

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
A.B.A. No.2127 of 2025

1. Prasanjit Panda @ Prasannjit Panda, S/o Sarat Chandra Panda.
2. Pratima Behera, D/o Prabhakar Patra, W/o Pramoda Kumar Bahera.

... .. **Petitioners**

Versus

The State of Jharkhand.

... .. **Opposite Party**

WITH

A.B.A. No.2214 of 2025

Monalisa Behera @ Monalish Behera, D/o Pramod Kumar Behera.

... .. **Petitioner**

Versus

The State of Jharkhand.

... .. **Opposite Party**

CORAM : SRI ANANDA SEN, J.

For the Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Indrajit Sinha, Advocate Mr. Shadab Eqbal, Advocate Mr. Shubham Sharma, through V.C.
For the State	:	Mr. Pankaj Kr. Mishra, A.P.P. Mr. Rajesh Kumar, A.P.P.

03/ 08.07.2025

These anticipatory bail applications under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023, have been preferred by the petitioners apprehending their arrest in connection with Dhurwa P.S. Case No.38 of 2025, for offences under Sections 316(5), 318(4), 338, 319(2) and 61(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023. The cases are presently pending before the Court of learned C.J.M., Ranchi.

2. It is alleged by the informant – Samendra Mandal, that he met with one Pramod Kumar Behera. The said Pramod Behera stated that he is a G.M. in H.E.C. and he is also an IAS Officer of 2001 Batch. It is stated that on the pretext of making available some plots for constructions and also for giving jobs to several persons, Pramod Behera, had taken huge amounts from several

persons including the informant, Neeraj Kumar Sah and others. It was later on found that Pramod Behera has cheated the informant and many other persons.

3. During the course of argument, Mr. Indrajit Sinha, learned counsel representing the petitioners submits that there is no allegation against the petitioner - Pratima Behera, who is the wife of Pramod Kumar Behera. So far as the petitioner – Monalisa Behera is concerned, she is the daughter of Pramod Kumar Behera and in her account Rs.43,700/- has been credited on the direction of Pramod Kumar Behera. He submits that if the entire *fardbeyan* is read properly, it would be crystal clear that the entire grievance of the informant is against Pramod Behera, who is the mastermind of the occurrence and since these three petitioners are wife, daughter and an acquaintance of the main accused, they have been roped in this case.

4. Learned A.P.P. representing the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail and submits that so far as the petitioner - Prasannjit Panda is concerned, there is sufficient evidence against him of taking money. Para-79 of the case diary suggests that cash of Rs.7,11,500/ was taken by him on the pretext of providing job which has been stated by one Niraj Kumar Sah, who is a witness. Para-82 of the case diary is the details of UPI transactions, which suggests that huge money has been transferred.

So far as the petitioner – Monalisa is concerned, learned A.P.P. admits that she is the daughter of main accused and on the instruction / direction of the main accused, the informant has deposited Rs.43,700/- in her account.

So far as the petitioner – Pratima Behera is concerned, except the fact that she is the wife of main accused, there is no other material save and except that when the informant used to visit the accused, she was present in the house and she was also in talking terms.

5. After hearing the parties and going through the records, I find that there is a serious allegation against the petitioner – Prasannjit Panda. There is evidence which suggests transaction of huge amount through UPI in the account of Prasannjit Panda. Para-85 of the case diary also suggests transaction of money in the account of the petitioner – Prasannjit Panda. Thus, it is not a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail so far as the petitioner – Prasannjit Panda is concerned, as it is necessary to investigate his role in the offence. There is a possibility of custodial interrogation also. Thus, the prayer for anticipatory bail on behalf of the petitioner – Prasannjit Panda (petitioner No.1 in A.B.A. No.2127 of 2025) is **rejected**.

6. So far as the petitioner – Pratima Behera is concerned, I find that there is no allegation against her. She is merely the wife of main accused - Pramod Kumar Behera, who is in custody.

So far as the petitioner - Monalisa Behera is concerned, she is the daughter of Pramod Kumar Behera and the only allegation is that she was present in the house when the informant and others used to visit her father and on the direction of her father, the informant had deposited an amount of Rs.43,700/- in her account.

Thus, there is nothing to suggest that these two

petitioners i.e. Pratima Behera and Monalisa Behera, had played active role in cheating anyone nor they induced the informant or others.

7. Considering the aforesaid fact, I am inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners - Pratima Behera (petitioner No.2 in A.B.A. No.2127 of 2025) and Monalisa Behera @ Monalish Behera (petitioner in A.B.A. No.2214 of 2025).

8. Accordingly, the Anticipatory Bail Applications being A.B.A. No.2127 of 2025 stands **party allowed** and A.B.A. No.2214 of 2025 stands **allowed**. The petitioners - Pratima Behera (petitioner No.2 in A.B.A. No.2127 of 2025) and Monalisa Behera @ Monalish Behera (petitioner in A.B.A. No.2214 of 2025), are directed to surrender before the learned court below within four weeks from the date of receipt of copy of this order and on the event of their surrender or arrest, they shall be released on bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) each, with two sureties of the like amount each, to the satisfaction of learned C.J.M., Ranchi, in connection with Dhurwa P.S. Case No.38 of 2025, subject to the condition that one of the bailers should be a close relative of the petitioners and other should be a resident of State of Jharkhand, having sufficient landed property in his name or in the name of his ancestors in which he is having share and to that effect, he has to file an affidavit before the Trial Court indicating his share in the property. The petitioners are directed to appear before the Investigating Officer and cooperate with the investigation.

(ANANDA SEN, J.)