GAHC040007142026

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

Case No. : AB/49/2026

Jumdo Karbak
Son of Lijum Karbak, resident of IG Park Colony, Itanagar, Papum Pare District, Arunachal Pradesh.

VERSUS

The State of AP
represented by the PP of AP

Advocate for the Petitioner : Idak Bam, Punyo Harming,Bate Joel Koyu,Mitem Ratan,Jumge Karbak

Advocate for the Respondent : P P of AP,

BEFORE
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MITALI THAKURIA

ORDER

01-06-2026

Heard Mr. I. Bam, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr. D. Loyi, learned Addl. PP for the State respondent.

2. This is an application filed under Section 482 BNSS, 2023, praying for grant of pre arrest bail to the petitioner, namely, **Shri Jumdo Karbak** who is apprehending arrest in connection with Papu Hills P.S. Case No. 27/2026 registered

under Sections 336(3)/335/338/340(2)/318(4)/329(3)/3(5) of BNS, 2023.

3. Case diary received. Perused the same.

4. It is submitted by Mr. Bam, learned counsel that after obtaining the order of interim pre-arrest bail on 19.05.2026, the petitioner appeared before the I.O., cooperated in the investigation and his statement was also recorded by the I.O.

5. He further submitted that prior to recording of his statement by the I.O., he appeared on two occasions before the Police Station and had cooperated in the investigation of the case.

6. Mr. Bam, learned counsel further submitted that the present accused petitioner is no way connected with the alleged offence and he had issued the land possession certificate only in presence of the witnesses and the owner of the land as per his official capacity. That apart he had not committed any such offence, as alleged in the FIR. It is the husband of the informant, who gifted the land in the name of other two persons and everything was done in the official capacity.

7. However, the petitioner is still ready and willing to extend his cooperation in the further investigation of the case, if he is granted with the privilege of pre-arrest bail.

8. Mr. Loyi, learned APP submitted that the petitioner had already appeared before the I.O., cooperated in the investigation of the case. He also submitted that there is no dispute regarding the ownership of the land. Further from the statement in the case diary it is seen that he issued the land possession certificate only in presence of witnesses by complying all the official procedure.

9. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the parties and also considering the materials in the case diary and also considering the fact that the petitioner cooperated in the investigation of the case, this Court is of the

opinion that custodial interrogation of the petitioner may not be required for the purpose of investigation of the case.

10. In view of above, the order of interim pre-arrest bail granted to the petitioner vide order dated 19.05.2026 is hereby made absolute on the same terms and conditions.

11. Accordingly, this pre-arrest bail application stands disposed of.

12. Return the case diary.

JUDGE

Comparing Assistant