale Deed in the year 2013. After selling two piece of land, the complainant had only 0.1255 hectare. Unfortunately, by two different orders by two different AS & SOs, Thoubal on the same day and date in the same Mut.Case No., i.e. Mut.Case No. 9/AS & SO, Thoubal his name was cancelled in the record of rights.

**[3.2]** The petitioners and the co-accused, namely Laishram Mache Devi filed bail application under Section 438 Cr.PC being Cril.Misc.(AB) No. 118 of 2021 before the Ld. Sessions Judge, Thoubal and vide order dated 28.12.2021, interim order was granted. The accused, namely Laishram (O) Mache Devi, was remanded to judicial custody and vide order dated 07.07.2022, the Ld. Special Judge (PC ACT), Thoubal remanded her to judicial custody in the same FIR. It is stated that the homestead land measuring an area of 0.4371 situated at village No. 33 Khangabok, Thoubal District covered by Dag No. 4582 under new Patta No. 1464 corresponding to the old patta No. 33/894, Thoubal was initially recorded in the name of pattadar namely Ningthoujam Panchano and later on, it was transferred in the name of Ningthoujam Nimai vide Mutation Case No. 16/ASO/TBL/2009 and Mr. Laishram Birendra Singh became the absolute owner of the whole homestead land. The said homestead land was

transferred by Laishram Birendra Singh to one Saikhom Kunjabihari Singh(informant/complainant) vide Mut.Case N0. 131/ASO/TBL of 2009 and became the absolute owner. Then, the land was disposed of in series of transaction one piece after another piece in favour of the present petitioner and her daughter namely Laishram (O) Mache @ Brojeshwari Devi in the following manners as:

- (i) That the said Saikhom Kunjabihari Singh disposed of a piece of Ingkhol measuring 0.2509 hectare corresponding to a "Sangam (in local term) out of total areas measuring 0.4371 hectares in consideration of Rs. 30,000/- on 02.03.2010 in favour of the petitioner No. 1 (Sale Deed No. 237/2010 on 04.03.2010), thus the name of the petitioner No. 1 along with S. Kunjabihari Singh were recorded as co-pattadars in the record of rights/jamabandi by their respective shares correctly vide order dated 01.09.2010 passed in Mut.Case No. 132/AS & SO/2010. Now the share of the petitioner and the share of S. Kunjabihari is 0.1862 hectares.
- (ii) Thereafter, out of the share of S. Kunjabihari Singh i.e. 0.1862 hectares, a piece of land measuring 0.0607 hectare corresponding to a 'Loushel' was again disposed of in favour of the petitioner No. 1's daughter, Laishram Ongbi Mache @ Brojeshwari Devi in

consideration of Rs. 34,000/- out of the remaining area of S. Kunjabihari Singh share i.e. 0.1862 hectare only by executing Regd. Sale Deed No. 1009/SR/TBL on 08.10.2013 and the name of Laishram Ongbi Mache @ Brojeshwari Devi was recorded in the record of rights/jamabandi vide order dated 02.01.2014. Now the share of Co-pattadar namely Laishram Ongbi Mache @ Brojeshwari Devi is 0.0607 hectares and the share of Co-pattadar, S. Kunjabihari Singh left is 0.1255 hectares.

- (iii) Now the remaining area of the aforesaid Ingkhol measuring 0.1255 hectare left with Co-pattadar namely S. Kunjabihari Singh along with standing structures is finally disposed of by way of sale in favour of the petitioner on 07.04.2015 wherein the name of the petitioner No. 1 was entered in the records-of-rights/jamabandi through field Mutation/field Naam-jarii vide order dated 07.04.2015 passed in Mutation Case No. 553 of 2015 and the sale was established through the record statement of the parties and the recorded statement of attesting witnesses dated 07.04.2015. Thereafter, the petitioner No. 1 become the absolute owner of the joint two pieces of Ingkhols measuring an area of 0.3764 hectare altogether. Now the petitioner

No. 1 and her daughter namely Laishram (O) Mache @ Brojeshwari owned the aforesaid Ingkhol measuring 0.4371 hectares. There the spot enquiry was done by the Mandol of the Assistant Settlement & Survey Officer (As & SO), Thoubal namely Khundrakpam Lalbabu Singh in presence of the petitioner No. 1 and S. Kunjabihari Singh in presence of the petitioner No. 2, the then ward Member, 13/5 Khangabok Pt-1 GP, L. Mache Devi W/o Late Surjit Singh and S. Jiten Singh, S/o Kondum of Khangabok Makha Leikai as attesting witnesses and their signature and photographs were also duly given at their own consent. While the said Mandol made the spot enquiry, the parties clearly gave their consent for the said Field Mutation (naam Jarii).

**[3.3]** Thereafter, there were subsequent transfers in favour of different persons by way of sale in series of transactions and also attesting witness in the Sale Deed being No. 1092/2015 dated 21.05.2015 and in favour of one Laishram Maniram Singh and his name was recorded in the land records vide Mut.Case No. 919 of 2015 of AS & SO-TBL. The petitioner No. 1 executed a Registered Sale Deed being No. 457 of 2018 on 08.03.2018 in favour of S. Kunjabihari Singh for an area of 0.4120. Thereafter, their names were recorded as co-pattadars vide Mutation Case No. 177 of 2018 AS 7 SO-VIII and further partition of shares vide Mut.Case No. 159 of 2018 of AS & SO-VIII. Further, out of the remaining area of

0.1250 hectare, the petitioner further sold 0.0627 hectares by executing Registered Sale Deed being 993 of 2018 on 28.05.2018 in favour of Khundrakpam Tomchou Singh. Thereafter, there was not recorded as co-pattadars vide Mut.Case No. 217 of 2018 AS & SO/TBL and after that only 0.0623 hectares was remaining with the petitioner. The petitioner No. 1 again transferred an area of 0.0405 in favour of her daughter namely Smt. Laishram Mache Devi @ Brojeshwari Devi and finally, an area of 0.0128 was remaining with the petitioner No. 1 and their names were recorded as co-pattadars vide Mut.Case No. 274 of 2018 of AS & SO TBL.

**[3.4]** It is stated that the complainant S. Kunjabihari has full knowledge of the series of transactions and he cannot deny being one of the witness in the Registered Sale Deed being No. 1092/2015 dated 21.05.2015. The complainant S. Kunjabihari lodged a false complaint with 'Meeyamgi Numit' conducted by the Chief Minister and complained for restoration of his land and the matter was forwarded to the Vigilance Anti-corruption and accordingly, FIR No. 09(11)2022 VGL PS U/Ss 120-B r/w 420 IPC & 13(2) r/w 13(1)(d) of PC Act 1988 was registered. The petitioners and Laishram Mache Devi @ Brojeshwari Devi jointly approached the learned Sessions Judge, Thoubal for granting anticipatory bail being Cril.Misc.(AB) Case No. 118 of 2021 and interim order was granted as police submitted that there is no ground for arresting the petitioner. Hence, the bail was disposed of vide order dated 10.02.2022. On 05.07.2022, the petitioner No. 1's daughter namely Laishram Mache @

Brojeshwari Devi was arrested and she was taken into custody and later on released on bail.

**[3.5]** It is stated that S. Kunjabihari Singh also filed another complaint i.e. FIR No. 115(12)2019 TBL PS U/S 193/205/209/468/420/120-B, IPC and the petitioner No. 1 had filed one anticipatory bail being AB No. 84 of 2019 before this Court and vide order dated 20.12.2019 interim protection was given to her. It is stated that the dispute is purely civil in nature and the complainant S. Kunjabihari Singh in connivance with the police harassed the petitioner. It is prayed that bail may be granted and the petitioner will abide by the conditions imposed by this Court.

**[3.6]** The respondent did not file any objection to the bail application. Vide order dated 12.07.2022 this Court directed the respondent not to arrest the petitioners.

**[4]** AB No. 84 of 2019 is arising out of the complaint dated 25.11.2019 by S. Kunjabihari to the Superintendent of Police, Thoubal for taking necessary action against the 2 (two) Revenue Officers and 4 (four) private respondents. This is the first case in this batch of cases and the facts of the present case is similar to that of AB No. 30 of 2022 where an FIR was registered by Vigilance and Anti-Corruption Police Station on a complaint submitted by the complainant herein to the Chief Minister, Manipur. The present FIR was registered on 16.12.2019 being FIR No. 115(12)2019 TBL PS U/S 193/205/209/468/420/120-B, IPC for occurrence on 07.04.2015. The facts of the complaint is not reproduced herein for the sake of gravity and the sum and substance of the allegation is that the

complainant's share of 0.1255 hectare of remaining land was cancelled vide Mut.Case No. 553 of 2015 order dated 07.04.2015 passed by the accused Revenue Officers by fabrication of the record, cheating and criminal conspiracy with the private parties.

**[4.1]** Vide order dated 20.12.2019, the petitioner was protected under interim order and the same order has been extended from time to time. The contents of the present petition are almost similar to the contents of the AB No. 30 of 2022 and the same are not reproduced. It is stated that the present dispute arising out of the civil dispute and the complainant/respondent No. 5 herein in connivance with the police is harassing the petitioner. It is stated that the petitioner herein also lodged a complaint dated 05.12.2019 to the Officer-in-Charge, Thoubal Police Station against the respondent No. 5 with respect to the cheating, impersonation and fabrication of her signature with respect to the sale deed but no action was taken. There are pending revenue cases in respect of the disputed property.

**[4.2]** The State respondents filed objection to the bail application. It is stated that the Revenue Officers were granted anticipatory bail by the learned Sessions Judge, Thoubal vide orders dated 20.12.2019 and 02.01.2020. It is stated that ASO Thoubal passed an order in Mut.Case No. 9/AS & SO/TBL/2014 dated 02.04.2014 and Mut.Case No. 553 of 2015 dated 07.04.2015 without examining any sale deed. It is stated that there is prima facie materials against the petitioners in the case. It is prayed that, the bail may be rejected. The respondent No. 5 (complainant) also filed

objection. The petitioner along with officials are accused of forging the signature of the complainant and fabricating the record of right manufacturing illegal documents. It is prayed that the bail may be rejected.

**[5]** Heard Mr. N. Jotendro, learned senior counsel assisted by Mr. Murtaza Ahmed, learned counsel for the petitioner, Mr. Y. Ashang, learned PP for the State respondents, Mr. L. Diko, learned counsel for the private respondent No. 2 in AB No. 47 of 2022 and Mr. Ph. Sanajaoba, learned counsel for the respondent No. 5 (complainant) in AB No. 84 of 2019.

**[6]** Mr. N. Jotendro, learned senior counsel for the petitioner, submits that the present case is purely civil dispute between the parties and there are litigations in the Civil as well as the Revenue Courts. 2 (two) FIRs No. 9(11)2021 VGL. PS U/Ss 120-B r/w 420IPC & 13(2) r/w 13(1)(d) of PC Act 1988 and 115(12)2019 TBL PS U/S 193/205/209/468/420/120-B, IPC are basically arising out of the same allegation, one addressed to the OC, Thoubal PS by Shri S. Kunjabihari Singh and other addressed to the Chief Minister, Manipur submitted to the Chief Minister, Manipur in 'Meeyamgi Numit'. Then, the third FIR being FIR No. 127(7)2022 TBL PS U/S. 447/307/34 IPC is arising out of the trespass and attempt to murder.

In FIR No. 115(12)2019 TBL PS U/S 193/205/209/468/420/120-B, IPC, the Revenue Officers were granted absolute anticipatory bail by the Ld. Sessions Judge, Thoubal by separate orders. Perhaps the bail orders were not challenged and attained finality.

Mr. N. Jotendro, learned senior counsel, prays that the private accused, i.e., petitioners in this set of applications herein, are also entitled

to the same benefit and parity along with officials of the Revenue Department. He further submits that except for the bald allegation, there is no material to attract the offences under Section 307 IPC in absence of any injury report or other relevant materials. He further submits that the present cases are filed by the complainant in connivance with the police to harass the petitioner in civil dispute between them. Learned senior counsel has pointed out to the fact that the complaints lodged by the petitioner against Shri S. Kunjabihari Singh have not been taken up by the police for the reason best known to them. He prays that the case of allegation and fabrication of document and cheating can be investigated while the petitioners are on bail as done with the case of the official accused. He prays that the interim bail may be made absolute with such condition as imposed by this Court and the petitioner will abide by all such conditions.

**[7]** Mr. Y. Ashang, learned PP for the State respondent, submits that the petitioners are alleged to have committed serious offences including an attempt to murder and their interim bail was rejected by the Ld. Sessions Judge, Thoubal due to their non-corporation. He prays that the bail application may be rejected.

**[8]** Mr. L.Diko, learned counsel for the respondent No. 2 (complainant) namely S. Kunjabihari Singh in AB No. 47 of 2022 states that the complaint filed by the petitioner herein against the complainant is for forgery and the same photographs with the complainant holding license gun in 2022 was already filed in criminal case before the Ld. CJM, Thoubal

in 2020. The petitioners have not come to this Court with clean hand and hence, their application may be rejected.

**[9]** Mr. Ph. Sanajaoba, learned counsel for the respondent No. 5/ complainant (S. Kunjabihari Singh) in AB No. 84 of 2019, submits that the whole allegation of the complainant is established by a report dated 24.09.2021 submitted by the AS & SO-VII TBL to the Director Settlement and Land Revenue, Manipur stating that the complainant name was cancelled from the land record by the revenue officials and private accused by fabricating documents. He prays that the bail application may be rejected.

**[10]** Considered the rival submission of the learned counsel for the parties, perused the documents on record and the provisions of law in the regard.

**[11]** It is seen that the present cases are arising out of property dispute between the complainant and the petitioners. The allegation is that the complainant name has been deleted from the land record by the petitioners in connivance with the revenue officers stealthily.

**[12]** Last FIR being FIR No. 127(7)2022 TBL PS U/S. 447/307/34 IPC is the outcome of the property dispute where there is allegation of trespassing and attempt to murder. While the complaint lodged by the complainant has been registered after 3 months, the complaint lodged by the petitioners against the complainant were never taken up by the police.

**[13]** Materials attracting Section 307 IPC are lacking in the present case.

**[14]** This Court is of the opinion that investigation can be conducted without taking the petitioner into custodial interrogation. Moreover, the Revenue Officers have already been granted anticipatory bail by the various orders of the Ld. Sessions Judge, Thoubal. In view of the above observations, the bail applications are allowed. In case of arrest the petitioners be released on bail with PR bond of each Rs. 50,000/- and with a surety of each like amount to the satisfaction of the arresting officer in each of the FIRs i.e. (1) FIR Nos. 9(11)2021 VGL. PS U/Ss 120-B r/w 420IPC & 13(2) r/w 13(1)(d) of PC Act 1988, (2) FIR No. 115(12)2019 TBL PS U/S 193/205/209/468/420/120-B, IPC and (3) FIR No. 127(7)2022 TBL PS U/S. 447/307/34 IPC subject to the conditions that:

- (a) The petitioners shall furnish personal bond of Rs. 50,000/- (Rupees Fifty Thousand) each with one surety each of the like amount.
- (b) The petitioners shall co-operate with the investigation.
- (c) The petitioners shall not tamper with the evidence or influence witnesses.
- (d) The petitioners shall not leave Manipur without permission of Ld. Sessions Judge, Thoubal.
- (e) On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the respondent police is entitled to take appropriate action against the petitioner in accordance with law.

**[15]** It is made clear that the observations made in this order are limited to the question of grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners and the merits of the complaint/case have not been delved into.

**[16]** Bail Applications are allowed.

**[17]** Send a copy of this order to the OC, Thoubal PS and Vigilance & Anti-Corruption Police Station for information.

**JUDGE**

**FR/NFR**

*joshua*

KH. JOSHUA  
MARING



Digitally signed by KH.  
JOSHUA MARING  
Date: 2023.04.17  
09:43:08 +05'30'