

**BEFORE
THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE T. NANDAKUMAR SINGH**

BA[SH]99/2013

29.07.2013

Heard Mr. P.K.Borah, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner.

As per the record, it is very clear that the charge-sheet had been filed against the petitioner. Filing of the charge-sheet against the petitioner is also indicated in the order of the Sessions Judge, Shillong dated 12-7-2013 passed in BA. No. 112/2013. A copy of the said order is available at page 20 to 22 to the present application for bail.

No doubt the accused can repeatedly file bail applications, but for filing subsequent bail application there should be developments after the rejection of the earlier bail. In the present application for bail, nothing is mentioned about the subsequent development after rejection of the bail filed by the accused vide order dated 12/7/2013.

In the above factual backdrop and also on perusal of the record, it appears that there is no material for granting pre-arrest bail to the petitioner. Petitioner is to seek for regular bail.

Accordingly, this application for anticipatory bail is rejected.

JUDGE

S. Rynjah