



Serial No. 08 Regular List

HIGH COURT OF MEGHALAYA
AT SHILLONG

AB. No. 3 of 2026

Date of Decision: 01.04.2026

Shri. Shaniahlang Suchen,
Son of Shri. Drik Mynthlu,
Resident of 46, Lakadong Ummat,
Ladrymbai, East Jaintia Hills District,
Meghalaya – 793160.

..... **Petitioner**

- Vs-

1. State of Meghalaya represented by its
Secretary, Home Police Department,
Govt. of Meghalaya, Shillong.
2. Officer-in-Charge,
Ladrymbai Police Outpost,
East Jaintia Hills District,
Meghalaya.
3. Officer-in-Charge,
Khliehriat Police Station,
East Jaintia Hills District,
Meghalaya.

..... **Respondents**

Coram:

Hon'ble Mr. Justice W. Diengdoh, Judge

Appearance:

For the Petitioner/Appellant(s) : Ms. Th. R. Fancon, Adv.
Mr. Th. Rakesh Singh, Adv.



Ms. M. Marak, Adv.

For the Respondent(s) : Mrs. N.G. Shylla, Sr. GA with
Mr. H. Abraham, GA

i)	Whether approved for reporting in Law journals etc.:	Yes/No
ii)	Whether approved for publication in press:	Yes/No

JUDGMENT AND ORDER (ORAL)

1. Heard Ms. Th. R. Fancon, learned counsel for the petitioner/accused, who has submitted that an FIR was lodged on 03.03.2026 before the Officer-in-Charge, Ladrymbai Police Outpost, Ladrymbai by one Shri. Dawanoo Rymbai, the contents of such information being that, on the said date, there was a spot inspection of a disputed land between two villages i.e. Lama Village and Lakadong Ummat Village in East Jaintia Hills District, wherein, the residents of both villages have gathered at the said place of inspection. In the midst of such inspection, it was alleged that the petitioner/accused along with others present were armed with firearms, and ultimately, had opened fire on the gathering, as a result of which, three villagers of Lama Village were seriously injured.

2. Accordingly, on receipt of such information, an FIR was filed and a case was registered being Khliehriat P.S. Case No. 104 of 2026 under Section 109 BNS, 2023.



3. The learned counsel has also submitted that the petitioner/accused was not present at the place of occurrence when the said incident had taken place that is on 03.03.2026, since he was attending to his ailing mother who was admitted in a critical condition at Nazareth Hospital, Shillong since 26.02.2026 and had expired at the said hospital on 12.03.2026.

4. During the period that his mother was at the Nazareth Hospital, the petitioner was lodged at Prakash Hotel, Laitumkhrah, Shillong since 01.03.2026 upto 04.03.2026. Copy of the bill issued by Prakash Hotel for the said period has been annexed in this petition as Annexure – 4. Therefore, he could not have been present at the place of occurrence on the said date, submits the learned counsel.

5. It is also the submission of the learned counsel that, because of the fact that he was said to be involved in the said incident, therefore, the police are on the lookout to arrest him, hence the apprehension of imminent arrest.

6. The learned counsel further submits that the petitioner/accused, being a daily wage labourer and the sole bread earner of the family, if in the event of his arrest, the family will be left with no source of income, apart from the fact that he has no previous criminal antecedent and also that he had appeared before the Investigating Officer during the period he was on interim bail.

7. He therefore submits that the petitioner/accused, if released on bail, will abide by any conditions that this Court may impose. It is also submitted that the petitioner/accused on interim bail being granted to him by this Court, as



directed, had appeared before the Investigating Officer on two occasions, and his statement was recorded.

8. Mrs. N.G. Shylla, learned Sr. GA assisted by Mr. H. Abraham, learned GA appearing for the State respondent has produced the status report dated 01.04.2026 filed by the Investigating Officer which is brought on record and marked as Annexure-X, and has fairly submitted that the report of the Investigating Officer, would confirm the fact that the petitioner/accused was indeed lodged at Prakash Hotel, Laitumkhrah, Shillong from 01.03.2026 to 04.03.2026, as such, he could not have been present at the place of occurrence on 03.03.2026. It is submitted that on the basis of such report, discretion is left to the Court to pass necessary orders.

9. On consideration of the submission made, since the petitioner/accused has been able to prove that he was not present at the place of occurrence on the said date of the incident, considering the fact that he is said to be named as an accused person in connection with the said incident, therefore, the apprehension of imminent arrest is well-founded. In view of the above, this Court is inclined to allow the prayer made.

10. Accordingly, in the event of his arrest, the petitioner/accused is directed to be released on bail on the following conditions:

- i) That he shall not abscond or tamper with the evidence or



witnesses;

- ii) That he shall attend court as and when called for;
- iii) That he shall not leave the jurisdiction of Meghalaya, except with due permission of the court concerned; and
- iv) That he shall bind himself on a personal bond of ₹ 30,000/- (Rupees thirty thousand) with one surety of like amount to the satisfaction of the Trial Court.

11. In view of the above, this petition is disposed of accordingly. No Costs.

Judge