

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

MC(CRL. A.) No. 10 of 2026

Irengbam Jugindro Meitei aged about 67 years, S/o
(L) I. Leiren Singh, a resident of Keishamthong Top
Leirak, P.O. & P.S. Imphal, Imphal West District,
Manipur.

... Applicant

- Versus -

National Investigation Agency, Ministry of Home
Affairs, Government of India, New Delhi represented
by Chief Investigation Officer (CIO), National
Investigation Agency, Branch Office, Imphal,
Manipur, Type – VI, Quarter G-1, Lamphel Officer
Colony, Lamphelpat, P.O. & P.S. Lamphel, Imphal
West District, Manipur – 795004.

... Respondent

B E F O R E

**HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE MR. M. SUNDAR
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A. BIMOL SINGH**

O R D E R
[M. Sundar, CJ]

29.04.2026

[1] Captioned 'miscellaneous case' ('MC' for the sake of
brevity) has been filed with condonation of delay (CoD) prayer qua
3 (three) days delay in filing a statutory appeal under Section 21 of

'National Investigation Agency Act, 2008 (34 of 2008)' ('NIA Act' for the sake of brevity and convenience).

[2] Mr. L. Romen, learned counsel for MC applicant is before this Court (Physical Court). Learned counsel for MC applicant submits that captioned statutory appeal under Section 21 of NIA Act is directed against a 'bail rejection order dated 28.01.2026 made in CRIL. MISC. (BAIL) CASE No. 444 of 2025 on the file of Special Judge, NIA Special Court – I, Manipur' ('impugned order' for the sake of clarity).

[3] Learned counsel for MC applicant, advertng to paragraph No. 3 of the captioned MC application, submits that there was a delay in applying for certified copy owing to incarceration of the appellant and lapse in communication between counsel and the person coordinating the matter with counsel on behalf of appellant. Learned counsel submits that the delay is neither willful nor wanton but only owing to such genuine difficulty.

[4] Issue notice.

[5] Mr. Nongdamba, learned counsel for sole respondent (NIA) who is present in Court (Physical Court) accepts notice.

[6] This Court with consent of learned counsel on both sides took up MC application.

[7] Learned counsel for sole respondent (NIA), without insisting on filing an affidavit-in-opposition, submitted that the delay could have been avoided if both counsel and the person coordinating the matter had been a little more diligent.

[8] This Court carefully considered the rival submissions of both sides.

[9] Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, nature of the matter, taking note of the fact that the main statutory appeal under Section 21 of NIA Act is directed against a bail rejection order (impugned order) and taking into account the manner in which the appellant is circumstanced and also noticing that the delay is very short i.e., 3 (three) days besides being neither willful nor wanton, this Court has no hesitation in coming to the conclusion that there is sufficient cause qua the appellant for not preferring this statutory appeal within the prescribed period of 30 (thirty) days. Be that as it may, the delay sought to be condoned is 3 (three) days which is well within the tolerance limit/cap qua two provisos to sub-section (5) of Section 21 of NIA Act.

[10] In the light of the narrative, discussion and dispositive reasoning set out supra, delay is condoned.

[11] Registry is directed to process the main appeal, assign a number, if objections stand removed and appeal is otherwise in order and list the matter.

[12] Ergo, sequitur is, delay is condoned. Captioned MC application is ordered as prayed for. There shall be no order as to costs.

JUDGE

CHIEF JUSTICE

Bipin