

**AB. No. 151 of 2013**

**27.11.2013**

**HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE**

Shri S.P.Mahanta, Advocate, present for the applicant (accused).

Shri K.Khan, Addl. Sr. Govt. Advocate, present for the State respondents.

Learned counsel for the applicant (accused) prays for and is allowed to withdraw this application.

Accordingly, this Anticipatory Bail Application is dismissed as withdrawn.

**CHIEF JUSTICE**

S.Rynjah

**CRL.M.C. No. 63 of 2013**  
**in CRL.Rev.P. No.67 of 2013**

**27.11.2013**

**HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE**

In view of the order passed in CRL.Rev.P. No. 67 of 2013, this Misc. Case also stands disposed of.

**CHIEF JUSTICE**

S.Rynjah

**CRL.REV.P. No. 67 of 2013****27.11.2013****HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE**

Shri. K.Paul, Advocate, present for the revisionist.

Shri N.D.Chullai, Sr. Govt. Advocate, present for the respondents.

Heard.

This revision is directed against the order dated 24-10-2013 passed by learned Addl. Deputy Commissioner/ Addl. Sessions Judge, Shillong whereby the application for Anticipatory Bail moved under Section 438 CrPC is rejected.

It appears that the revisionist is named as accused in connection with Laban P.S.Case No. 81(9) 2013 relating to offences punishable under Sections 406/420 IPC. There are allegations of cheating against him by the informants, to the tune of almost Rs. 20 lakhs. It appears that the revisionist sought Anticipatory Bail from the Court of Sessions on which as an ad-interim measure, he was granted interim bail on 1-10-2013 whereafter the next date was fixed i.e. 15-10-2013, and thereafter 24-10-2013 was the last date fixed.

On 24-10-2013, at the time of hearing, the Investigating Officer brought this fact to the notice of the lower Court that the accused (present revisionist) failed to appear before him for further investigation. It was also reported that the accused (present revisionist) keeps his mobile phone switched off. It is also reported by the Investigating Officer that when he visited the house of the petitioner, he was not found there.

Learned counsel for the revisionist has submitted that the revisionist was suffering from illness. However, he has no explanation as to why he kept his mobile phone switched off, and it is not his case that he remained hospitalized.

In the above circumstances, this Court finds no illegality in the order passed by the Court of Sessions rejecting the application for extension of his interim bail, and rejection of the Application for Anticipatory Bail.

Accordingly, this revision is dismissed summarily with the observation that if the revisionist, Dr. Suryajeet Kapoor surrenders before the Court concerned his Bail Application may be disposed of without unreasonable delay.

(Prafulla C.Pant)  
**CHIEF JUSTICE**

S.Rynjah