



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK

BLAPL No. 3474 of 2026

Himanshu Sekhar Sahu

..... *Petitioner(s)*
Mr. Niranjana Lenka, Adv.

-Versus-

State of Odisha

..... *Opposite Party(s)*
Mr. Tej Kumar, ASC

CORAM:

DR. JUSTICE SANJEEB K PANIGRAHI

ORDER

05.05.2026

Order No.

01.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Case No. and Courts' Name	Sections
359	16.07.2025	Baisinga	S.T. Case No.150 of 2025 (C.T.807 of 2025) pending in the court of learned First Addl. Sessions Judge, Baripada	Sections 103(1) of BNS, 2023

1. This matter is taken up through hybrid arrangement.
2. Heard learned counsel for the parties.



3. The Petitioner being in custody in Baisinga P.S. Case No. 359 of 2025, corresponding to S.T. Case No.150 of 2025 (C.T.807 of 2025) pending in the court of learned First Addl. Sessions Judge, Baripada, registered for the alleged commission of offences under Sections 103(1) of BNS, 2023, has filed this petition for his release on bail.
4. The brief fact of the case is that on 16.07.2025, the informant named Pramila Behera lodged an FIR before the Baisinga P.S. alleging that on 15/16.07.2025 at about 12:30 A.M., her younger brother, i.e. the present Petitioner, informed her over the phone that he could not take care of his parents. He further stated that he had committed the murder of his father and mother by means of a stone and threw that stone into the back yard of his paddy yard. After receiving this information, the informant went to her parents' house and confirmed it was true. Hence, this case.
5. Learned counsel for the Petitioner submits that the Petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case and he is no way connected with the offences as alleged by the prosecution in any manner. He further submits that in the meanwhile two material witnesses have been examined by the prosecution, but no evidence direct or circumstance has been found





against the Petitioner. He further submits that the Petitioner is in custody since 16.07.2025. Hence, he submits that the Petitioner may be enlarged on bail.

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

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed
Signed by: LITARAM MURMU
Designation: P.A.
Reason: Authentication
Location: OHC
Date: 08-May-2026 19:36:14

