



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK
CRLA No.575 of 2026
CNR No. ODHC010490662026

Saroj Panigrahi

...

Appellant

*Mr. A.K. Budhia, proxy counsel on
behalf of Mr. D.K. Mohapatra, Advocate
-versus-*

State of Orissa and another

...

Respondents

*Mr. T.K. Acharya, Addl. PP
Ms. A. Prusty, LADC (Informant)*

CORAM: JUSTICE G. SATAPATHY

Order No.
02.

ORDER(ORAL):09.09.2026

1. This matter is taken up through Hybrid Arrangement (Virtual/Physical Mode).
2. This Criminal Appeal in the nature of bail U/S.14-A of the Scheduled Caste & Scheduled Tribe (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 together with amendment Act, 2016 (in short, "the Act") is directed against the impugned order dated 25.06.2026 passed in Special GR Case No.156/2 of 2025-26 by which the learned Sessions Judge-Cum-Special Judge, Sundargarh, has refused to grant bail to the appellant in connection with Hemgiri PS Case No.510 of 2025, for commission of offence punishable U/Ss.326(g)/75(2)/296/351(3) of BNS r/w Section 3(2)(va) of the Act, on the main allegation of setting fire to the dwelling house of the informant and disconnecting electric connection to the said house.
3. Heard, Mr. Arun Kumar Budhia, learned proxy counsel appearing on behalf of Mr. Dhirendra Kumar



Mohapatra, learned counsel for the appellant; Mr. T.K. Acharya, learned Additional Public Prosecutor and Ms. Anisha Prusty, learned Legal Aid Defence Counsel (LADC) appearing along with the victim-informant virtually and perused the record.

3.1. At the outset, Ms. Anisha Prusty, learned Legal Aid Defence Counsel appearing along with the victim-informant vehemently argues and submits that not only the appellant has set fire to the dwelling house of the victim-informant, but also he has threatened the informant of dire consequence and till today, the appellant has not paid the money of the husband of the informant for the work done by him for the appellant. Accordingly, it is prayed to dismiss the Criminal Appeal.

4. After having considered the rival submissions and taking into consideration the nature and gravity of the offence alleged against the appellant vis-a-vis the accusations sought to be brought against him and regard being had to the pre-trial detention of the appellant in custody since 11.12.2025 with registration of FIR after more than a month of the alleged occurrence and there being no direct evidence available against the appellant for the occurrence and taking into account the other circumstances on record in entirety including the inherent right of the accused-appellant to be presumed innocent until proven guilty at the trial and the circumstance of transaction and



lastly, the incident only revealing about damage to the household articles through fire and no material being collected to suggest that the appellant would abscond or pose threat to the witnesses, if released on bail and further, the acquittal of the appellant in four out of the five criminal cases shown to have been his antecedents, this Court without expressing any view on the merits, considers it proper to admit the appellant to bail.

5. Hence, the CRLA stands allowed and the impugned order is, hereby, set aside. Consequently, the appellant is directed to be released on bail on such terms and conditions **except cash surety** as deem fit and proper by the learned Court in seisin over the matter.

6. A soft copy of this order be immediately communicated to the concerned Court, who shall afterwards communicate the same to the concerned Jail through e-mail for reference.

(G. Satapathy)
Judge

Subhasmita

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed
Signed by: SUBHASHMITA DAS
Designation: Sr. Stenographer
Reason: Authentication
Location: High Court of Orissa
Date: 09-Sep-2026 19:36:55

