

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF MANIPUR
AT IMPHAL**

CRL. A. No. 25 of 2025

The State of Manipur represented by the Joint Secretary (Home), Government of Manipur, Manipur Secretariat, Babupara, Imphal West District, Manipur.

... Appellant

- Versus -

Yumlembam Romesh Singh @ Ratan, aged about 45 years, S/o Y. Kaka Singh, a resident of Sugnu Mayai Leikai, P.S. Sugnu, Thoubal District, Manipur.

... Respondent

B E F O R E

**HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE MR. M. SUNDAR
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AHANTHEM BIMOL SINGH**

For the appellant	:	Ms. Ch. Sundari, Additional Public Prosecutor
For the respondent	:	Ms. L. Sarita Devi, Advocate
Date of Judgment & Order	:	02.06.2026

**JUDGMENT & ORDER
(ORAL)**

[M. Sundar, CJ]

[1] Captioned 'Criminal Appeal' ('Crl. A.' for the sake of brevity) is a statutory appeal under Section 21 of 'National Investigation Agency Act, 2008 (34 of 2008)' [hereinafter referred to as 'NIA Act' for the sake of brevity].

[2] Nucleus of captioned appeal is FIR case No. 6(3)2025 Kumbi P.S. u/s 20 UA(P) Act & 25(1-C) A. Act and Cril. Misc. (B) Case No. 92 of 2025 on the file of Court of Special Judge (NIA), Bishnupur, Manipur. This case shall be referred to as 'said NIA case' and the Court concerned shall be referred to as 'said NIA Court' both for the sake of brevity, convenience and clarity.

[3] The sole respondent in the captioned appeal is 'Accused No. 2' ('A-2' for the sake of convenience) in the said NIA case.

[4] On facts, it will suffice to write that A-2 applied for bail in said NIA Court (obviously in said NIA case) vide Cril. Misc. (B) Case No. 92 of 2025. In and vide order dated 23.05.2025, said NIA Court after hearing both sides and after full contest granted bail and imposed certain bail conditions. This 23.05.2025 order of said NIA Court granting bail to A-2 (sole respondent in captioned Cril. A.) shall be referred to as 'impugned order' for the sake of brevity, convenience and clarity. State has filed captioned statutory appeal assailing this impugned order. Owing to the trajectory the captioned appeal has taken today in the hearing (about which there will be allusion elsewhere infra in this order) it is not necessary to be detained further by facts. To put it differently, it is not necessary to dilate more on facts.

[5] Ms. Ch. Sundari, learned Addl. PP (Additional Public Prosecutor), High Court of Manipur is in the Physical Court and Ms. L. Sarita Devi, learned counsel for sole respondent (A-2) is before this Court on the Video Conferencing (VC) platform.

[6] Captioned main Crl. A. was taken up and heard out with the consent of aforementioned learned Addl. PP for appellant and learned counsel for lone respondent.

[7] At the outset, though the learned State counsel for appellant has first right of audience, it is imperative to capture the submission of learned counsel for respondent. Learned counsel for respondent (A-2 in the said NIA case) submits that the respondent has complied with all bail conditions qua impugned order and is continuing to do so. It is further submitted by learned counsel for respondent that respondent (A-2) is cooperating with State for smooth conduct of investigation.

[8] To be noted, the impugned order was made more than 1 (one) year ago (on 23.05.2025 to be precise).

[9] Be that as it may, learned State counsel i.e., learned Addl. PP for appellant Ms. Ch. Sundari very fairly submitted that it is true and correct that there is nothing to demonstrate that respondent (A-2) is not cooperating qua smooth conduct of investigation after

complying with all bail conditions imposed by impugned order and therefore there would be no difficulty in he remaining enlarged on bail as long as he continues to extend cooperation for investigation.

[10] In the light of the afore-referred position, there is no disputation or contestation in the captioned Crl. A. The fair submission of learned Addl. PP for appellant i.e., learned Addl. PP for appellant that the bail order (impugned order) can continue subject to respondent extending cooperation for investigation is recorded. Learned State counsel makes a further request that all questions raised by State in the captioned Crl. A. may please be left open for being canvassed in another matter if need arises. Learned counsel for State submits that A-2 (respondent) can remain enlarged on bail but requests that it may be made clear that it would be open to State to seek cancellation of bail qua respondent (A-2) if the need arises/if there are change of circumstances.

[11] The above scenario makes the task of making a closure order in captioned Crl.A. at hand fairly simple.

[12] The sequitur is, captioned appeal is disposed of as closed vide instant consent order, refraining from legal drill of testing the impugned order on merits. To put it differently, the impugned order i.e., order 23.05.2025 made in Criminal Misc. (B) Case No. 92 of 2025

on the file of Court of learned Special Judge (NIA), Bishnupur, Manipur is confirmed by consent {without testing it on merits} albeit (a) leaving open all questions raised by State as well as the respondent in the captioned criminal appeal for being canvassed in another matter if need arises and (b) leaving open the right of State to seek cancellation of bail vide impugned order if the need arises/if there is change of circumstances and preserving the rights of respondent to resist the same (if such a scenario unfurls).

[13] Captioned criminal appeal is disposed of as closed in the aforesaid manner affirming the impugned bail order (albeit with afore referred preservation of rights of both sides and observations set out supra), vide instant consent order. There shall be no order as to costs.

	JUDGE	CHIEF JUSTICE
FR/NFR		

Bipin

P.S. I : Upload forthwith.

P.S. II : All concerned will stand bound by web copy uploaded in High Court website inter alia as the same is QR coded.