



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK
BLAPL No.914 of 2026

Manas Ranjan Das ... ***Petitioner***

Mr. B.P. Tripathy, Sr. Advocate, along with
Mr. P. Agrawal, Advocate
-versus-

State of Orissa ... ***Opposite Party***

Mr. R.B. Mishra, Addl. PP
Ms. B. Mishra, Proxy counsel on behalf of
Ms. P.S. Mohanty, Advocate

CORAM: JUSTICE G. SATAPATHY
ORDER(ORAL)29.04.2026

Order No.

03.

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 Baliapala PS Case No.382 of 2025 corresponding to CT Case No.1200 of 2025 pending in the file of learned JMFC, Basta, Balasore being charge-sheeted for commission of offences punishable U/Ss.85/80(2)115(2)/3(5) of BNS r/w Sec.4 of DP Act, on the main allegation of committing dowry death of the deceased by subjecting her to torture and cruelty for demand of dowry, along with co-accused persons in furtherance of their common intention.
3. In the course of hearing Mr. Bibhu Prasad Tripathy, learned Sr. counsel who is being assisted by Mr. Partha Agrawal, learned counsel for the petitioner by filing the copy of the charge-sheet and order-sheet submits that cognizance of offence have already been taken, but no offence U/S.80(2) of the BNS is attracted against the petitioner since the marriage of the deceased with the petitioner had



taken place 10 years before as per the averments of the FIR and rest of the offences being not punishable with substantive imprisonment for more than seven years, the petitioner having detained in custody for around four months, may kindly be granted bail.

3.1 On the other hand Mr. R.B. Mishra, learned Addl. PP strongly opposes the bail application of the petitioner by contending inter alia that the deceased was meted with torture and cruelty for demand of Rs.10,00,000/- out of which Rs.7,00,000/- has already been paid to the petitioner and therefore, the petitioner should not be granted bail. In echoing such submission of State counsel, Ms. Bini Mishra, learned proxy counsel appearing on behalf of Ms. Prajna Sarita Mohanty, learned counsel for the informant submits that although the offence U/S.80(2) of the BNS prima facie being not made out, but prima facie there is sufficient allegation against the petitioner to proceed against him for offence U/S.108 of BNS and the petitioner have being instrumental in inflicting torture to the deceased, his bail application may kindly be rejected.

4. After having considered the rival submissions upon perusal of record, it appears from the FIR that the marriage of the petitioner with the deceased had taken place around ten years before, but the petitioner has been charge-sheeted for offence U/S.80(2) of BNS. In the aforesaid facts and circumstances and taking into account the materials so placed on record and regard being had to pre-trial detention of the petitioner in custody with submission of charge-sheet



in the meantime and taking into account the cause of death as opined by the doctor in the PM report to be account of Venous congestion and Asphyxia as a result of ante-mortem hanging and the PM report of the deceased not disclosing any external injury except the ligature mark on the person of the deceased and keeping in view the other circumstances on record in entirety including the inherent right of the accused persons to be presumed innocent until proven guilty at the trial and the grant of bail to co-accused Manoranjan Das & Another in BLAPL No.883 of 2026, this Court without expressing any view on merit admits the petitioners to bail.

5. Hence, the bail application of the petitioners stand allowed and the petitioners are allowed to go on bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs.25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five Thousand) only with one solvent surety for the like amount to the satisfaction of the learned Court in seisin of the case on such terms and conditions as deem fit and proper by it.

6. Accordingly, the BLAPL stands disposed of..

Issue urgent certified copy of the order as per Rules. A soft copy of this order be immediately communicated to the concerned Court, who shall afterwards communicate the same to the concerned Jail through e-mail for reference.

(G. Satapathy)
Judge