



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK

BLAPL No. 3115 of 2026

Khuba Banjara

..... *Petitioner(s)*
Mr. Jnyananda Panda, Adv.

-Versus-

State of Odisha

..... *Opposite Party(s)*
Ms. Gayatri Patra, ASC

CORAM:

DR. JUSTICE SANJEEB K PANIGRAHI

ORDER

04.05.2026

Order No.

01.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Case No. and Courts' Name	Sections
89	22.02.2026	Dharamgarh	C.T. Case No.170 of 2026 pending in the court of learned S.D.J.M., Dharamgarh	Sections 143(3)/318(2)/127(3) of BNS

1. This matter is taken up through hybrid arrangement.
2. Heard learned counsel for the parties.
3. The Petitioner being in custody in Dharamgarh P.S. Case No. 89 of 2026, corresponding to C.T. Case No.170 of 2026 pending in the court of learned S.D.J.M., Dharamgarh,





registered for the alleged commission of offences under Sections 143(3)/318(2)/127(3) of BNS, has filed this petition for his release on bail.

4. The brief fact of the case is that the Petitioner had hired different labourers of village Sinapali and other nearby villages and kept them near his house with an intention to transport them to Telangana. The Petitioner had received Rs. 10,000/- per labourer from the labour Sardar, who had promised to pay a substantial amount upon the labourers' arrival at the destination. It is further alleged that the Petitioner had no passbook, no identity proofs in favour of the labourers, and no movement order from the labour office. Based on the aforesaid report, Dharamgarh P.S. Case No.89 of 2026 has been registered. Hence, this case.
5. The learned counsel for the Petitioner submits that the Petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case, and there is no credible or incriminating material on record that establishes his involvement in the alleged offences. The petitioner has been in judicial custody since 23.02.2026. In view of the foregoing, it is prayed that the petitioner be enlarged on bail, as his continued incarceration is unwarranted and disproportionate in the absence of any substantial evidence against him.



6. Learned counsel for the State vehemently opposes the prayer for bail, emphasizing the seriousness of the allegations.
7. Considering the nature and gravity of the accusation, character of evidence appearing against the Petitioner, the stringent punishment provided and that there are reasonable grounds for believing that the Petitioner is not guilty of the offence alleged or not likely to commit any such offence, which is not possible to record in this case, the prayer for bail is devoid of merit. Hence, his prayer for bail stands rejected.
8. The BLAPL is, accordingly, dismissed.

(Dr. Sanjeeb K Panigrahi)
Judge

Murmu