

GAHC040003802025



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

Case No. : AB/31/2025

Smti Yana Rangmo
Wife of Shri Tabing Lamgu,
resident of Upper Nyorch,
Yupia,
PO and PS Doimukh,
Papum Pare District,
Arunachal Pradesh.

VERSUS

The State of AP
represented by the PP of AP

Advocate for the Petitioner : Muk Pertin, Senior Advocate, Takom Pabin, Mukbang Pertin, Dakjum Riba, Tshering Yangzom Bhutia, Mukbom Pertin, Rimo Riba, Karyom Dabi

Advocate for the Respondent : P P of AP,

BEFORE
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PARTHIVJYOTI SAIKIA

ORDER

Date : 17.03.2025

Heard the learned senior counsel, Mr. Muk Pertin, assisted by Mr. Mukbang Pertin, learned counsel for the petitioner. I have also heard Ms. T. Jini, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State of Arunachal Pradesh and Mr. A.

Tiwari, learned counsel for the informant/respondent No. 2.

2. This is an application filed under Section 482 of the BNNS, 2023 praying for grant of pre-arrest bail to the accused person, namely, **Shri Tabing Lamgu**, in connection with Chayangtajo P. S. Case No. 06/2023 under Sections 103(2)/238(a)/61(2) of the BNS, 2023.

3. The accused person has been accused of committing offences like murder, causing disappearance of evidence and of criminal conspiracy. As the earlier bail application filed by the accused person was rejected by this Court, the accused person approached the Hon'ble Supreme Court vide Special Leave Appeal (Crl.) No. 2761-2762/2025. The Hon'ble Supreme Court dismissed the said SLP on the ground that there was no ground for granting pre-arrest bail. Thereafter, the present bail application has been filed by the wife of the accused person, on the ground that the accused person is undergoing treatment at Medanta Hospital, New Delhi for treatment of Non-Reconstructable Peripheral Artery Disease.

4. Ms. T. Jini, learned Additional Public Prosecutor has pointed out that the proclamation order has already been issued against the accused person.

5. Mr. A. Tiwari, learned counsel appearing for the informant has also pointed out that unless the proclamation order is cancelled, the bail application cannot be considered.

6. I have considered the submissions made by the learned counsel for both the sides.

7. The accused person is named as an accused in the FIR. Since the Hon'ble Supreme Court has rejected the bail application of the accused person, this Court is not supposed to consider the bail application for the sake of judicial propriety. Therefore, the present bail application is found to be devoid of merit

and stands dismissed, accordingly.

JUDGE

Comparing Assistant