



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK**  
**ABLAPL No.1375 of 2026**

**Bikash Nayak** ..... **Petitioner**  
Mr. Sulochana Patro, Advocate  
-Versus-

**State of Odisha** ..... **Opposite Party**  
Mr. S. Panda, ASC

**ABLAPL No.2549 of 2026**

**Rohan Nayak** ..... **Petitioner**  
Ms. Sulochana Patro, Advocate  
-Versus-

**State of Odisha** ..... **Opposite Party**  
Mr. S. Panda, ASC

**And**

**ABLAPL No.2550 of 2026**

**Bhaskar @ Bhaskar Nayak** ..... **Petitioner**  
Ms. Sulochana Patro, Advocate  
-Versus-

**State of Odisha** ..... **Opposite Party**  
Mr. S. Panda, ASC

**CORAM:**  
**MR. JUSTICE R.K. PATTANAİK**

**ORDER**  
**31.03.2026**

**Order**  
**No.**  
03.

1. The ABLAPLs are taken up together for common orders.



2. Recorded the submissions of learned counsel for the respective parties.

3. Instant petitions have been filed under Section 482 BNSS by the petitioners seeking pre-arrest bail in connection with Baidyanathpur P.S. Case No. 22 of 2026 corresponding to G.R. Case No.122 of 2026 pending in the file of learned SDJM, Berhampur on the grounds stated.

4. Perused the F.I.R. as at Annexure-1. The dying declaration of the victim has been recorded and copy of the same is at Annexure-2. The case diary is produced by learned counsel for the State along with other relevant documents and also the medical examination report of the injured, namely, Amit Mukhi and the same are gone through. The alleged incident is narrated by the informant. From the dying declaration of the injured dated 15th January, 2026, it is made to reveal that he has named the petitioners. It has been claimed that one of the accused persons, namely, Bikash Nayak to have hatched conspiracy to eliminate him. The medical examination report of the injured reveals that he sustained multiple lacerations. It is submitted by Ms. Patro, learned counsel for the petitioners that the injured is having criminal antecedents but from the materials on record and in view of the revelation made by the injured, it is made to understand that two of the petitioners participated in the alleged assault, whereas, the other accused, namely, Bikash Nayak was alleged to be the brainchild and responsible for the incident. Considering the submission of learned counsel for the respective parties and the



evidence collected during investigation with the statements of the witnesses recorded under Section 180 BNSS, it is not a case where pre-arrest bail is to be granted.

5. Accordingly, it is ordered.
6. In the result, the ABLAPLs are dismissed.
7. Issue urgent certified copy of this order as per rules.

**(R.K. Pattanaik)**  
**Judge**

Kabita