



Serial No. 01
Supplementary List

HIGH COURT OF MEGHALAYA
AT SHILLONG

Crl.M.C. No. 22 of 2026

Date of Decision: 03.03.2026

Shri. Bhupen Rabha,
 S/o (L) Horkeshore Rabha,
 R/o Manikganj Village,
 P.S Mendipathar, North Garo Hills District,
 Meghalaya.

..... **Petitioner**

-Vs-

State of Meghalaya
 Through the Commissioner &
 Secretary to the Government of
 Meghalaya,
 Department of Home (Police),
 Civil Secretariat, Shillong.

..... **Respondent**

Coram:

Hon'ble Mr. Justice W. Diengdoh, Judge

Appearance:

For the Petitioner/Applicant(s) : Mr. S. Chanda, Legal Aid Counsel.

For the Respondent(s) : Mr. H. Abraham, GA.
 Mr. S. Sengupta, Addl. PP.

- | | | |
|-----|---|--------|
| i) | Whether approved for reporting in
Law journals etc.: | Yes/No |
| ii) | Whether approved for publication
in press: | Yes/No |



JUDGMENT AND ORDER (ORAL)

1. Heard Mr. S. Chanda, learned Legal Aid Counsel for the petitioner, who has submitted that an appeal has been preferred by the appellant, being aggrieved and dissatisfied by the judgment and order of conviction dated 20.10.2023 and related order of sentence dated 03.11.2023 passed by the Court of the learned Special Judge (POCSO), North Garo Hills District, Mendipathar in Special (POCSO) Case No. 22 of 2017 under Section 8 of the POCSO Act, 2012, wherein, he was directed to undergo simple imprisonment for a term of 3 years and 6 months along with fine of ₹ 10,000/- (Rupees ten thousand) only, and in default thereof, to undergo an additional simple imprisonment of 2 months.

2. However, because the petitioner is an indigent person with no support from his family members or relatives, therefore, legal aid was sought for, and accordingly, this application was processed through Legal Aid Counsel.

3. In the meantime, while preferring an appeal, a delay of 801 days has occurred, for which prayer is made that the delay be condoned and the appeal be admitted.

4. Mr. H. Abraham, learned GA along with Mr. S. Sengupta, learned Addl. PP appearing for the State respondent has no objection to the prayer made.



5. On consideration of the submission made, this Court is inclined to allow this application on being satisfied that the grounds cited for the delay contain sufficient cause. Accordingly, the delay of 801 days in preferring the appeal is hereby condoned.

6. Registry is directed to diarize the appeal and list it for admission after 1(one) week.

7. Misc. Case disposed of.

Judge