

REPORTABLE

IN THE HIGH COURT OF MANIPUR

AT IMPHAL

A.B. No. 2 of 2025

Crl. M. C. No. 4 of 2025

Shri Kshetrimayum Roosevelt @ Kemesh Singh, aged about 31 years, S/O (L) Ksh. Neta Singh, a resident of Tharoijam Mamang Leikai, P.O. Langjing, P.S. Patsoi, District- Imphal West, Manipur, 795113.

.....Petitioner

-verses-

The Officer-in-Charge, Patsoi Police Station, P.O. Langjing, P.S. Patsoi, Imphal West District, Manipur, 795138.

.....Respondent

B E F O R E

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A. GUNESHWAR SHARMA

For the petitioner : Mr. Ph. Sanajaoba, Advocate

For the respondent : Mr. M. Rarry, Spl PP

assisted by Ms. M. Nikita, Advocate

Date of reserving for order : 05.03.2025

Date of Judgment & Order : **02.07.2025**

ORDER [CAV]

[1] This is an application filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 praying for granting appropriate order/direction to the

respondents for enlarging the applicant on bail in the event of his arrest under FIR No. 27(11)2024 Patsoi P.S. U/S191(3)/223/324(4)(5)/326(g)/329(3)/351(2)/3(5) BNS & 25(1-C) Arms Act. Vide order dated 30.01.2025, this Court granted interim protection to the petitioner.

The facts leading to the filing of the present case is that:-

[2] On 16.11.2024, in the afternoon, while the petitioner was at his poultry farm, he heard a loudspeaker from his nearby locality thereby announcing the public to gather at the public field of Tharoijam Mamang Leikai so as to know the stand taken by its local MLA, namely; Shri Sorokhaibam Rajen Singh in connection with the kidnapping and killing of 6 (six) innocent women and children at Jiribam District by Kuki militants. As such, he went to the residence of the said MLA and while the petitioner was at the residence of the said MLA many people from all the directions approached the spot and the mob could not be controlled by the security personnel then and there as the mob grew up in thousands. Out of blue the mob started ransacking the house of the said MLA like a wild fire. Having no option and daring his life the petitioner rushed towards his residence without any delay.

[3] On 06.12.2024, while the petitioner was busy at his poultry farm, a police summon in connection with the above referred police case was served against him by the personnel of Patsoi police station thereby informing him to appear before the said station on the very next day, i.e. 07.12.2024 at 10:00 a.m.

[4] The petitioner, having learnt that he has been implicated in the said police case and apprehending his arrest, approached the Ld. Sessions Judge, Imphal West by way of filing a pre-arrest bail application.

[5] The Ld. Sessions Judge, Imphal West was pleased to transfer the same to Ld. Addl. Sessions Judge (FTC), Manipur East. The said pre-arrest bail was

registered as Cril. Misc. (AB) Case No. 80 of 2024. The Ld. Addl. Sessions Judge (FTC), Manipur East vide its order dated 09.12.2024 was pleased to grant interim bail to the petitioner. Thereafter, on 15-12.2024 the petitioner appeared before the I.O. of the said case and his statement was duly recorded on the said day. On 17.12.2024 the respondent submitted the bail objection report of the said pre-arrest bail application through the Ld. PP (D) of the concerned Court.

[6] On 22.01.2024 the Ld. Sessions Judge (FTC), Manipur East was pleased to disposed of the petition thereby cancelling the interim bail dated 09.12.2024.

[7] The Ld. Session Judge (FTC), Manipur East disposed the petition by cancelling the interim bail on 22.01.2024. Hence this petition praying for granting appropriate order/direction to the respondents for enlarging the applicant on bail in connection with FIR No. 27(11)2024 Patsoi – P.S. U/S 191 (3)/223/324 (4) (5)/326 (g)/329(3)/351(2)/3(5) BNS & 25(1-C) Arms Act.

[8] The respondent Officer-in-Charge filed affidavit-in-opposition and stated that the present petitioner is not entitled to grant the relief prayed for the Anticipatory Bail as the involvement of the petitioner in the crime has been established by the prosecution beyond any reasonable doubt and there is a clear admission of petitioner's involvement by the petitioner in para no.4.1 of the present application nor is any contrary proof produced by the petitioner that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the FIR Case.

[9] The respondent stated that the allegation against the petitioner is that the undisputed fact of the record that the petitioner admits of being directly involved in the said group of people and other vested group involved in forming the mob and attacking the residence of Hon'ble MLA of Lamsang AC, namely MLA Sorokhaibam Rajen Singh on 16.11.2024.

[10] The respondent filed Bail Objection Report before the Ld. Additional Session Judge (FTC) Manipur East and the same is reproduced below :

*"In the Court of the Hon'ble Addl. Sessions Judge (FTC), Manipur East
Through the Ld. PP(D) to Addl. Sessions Judge, Manipur East*

Subject: Submission of Anticipatory bail objection report.

*Ref:- FIR NO. 27(11)2024 PSI PS U/S
191(3)/233(4)(5)/326(g)/329(3)/351(2)/3(5) BNS 2023&25(1-C)
Arms Act.*

Hon'ble Sheweth,

In submitting herewith the Anticipatory Bail Objection report of the undernoted alleged involved persons, I have the honour to state the following few lines for your kind perusal and further necessary action to reject the anticipatory bail in the interest of the investigation of the above reference.

The brief fact of the case is that on 16/11/2024 at 9.25 pm, received information that on the same day at around 9.15 pm, a huge irate mob numbering about 1000 persons including men and women holding with deadly weapons like arms, daw, stick, iron rod, catapult etc. stormed at the house of Shri S. Rajen Singh, Hon'ble MLA, Lamsang AC, Thaoroijam, Imphal West by violating the prohibitory order of the DM-IW dtd. 16/11/2024 u/s 163 of BNSS as a protest against the kidnapping and killing of women and children by suspected Kuki militants at Jiribam District. Hence, a Police team of Patsoi-PS rushed at the spot but could not control the mob. Further, the mob started ransacking the house of Shri S. Rajen Singh, Hon'ble MLA, Lamsang AC, Thaoroijam and entered inside the house by breaking the doors. The members of the irate mob have caused a huge damage the household properties and structures. Furthe, the irate mob burnt down many valuable properties. Hence the case.

During the course of investigation, examined the complainant U/S 180 BNSS very carefully and minutely and his statement is fully Corroborated with the OE lodged by him. Visited the spot and inspected it very carefully and minutely. Drawn a rough sketch map of the P.O with its proper index by observing formalities. Conducted the videography of the scene of crime and is being submitted. Examined some PW'S where they supported the facts of the case. Scene of crime is being again inspected with the team of FSL. Further on examination of the family members of the Hon'ble MLA S. Rajen Singh, the total cost of damage could not be ascertained. However the cost

of damaged would be in terms of crore.2 (Two) nos. Of suspected persons namely 1.Khumukcham Raman Singh (45) S/o (L) Kh. Tamonjao Singh of Awangkhumou Maning Leikai 3.Keithellakpam Robi Singh (28) S/o K. Babu Singh of Awangkhumou Maning Leikai were arested on 22/11/2024. They were produced before the Hon'ble of Duty Magistrate, IW on 23/11/2024 praying for remanding the accused persons into Police Custody for a period of 7(seven) days. However, the Hon'ble court of Duty Magistrate, IW released the accused persons on bail.

Further course of investigation on 28/11/2024 one Chongtham Thoicha Meitei (20) S/o Ch. Phulachandra Meitei of Kiyam Mamang Leikai was arrested from his residence by observing formalities. He was produced before the Hon'ble court of JMFC Imphal West II for police custody remand and the accused was remanded into police custody for the period of 4 days i.e. 29th November till 2nd December 2024. Further the above mentioned accused person was released on bail by the Hon'ble court of JMFC Imphal West II on dated 2nd December 2024.

Further on 06/12/2024, summoned to the 3 (three) involved alleged persons namely 1), Langam Bobi Meitei, aged about 43 years, S/o L. Jillagamba Meitei of Kiyam Makha Leikai, Imphal West, 2) Pichimayum Rajesh Meitei aged about 29 years S/o P. Raghmani Meitei of Kiyam Makha Leikai, Imphal West and 3) Kshetrimayum Kemesh Singh aged about 31 years S/o (L) Ksh. Neta Singh of Thaoroijam Mamang Leikai, Imphal west to appear before the OC/PSI PS on 07/12/2024 for recording their statements. And on the next day i.e. 07/12/2024 received 2 (Two) Cril. Misc. (A.B) Cases under case number 77 and 78 of 2024 ref. Non FIR from Patsoi PS of the petitioners 1) Langam Bobi Meitei, aged about 43 years, S/o L. Jillagamba Meitei of Kiyam Makha Leikai, Imphal West and 2) Pichimayum Rajesh Meitei aged about 29 years S/o P. Raghmani Meitei of Kiyam Makha Leikai, Imphal West.

Despite of serving Summoned to the accused person mentioned in Sl. No. 1. Namely Langam Bobi Meitei, aged about 43 years, S/OL Jillagamba Meitei of Kiyam Makha Leikai, Imphal West, he did not appeared before the OC/PSI PS till date. So, he did not co-operate in the investigation of the case nor to the I.O of the case.

On date 09/12/2024, the accused person mentioned in Sl. No. 2 namely Pichimayum Rajesh Meitei aged about 29 years S/o P. Raghmani Meitei of Kiyam Makha Leikai, Imphal West. Has appeared before the I.O. of the case and recorded his statement. According to the statement given by the accused person it is learned that, he went to the Hospital namely Hill Plus and Research Institute located at Porompat owned by the above accused

person and remained at the Hospital till 8:00 pm of dated 16/11/2024. Then he visited at residence of one Mr. Toijam Opendro Singh which is in-law of the accused No.2 located at Wangkhei Thambalkhong. Then he left the place for returning to his home at @ 10:00 pm. On reaching at SR Construction, Thaoroijam, he met the mob of huge crowd gathered near SR Construction owned by Shri S. Rajen Singh, MLA Lamsang AC. So, he had participated in the agitation in c/w the present crisis of ethnic clash in between the two communities.

Further on 14/12/2024, received 1 (One) Cril. Misc. (A.B) case under 80 of 2024 ref case FIR NO. 27(11)2024 PSI PS U/S 11(5)/233(4)(5)/326(g)/329(3)/351(2)/3(5) BNS 2023 & 25 (1-C) Arms Act of the petitioner mentioned in No. 3. On the next day i.e. 15/12/2024, the petitioner appeared before the IO of the case and recorded the statement of the accused person, the accused revealed that while he was at his poultry farm located at Thaoroijam Awang Leikai, he heard the loudspeaker announcing to gather at the Public field of Thaoroijam Mamang Leikai in order to agitate against the kidnapping and killing of women and children by suspected Kuki militants at Jiribam District, demanding for assurance from the Concerned local MLA of his stand regarding the crisis as it is mandatory to participate one member of a family members of the locality to took part at the agitation without fail. So, he himself participated in the agitation at SR Construction, Thaoroijam.

The arrests of the other involved persons are needed to be verified and ascertained from the accused persons and such crimes are highly required to stop by arresting all the culprits involved. The accused persons are highly required for custodial interrogation to prevent them from such criminal acts as well as to protect the evidence of the case.

In the light of the above facts and circumstances, the Hon'ble Addl. Sessions Judge (FTC), Manipur East is therefore prayed to kindly reject the interim bail motion moved by the undernoted accused persons as the case is in early stage and collective efforts are also under process for the end of justice.

Particulars of the accused persons: -

1. Langam Bobi Meitei, aged about 43 years, S/o L. Jillagamba Meitei of Kiyam Makha Leikai, Imphal West
2. Pichimmayum Rajesh Meitei aged about 29 years S/o P. Raghumani Meitei of Kiyam Makha Leikai, Imphal West

3. Kshetrimayum Kemesh Singh aged about 31 years S/o (L) Ksh. Neta Singh of Thaoroijam Mamang Leikai, Imphal West.

Dated/Patsoi :-

The 17th December 2024

*Yours Sincerely
(SI AS Velin Zimik)
Patsoi Police Station”*

[11] The respondent also stated that they have submitted a prayer for rejecting the Anticipatory Bail Application of the petitioner vide Bail Objection Report dated 06.01.2025 before the Ld. Additional Session Judge (FTC), Manipur East in Cril. MC (AB) Case no. 80 of 2024 filed by the petitioner. It is also submitted that there are some changes made in the Bail Objection Report dated 06.01.2025 of the IO.

[12] The respondent further submitted that during the course of investigation, it was found out that the culprits involved in the crime along with the petitioner have stolen many valuable gold ornaments and money by breaking the iron locker besides stealing many other valuable documents viz. Insurance, banking and Educational Certificates.

[13] The respondent, in continuation, submitted that according to the IO's Case Diary of the case dated 15.12.2024, it mentions that “on questioning the timing and identities of the co-accused persons, he kept concealing intentionally. So, he was allowed to go home at about 1.00 pm and instructed him to turned up and report at 11.00 pm of the next day”. But the petitioner did not report at the police station on the next date therefore he is not co-operating with the IO.

[14] Vide the order dated 09.12.2024 in Cril. Misc. (AB) Case No. 80 of 2024, learned Addl. Sessions Judge (FTC), Manipur East granted interim protection to the petitioner and the matter was taken up on 22.01.2025 for hearing of the anticipatory bail application after submission of the detailed bail report from the

IO of Patsoi PS. After hearing the parties at length and on perusal of the bail report, the pre-arrest bail was rejected on the ground that even though the petitioner appeared before the IO who recorded his statement, he was reluctant to disclose the names of his associates involved in the crime and hence was not co-operating with the investigation. Accordingly, the interim bail dated 09.12.2024 was also cancelled.

[15] Mr. Ph. Sanajaoba, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has no previous criminal record and is a respectable person in the locality. He is the sole earning member of the family. There is no incriminating materials against him for involvement in the present FIR. Learned ASJ (FTC), Manipur East has wrongly misread the bail report submitted by the OC, Patsoi PS. As per the bail report dated 17.12.2024, it is stated that after obtaining interim pre-arrest bail, the petitioner appeared before the IO on 15.12.2024 and his statement was recorded. The petitioner disclosed to the IO that when he was at his poultry farm located at Tharoijam Awang Leikai, he heard public announcement to gather at the public field of Tharoijam Mamang Leikai in order to agitate against kidnapping and killing of women and children at Jiribam by Kuki militants. As it was made mandatory to participate one person from each family, the petitioner took part in the agitation. It is mentioned in the report that the arrests of other involved persons were needed to be verified from the petitioner. Mr. Ph. Sanajaoba clarifies that in the bail report it has never been stated that the petitioner refused to disclose names of other persons involved in the case. It only stated that verification of identities of other accused is to be ascertained from the petitioner. It is further pointed out that the bail report has not mentioned that the petitioner is the kingpin of the crime. Learned counsel refers to the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **P. Chidambaram v. Directorate of Enforcement: (2020) 13 SCC 791** with

respect to *triple test of flight risk, tampering with evidence and influencing of witnesses*; and also, *not to decide on merit of the case while dealing with bail application*. It is submitted that the petitioner has also satisfied the triple test, as he is not a flight risk and there is no allegation of tampering with evidence and influencing the witnesses. Severity of the offences alone shall not be a ground to reject bail application. It is also pointed out that there are more than 1000 persons involved on that day, three accused have been released on regular bail and two more accused got absolute pre-arrest bail. The bail orders of the co-accused are not challenged before higher forum and only the petitioner is singled out by the police with an ulterior motive. When the bail application is pending before this Court, in his further statement given to the IO the petitioner has disclosed names of seven persons and none of them has been arrested till date. It is undertaken that the petitioner will abide by all the conditions imposed by this Court while releasing on bail.

[16] On other hand, Mr. M. Rarry, learned Spl. PP submits that the petitioner is involved in a mob attack at the residence of the sitting local MLA for a cause not related to him at all. Taking advantage of the public outrage, some miscreants attacked the political opponents and such incidents are happening in Manipur on regular interval and this trend is required to be stopped by any means. The punishments for the offences range from imprisonment for a period for 2 years to life imprisonment. If exemplary punishments are not given and bail applications are not rejected, the public will be tempted to repeat such crime for political or any cause. It is stated that the bail application was rightly rejected by the learned court below as the petitioner failed to disclose names of the co-accused. The same is recorded in the case diary recoded on 15.12.2024. It is mentioned that the petitioner appeared before the IO on 15.12.2024 at 11.00 am along with of a copy of interim bail order dated 09.12.2024. On examination, he

did not disclose the facts of the crime and admitted his participation, but he intentionally concealed the identities of the co-accused. Learned Spl. PP clarifies that this important fact was inadvertently not mentioned in the bail report dated 17.12.2024 submitted to the court. However, learned ASJ (FTC), Manipur East rejected the bail application on perusal of the case diary.

[17] It may be noted that the statements of the petitioner recorded by the IO and extract of case diary dated 15.12.2024 were submitted by the learned Spl. PP during the course of hearing on 05.03.2025 and the same has been kept in safe custody and was opened only on 29.06.2025 while preparing this order and resealed on the same day.

[18] Mr. M. Rarry, learned Spl. PP refers to the decision in **(2011) 1 SCC 694: Siddharam Satlingappa Mhetre v. State of Maharashtra**, **(2020) 5 SCC 1: Sushila Aggarwal v. State (NCT of Delhi)** and **(2020) 13 SCC 791: P. Chidambaram v. Directorate of Enforcement** with regard to the requirement of custodial interrogation for complete disclosure of the relevant details of the case. Learned Spl. PP draws attention of this Court to the recent decision of the co-ordinate Bench in **Order dated 07.01.2025 in AB No. 45 of 2024: Naorem Priyobarta Singh v. Officer-in-Charge, Kakching Police Station, Manipur** where in similar case of attack at the residence of sitting MLA of Kakching A/C, the anticipatory bail was rejected. It is prayed that the bail application be dismissed.

[19] This Court has considered the materials on record, the submissions made at bar and the decisions relied by the parties. The sealed enveloped submitted by the learned Spl. PP containing the statements of the petitioner and the extract of case diary recorded on 15.12.2024 was opened on 29.06.2025 during the drafting of this order and resealed on the same day after perusing the contents.

[20] On minute examination of the available record, the factual position is that the petitioner has admitted his participation in the mob agitation on that fateful day and in the process the mob vandalised the property of the sitting local MLA. The petitioner also appeared before the IO on 15.12.2024 and recorded his statement. This much is admitted by both parties. The difference arises when the bail application was rejected by the learned ASJ (FTC), ME on the ground that the petitioner did not co-operate with the IO as he refused to disclose names of co-accused.

[21] This Court has minutely read the bail report dated 17.12.2024. The report states that the petitioner appeared on 15.12.2024 and his statement was recorded. He admitted his participation in the agitation against kidnapping and murder of innocent persons at Jiribam, as a member of each family had to take part in the agitation. The relevant portion of the bail report dated 17.12.2024 reads as follows:

“ On the next day, i.e., 15.12.2024, the petitioner appeared before the IO of the case and recorded the statement of the accused person, the accused revealed that while he was at his poultry farm located at Tharoijam Awang Leikai, he heard the loudspeaker announcing to gather at the Public field of Tharoijam Mamang Leikai in order to agitate against the kidnapping and killing of women and children by suspected Kuki militants at Jiribam District, demanding for assurance from the concerned local MLA of his stand regarding the crisis as it is mandatory to participate one member of a family members of the locality to took (sic, take) part at the agitation without fail. So, he himself participated in the agitation at SR Construction, Thaoroijam.

The arrests of the other persons are needed to be verified and ascertained from the accused persons and such crimes are highly required to stop by arresting all the culprits involved. The accused persons are highly required for custodial interrogation to prevent from such criminal acts as well as to protect the evidence of the case.”

[22] From the above quoted bail report, it is ample clear that the petitioner took part in the agitation against the abduction and murder of innocent persons at Jiribam and in the process the mob vandalised the property of sitting MLA. The statement of the petitioner has also been recorded by the IO and it mentioned for further verification of the identities of other accused persons from the petitioner. However, the bail report never mentioned that the petitioner refused to disclose identities of co-accused. This Court is at loss to ascertain how learned ASJ (FTC), ME made a conclusion to the fact that the petitioner was reluctant to disclose identities of his associates and hence was not co-operating with the investigating agency. In the impugned order dated 22.01.2025, the bail report has extensively been reproduced. In the impugned order, it does not mention that the court has read over the case diary and the factum of refusal of the petitioner to disclose names of co-accused has been extracted from the diary. Learned Spl. PP has vehemently tried to justify the same by insisting that learned Judge has read the case diary and such important fact was inadvertently missing in the bail report dated 17.12.2024. This Court finds this preposterous submission hard to believe. When the author of the order is silent about the reading of the case diary, it will be logical to conclude that he reads only the bail report. This Court has also perused the extract of case diary noting dated 15.12.2024 submitted by the learned Spl. PP in sealed cover. The IO recorded that the petitioner refused to disclose names of co-accused and relevant portion is reproduced for clarity as “... On questioning the timing and identities of the co-accused persons, he kept concealing intentionally.”.

Purpose & Object of Bail Report and Case Diary of the Investigating Agency:

[23] This Court intends to highlight the importance of bail report submitted by the investigating agency during course of consideration of bail application, both

pre-arrest and post-arrest. The report is expected to be a summary or concise of the contents of the case diary. In the diary, important facts of the case including the developments made in the investigation, brief statements about the recovery, arrest and seizure and forensic and any scientific report are to be recorded and updated from time to time. In the bail report, a concise statement of case mirroring the contents of the case diary, sans prohibited information, is to be written. In short, a bail report is a precis of the case diary, after withholding prohibited details. Generally, case diary is not called for by the courts unless it is required to ascertain certain facts. As a rule, the court is to go by the bail report submitted by the investigation. Investigating Officer is expected to update the case diary regularly and the bail report ought to contain a concise detail of the entries made in the diary. The fate of a bail application will depend on the contents of the bail report submitted to the court by the investigating agency. It is emphasized again at the cost of repetition that the bail report should reflect the brief facts of the case, the role of the accused, the development made so far in the investigation to mention a few. However, it does not mean that the bail report should only contain the above-mentioned details. Other important facts as per the investigation may also be included.

Bail Report in the present case:

[24] In the present case, the bail report dated 17.12.2024 does not reflect the most important crucial fact of refusal to disclose the names of the co-accused by the petitioner on 15.12.2024 when his statement was recorded by the IO. A prudent Investigating Officer is expected to record this important fact in his/her bail report. This sole fact will decide the fate of the bail application. On the other hand, learned ASJ (FTC), ME never mentioned in his order dated 22.01.2025 that the factum of the petitioner's refusal to disclose names of co-accused has been culled out from the case diary noting dated 15.12.2024. In such situation,

it may be possible that case diary might be recorded pre-dated on a later period. This Court is not expressing any opinion on the authenticity of the noting of case diary dated 15.12.2024, but has taken judicial note of the fact that the noting dated 15.12.2024 of the diary does not find a place in the bail report dated 17.12.2024. In such compelling situation, this Court is of the considered view that learned ASJ (FTC) ME has not materials to conclude that the petitioner refused to disclose names of the co-accused and thereby rejected the bail application for non-co-operation with the investigating agency. This finding is perverse and is not based on available materials.

Discussions:

[25] It is settled principle of law that every bail application is to be examined on its peculiar facts and accompanying circumstances- such as antecedents of the accused, severity of the offence, stage of investigation, likelihood of interfering in the investigation and tampering of evidence and possibility of absconding, etc. In the present case, it is not the specific case of the prosecution that the petitioner is the kingpin in this FIR nor has he ever tried to obstruct the investigation after obtaining interim bail. There is no material to show that the petitioner is a flight risk. During the course of hearing, Mr. Ph. Sanajoaba submits that the petitioner appeared before the IO on 05.02.2025 and disclosed names of 7 (seven) co-accused, but none of them has been arrested. 3 co-accused have been released on regular bail and 2 persons got absolute pre-arrest bail. Bail orders of the co-accused have not been challenged in superior courts.

[26] This Court has gone through the bail order dated 07.01.2025 passed by a co-ordinate Bench in AB No. 45 of 2024. The interim AB was cancelled both by the learned Session Judge as well this Court, as the petitioner therein failed

to appear before the IO on the stipulated date while on interim bail. The fact is not identical with the case in hand.

[27] In the circumstances, the bail application is allowed and in case of arrest the petitioner shall be released on bail on personal bond of Rs.50,000/- with a surety of like amount (government servant) to the satisfaction of the Investigating Officer subject to the condition that:

(I) The petitioner shall co-operate with the investigation and shall appear before the IO on first day of every month at 11.00 am, till he is discharged by the IO.

(II) The petitioner shall not try to influence with any person acquainted with the facts of the present case and shall not tamper with the material evidences.

(III) The petitioner shall not leave the State of Manipur without permission of this Court.

(IV) If any of the conditions is violated by the petitioner, the respondent may approach this Court for cancellation of the bail.

[28] Bail application and misc. applications are disposed of. Interim order dated 30.01.2025 is made absolute. Send a copy of this order to learned ASJ (FTC) ME and OC, Patsoi PS for information. Returned the resealed documents to the learned Spl. PP on proper receipt.

OINAM
THOIBA
MEITEI
FR/NFR
suchitra

Digitally signed by
OINAM THOIBA
MEITEI
Date: 2025.07.02
15:01:08 +05'30'

JUDGE