



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK
BLAPL No.6838 of 2024

Parsuram Rajneth Bhai Pal* ... *Petitioner

Mr. R. Tripathy, Advocate

-versus-

State of Odisha* ... *Opposite Party

Mr. J.P.Patra, Advocate (OPID)

CORAM:
JUSTICE G. SATAPATHY

ORDER(ORAL)
27.02.2026

Order No.
26.

IA No. 69 of 2026

1. This matter is taken up through Hybrid Arrangement (Virtual/Physical Mode).
2. This is an application by the petitioner for extension of interim bail for a period of another two months (60days) on the ground of self treatment.
3. Heard Mr.Rajesh Tripathy, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr.J.P.Patra, learned counsel for the OPID and perused the record together with the documents as produced including the affidavit produced for the petitioner.
4. On perusal of record, it appears that this Court by an order dated 01.12.2025 passed in IA No. 1069 of 2025 has granted interim bail to the petitioner for a period of 45 days subject to certain conditions for his treatment for multi vessel coronary artery disease which requires CABG(coronary artery



bypass graft), but the petitioner instead of undergoing any surgery has sought for extension of interim bail after expiry of interim bail for a period of 45 days and till date, he is yet to undergo surgery and one or some pretext, he appears to be prolonging his treatment only for extension of interim bail. It is relevant to reiterate here that the petitioner had earlier sought for and avail interim bail w.e.f. 06.06.2025 to 04.07.2025, but during that period it was found from the report of the IO that the petitioner stayed in a hotel namely Royal Lagoon in Room No. 102 situated at Rajmahal Chhak, Bhubaneswar and visited AIIMS hospital, Bhubaneswar for many times, however, he avoided heart surgery taking various plea and the petitioner did not cooperate with escort party then also. The aforesaid interim bail of 45 days has already expired on 6th February, 2026, but on the prayer of learned counsel for the petitioner, no coercive action has been taken against the petitioner with a hope that the petitioner would go undergo surgery and disclose his treatment plan, however, instead of disclosing treatment plan, an affidavit has been filed on behalf of the petitioner only to state that the operation would be conducted only after doctors are satisfied that all safety parameters are within permissible limits. In such affidavit, one prescription dated 21.02.2026 of the doctor has been annexed in which



it is stated that the petitioner is undergoing dental treatment for infection and plan is to do PCI after dental treatment. Further, although this Court has directed the IO to take instruction from concerned Medanta Hospital in which the petitioner is undergoing treatment, but the IO in his report dated 12.02.2026 has stated that the report of Medanta Hospital, New-Delhi is still awaited.

5. In the aforesaid fact and situation and taking into account the conduct of the petitioner, once again the petitioner is hereby directed to disclose his treatment plan within a week, failing which necessary order would be passed. It is, however, observed that no coercive action shall be taken against the petitioner till the next date. In addition, the IO may obtain the report from Hospital, New-Delhi in the meantime.

Accordingly, list this matter on 7th March, 2026.

(G. Satapathy)
Judge

kishore