



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK

BLAPL No. 1714 of 2024, BLAPL No. 4272 of 2024, BLAPL No. 4381 of 2024, BLAPL No. 4383 of 2024 and BLAPL No. 4662 of 2024

Applications under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973

BLAPL No. 1714 of 2024

Bhim *Petitioner*
-versus-

State of Odisha *Opp. Party*

For Petitioner : Mr. Vikas Singh Basta,
Advocate

For Opp. Party : Mr. S.S. Mohapatra, ASC and
Mr. J.P.Patra ASC

BLAPL No. 4272 of 2024

Yogendra Singh *Petitioner*
-versus-

State of Odisha *Opp. Party*

For Petitioner : Mr. Prabhu Prasanna Behera,
Advocate

For Opp. Party : Mr. J.P.Patra, ASC and
Mr. G.N. Rout, ASC

BLAPL No. 4381 of 2024

Ashish Kumar *Petitioner*
-versus-

State of Odisha *Opp. Party*



For Petitioner : Mr. Haripad Mohanty,
Advocate

For Opp. Party : Ms. Samapika Mishra, ASC
and Mr. J.P.Patra ASC

BLAPL No. 4383 of 2024

Tej Kumar *Petitioner*
-versus-

State of Odisha *Opp. Party*

For Petitioner : Mr. Haripad Mohanty,
Advocate

For Opp. Party : Ms. Samapika Mishra, ASC
and Mr. J.P. Patra ASC

BLAPL No. 4662 of 2024

Raghu Anand *Petitioner*
-versus-

State of Odisha *Opp. Party*

For Petitioner : Mr. Sukumar Gourab,
Advocate

For Opp. Party : Ms. Samapika Mishra, ASC
and Mr. J.P. Patra ASC

**CORAM:
HONOURABLE MISS JUSTICE SAVITRI RATHO**

**JUDGMENT
05.03.2025**

Savitri Ratho, J. All these applications under Section 439 of Cr.P.C. have been



filed for grant of bail to the petitioners in connection with Cyber Crime P.S. Case No. 21 of 2023 corresponding to C.T. Case No. 1630 of 2023 in the Court of the learned S.D.J.M., Bhubaneswar under Sections 419, 420, 465, 467, 471, 120-B/34 of IPC read with Section 66 (C)/ 66 (D) of the I.T. Act. These applications were heard on different dates. As they arise out of the same FIR, they are being disposed of this common order.

Mr Karnan Sattar learned counsel appearing in BL APL 4381 of 2024 filed by Ashish Kumar has submitted in Court today that during pendency of the bail application, C.T. No. 1630 of 2023 has been transferred from the Court of the SDJM, Bhubaneswar to the Court of the JMFC (LR And TV) Bhubaneswar. He has also submitted a Memo to that effect which is taken on record.

PROSECUTION ALLEGATIONS

2. Initially FIR was registered against unknown persons on the information of one Dillip Kumar Jalan lodged FIR on 04.10.2023 at the Cyber Cell Police Station. He alleged that he has a HDFC Life Insurance Policy in the name of his wife. In the first week of July, 2023, he received a call from an unknown person regarding premature release of the policy. He received calls from numbers 9812467649,



7207660964, 9911266906, 9193041401, 9812493952, 9953057289, 8376858433, 9910586356, 9911041392, 8750376496 and as per the advice of the caller, he transferred Rs.76,15,955/- to different bank accounts between 05.07.2023 to 28.09.2023 in Account No. 921010046625512, 34889554692, 10577035908 and 2845322439 and had attached the payment details. On the basis of his FIR, a case was registered against unknown persons for commission of offences under Sections- 419, 420, 465, 467, 471, 120-B, 34 of IPC read with Sections 66(C) / 66(D) of IT Act. During investigation it was found that from these accounts, amounts had been withdrawn or transferred to other accounts .

3. Chargesheet has been submitted on 18.03.2024 under Sections 419, 420, 465, 467, 471, 120-B/34 of IPC read with 66-C/66-D of IT Act, 2000 against **Bhim , Yogendra Singh, Tej Kumar, Ashish Kumar, , Raghu Anand, Rupali Gupta, Pramoda Valli and Bhanu Pratap Yadav**, keeping investigation open under Section 173 (8) of Cr.P.C. for collection of additional evidence and identity of Kabya Singh (Axis Bank account holder) and Vikas Kumar Gupta(Union Bank of India account holder), certificates under Bankers Book of Accounts and Section – 65 B of the Indian Evidence Act . In the chargesheet one



hundred sixty six articles / documents have been mentioned to have seized during investigation and relied upon and thirty four witnesses have been cited. Trial has not started in the case.

EARLIER BAIL APPLICATIONS

4. BLAPL No. 375 of 2024 filed earlier by **Ashish Kumar** petitioner in BLAPL No. 4381 of 2024; BLAPL No. 370 of 2024 filed earlier by **Tej Kumar** petitioner in BLAPL No. 4383 of 2024 and BLAPL No. 378 of 2024 filed earlier by **Yogendra Singh** petitioner in BLAPL No. 4272 of 2024 have been disposed of on 22.01.2024 granting liberty to them to move the learned court below for bail afresh after completion of investigation.

5. Before that the prayer for bail of **Bhim**, petitioner in BLAPL No.1714 of 2024 has been rejected on 11.01.2024 by the learned 5th Additional Sessions Judge, Bhubaneswar. After filing of chargesheet on 18.03.2024, the prayer for bail of the **Ashish Kumar**, petitioner in BLAPL No. 4381 of 2024), **Tej Kumar** petitioner in BLAPL No. 4383 of 2024), **Raghu Anand**, petitioner in BLAPL No. 4662 of 2024 and **Yogendra Singh** petitioner in BLAPL No. 4272 of 2024) have been dismissed on 22.04.2024 by the learned 4th Additional Sessions Judge, Bhubaneswar in BLAPL No. 707 of 2024, BLAPL No.708 of 2024,



BLAPL No.722 of 2024 and BLAPL No. 705 of 2024 respectively.

6. The prayer for bail of co accused **Pramada Valli @ Pramada Valli Ponukumati** in BLAPL No. 14282 of 2023 and **Rupali Gupta** in BLAPL No.3805 of 2024 have been allowed by this Court on 12.07.2024.

SUBMISSIONS

7. I have heard the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners and the learned State Counsels on different dates and perused the case diary.

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONERS

BHIM

8. Mr Basta learned counsel appearing on behalf of **Bhim**, petitioner in BLAPL No. 1714 of 2024 has submitted that the petitioner is in custody since 20.11.2023 . The petitioner works in a call centre and no incriminating material has been recovered against the petitioner. The insurance policy allegedly purchased by the informant on 29.08.2013 has not been seized by the police. He has no previous criminal antecedents and as investigation has been completed he may be released on bail.



YOGENDRA SINGH

Mr. Prabhu Prasanna Behera, learned counsel for the petitioner- **Yogendra Singh** in BLAPL No. 4272 of 2024, has submitted that the petitioner runs a financial institution and he is in custody since 20.11.2023. The complainant has submitted that money has been transferred to four accounts but none of these accounts belong to the petitioner. It has been alleged that a sum of Rs.11,19,000/- has been transferred to his account from two of these four accounts, one of which belongs to Kavya Singh, but Kavya Singh is not an accused in the case nor does he know Kavya Singh. He has no criminal antecedents and has been falsely implicated in the case. He has submitted that one Ankush who had business connections with the petitioner was to pay him money for investing and assuming that the money had been deposited in his account on behalf of Ankush, he had withdrawn the amount of Rs.11,19,000/-. He had intimated this to the investigating officer but the latter made no effort to trace or examine Ankush. He further submitted that the petitioner is ready to deposit an amount up to Rs.5,00,000/- without prejudice to his rights and defence in the case.

ASHISH KUMAR and TEJ KUMAR

Mr. Haripad Mohanty, learned counsel appearing for the



petitioner- **Ashish Kumar** in BLAPL No. 4381 of 2024 and petitioner- **Tej Kumar** in BLAPL No. 4383 of 2024 has submitted that the petitioners are in custody since 21.11.2023 and they do not have any criminal antecedents. He further submitted that Ashish Kumar is a nephew of Tej Kumar and had transferred Rs.65,000/- to his account. In case of co-accused Pramoda Valli, the entire amount which came to her account and Rs. 28,00,000/- has been transferred to account of Ashish Kumar and Rs.5,00,000/- had been transferred to the account of Tej Kumar. From the account of Tej Kumar, Rs.65,00,000/- had been transferred to the account of Ashish Kumar. Ashish Kumar had transferred the amount of Rs.45,000/- to the account of Bhanu Pratap. Only the balance amount had been withdrawn by him.

RAGHU ANAND

Mr. Sukumar Gourab, learned counsel for the **Raghu Anand**, petitioner in BLAPL No. 4662 of 2024) has submitted that petitioner is in custody since 21.11.2023 and he has no criminal antecedent and there is no chance of his absconding and influencing witnesses for which he may be released on bail. He has further submitted that the investigation is defective and even accepting the allegations against the petitioner to be true, no offence under Sections - 465, 467, 471, of the IPC nor



Sections 66 (C) and 66(D) of the IT Act is made out against him. As investigation in the case is over, he should not be detained any further in jail custody.

SUBMISSION SON BEHALF OF STATE OF ODISHA

9. Ms. Samapika Mishra, Mr. S.S. Mohapatra, Mr. J.P. Patra and Mr. G.N Rout learned Additional Standing Counsels appearing for the State of Odisha on different dates, vehemently opposed the prayer for bail submitting that the petitioners alongwith the co accused Rupali Gupta and Pramada Valli @ Pramada Valli Ponukumati, have cheated the complainant and her husband of a huge amount of money in a preplanned manner and they acted conjointly in pre - planned manner. The two co accused - Rupali Gupta and Pramada Valli @ Pramada Valli Ponukumati who are women have been granted bail as they are women and therefore, they stand on a different footing than the present petitioners. As the petitioners do not belong to the State of Odisha and some of them have similar criminal antecedents, they are likely to commit similar offences and it will be difficult to secure their presence during trial.



BHIM

It has been submitted by the learned State Counsels that accused **Bhim** was working in one company-MSR Wealth Creation Pvt. Ltd and was dealing with selling of Insurance Policies and has shared the policy details of the complainant Dillip Jalan with accused –petitioner Raghu Anand. He has spoken with the complainant Dillip Jalan and told him to deposit cash in the accounts of SBI and Kotak Mohindra banks, in the account numbers given by **Raghu Anand**. He has taken 25% share of the deposits done by the complainant and purchased gold and silver jewellery for his four unmarried sisters. He has also repaid some handloans taken by his father using this money. During interrogation co-accused Rupali Gupta has admitted that she was working along with her associates **Raghu Anand** and **Bhim**. One Rupay credit card has been seized at his instance. As the petitioner does not belong to Odisha, it will be difficult to secure his attendance in the trial and investigation if he is released on bail.

YOGENDRA SINGH

The learned State counsels have submitted that accused **Yogendra Singh** has two bank accounts and on a number of occasions money has been transferred to his two accounts from that of one Kavya Singh



which amounts to Rs.11,19,000/- and this money has been withdrawn by the petitioner. Neither Ankush nor Kavya Singh could be traced. He further submitted that as accused is a resident of Uttar Pradesh, he is likely to abscond, if he is released on bail.

ASHISH KUMAR

The learned State counsels have submitted that during investigation, it was ascertained that Kotak Mahindra Bank Account No. 2845322439 stands in the name of the petitioner **Ashish Kumar**, PB No. 59 536A, Kitex house, Choorakodu, Kizhakkambalam, Aluva, Ernakulam-683562, Kerala. Mobile No. 6390073232, Debit Card No. 4280902897202594, and the complainant Dillip Kumar Jalan has transferred Rs.11,56,000/- to this account. On analysis of the account statement of A/C No. 2845322439 for the period from 1st July 2023 to 6th October, 2023, it could be ascertained that Rs.11,56,000/- has been credited in this account from the account of victims. Out of that amount Rs.07,58,000/- has been transferred to the Union Bank A/C No. 359802011014438 of **Bhanu Pratap Yadav** and Rs.3,76,000/- has been withdrawn from ATM at Azamgarh. Further **Ashish Kumar** received Rs.65,000/- from **Tej Kumar** out of this, he transferred Rs.45,000/- to Union Bank A/C No. 359802011014438 of **Bhanu Pratap Yadav**.



TEJ KUMAR

Opposing the prayer for bail of petitioner -**Tej Kumar**, the learned State Counsels have submitted that the complainant Dillip Kumar Jalan has transferred Rs.08,32,000/- to SBI A/C No. 34889554692 which stands in the name of name of **Tej Kumar**, S/o- Khedan Ram. Mobile No. 9598074317, Aadhar No., ATM Card issued on 01 June, 2023. From analysis of the account statement, it was found that Rs.08,32,000/- has been credited in this account from the accounts of complainant between 01.07.2023 and 05.10.2023. Out of this amount, Rs.5,70,000/- has been transferred to Account No. 359802011014438 of Union Bank of India (IFSC No. UBIN0535982) belonging to **Bhanu Pratap Yadav**, Rs.65,000/- has been transferred to Kotak Mahindra Account No. 2845322439 of **Ashis Kumar**, Rs.1,23,490/- has been transferred to Union Bank Account No. 658401150000001 and 658401010050041 of **Vikash Kumar Gupta**.

RAGHU ANAND

The learned State Counsels have opposed the prayer for bail of accused **Raghu Anand** stating that the complainant Dillip Kumar Jalan has reported in the F.I.R. that the fraudster has called him from Mobile



No. 9911041392, which has been seized from co accused **Rupali Gupta @ Aditi Agrawal @ Manshi**. During interrogation co-accused Rupali Gupta has admitted that she was working along with her associates **Raghu Anand** and **Bhim**. She also produced the communications (screen shots from her mobile phone) she had with other co-accused namely **Raghu Anand, Tej Kumar, Pramada Valli, Bhanu Pratap Yadav** and also with the complainant Dillip Kumar Jalan. The petitioner-**Raghu Anand** has been arrested on 20.11.2023 During investigation, he opened his mobile and in the presence of two witnesses produced screen shots of his communication with the informant and other accused persons. The following articles have been seized from him:

- (i) One cheque book in the name of **Bhanu Pratap Yadav** bearing A/C No. 359802011014438 having IFSC No. UBIN0535982 of Union Bank of India containing 21 pages.
- (ii) One VISA Debit card bearing no. 4364700002192174 of Axis Bank in the name of **Bhanu Pratap Yadav** has been seized from his possession.
- (iii) Cash of Rs.7,51,800/- has been seized from his possession.



In addition to this number a debit card, passbook, cheque of different banks and ID card of many non-banking finance companies have also been seized from him and he admitted during investigation that the money deposited by the complainant Dillip Kumar Jalan was transferred to the Union Bank and Axis Bank accounts of **Bhanu Pratap Yadav** and he withdrawn money from the account of co accused **Bhanu Pratap Yadav** by using his debit cards of Union Bank and Axis Bank. Using this money he has purchased one car (Hyundasi Creta) on 8th November, 2023 by making down payment of Rs.10 lakhs. He unlocked his mobile and in presence of two Government witnesses and produced the screenshots of the whatsapp communication with other accused persons which have been seized on his production.

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION

10. Almost fifty years ago, in the case of *Gudikanti Narasimhulu v. Public Prosecutor, High Court: (1978) 1 SCC 240*, the Supreme Court observed thus:

“What is often forgotten, and therefore warrants reminder, is the object to keep a person in judicial custody pending trial or disposal of an appeal. Lord Russel, C.J., said [R v. Rose, (1898) 18 Cox]:



“I observe that in this case bail was refused for the prisoner. It cannot be too strongly impressed on the magistracy of the country that bail is not to be withheld as a punishment, but that the requirements as to bail are merely to secure the attendance of the prisoner at trial.””

In the case of ***Manish Sisodia v. Directorate of Enforcement:***

2024 SCC OnLine SC 1920, referring to the decision of ***Gudikanti***

Narasimhulu (supra) the Supreme Court has observed as follows : :-

“53. The Court further observed that, over a period of time, the trial courts and the High Courts have forgotten a very well-settled principle of law that bail is not to be withheld as a punishment. From our experience, we can say that it appears that the trial courts and the High Courts attempt to play safe in matters of grant of bail. The principle that bail is a rule and refusal is an exception is, at times, followed in breach. On account of non-grant of bail even in straight forward open and shut cases, this Court is flooded with huge number of bail petitions thereby adding to the huge 36 pendency. It is high time that the trial courts and the High Courts should recognize the principle that “bail is rule and jail is exception”.

*“55. As observed by this Court in the case of **Gudikanti Narasimhulu** (supra), the objective to keep a person in judicial custody pending trial or disposal of an appeal is to secure the attendance of the prisoner at trial.*

56. In the present case, the appellant is having deep roots in the society. There is no possibility of him fleeing away from the



country and not being available for facing the trial. In any case, conditions can be imposed to address the concern of the State.

57. Insofar as the apprehension given by the learned ASG regarding the possibility of tampering the evidence is concerned, it is to be noted that the case largely depends on documentary evidence which is already seized by the prosecution. As such, there is no possibility of tampering with the evidence. Insofar as the concern with regard to influencing the witnesses is concerned, the said concern can be addressed by imposing stringent conditions upon the appellant.....”

11. In a catena of decisions, the Supreme Court has laid down the principles to be kept in mind while considering a prayer for bail.

In the case of in ***Mahipal vs. Rajesh Kumar: (2020) 2 SCC 118***, the Supreme Court has held as follows:-

“12. The determination of whether a case is fit for the grant of bail involves the balancing of numerous factors, among which the nature of the offence, the severity of the punishment and a prima facie view of the involvement of the accused are important. No straight jacket formula exists for courts to assess an application for the grant or rejection of bail. At the stage of assessing whether a case is fit for the grant of bail, the court is not required to enter into a detailed analysis of the evidence on record to establish beyond reasonable doubt the commission of the crime by the accused. That is a matter for



trial. However, the Court is required to examine whether there is a prima facie or reasonable ground to believe that the accused had committed the offence and on a balance of the considerations involved, the continued custody of the accused sub-serves the purpose of the criminal justice system.....”

In the case of **Sanjay Chandra vrs. C.B.I.: (2012) 1 SCC 40**, the Supreme Court has inter alia held as follows: -

“ 21. In bail applications, generally, it has been laid down from the earliest times that the object of bail is to secure the appearance of the accused person at his trial by reasonable amount of bail. The object of bail is neither punitive nor preventative. Deprivation of liberty must be considered a punishment ,unless it can be required to ensure that an accused person will stand his trial when called upon. The courts owe more than verbal respect to the principle that punishment begins after conviction, and that every man is deemed to be innocent until duly tried and duly found guilty.

22. From the earliest times, it was appreciated that detention in custody pending completion of trial could be a cause of great hardship. From time to time, necessity demands that some un-convicted persons should be held in custody pending trial to secure their attendance at the trial but in such cases, 'necessity' is the operative test. In this country, it would be quite contrary to the concept of personal liberty enshrined in the Constitution that any person should be punished in



respect of any matter, upon which, he has not been convicted or that in any circumstances, he should be deprived of his liberty upon only the belief that he will tamper with the witnesses if left at liberty, save in the most extraordinary circumstances. Apart from the question of prevention being the object of a refusal of bail, one must not lose sight of the fact that any imprisonment before conviction has a substantial punitive content and it would be improper for any Court to refuse bail as a mark of disapproval of former conduct whether the accused has been convicted for it or not or to refuse bail to an un-convicted person for the purpose of giving him a taste of imprisonment as a lesson.”

xxxxxxx

“40. The grant or refusal to grant bail lies within the discretion of the Court. The grant or denial is regulated, to a large extent, by the facts and circumstances of each particular case. But at the same time, right to bail is not to be denied merely because of the sentiments of the community against the accused. The primary purposes of bail in a criminal case are to relieve the accused of imprisonment, to relieve the State of the burden of keeping him, pending the trial, and at the same time, to keep the accused constructively in the custody of the Court, whether before or after conviction, to assure that he will submit to the jurisdiction of the Court and be in attendance thereon whenever his presence is required.



41. This Court in **Gurcharan Singh and Ors. Vs. State AIR 1978 SC 179** observed that two paramount considerations, while considering petition for grant of bail in non-bailable offence, apart from the seriousness of the offence, are the likelihood of the accused fleeing from justice and his tampering with the prosecution witnesses.

42. Both of them relate to ensure of the fair trial of the case. Though, this aspect is dealt by the High Court in its impugned order, in our view, the same is not convincing.

43. When the undertrial prisoners are detained in jail custody to an indefinite period, Article 21 of the Constitution is violated. Every person, detained or arrested, is entitled to speedy trial, the question is: whether the same is possible in the present case. There are seventeen accused persons. Statement of the witnesses runs to several hundred pages and the documents on which reliance is placed by the prosecution, is voluminous. The trial may take considerable time and it looks to us that the appellants, who are in jail, have to remain in jail longer than the period of detention, had they been convicted. It is not in the interest of justice that accused should be in jail for an indefinite period. No doubt, the offence alleged against the appellants is a serious one in terms of alleged huge loss to the State exchequer, that, by itself, should not deter us from enlarging the appellants on bail when there is no serious contention of the respondent



that the accused, if released on bail, would interfere with the trial or tamper with evidence. We do not see any good reason to detain the accused in custody, that too, after the completion of the investigation and filing of the charge-sheet... ”

12. It is no longer *res integra* that a person's right to life and liberty, which is guaranteed by Article 21 of the Constitution of India, cannot be curtailed for an indefinite period, merely because the person is accused of committing an offence. The purpose behind arresting and detaining a person in jail is mainly for ensuring his presence during trial. Detention of an accused may also be necessary during investigation, so that he / she does not tamper with evidence or interfere with the investigation. It is true that the amount the complainant and his wife have been defrauded of, is a large sum and it prima facie appears that the petitioners have acted in tandem pursuant to well chalked out plan. But all the offences alleged against the petitioners are triable by a Magistrate. Trial has not yet started. In view of the nature of allegations against the petitioners, the documents which are required to be proved and the number of witnesses who are to be examined, it is apparent that the trial cannot be concluded at an early date. Without the allegations against the petitioners being proved in the trial, I am of the view that their further detention will amount to pre-trial punishment.



13. In view of the above discussion and considering the nature of allegations against the petitioners who have remained in custody for more than fourteen months, the submissions that the petitioners do not have similar criminal antecedents, I am inclined to allow their prayers for bail, but subject to stringent conditions as the petitioners are not residents of Odisha, in order to ensure their presence in the trial Court during trial.

14. It is accordingly directed that the petitioners **Bhim, Yogendra Singh, Tej Kumar, Ashish Kumar** and **Raghu Anand** shall be released on bail on such terms and conditions as the learned court in seisin over the matter in C.T. case No 1630 of 2023 may consider fit and proper, after verifying that they do not have similar criminal antecedents, including imposition of appropriate cash surety, as well as the following conditions:

- (i) One of the sureties shall be a blood relation.
- (ii) The petitioners should not tamper with prosecution evidence or try to influence or threaten witnesses.
- (iii) The petitioners shall not indulge in any criminal activity.
- (iv) The petitioners shall provide the address in Bhubaneswar where they intend to reside after their release and also provide the details of



their permanent address along with name of the Police Station to the learned trial Court, so that both addresses can be verified by the I.O. and the latter can establish contact with the Officer in Charge / Station House Officer of the Police Station before they are released on bail.

(v) The petitioners shall provide their active mobile number(s) to the learned trial Court, so that the same can be verified by the I.O., before they are released on bail. Any change in the mobile number(s) shall be immediately informed to the Court, by their counsel within two days of the change.

(vi) The petitioners shall not leave the Bhubaneswar U.P.D., without permission of the learned trial Court.

(vii) The petitioners shall surrender their passports in the learned trial Court. In case they do not possess passports, they shall submit affidavits to that effect.

(ix) The petitioners shall remain personally present in the learned trial court on each date of trial and co-operate for early disposal of the trial.

(x) They shall not seek for adjournment on frivolous grounds.

15. In the event of violation of any of these conditions or any other condition that may be imposed by the learned Court in seisin over the



matter, this order is liable to be recalled and / or the bail granted to the petitioners cancelled.

16. Observations in this order have been made for purpose of considering the bail application and are prima facie views and should not influence the learned trial court which is to try the case strictly on the basis of evidence led in the case.

17. **BLAPL No. 1714 of 2024, BLAPL No. 4272 of 2024, BLAPL No. 4381 of 2024, BLAPL No. 4383 of 2024 and BLAPL No. 4662 of 2024** are accordingly allowed.

18. Urgent certified copy of this order be granted on proper application.

19. Copy of this order be supplied to Mr Gyanalok Mohanty learned Standing Counsel for onward transmission to the I.O., Smt. Sabita Sahoo, Inspector, CID, CB, Cuttack.

.....
(Savitri Ratho, J.)

*Orissa High Court, Cuttack.
5th March, 2024,
Puspa, Personal Assistant.*

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed
Signed by: PUSPANJALI MOHAPATRA
Reason: Authentication
Location: Orissa High Court
Date: 05-Mar-2025 20:08:56

BLAPL No. 1714 of 2024, BLAPL No. 4272 of 2024, BLAPL No. 4381 of 2024, BLAPL No. 4383 of 2024 and BLAPL No. 4662 of 2024