



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK**  
**CRLA No. 175 of 2024**

***Ajaya Kumar Naik*** ... ***Appellant***  
*Mr. A. Tripathy, Advocate*  
*-versus-*  
***State of Odisha*** ... ***Respondent***  
*Mr. S.K. Rout, Addl. PP*  
*Mr. B. Dash, Advocate (informant)*

**CORAM:**  
**JUSTICE G. SATAPATHY**

**ORDER(ORAL)**  
**15.04.2025**

**Order No.**  
**04.**

**I.A. No. 398 of 2024**

1. This matter is taken up through Hybrid Arrangement (Virtual/Physical Mode).
2. This is an application for stay realization of fine as imposed on the appellant-petitioner by the impugned judgment.
3. Heard, Mr. Amitav Tripathy, learned counsel for the appellant-petitioner, Mr. Bijayananda Dash, learned counsel for the informant and Mr. S.K. Rout, learned Addl. Public Prosecutor in the matter and perused the record.
4. Realization of fine from the appellant-petitioner under the impugned judgment in T.R. Case No. 30 of 2022 of the Court of learned Addl. Sessions Judge-cum-Special Court under the POCSO Act,



Nayagarh shall remain stayed till disposal of the appeal.

5. Accordingly, the IA stands disposed of.

**I.A. No. 399 of 2024**

6. This is an application by the appellant for grant of bail pending suspension of his further execution of sentence till disposal of the appeal.

7. Heard, Mr. Amitav Tripathy, learned counsel for the appellant-petitioner, Mr. Bijayananda Dash, learned counsel for the informant and Mr. S.K. Rout, learned Addl. Public Prosecutor in the matter and perused the record including the evidence of the victim.

8. It appears from the record that the present appellant-petitioner has been convicted for commission of offences punishable U/Ss.343/363/376(2)(n)/376(3)/506 of the IPC r/w. Section 6 of the POCSO Act and the maximum substantive sentence as awarded to the appellant-petitioner is Rigorous Imprisonment (R.I.) for 25 years.

9. In view of the aforesaid facts and after having considered the rival submissions and on going through the evidence of witnesses, more particularly that of the victim and taking into consideration the grounds of challenge of the conviction of the appellant-petitioner and keeping in view the impugned judgment and there being unchallenged evidence of the victim with regard to her age and



taking into consideration all other evidence on record, this Court does not find any merit in the plea for bail of the appellant-petitioner.

Hence, the prayer for bail of the appellant-petitioner stands rejected.

10. Accordingly, the IA stands disposed of.

**CRLA No. 175 of 2024**

11. Since LCR is already available, Office is requested to prepare paper books and supply the same to the counsel for the parties in accordance with Rules.

12. List this matter on 15<sup>th</sup> July, 2025.

**(G. Satapathy)**  
**Judge**

*S.Sasmal*