



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK

BLAPL No.1620 of 2026

(In the matter of application under Section 483 of the BNSS, 2023).

Narayan Sahu @ Rupabala ... Petitioner
@ Naran @ Narayan Sahoo
-versus-

State of Odisha ... Opposite Party

For Petitioner : Mr. B.K. Ghadei, Advocate

For Opposite Party : Mr. P. Satpathy, Addl. PP

CORAM: JUSTICE G. SATAPATHY

DATE OF HEARING & DATE OF JUDGMENT: 22.07.2026 (ORAL)

G. Satapathy, J.

1. This is the bail application U/S.483 of the BNSS by the petitioner for grant of bail in connection with Chauliaganj P.S. Case No. 235 of 2019 corresponding to S.T. Case No. 221 of 2022 (G.R. Case No. 1268 of 2019) pending in the Court of learned 1st Addl. Sessions Judge, Cuttack, for commission of offence punishable U/S. 302 IPC, on the main allegation of committing murder of one person namely Panda by assaulting him with a farsa (sharp cutting weapon).



2. In the course of hearing, Mr. Bideshi Kumar Ghadei, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that although ten witnesses have been examined, but none has supported the prosecution allegation and the petitioner being implicated in another case has been granted bail by this Court and therefore, the petitioner may kindly be granted bail.

2.1. On the other hand, Mr. P. Satapathy, learned Addl. PP submits that not only PW.6 has supported the prosecution allegation against the petitioner, but also the petitioner is found involved in another case of murder and thereby, the petitioner being a habitual offender, he should not be enlarged on bail and therefore, the bail application of the petitioner may kindly be rejected.

3. After having considered the rival submissions upon perusal of record, there appears not only allegation against the petitioner for committing murder of one person in the present case, but also he is found allegedly involved in another case vide Chauliaganj P.S. Case No. 227 of 2019 for murder of another person. The



petitioner, however, has not disclosed the details of Chauliaganj P.S. Case No. 227 of 2019, although he has referred to it in his bail application. In the context of suppression of material facts, this Court feels it proper to refer to the decision of the Apex Court in ***Munnesh Vrs. State of Uttar Pradesh; (2025) SCC OnLine SC 1319***, wherein the Apex Court in paragraph-9 has *inter alia* held as under :-

"9. since the petitioner has suppressed material facts with regard to his involvement in criminal cases, he is not entitled to the discretionary relief of bail." XXXX xxx xx xx.

4. In view of the above facts and circumstances and taking into consideration the nature and gravity of the offence as alleged against the petitioner vis-à-vis the accusations sought to be brought against him and regard being had to the alleged involvement of the petitioner in another case of similar nature and taking into account the evidence of witnesses so far examined, more particularly that of PW.6 coupled with the alleged recovery of the weapon of offence pursuant to the



disclosure statement of the petitioner, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at this stage.

Hence, the bail application of the petitioner stands rejected. In view of the alternative oral prayer as advanced for the petitioner, trial be expedited, if there is no other legal impediment. Accordingly, the bail application stands disposed of. A soft copy of this judgment be immediately transmitted to the Court in seisin over the matter for reference.

(G. Satapathy)
Judge

*Orissa High Court, Cuttack,
Dated the 22nd day of July, 2026/S.Sasmal*

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed
Signed by: SUBHASHMITA DAS
Designation: Sr. Stenographer
Reason: Authentication
Location: High Court of Orissa
Date: 22-Jul-2026 20:32:16

