



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK**  
**BLAPL No.12002 of 2025**

***Pradip Parida @ Pradeep Parida*** ... ***Petitioner***

*Mr. J. Sahoo, Advocate*

-versus-

***State of Odisha*** ... ***Opposite Party***

*Mr. T.K. Acharya, Addl. PP*

**CORAM:**  
**JUSTICE G. SATAPATHY**

**ORDER(ORAL)**  
**16.12.2025**

**Order No.**  
**01.**

1. This matter is taken up through Hybrid Arrangement (Virtual/Physical Mode).
2. This is the 3<sup>rd</sup> bail application U/S.483 of BNSS by the petitioner for grant of bail in connection with Dharakote PS Case No.230 of 2024 corresponding to ST Case No.105 of 2025 (GR Case No.1289 of 2024) pending in the file of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Aska, being charge-sheeted for commission of offences punishable U/Ss.331(4)/309(4)/127(6)/238/53/317(2) of BNS r/w Sections 25(1)(a)/27 of Arms Act.
3. The allegation against the petitioner is that three unknown persons committed robbery in the shop of the informant and took away 3 Kg of gold, 8 Kg of Silver and Cash of Rupees Two Lakhs Twenty Seven Thousand along with four golden finger rings & one Vivo Mobile phone, whose approximate cost would be rupees One Crore Seventy Lakhs as per the informant



by tying the mouth and hand of the informant and subsequently, the investigation unearthed the involvement of the petitioner in this case.

4. In the course of hearing, Mr. Jyotirmaya Sahoo, learned counsel for the petitioner by filing a comprehensive affidavit for the petitioner and copy of deposition of the informant, which are taken on record, submits that the identification of the petitioner in the TI parade does not merit consideration, since the petitioner was known to the accused earlier and nothing having recovered from the present petitioner, his implication in this case is without any basis and, therefore, the petitioner may kindly be granted bail.

4.1. On the other hand, Mr. T.K. Acharya, learned Additional Public Prosecutor by inviting attention of the Court to the long criminal antecedents of the petitioner prays to reject his bail application by taking into consideration the evidence of the informant. Mr. Acharya further submits that not only the informant has been identified in the Court, but also in the TI parade and the petitioner being involved in 24 criminal cases, including four cases for commission of murder of different persons, his release on bail would have adverse impact on the society.

5. After having considered the rival submissions upon perusal of record, there appears some allegation against the petitioner for committing robbery from the jewellery shop of the informant, but fact remains that



the petitioner has checkered criminal history, since the comprehensive affidavit filed on behalf of the petitioner reveals that he is allegedly involved in 28 criminal cases, out of which it is stated for him to have been acquitted in some cases, but it is never disputed that the petitioner was also involved for commission of offence U/S.302 of IPC in four cases. In that view of the matter and taking into account the nature and gravity of the offences vis-à-vis the allegation sought to be brought against the petitioner and regard being had to the materials placed on record keeping in view the evidence of the informant and the identification of the petitioner in the TI parade and taking into account the other circumstances on record in entirety, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

6. Hence, the bail application of the petitioner stands rejected. In view of the alternative oral prayer as advanced for the petitioner, trial be expedited, if there is no other legal impediment.

7. Accordingly, the BLAPL stands disposed of. A copy of this order be immediately transmitted to the concerned Court.

**(G. Satapathy)**  
**Judge**