



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK

ABLAPL No.3049 of 2026

***Purnachandra @ Purna Chandra
Sahoo & Anr.***

.....

Petitioners

Represented by Adv. -
Soumyajyoti Biswal

-versus-

State of Odisha

.....

Opposite Party

Represented by Adv. -
Mr. U.C.Jena, A.S.C.

CORAM:

**THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ADITYA KUMAR
MOHAPATRA**

ORDER

24.04.2024

Order No.

01. 1. This matter is taken up through Hybrid Arrangement (Virtual/Physical Mode).
2. Heard learned counsel for the Petitioners and learned Additional Standing Counsel appearing for the Opposite Party-State.
3. The present application has been filed under Section 482 of B.N.S.S. by the Petitioners seeking pre-arrest bail in connection with Khandapada P.S. case No.50 dated 25.02.2026, corresponding to 1.C.C. Case No.23 of 2024, pending in the court of learned J.M.F.C., Khandapada, for alleged commission of offences punishable under Sections 296/ 115(2)/ 127(1)/ 329(4)/ 304/ 109/ 351 / 3(5) / 85 of BNS, 2023 and U/s 4 of DP Act, 1961.
4. It is stated by the learned counsel for the Petitioners that the Petitioner No.1 is the husband and Petitioner No.2 is the mother-in-law of the informant. She further contended that the matrimonial



discord arose between the Petitioner No.1 and his wife-Informant, as a result of which the informant-wife has lodged the present case by making false allegations against the Petitioners. She further contended that both the Petitioners and informant are staying separately at the moment. It was also contended that a maintenance proceeding is pending before the learned Judge, Family Court, Nayagarh, wherein, vide order dated 07.02.2026, Petitioner No.1 has been directed to pay maintenance of Rs.10,000/-. She further contended that the present criminal case has been lodged at the instance of the informant to put pressure on the family of the Petitioners. It was also contended that the informant has not sustained any injury.

5. Learned counsel for the State on the other hand contended that taking into consideration the gravity and seriousness of the allegations, the Petitioners should not be enlarged on pre-arrest bail. He further submitted that the investigation is still on. Therefore, the release of the Petitioners at this juncture would cause delay the conclusion of the investigation.

6. Considering the nature of allegation, gravity of offence and the surrounding facts of the case, I am not inclined to grant pre-arrest bail to the Petitioners. However, it is directed that in the event the Petitioners surrender before the Court in seisin over the matter within a period of three weeks from today and move an application for bail, the Court in seisin over the matter shall release them on bail in connection with the aforesaid case on such terms and conditions as it may deem just and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case, but subject to verification of injury. In the event it is found by the learned court below that the injuries sustained by the injured are



grievous in nature, then this order shall automatically stand revoked.

7. The release of the Petitioners shall also be subject to following conditions: -

- I) shall cooperate with the investigation and appear before the I.O. as and when their presence is required and shall cooperate with the early conclusion of the investigation.
- II) shall not harass, threaten or terrorise the informant and her family members in any manner whatsoever.
- III) Shall pay the maintenance amount as would be directed by the learned Judge, Family Court, Nayagarh.

8. Accordingly, the ABLAPL is disposed of.

Urgent certified copy of this order be granted on proper application.

(Aditya Kumar Mohapatra)
Judge

Rubi

