



Serial Nos. 03, 04 & 08
Regular List

HIGH COURT OF MEGHALAYA
AT SHILLONG

BA. No. 45 of 2025 with
BA. No. 46 of 2025
BA. No. 44 of 2025

Date of Decision: 08.09.2025

BA. No. 45 of 2025

Shri. Nishalson Tariang @ Jill
 Aged about 24 years,
 Son of Shri. Raymond Kharkongor,
 R/o Umsning Lumromon, Ri-Bhoi District,
 Meghalaya.

..... **Petitioner**

- Vs-

1. The State of Meghalaya
 Represented by Secretary (Home)
 Government of Meghalaya.
2. The Superintendent of Police,
 Ri-Bhoi District, Meghalaya.

..... **Respondents**

BA. No. 46 of 2025

Shri. Shiningstar Nongrum @ Babu
 aged about 38 years, Son of (L) D. Dkhar,
 R/o Umsning Patarim,
 Ri-Bhoi District, Meghalaya.

..... **Petitioner**

- Vs-

1. The State of Meghalaya



Represented by Secretary (Home)
Government of Meghalaya.

2. The Superintendent of Police,
Ri-Bhoi District, Meghalaya.

..... Respondents

BA. No. 44 of 2025

Shri. Damanbha Ripnar aged about 27 years,
Son of Shri. Abison Lapang,
R/o Umsning, Ri-Bhoi District,
Meghalaya.

..... Petitioner

- Vs -

1. The State of Meghalaya
Represented by Secretary (Home)
Government of Meghalaya.
2. The Superintendent of Police,
Ri-Bhoi District, Meghalaya.

..... Respondents

Coram:

Hon'ble Mr. Justice W. Diengdoh, Judge

Appearance:

For the Petitioner/Appellant(s) : Mr. S.S. Yadav, Adv.
Ms. E. Law, Adv.

For the Respondent(s) : Mr. N.D. Chullai, AAG with
Mr. E.R. Chyne, GA.

i) Whether approved for reporting in Law journals etc.: Yes/No

ii) Whether approved for publication



in press:

Yes/No

COMMON JUDGMENT AND ORDER (ORAL)

1. These three bail applications have one common aspect that is, all three are related to the case considered in Special UA(P) Case No. 1 of 2024 before the Court of the learned Special Judge UA(P), Ri-Bhoi District, Nongpoh. As such, the same are taken up and disposed of by this common judgment and order.
2. The genesis of the matter stems from the lodgment of an FIR dated 11.03.2024 filed by one Inspector Simseng A. Sangma, I/C Special Operation Team, East Khasi Hills, Shillong before the Officer-in-Charge, Nongpoh Police Station, Ri-Bhoi District.
3. The facts of the case indicated in the said FIR is that, on the basis of an incident involving an IED blast at Syndicate Bus Stand Punjabi Lane, Shillong at around 11:30 PM or so on 09.03.2024, some persons suspected to be involved in the said incident have been arrested, and a case was also registered as Sadar P.S. Case No. 80(03)2024 under Section 120B/121A/307/324 IPC read with Section 10/13/16/18 UAP Act and under Section 3(a)/3(b)/5/6 Explosive Substances Act.
4. The arrested persons namely, Shri, Damanbha Ripnar, Shri. Robinus Ripnar, Shri. Shiningstar Nongrum and Shri. Nishelson Tariang



were charged under the relevant sections of law on the Investigating Officer filing his charge sheet implicating the abovenamed persons. The said accused persons have then been sent up to stand trial in the said Special UA(P) Case No. 1 of 2024. However, it is admitted that till date, charges have not been framed against the said accused persons. In the meantime, one of the accused persons, Shri. Robinus Ripnar, had approached this Court with a prayer for grant of bail, mainly on the ground of technical defect in the process of his arrest, that is, that he was not informed of the grounds of arrest at the time when he was intercepted and arrested in connection with the said case. This according to the petitioner, is a violation of the provision of Article 22(1) of the Constitution of India read with Section 43B of the UA(P) Act, 1967, affecting his life and personal liberty.

5. This Court, on consideration of the submission made and the contention raised by the learned counsel for the parties, that is, the learned counsel for the petitioners and the learned AAG, had allowed the petition and had accordingly granted bail with conditions to the accused, Shri. Robinus Ripnar.

6. Now, at the present, Mr. S.S. Yadav, learned counsel for the petitioners had again approach this Court, making similar submission and



contention, more particularly, seeking bail on ground of parity, inasmuch, as even the three accused persons in these three separate applications, though, they were arrested in connection with the said Sadar P.S. Case No. 80(03)2024, they were never informed of the grounds of arrest at the time when they were arrested. Hence, these applications and prayer therein. It is accordingly prayed that these applications may be allowed and bail may be granted to the respective petitioners with any conditions to be imposed by the Court.

7. Mr. N.D. Chullai, learned AAG assisted by Mr. E.R. Chyne, learned GA for the State respondents, in all fairness, has submitted that the prosecution has no objection to make at this point of time in view of the related order passed by this Court in the case of Shri. Robinus Ripnar v. The State of Meghalaya & Anr, wherein by order dated 26.08.2025 passed in BA. No. 38 of 2025, this Court as has been noted, has granted bail to the said petitioner, and the three petitioners herein being identically situated, therefore, there is no scope of objection at this point of time. It is prayed that necessary orders may be passed by this Court.

8. Accordingly, in view of the submission made before this Court and on the ground of parity, this Court is inclined to allow the prayer made by the petitioners, and directs that they shall be released on bail forthwith,



if not wanted in any other case or cases on their compliance with the following conditions:

- i) That they shall not abscond or tamper with the witnesses;
- ii) That they shall attend court as and when called for;
- iii) That they shall not leave the jurisdiction of Meghalaya, except with due permission of the court concerned; and
- iv) That they shall bind themselves on a bond of ₹ 50,000/- (Rupees fifty thousand) each with one surety of like amount to the satisfaction of the Trial Court.

9. It is the further direction of this Court that, in the event that any of the conditions set forth is breached by the petitioners, the prosecution can move the Trial Court for cancellation of the bail.

10. In view of the above noted observations, these bail applications are accordingly disposed of. No costs.

Judge