GAHC010207032026

2026:GAU-AS:14811

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

Case No. : AB/2358/2026

ANIKET SOVASARIA
S/O- LATE RADHESHYAM SOVASARIA, R/O- FLAT NO. 2D, ROYAL PLAZA, BASISTHAPUR, NEAR BSNL OFFICE, GUWAHATI, P.S. DISPUR, DISTRICT KAMRUP M, ASSAM, PIN 781028.

VERSUS

THE STATE OF ASSAM
REPRESENTED BY P. P. ASSAM.

Advocate for the Petitioner : MR A RASHID, MS S PARVEEN

Advocate for the Respondent : PP, ASSAM,

BEFORE
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ROBIN PHUKAN

ORDER

05.10.2026

Heard Mr. A. Roshid, learned counsel for the applicant and Mr. P. Borthakur, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State respondent.

2. Apprehending arrest in connection with Tinsukia PS Case No. 168/2026, under Sections 61(2)/308(2)/308(7)/318(2)/351(2)/3(5) of the BNS, this application,

under Section 482 of the BNSS, is preferred by the applicant, namely, Aniket Sovasaria, for grant of pre-arrest bail.

3. It is to be noted here that the aforementioned case has been registered on the basis of an FIR lodged by one Pankaj Sharma, on 18.07.2026.

3.1. The essence of allegation in the FIR, dated 18.07.2026, is that the informant was deceived by Satyajit Bora, Girish Bora, broker Nijam Hussain and his associates through a well planned conspiracy and they had dishonestly induced him to part with his money on the false promise of arranging finance for his tea factory, and also compelled him to transfer substantial amount to various bank accounts, under different false pretexts.

4. Mr. Roshid, learned counsel for the applicant, submits that the present applicant is innocent and no way involved with the offence alleged in the FIR and that some of the co-accused have already been granted the privilege of pre-arrest bail by this Court, vide order dated 29.09.2026, in AB No. 1775/2026. Mr. Roshid further submits that the applicant is ready to cooperate with the investigating agency and therefore, he has contended to allow this petition.

5. Per-contra, Mr. Borthakur, learned Additional Public Prosecutor, producing the case diary before this Court, submits that the IO has collected sufficient incriminating materials against the applicant and that he has received a sum of Rs. 10,000/-. Mr. Borthakur further submits that some of the co-accused are still absconding and if the present applicant is enlarged on pre-arrest bail, at this stage, it will hamper the investigation and therefore, he has contended to dismiss this petition.

6. Having heard the submission of learned Advocates of both sides, this Court has carefully gone through the petition as well as the documents placed on record and also perused the case diary with the assistance of learned Additional Public

Prosecutor.

7. Though some of the co-accused have been enlarged on pre-arrest bail by this Court, vide order dated 29.09.2026, in AB No. 1775/2026, yet it appears that the IO has collected sufficient incriminating materials against the present applicant. It also appears that he has received Rs. 10,000/- through UPI from the account of the informant. And as such, it cannot be said that custodial interrogation of the applicant is not required in the interest of investigation.

8. Therefore, this Court is of the view that this is not a fit case where the privilege of pre-arrest bail can be extended to the applicant and therefore, the same is dismissed.

9. Case diary be returned.

JUDGE

Comparing Assistant