GAHC010242362026

undefined

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

Case No. : AB/2772/2026

IMRAN SIDDIK LASKAR
SON OF JIAB UDDIN LASKAR, RESIDENT OF VILLAGE ALOICHERRA PART-III, P.O. AND P.S. KATLICHERRA, DISTRICT HAILAKANDI, ASSAM.

VERSUS

THE STATE OF ASSAM
REPRESENTED BY THE LEARNED PUBLIC PROSECUTOR, ASSAM.

Advocate for the Petitioner : MR M J QUADIR, MR. A K HANNAN

Advocate for the Respondent : PP, ASSAM, MS D DUTTA(INFORMANT),MR. H A LASKAR(INFORMANT),MR. S B LASKAR(INFORMANT)

BEFORE
HONOURABLE MRS. JUSTICE SHAMIMA JAHAN

ORDER

12.11.2026

1. Heard Mr. M.J. Quadir, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner. Also heard Ms. A. Begum, learned APP appearing for the State of Assam and Mr. H.A. Laskar, learned counsel appearing for the informant.

2. By this application the petitioner has prayed for pre-arrest bail in

connection with Katlicherra Police Station Case No. 108/2026 registered under Sections 190/191(3)/332(b)/118(2)/109(1) of the BNS, 2023.

3. The FIR in connection with which the petitioner is apprehending arrest was lodged by the brothers of the victim stating *inter alia* that on 11.09.2026 at around 7:30 p.m. when the victim went to the shop of one Sabbir Hussain the petitioner informed the other accused persons named in the FIR over the phone about the victim's presence at the said location. It is further alleged that thereafter the other accused persons arrived at the place of occurrence and assaulted the victim with lethal weapons causing him severe injuries.

4. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the petitioner neither assaulted the victim nor informed the other accused persons about the victim's presence at the said location. He further submits that the allegation is not believable, as there is nothing to indicate how the informant could have known that the petitioner had informed the other accused persons over the phone. He also submits that had the victim knew that the petitioner had informed the other accused persons about his presence, he would have fled from the place of occurrence.

5. Ms. A. Begum, learned APP upon perusal of the case diary submits that the victim had sustained grievous injuries and that in his statement, he specifically stated that it was the petitioner who had informed the other accused persons about his presence. She further submits that after the other accused persons entered the shop, the petitioner closed the shutter of the shop.

6. The learned counsel appearing for the informant has also supported the submissions made by the learned APP.

7. Upon consideration of the submissions made by the learned counsel for the parties, more so in view of the fact that the victim being the best witness to the occurrence has specifically stated that it was the petitioner who had informed the other accused persons who thereafter arrived at the place of occurrence and assaulted him causing him severe injuries, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on pre-arrest bail at this stage.

8. Accordingly, the petition stands dismissed.

JUDGE

Comparing Assistant