GAHC010216902026

2026:GAU-AS:16701

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

Case No. : AB/2481/2026

RAJU AHMED
SON OF HANIF UDDIN RESIDENT OF VILLAGE DHOLAGOSA P O RANGAPANI P S MERERCHAR POLICE STATION DISTRICT BONGAIGAON ASSAM PIN 783384

VERSUS

THE STATE OF ASSAM
REPRESENTED BY THE PP, ASSAM

Advocate for the Petitioner : MR G CHAMUAH, MR. D GOGOI

Advocate for the Respondent : PP, ASSAM,

BEFORE
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANJAN MONI KALITA

ORDER

Date : 13.11.2026

Heard Mr. G. Chamuah, learned counsel for the petitioner. Also heard Mr. P.S. Lahkar, learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the State.

2. This is an application filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023, praying for

granting pre-arrest bail to the accused-applicant Raju Ahmed, in connection with Kalgachia P.S. Case No. 46/2026 under Sections 61(2)/318(4)/319(2)/316(2)/3(5) of the BNS read with Section 14 of the Assam Games and Betting Act, 1960.

3. An FIR was lodged by one Jitul Das, S.I. Kalgachia Police Station on 07.05.2026 to the effect that on receipt of secret information, police conducted a search operation at the residential house of the accused person and during the course of search, one Masud Zinnul Ahmed was apprehended and several debit cards and mobile phones were recovered from his possession. During his interrogation, he led the police team to Chenimari to a shop located there and after conducting search in the shop, several mobile phones were recovered and seized. Thereafter, police proceeded to the residence of Raju Ahmed and recovered 45 nos. of mobile phones; 41 nos. of Visa Credit Cards; RuPay debit cards, check books of different banks and cash of Rs.3 lakhs as well as one Pulsar bike from the house of the aforesaid Raju Ahmed.

4. It is seen that prior to filing of the instant application, the accused applicant approached this Court by filing AB No. 1320/2026, which was rejected by a Coordinate Bench of this Court after consideration of the case diary.

5. The learned counsel for the applicant submits that the accused applicant is a shop owner dealing with mobile phones therefore, several mobile phones have been recovered from his place, as well as, credit cards were used to purchase mobile phones and there is nothing surprising that several credit cards were recovered from his house.

6. He submits that he is ready to cooperate with the investigation and other co-accused persons have already been granted bail by this Court.

7. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor on the other hand opposes the

prayer for pre-arrest bail of the accused applicant.

8. This Court has gone through the materials available in the case diary and also considered the submissions made by the learned counsel appearing for the accused applicant.

9. Taking into account the entire facts of the case and having found sufficient *prima facie* incriminating materials against the accused applicant, this Court is not inclined to grant any relief to the accused applicant at this stage.

10. Accordingly, the anticipatory bail application stands rejected and dismissed.

JUDGE

Comparing Assistant