



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK
CRLMP No. 29 of 2026

Antaram Pradhan

.....

Petitioner

Mr. Dilip Kumar Sahu, Advocate

-versus-

State of Orissa and another

.....

Opposite Parties

Mr. Amitabh Pradhan,
Additional Standing Counsel

CORAM:

HON'BLE MISS JUSTICE SAVITRI RATHO

ORDER

26.03.2026

Order No.

02.

(Through hybrid Mode)

1. This CRLMP has been filed to conduct a proper investigation in Barpali PS Case No. 01 of 2024 which corresponds to GR Case No. 01 of 2024 within a stipulated time.
2. Annexure-1 is the FIR on basis of which Barpali PS Case No. 01 of 2024 has been registered under Section 307/34 of the IPC against one Anil Padhan, Pandaba Charan Das, Saroj Padhan, Khirodra Padhan, Dharmaraj Padhan, Mutu Seth. As the injured Sudhir Padhan expired during treatment, the case turned to under Section 302 of the IPC. The petitioner is aggrieved as because after investigation, charge sheet has been submitted against Saroj @ Brundaban Padhan only. It is his allegation that during investigation, the police has not examined material witnesses, who had witnessed the assault on the deceased by all the accused persons especially Anil Padhan who had borrowed money from the deceased and was not returning the same and had a reason to assault/murder him. But the co-accused have been left scot-free deliberately.
3. On 27.02.2026, although Mr. Sahu, learned counsel for the



petitioner had prayed for an adjournment to satisfy the Court that re-investigation on the ground of non-examination of vital witnesses and non-submission of charge sheet against some of the accused persons should be directed, today, he submits that since these material witnesses have deliberately not been examined by the IIC, direction for re-investigation may not serve any useful purpose unless it is by an independent agency. He therefore submits that he may be granted liberty to challenge the charge sheet in the proper forum by filing protest petition or avail any other remedy which is available to him under law.

4. The CRLMP is disposed of observing that the petitioner is at liberty to avail of the remedies which are available to him under law.

5. The typographical error in order dated 23.02.2026, where reference the instruction dated 22.02.2026 has been typed as 28.02.2026. The said typographical error may be corrected.

(Savitri Ratho)
Judge

Subhalaxmi