GAHC010245812026

2026:GAU-AS:17351

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

Case No. : Bail Appln./3569/2026

RAMEN SAIKIA ALIAS JAAN SAIKIA
S/O- DHANESWAR SAIKIA R/O- H/NO.- 83, DHARMA SARMA PATH GOPINATH NAGAR, BIRUBARI, GUWAHATI, P.S.- PALTAN BAZAR DIST- KAMRUP(M), ASSAM

VERSUS

THE STATE OF ASSAM
REPRESENTED BY P.P., ASSAM

Advocate for the Petitioner : MR. M DASGUPTA, MR M RAHMAN,MD S ALI

Advocate for the Respondent : PP, ASSAM,

BEFORE
HONOURABLE MRS. JUSTICE SHAMIMA JAHAN

ORDER

Date : ***24.11.2026***

Heard Mr S Ali, learned counsel for the petitioner. Also heard Mr P Borthakur, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State of Assam.

2. By this application, the petitioner has prayed for bail in connection with CID PS Case No. 05/2026, under Sections 120(B)/420/468 as well as Section 471 of the IPC, 1860.

3. The FIR in connection with which the petitioner was arrested on 06.10.2026, was lodged by the Branch In-Charge of Canara Bank, stating *inter alia,* that four numbers of vehicle loans were sanctioned and disbursed by the said Bank on submission of fake documents. It was stated that one vehicle loan was disbursed in the name of the petitioner and on verification of the records that the petitioner had submitted fake quotation, fabricated RC copy as well as other documents.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the story narrated in the FIR is concocted and that the petitioner being unable to pay his installment, his account was declared as non-performing asset and thereafter, this case was lodged against him..

5. On the other hand, Mr P Borthakur, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State, on perusal of the Case Diary submits that even the authorized dealer of Mahindra and Mahindra Limited, Jorhat, had stated that the quotations were not given from his company and that there was no purchase made from his company by the petitioner. Mr Borthakur further submits that the petitioner is a habitual offender.

6. Upon consideration of the submissions made by the learned counsels for the parties and in view of the fact that the petitioner has been inside the jail for the last 48 days, and also due to the fact that no custodial interrogation would be required, this Court enlarges the petitioner on bail on furnishing a bail bond of Rs. 20,000/-, with one surety of the like amount to the satisfaction of the CJM, Kamrup (Metro), under the following conditions:-

i) the petitioner shall appear before the Investigating Officer/concerned Court as and when called for.

ii) the petitioner shall not hamper and tamper with the evidence of the case, and/or influence the witnesses; and

iii) the petitioner shall not leave his residence without prior permission of the Investigating Officer.

6. Bail Application stands disposed of.

7. Send back the Case Diary.

JUDGE

Comparing Assistant