

GAHC040015382022



**THE GAUHATI HIGH COURT**  
**(HIGH COURT OF ASSAM, NAGALAND, MIZORAM AND ARUNACHAL PRADESH)**  
**(ITANAGAR BENCH)**

**Case No. : BA 126/2022**

1:Meli Tajo  
Wife of Sri Michael Tajo,  
Resident of Chayang Tajo Village, PO and PS Chayang Tajo, East Kameng District,  
Arunachal Pradesh.  
Mobile No  
918798672946

VERSUS

1:THE STATE OF AP  
Represented by the Public Prosecutor.

**Advocate for the Petitioner** : G Taloh

**Advocate for the Respondent** : P P of AP

**BEFORE**  
**HONBLE MRS. JUSTICE MITALI THAKURIA**

**ORDER**

**Date : 05-01-2023**

Heard Mr. P. D. Nair, learned counsel for the accused and Mr. J. Tsering, learned PP for the State of Arunachal Pradesh.

Case Diary is received and the same has been perused.

It is submitted by the learned counsel for the accused that the

accused is not at all involved in the alleged offence and they are well acquainted with each other. The accused had visited the house of victim only to discuss about the work that was sanctioned in his division and during the discussion, it was decided that they will travel to the office of the PCCF, Itanagar to explore the possibility and to initiate other official formalities and the vehicle of the accused along with the victim were intercepted by the Police on the way to Itanagar on 06.12.2022 and the FIR has been lodged against the present accused and he is in custody since 06.12.2022. The I.O. has got sufficient opportunity to interrogate with the accused in custody and hence, further custodial interrogation of the accused is not necessary for the purpose of investigation. However, the accused is a permanent resident and local indigenous tribe of Arunachal Pradesh and there is no possibility of absconding and tampering or hampering with the investigation of the case.

The learned PP has submitted, in this regard, that as per the Case Diary, the statement of the victim as well as the accused person has already been recorded and there is substantial progress in the investigation. However, there is an objection filed by the I.O. in releasing the accused on bail.

The learned counsel for the accused has submitted one scanned copies of WT Message which was addressed to jail Superintendent by O.C. P.S., Chayang Tajo informing that the mother of the present accused has expired on 27.12.2022.

After hearing the learned counsel for both the parties, I have

perused the scanned copies of the Case Diary as well as the objection filed by the I.O. against the bail prayer of the accused, it reveals from the objection filed by the I.O. that there was huge transaction of money amounting to Rs. 1.7 crores and it is further stated that there may be involvement of other persons which are yet to be booked in connection with this case. There is also documentary evidence to be collected and if the accused is enlarged on bail, at this stage, there is every possibility of tampering of those documents and hampering of evidence of the witnesses. Moreso, it is stated by the I.O. that there is an apprehension of threat of the family members of the complainant and other staffs of DFO in connection with this case.

Considering the gravity of the offence and the objection raised by the I.O., I do not find it appropriate to enlarge the accused on bail. But, the I.O. is hereby directed to make an enquiry if there is any last rites to be done for the mother of the accused, who had already expired. Further, the I.O. may take necessary steps in this regard to escort the accused to his house so as to enable him to perform last rites of his mother, if any.

The bail application stands rejected.

In view of the above, this bail application stands disposed of.

**JUDGE**