

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

**AB No. 38 of 2025 with
Crl. M.C. No. 46 of 2025**

Thangjam Bangkimchandra Meitei

... Petitioner

- Versus -

Officer in Charge, Sagolmang Police Station

... Respondent

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

ORDER

18.02.2026

[1] Heard Mr. N. Ibotombi, learned sr. counsel assisted by Ms. Y. Jinita, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr. H. Samarjit, learned PP assisted by Mr. Y. Robert, learned Dy. GA for the State respondent.

[2] The petitioner who is a police personnel approached the Court of Ld. Spl. Judge (NIA), Imphal East by way of Cril. Misc. (AB) No. 47 of 2025 in connection with FIR No. 30 (09) 2025 SMG-PS under Sections 190/132/262/263/324(5) BNS (r/w u/s 25(1A)/(1C) Arms Act & 17/20 UA(P) Act. Even though, the petitioner was not named in the FIR, he apprehended his arrest. Vide order dated 03.10.2025 in Cril. Misc. (AB) No. 195 of 2025, the Ld. Addl. Sessions Judge, Manipur East (FTC) gave interim protection to the petitioner. However, vide impugned order dated 12.11.2025 in Cril. Misc. (AB) No. 47 of 2025, the anticipatory bail application was rejected, mainly on the ground that the petitioner who is a police constable, participated in vandalizing police vehicles. It was also observed that in the said impugned order that the provision of UA(P) Act may not be attracted against the petitioner. Aggrieved by the same, the petitioner approached this Court by way of the present application being AB No. 38 of 2025 and vide order dated 14.11.2025, this Court granted interim protection to the petitioner and the relevant para is reproduced below:

"[10] Considering the facts of the case that the petitioner is a policeman and was on interim bail before the Trial Court, in the circumstances, in case of arrest, the petitioner be released on interim bail during the pendency of the present application by furnishing PR bond of Rs. 50,000/- (Rupees fifty thousand) with a surety like amount (one Govt. Employee) to the satisfaction of the Investigating Officer (I.O.) subject to the following conditions:

- a) The petitioner shall co-operate with the investigation.*
- b) The petitioner shall not tamper with the evidence or influence witnesses.*
- c) The petitioner shall not leave Manipur without permission of this Court.*
- d) On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the respondent is entitled to take appropriate action against the petitioner in accordance with law."*

[3] Mr. N. Ibotombi, learned sr. counsel for the petitioner submits that in the original complaint dated 30.09.2025 and also subsequent report submitted by one Mr. Sidrath Thokchom, ASI of Special Commando Unit, Khabeisoi on 30.09.2025 which was merged in the FIR, the name and the role of the petitioner was not specifically mentioned. However, the petitioner admitted that he was present at the spot as the alleged incidence of vandalizing police vehicles by mob and snatching of the arrested persons were occurred in his locality. It is also submitted that during the pendency of the anticipatory bail before the Ld. Spl. Court, the petitioner appeared before the I.O. on 06.11.2025 and admitted his presence.

[4] The learned sr. counsel for the petitioner also refers to the objection filed by the State respondent where, one of the witness has stated that the petitioner and other members in the mob intervened and handed over certain documents from damaged vehicles to the police.

[5] The learned sr. counsel for the petitioner submits that the 2(two) accused who were alleged to be members of an underground organization were arrested by the police. Vide order dated 10.10.2025 passed by the Ld. Spl. Judge, Imphal East in the said FIR, these 2(two) persons belonging to an underground organization were released on regular bail. Seeking parity, it is prayed that the petitioner who is a police personnel and co-operating with the investigation may be protected and the interim order granted by this Court is made absolute on the same conditions.

[6] On the other hand, the learned PP submits that the petitioner who is a police personnel has participated in the mob in vandalizing police vehicles and the same is not totally expected from policeman. The learned PP also submitted that the presence of the petitioner is confirming by one of his batch mate as recorded in 'para-8' of the objection filed by the State respondent and it is submitted that the bail application may be rejected.

[7] This Court has considered the materials on record and submissions made at the bar. In the present case, the petitioner has admitted his presence at the spot when the mob was snatching the persons arrested by the police and the mob vandalized 2(two) police vehicles.

[8] On perusal of the materials on record, the allegation against the petitioner is for participating in vandalizing of the police vehicles, even though the provision of UA(P) Act are also invoked in the FIR. In the objection filed by the State respondent, it is double verified that the presence of the petitioner at the spot and his participation in the mob. In 'para-14', it is also recorded that the petitioner and some other persons also intervened the mob and the petitioner was accused by the mob for the same.

[9] This Court is of the view that with the nature of allegation against the petitioner who is a police personnel and even if, he has admitted presence in the mob, there is some statement about his effort to intervene the mob. On the other hand, 2(two) members of the underground organization arrested by the police in the same FIR were released on regular bail by the Ld. Spl. Judge (NIA), Imphal East.

[10] In the circumstances, the bail application is allowed and interim order dated 14.11.2025 is made absolute on the same conditions.

[11] With these observations, the AB No. 38 of 2025 & Crl. M.C. No. 46 of 2025 are disposed of.

JUDGE

Thoiba

KABORAMB
AM LARSON

Digitally signed by
KABORAMBAM LARSON
Date: 2026.02.19
16:59:53 +05'30'