GAHC010191642026

undefined

THE GAUHATI HIGH COURT
(HIGH COURT OF ASSAM, NAGALAND, MIZORAM AND ARUNACHAL PRADESH)

Case No. : Bail Appln./2642/2026

MANOSHI DAS AND ANR
W/O DEBAJIT DEURI, R/O VILL UTTAR DOLIJOLIA, PS DERGAON, DIST GOLAGHAT, ASSAM

2: SINTU RAY
S/O DHARMESWAR RAY
R/O VILL ABHAYAPURI
PS JOGIGHOPA
DIST BONGAIGAON
ASSA

VERSUS

THE STATE OF ASSAM
REPRESENTED BY THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR, ASSAM

Advocate for the Petitioner : MR D MEDHI, MR P SONOWAL

Advocate for the Respondent : PP, ASSAM,

BEFORE
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV KUMAR SHARMA

ORDER

Date : 17.09.2026

Heard Mr. D. Medhi, learned counsel for the petitioner. Also heard Mr. K.K. Das, learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the State.

2. This is an application under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023

whereby the petitioners, **1. Manoshi Das & 2. Sintu Ray,** have prayed for granting his bail after they were arrested on 25.08.2026 in connection with Hatigaon P.S. Case No.178/2026 under Sections 318(4)/316(2)/3(5) of BNS, 2023.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioners are not affair named accused persons and although it is stated in the forwarding report that they were apprehended by the informant with the assistance of local persons while they were allegedly approaching the informant for collection of further money in connection with the instant transaction, that aspect of the matter has not been mentioned in the FIR which was lodged on 26/08/2026, i.e., after the apprehension of the petitioners.

4. It is submitted that the petitioners are no way involved in the alleged offence and having regard to the period of detention, the prayer for bail may be considered.

5. Per-contra learned Additional PP submits that the main FIR named accused Sunil Das is absconding and CDR analysis reveals the connection between the said Sunil Das and the petitioners. Although the date of registration is mentioned as 26/08/2026, in the format of the FIR, it was actually lodged on 23/08/2026 before apprehension of the petitioner which date is available on the body of the FIR and therefore, the fact of apprehension of the petitioners was not mentioned by the informant, which took place on 26/08/2026.

6. A perusal of the CD clearly reveals that the petitioners were apprehended by the informant and local people on 26/08/2026 in front of Rajdhani Majid, Hatigaon and prior information about the approach of the petitioners was given to the police and there appears to be sufficient incriminating material against the petitioners and the offence also is of a serious nature wherein, an innocent person was allegedly duped of Rs. 4 lakhs.

7. Having regard to the above, the prayer for bail is rejected at this stage.

Send back the CD

JUDGE

Comparing Assistant