

IN THE HIGH COURT OF SIKKIM

ORDER SHEET

Crl. Rev. P.	No. 4	of 200 8
THUKCHUK LACHUNGPA		/ Appellant

Versus

STATE OF SIKKIM Respondent

Serial No. of Order	Date of Order	Order with Signature		Office Note as to action (if any) taken on Order
1.	19.08.2008	Present:	Mr. K.T. Bhutia, Mr. B.R. Pradhan and Mr. S.S. Hamal, Advocates for the Applicant.	•
			Mr. J.B. Pradhan, Public Prosecutor for the State.	
		This	is an application for revision under	
	Section 397 of the Code of Criminal Procedure			
	:	directed a	ŧ	
		Sessions Judge, East and North Sikkim at Gangtok on the 18 th of August, 2008. The said order is an order of cancellation of bail for violation of a		
condition of grant of bail.			of grant of bail.	
•		The	order itself is a reasoned one running	
		into sevei	ral pages and the facts are all set out	
	there.			
	. Basi	cally a case was started against the		
	contractor	, who is the accused and also the		
		petitioner	before this Court today, on account of a	·
		bridge co	llapse which took place at Ranipool on	•
*		29 th May,	2008.	



Order Order

Order with Signature

Office Note as to action (if any) taken on Order

The accused is both a contractor under whom the construction was going on and a former minister of the State.

Bail was granted from the very beginning and the conditions were varied and also new conditions were imposed from time to time.

The accused needed some medical treatment, since, on day of the collapse, he was himself injured, but the main reason the case has been filed against him is that four labourers died.

The accused had been allowed by an appropriate order to travel to Delhi for treatment and was then asked by another order not to enter Sikkim thereafter without permission. But even that condition was relaxed, and the only important condition which remained was that he should not visit the site where the incident had occurred.

This is the exact condition which he violated on the most important day.

The most important day was 25th July, 2008.

It was the most important day because a

Committee constituted by the topmost

administration of the State, i.e., the Governor

himself, was visiting the site with the suspended departmental engineers to make a report.



No. of of Grider

ij

Order with Signature

Office Note as to action (if any) taken on Order

A copy of the letter dated 23rd July, 2008 fixing the inspection was given to the accused for information.

The accused chose not to remain content with merely being informed, but went to the site on the day of inspection itself.

He participated fully apparently making statements also to the investigating committee.

On the 30th July, 2008 cancellation of bail was applied for by the State.

There is a letter dated 31st July, 2008, written to the accused, the day after the cancellation of the bail was applied for, (which is issued by the same person who wrote the earlier letter dated 23rd July, 2008 fixing the date 25th July, 2008), giving a wrong statement that the accused was asked to be present on the site. Why this letter should be written by the Additional Secretary on 31st July, 2008 to the accused himself, or why it should be flatly contradictory to his earlier letter of 23rd July, 2008 and also the bail condition, we do not know.

It is clear however, that the Court below has committed absolutely no irregularity. A very

important condition of the bail was violated on a



No. of of Order Order

Order with Signature

Office Note as to action (if any) taken on Order

very important day. If bail is not cancelled even thereafter then the condition might not have imposed at all in the very first place.

There being no apparent injustice or irregularity which needs immediate or any correction by this Court, the application is rejected.

(A. N. Ray, C.J.)

A Copy of order forwarded to Screens Judge (SFD) or 21-8 08 lugars