



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK
BLAPL No. 2273 of 2026

1. Bindu Pradhan
2. Puna Pradhan
3. Tuna @ Tunia
Pradhan
4. Duni Pradhan

Petitioners

....

Mr. S. Dwibedi, Advocate

-versus-

State of Odisha

....

Opposite Party

Mr. C.R. Swain, AGA

CORAM: JUSTICE V. NARASINGH

ORDER

08.05.2026

Order No.

- 02.** 1. Heard learned counsel for the Petitioner and learned counsel for the State.
2. The Petitioner is an accused in connection with S.T. Case No.117 of 2023 (C.T. Case No.218 of 2023) pending on the file of learned Additional District & Sessions Judge, Balliguda, arising out of **Balliguda P.S. Case No.134 of 2023** for commission of offence alleged under Sections 302/201/34 of IPC.
3. Learned counsel, on instruction, submits that except the present BLAPL, no other bail application of the Petitioner relating to the aforementioned P.S. case is pending in any other Court.
4. Being aggrieved by the rejection of their application for bail U/s.483 of the BNSS by the



learned Additional Sessions Judge, Balliguda, Kandhamal by order dated 24.02.2026 in the aforementioned case, the present BLAPL has been filed.

5. The Petitioners are accused of causing the death of the deceased Paula Pradhan.

6. It is submitted by the learned counsel that the Petitioner No.1 was before this Court in BLAPL No.4167 of 2025 and Petitioner Nos.2 to 4 were before this Court in BLAPL No.4183 of 2025 and both the applications were disposed of by a common order dated 04.09.2025 giving liberty to the Petitioners to renew their prayer after examination of the witness-Tuna Pradhan and in the meanwhile, he has been examined as P.W.7 and since he has turned hostile, the Petitioners may be enlarged on bail.

7. Learned counsel for the State, on the other hand, opposes such prayer for bail referring to the very statement of P.W.7.

8. It is apt to note that in the case at hand the informant (Sanjiram Pradhan) is the son of the deceased and the wife (Sreekali Pradhan) of the deceased, who was examined during the course of examination, has unfortunately passed away for reasons unconnected with this said case.

9. Learned counsel for the State also draws the attention of this Court to the statement purported to



be recorded under Section 27 of the Evidence Act, 1872 of the accused No.1 Bindhu Pradhan.

10. This Court carefully perused the evidence of P.W.7 as well as that of the wife of the deceased, whose statement has been recorded under Section 161 of Cr.P.C..

11. Considering the nature of the allegations and the manner in which the offence has been committed, this Court is **not inclined** to entertain the bail application of the Petitioner Nos.1 and 2 (Bindu Pradhan and Puna Pradhan respectively) and the same stands rejected.

12. So far as the present BLAPL in respect of Petitioner Nos.3 and 4 (Tuna @ Tunia Pradhan and Duni Pradhan respective) is concerned taking into account the role ascribed to them, this Court directs the said Petitioners to be released on bail on such terms to be fixed by the learned Court in seisin so as to ensure their presence during the trial.

13. Accordingly, the BLAPL stands disposed of. U.C.C as per rules.

(V. NARASINGH)
Judge