GAHC010210552026

2026:GAU-AS:15041

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

Case No. : Bail Appln./2936/2026

MD ROFIKUL ISLAM
S/O MOBARAK ALI, R/O NO 1 TUPAMARI, P.S.NAGARBERA, DIST. KAMRUP, ASSAM.

VERSUS

THE STATE OF ASSAM
REP BY THE PP, ASSAM

Advocate for the Petitioner : MR. A PARAMANIK, P. KALITA

Advocate for the Respondent : PP, ASSAM,

BEFORE
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANJAN MONI KALITA

ORDER

Date : 07.10.2026

Heard Mr. A. Paramanik, learned counsel appearing for the accused-applicant. Also heard Mr. M.P. Goswami, learned Addl. P.P., representing the State respondent.

2. This is an application filed under Section 483 of the BNSS, 2023, praying for granting bail to the accused-applicant in connection with Nagarbera P.S. Case No.

65/2026, registered under Sections 318(4)/336(3)/340(2) of BNS, 2023, read with Section 9(1) of the Promotion & Regulation of Online Gaming Act, 2025.

3. The facts of the case, in brief, is that the police recovered huge numbers of gaming chips as well as mobile phones containing substantial evidence of involvement in gaming, and transactions of money, whereby huge amount of money, to the tune of Rs. 23,87,499/- has been shown as balance in the account. It is also alleged that several other people are involved in the gaming activities. During the search, police recovered 63 passbooks belonging to different persons of different banks from the centre belonging to the accused-applicant.

4. On the basis of the FIR, police registered Nagarbera P.S. Case No. 65/2026, under the aforementioned sections.

5. The learned counsel appearing for the accused-applicant submits that the accused-applicant is a Customer Service Provider and, therefore, he possesses all the aforesaid chips, and he is not involved in any kind of gaming activities. Therefore, he prays that the accused-applicant should be granted bail in this case, since he has been behind the bars for 22 days.

6. Mr. M.P. Goswami, learned Additional Public Prosecutor, on the other hand, opposes the prayer for bail.

7. Case Diary in the instant case has been received, and the same is perused.

8. On perusal of the Case Diary and considering the nature of the allegations made in the FIR, and also the fact that the investigation is yet to be completed, this Court is not inclined to grant any relief to the accused-applicant.

9. Accordingly, the instant bail application stands rejected.

JUDGE

Miriam Degu
(SPA)