



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK

BLAPL No. 12319 of 2025

Asish Kumar Yadav

..... *Petitioner(s)*

Mr. Chinmay Mohanty, Adv.

-versus-

State of Odisha

..... *Opposite Party*

Ms. Sarita Moharana, ASC

CORAM:

DR. JUSTICE SANJEEB K PANIGRAHI

ORDER

17.12.2025

Order No.

01

F.I.R. No.	Dated	Police Station	Case No. and Courts' Name	Sections
04	02.05.2023	CID Cyber Crime	G.R. Case No.308 of 2023 pending in the court of learned JMFC III (Cog Taking), Cuttack	Sections 419/420/467/468/471/ 120(b)/34 of IPC r/w Sec-66(C)/66(D) of IT Act.

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



3. The Petitioner being in custody in CID Cyber P.S. Case No. 04 of 2023 corresponding to G.R. Case No.308 of 2023 pending in the court of learned JMFC III (Cog Taking), Cuttack, registered for the alleged commission of offences under Sections 419/420/467/468/471/120(b)/34 of IPC r/w Sec-66(C)/66(D) of IT Act., has filed this petition for his release on bail.
4. The brief fact of the case as per the FIR lodged by one by one Debadutta Basantia alleging therein that before few days he inquired about taking of dealership of OKINAWA Electric Scooter and got himself registered in the website month of January- 2023. It is further alleged that on 06.01.2023 three to four unknown person talked with him and started messaging through WhatsApp using different mobile numbers and asked the complainant for different requirements. On 13.02.2023 they asked the complainant to transfer Rs. 14,500/- for registration fees and on 14.02.2023 they again insisted him to transfer an amount of Rs.38,746/- for agreement fees and subsequently the complainant transferred an amount of Rs.25,35,646/- in 17 transaction to various Bank accounts but the culprits again asked for more money for which the complainant suspected it and came to know that he became a victim of a cyber crime. Based on such information, CID Cyber Crime P.S. Case No.4 of 2023 as registered. Hence, this case.



5. Learned counsel for the Petitioner submits that the Petitioner is no way connected with the alleged offences in any manner. He further contends that FIR as well as other documents does not prima facie reveal any ingredients for the alleged offences against the Petitioner. He further submits that the Petitioner has not made any transaction related to the alleged fraud. In the meantime, charge sheet has already been submitted by the I.O. The Petitioner has been in custody since 18.09.2025. Accordingly, it is prayed that the present application for grant of bail may be favourably considered.
6. Learned counsel for the State vehemently opposes the prayer for bail stating that there are sufficient materials available in the case record to make out a strong prima facie case against the Petitioner in the commission of offence.
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