

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF MANIPUR
AT IMPHAL**

Cril. Petn. No. 58 of 2025

Md. Abdul Wakil

... *Petitioner*

- *Versus* -

Union of India

... *Respondent*

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

ORDER

09.09.2025

[1] This matter is taken up as unlisted item on mentioning.

[2] Heard Mr. H. Kenajit, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr. W. Darakishwor, learned Sr. PCCG for the respondent.

[3] The petitioner approached this Court for clarification of impugned order dated 27.08.2025 passed by the Learned Judge, Special Court (ND & PS), Manipur (in short Ld. Court) at Lamphelpat in Cril. Misc. (B) Case No. 119 of 2025 (Special Trial Case No. 26 of 2023). It is submitted that the petitioner was released on bail on execution of a bail bond of Rs. 10,00,000/- with two sureties of like amount (local Government employees of the State) to the satisfaction of the Court and the relevant para is reproduced below:

"9. Accordingly the accused/Petitioner, Md. Abdul Wakil, is hereby released on bail on execution of a bail bond of Rs. 10,00,000/- only with two sureties of like amount (both of which local Government employee of the State) to the satisfaction of this Court and on the conditions that the accused shall:-

- a. co-operate with the prosecution and appear before this Court as and when directed as per law;*
- b. co-operate with the investigation of the case;*
- c. not hamper/tamper with evidence(s)/witness(es);*
- d. not commit similar offence while on bail;*
- e. not leave the State without prior permission of the Court"*

[4] In pursuance of this, the petitioner submitted bail bond with two sureties bonds of local Govt. employees on 04.09.2025, i) Hashina Begum, Female Health Worker (ANM), Government of Manipur, who is drawing a monthly salary of Rs.44,300/- and ii) Thoubalmayum Abdul Warish, Road Mohirrir in the Rural Development & Panchayati Raj, Government of Manipur, who is drawing a monthly salary of Rs.38,176/-. Further, the Ld. Court enquired about the relationship between the two sureties and found that they were a couple and a couple cannot stand as surety. However, the Ld. Court rejected the sureties furnished along with the bail bond, stating that the two sureties should be gazette officers and the sureties submitted by the petitioner are only Govt. employees.

[5] It is submitted that the bail bond and two sureties bonds submitted by the petitioner are in terms of the directions contained in 'para no. 9' of impugned order dated 27.08.2025 passed by the Ld. Court and the same is allowed.

[6] The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that on perusal of 'para no. 9' of the impugned order dated 27.08.2025, the Ld. Court has directed two sureties bonds of local Govt. employees and the word 'gazette officers' is not clarified in the order.

[7] In the circumstances, the present cril. petition is disposed of by clarifying that the 'para no. 9' of the impugned order dated 27.08.2025 passed by the Ld. Court stipulates the two sureties bonds of local Govt. employees.

[8] This Court is of the opinion that the bail bond and two sureties bonds of local Govt. employees submitted by the petitioner is in terms of the directions contained in 'para no. 9' of the impugned order dated 27.08.2025 and hence, they are the valid bonds.

[9] With these observations, the present Cril. Petition No. 58 of 2025 is disposed of.

JUDGE