



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK
BLAPL No.812 of 2026

Chhatish @ Satish Barik ... ***Petitioner***

Mrs. D. Behuray, Advocate

-versus-

State of Odisha ... ***Opposite Party***

Mr. C. Mohanty, Addl. PP

CORAM: JUSTICE G. SATAPATHY
RETYPE ON :09.04.2026

1. This matter is taken up through Hybrid Arrangement (Virtual/Physical Mode).
2. This is a bail application U/S.483 of BNSS by the petitioner for grant of bail in connection with Soro PS Case No.281 of 2025 corresponding to CT Case No.582 of 2025 pending in the file of learned JMFC, Soro for commission of offences punishable U/Ss.310(2) of BNS r/w Sec. 25/27 of the Arms Act, on the main allegation of committing dacoity in the house of the informant by putting her in fear of death and assaulting her husband and taking away gold ornaments and cash of Rs.5,00,000/-.
3. Heard Mrs. Dalirani Behuray, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr. C. Mohanty, learned Addl. PP in the matter and perused the record.
4. The petitioner in fact has sought to renew his prayer for bail after submission of charge-sheet, but charge-sheet was submitted way back on 14.12.2025, however, the petitioner has sought for liberty in BLAPL No.11927 of 2025 on 15.12.20215 i.e. one day after the submission of charge-sheet by stating before this Court that the petitioner wants to renew his prayer for bail after



submission of charge-sheet. It is also not in dispute that the petitioner is having six criminal antecedents vide Soro PS Case No.226 of 2025, 182 of 2025, 281 of 2025, 390 of 2023, 411 of 2024 and 352 of 2023 as per the impugned order, however, such criminal antecedents has not been disclosed in the bail application. Besides, the implication of the petitioner is on the basis of their confession before one witness as per the charge-sheet. In the aforesaid facts and circumstances and taking into account the nature and gravity of the offences as alleged against the petitioner vis-à-vis the accusation sought to be brought against him and regard being had to the alleged involvement of the petitioner in six criminal cases, this Court does not consider it proper to grant bail to the petitioner at this stage, especially when the informant and her husband are yet to be examined.

5. Hence, the bail application of the petitioner stands rejected. Accordingly, the BLAPL stands disposed of. A soft copy of the order be immediately communicated to the learned trial Court.

(G. Satapathy)
Judge

Priyajit