GAHC010211272026

2026:GAU-AS:15517

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

Case No. : Bail Appln./3060/2026

MUKLESUR REJA
SON OF ABU MUKARIM, RESIDENT OF VILLAGENAYAGAON, JHOWDANGA PART-II, POST OFFICEJHOWDANGA, POLICE STATION-MANKACHAR, DISTRICT- SOUTH SALMARA MANKACHAR, ASSAM.

VERSUS

THE STATE OF ASSAM
REPRESENTED BY THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR, ASSAM

Advocate for the Petitioner : MR. M AHMED, MS A KHATUN,MR A HAI

Advocate for the Respondent : PP, ASSAM,

BEFORE
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANJAN MONI KALITA

ORDER

Date : 13.10.2026

Heard Mr. M. Ahmed, learned counsel, appearing on behalf of the accused-applicant. Also heard Mr. K.K. Parasar, learned Addl. P.P., representing the State respondent.

2. This is an application filed under Section 483 of the BNSS, 2023, praying for

grant of bail to the accused-applicant in connection with Bhangagarh P.S. Case No. 413/2021, registered under Section 420 of IPC, read with Section 66(C)/66(D) of the IT Act, 2000, with added Sections 419/468/471 of the IPC, 1860.

3. The gist of the case is that on 22.07.2021, an FIR was lodged before the Officer-in-Charge of Bhangagarh Police Station, alleging, *inter alia*, that Rs. 40, 00,000/- (Forty Lakhs) was withdrawn from the informant's account without his knowledge and permission. The informant also stated that an amount of Rs. 7,33,000/- (Seven Lakh Thirty Three Thousand) was sanctioned as loan, though he never applied for the same.

4. During the course of investigation, Sections 419/468/471 of the IPC, 1860, were added.

5. On receipt of the FIR, police registered Bhangagarh P.S. Case No. 413/2021, under the aforementioned Sections, including the added Sections.

6. The accused-applicant was arrested during the course of investigation on 25.06.2026, and since then he is behind bars.

7. The learned counsel appearing for the accused-applicant submits that the accused-applicant has already spent 44 days behind bars, and the allegations are of the year 2021, and he is not involved in any kind of cyber offence as has been alleged in the FIR. Accordingly, he prays for the release of the accused-applicant, taking into account the long detention behind bars.

8. The learned Addl. PP, on the other hand, opposes the prayer for bail of the accused-applicant at this stage.

9. This Court has considered the submissions made by the counsel appearing for the parties, as well as perused the Case Diary.

10. Having found sufficient *prima facie* incriminating materials against the accused-applicant, and taking into account that money has been withdrawn from the account of the informant by forging his signature, which has been revealed in the FSL report, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the accused-applicant at this stage. Accordingly, the instant bail application stands dismissed as rejected.

JUDGE

Miriam Degu
(SPA)