

GAHC010217842024



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

**Case No. : Bail Appln./3184/2024**

SUNENDRA NEOG @ SURENDRA NEOG  
S/O LATE RAJU NEOG, VILL- MIKIR BORACHUK, P.O.-MIKIR BORACHUK,  
P.S.-GOHPUR, DIST- BISWANATH, ASSAM, PIN-784178

VERSUS

THE STATE OF ASSAM  
REPRESENTED BY THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR, ASSAM

**Advocate for the Petitioner** : MR. M K HUSSAIN, MR. M ALOM, MS. F H AHMED, MRS. S Y AHMED

**Advocate for the Respondent** : PP, ASSAM,

Linked Case : Bail Appln./3163/2024

RUPAM CHARENGIA AND ANR  
S/O SRI JITEN CHARENGIA

VILLAGE JARONI GOAN  
PO DUBIA  
PS GOHPUR  
DIST BISWANATH ASSAM 784178

2: LATU BORAH  
S/O DAMBARU BORAH

VILLAGE DUBIA  
PO DUBIA  
PS GOHPUR  
DIST BISWANATH ASSAM 784178  
VERSUS

THE STATE OF ASSAM

REP BY THE PP ASSAM

-----  
Advocate for : MR. M K HUSSAIN

Advocate for : PP

ASSAM appearing for THE STATE OF ASSAM

**BEFORE  
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PARTHIVJYOTI SAIKIA**

**ORDER**

**06.11.2024**

Heard Mr. M K Hussain, learned counsel for the petitioners and Mr. R J Baruah, learned Additional Public Prosecutor, Assam.

By these applications filed under Section 483 of the BNSS, 2023 the petitioners, namely, (1) Sri Sunendra Neog @ Surendra Neog, (2) Sri Rupam Charengia and (3) Sri Latu Borah, have prayed for release on bail who were arrested in connection with Gohpur P.S. Case No. 139/2024.

It is alleged in the FIR that on 28.09.2024 while the informant was carrying fish in a vehicle, his vehicle was stopped by another vehicle and forcibly took an amount of Rs.2500/- from him. The informant has alleged that on previous occasion also, some people wearing uniform of CRPF and Army stopped the vehicle carrying fish and extorts money from the drivers.

According to Mr. Baruah the petitioners have been named in the FIR along with two other persons.

Mr. Baruah has further submitted that these persons commit such offence regularly by wearing uniform of CRPF and Army.

Mr. Hussain has submitted that the petitioners have already completed 37 days in judicial custody and the period of detention should be taken as a ground for releasing them on bail.

I have considered the submission made by the learned counsel for both sides.

This Court is of the opinion that the petitioners do not deserve to be released on bail at this stage.

Therefore, the bail applications of the petitioners are rejected.

Accordingly, the bail applications are dismissed and disposed of.

Case Diary shall be returned.

JUDGE

**Comparing Assistant**