GAHC010215672026

undefined

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

Case No. : Bail Appln./3079/2026

MONDEEP CHANGMAI
SON OF RUDRESWAR CHANGMAI RESIDENT OF NEAR NAKHAT SAMBHAI
VILLAGE CHANGMAI GAON LENGERI NO 4 PO LENGERI BAZAR
DISTRICT DIBRUGARH ASSAM 786613

VERSUS

THE STATE OF ASSAM
REPRESENTED BY THE LEARNED PP, ASSAM

Advocate for the Petitioner : MR. C SHARMA, MR. SURAJIT DAS

Advocate for the Respondent : PP, ASSAM,

BEFORE
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ROBIN PHUKAN

ORDER

Date : 07.10.2026

Heard Mr. S. Das, learned counsel for the accused. Also heard Mr. P. Borthakur, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State respondent.

2. This petition, under Section 483, BNSS is preferred by accused, namely, Mondeep Changmai, who has been languishing in jail hazot, since 04.07.2026,

in connection with Tingkhong P.S. Case No. 48/2026, registered under Sections 10 and 13 of the Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act, 1967 and Section 308 of the BNS, 2023, for grant of bail.

3. It is to be noted here that the aforementioned case has been registered on the basis of an FIR lodged by one Rabindra Shah on 03.07.2026. The essence of allegation in the FIR dated 03.07.2026, is that on 01.07.2026, persons introducing themselves as members of ULFA, demanded money from the informant and also threatened him.

4. Mr. Das, learned counsel for the accused, submits that the accused was arrested on 04.07.2026, and since then he has been languishing in jail hazot. Mr. Das also submits that the mandatory period of detention herein this case is 90 days, which expired on 01.10.2026, and the same has not been extended by the learned Court below and no charge-sheet has been submitted till date, and therefore, the accused is entitled to default bail. Under such circumstances, he has contended to allow this petition.

5. While the matter was taken up in the first half of the day, Mr. Borthakur, learned Additional Public Prosecutor was directed to obtain instruction as to whether any extension of the period of detention has been made or not, and whether charge-sheet is submitted in the meantime or not. Then, at 2 p.m., while the matter is again taken up, Mr. Borthakur on instructions, has apprised this Court that no extension has been made and no charge-sheet has been filed till date.

6. In view of the above facts and circumstances, this Court is of the view that the accused is entitled to default bail.

7. Accordingly, it is provided that on furnishing a bond of Rs. 50,000/-, with

one surety of like amount, to the satisfaction of the learned Sessions Judge, Dibrugarh, the accused be enlarged on bail.

8. In terms of above, this bail application stands disposed of.

JUDGE

Comparing Assistant