



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK
BLAPL No.12135 of 2025
CNR No.ODHC010825212025

(In the matter of application under Section 483 of
BNSS, 2023).

Ramnarayan Bal ... ***Petitioner***

-versus-

State of Orissa ... ***Opposite Party***

For Petitioner : ***Mr. S. Luthra, Sr. Advocate***
along with Mr. S. Satapathy,

For Opposite Party : ***Mr. P.Satapathy, Addl. PP***
For Informant : ***Mr. S. Agarwal, Sr. Advocate***
along with Mr. S.S. Mohanty,

CORAM: JUSTICE G. SATAPATHY

DATE OF HEARING & JUDGMENT:14.08.2026

G. Satapathy, J.

1. This is a bail application U/S.483 of BNSS by the petitioner for grant of bail in connection with EOW, Bhubaneswar P.S. Case No. 17 of 2025 corresponding to C.T. Case No. 20 of 2025 pending in the file of learned Presiding Officer, Designated Court under OPID Act, Cuttack, for commission of offences punishable U/Ss. 318(4)/319(2)/338/336(3)/340(2)/341(1)/61(2) of BNS.



2. The case against the petitioner arises out of Bhubaneswar EOW FIR No. 17 dated 28.10.2025 lodged by one Gobinda Chandra Nayak, who alleged therein that the petitioner by impersonating himself as an employee of State Bank of India(in short, the "Bank") misrepresented the informant, who is the representative of the company M/s. The World Ventures Ltd. (hereinafter referred to as "the company") for dealing with mortgaged property of the Bank and induced him(informant) to purchase the assets, particularly land and buildings under possession of the Bank at much lesser price than the market value and believing such misrepresentation to be true, the informant expressed his interest to purchase the assets for the company and accordingly, the petitioner fraudulently executed certain documents in favour of Mr. Srinibas Sahoo, the Director of Company to sell the mortgaged property of the Bank to the company and accordingly, the company transferred a sum of Rs.14,01,83,039/- on different dates to the account number given by the petitioner in



the letter of proposal stated to be issued by the Bank, which was in fact not issued by the Bank for purchase of six properties of the Bank, but later on, it was ascertained by the Company that the account number given by the petitioner is not the account number of Bank, rather it was the personal account of the petitioner, whereupon it was found by the company that the petitioner was not working with the Bank in any capacity then, but he(petitioner) had executed the documents by impersonating himself as an employee of Bank by using the seal of the Bank as genuine and forging the signatures of DGM (Zone-3) of the Bank namely Mr. Harihar Pattnaik with fake documents. On registration of the FIR, the allegation against the petitioner was investigated into, in the course of which it was ascertained that the petitioner was working as a Sales Manager of the "SBI Cap Securities" at Bhubaneswar during the year 2014 to 2022 and he was well aware of the procedure for sell and purchase of the mortgaged property of the Bank, where the loanees



failed to repay the loan amount. Accordingly, it was unearthed in the investigation that the petitioner has misappropriated a sum of Rs.14,01,83,039/- of the company by fraudulently executing documents without any authority and producing fake documents with forged signatures of the authority of the Bank and in the process, he cheated the company. On conclusion of investigation, charge sheet was submitted against the petitioner for commission of offence punishable U/Ss. 318(4)/319(2)/338/336(3)/340(2)/341(1)/61(2) of BNS. Finding prima facie materials, the petitioner was taken into custody for commission of above offences, but he remained unsuccessful in securing his liberty by way of bail from the Court in seisin over the matter and thereafter, he is before this Court in this bail application.

3. This Court has heard Mr. Sidharth Luthra, learned Senior Counsel who is being assisted by Mr. Subham Satapathy, learned counsel for the petitioner; Mr. P.Satapathy, learned Addl. Public Prosecutor and Mr.Sidhartha Agarwal, learned Senior Counsel who is



being assisted by Mr. Satya Smruti Mohanty, learned counsel for the informant in the matter and perused the record.

4. After having considered the rival submissions upon perusal of record including the averments taken in the bail application, the petitioner albeit has sought for bail mainly on two grounds; such as non-compliance of Sec.47 of BNSS r/w. Article 22(1) of the Constitution of India and on merits, but this Court before dwelling upon such issues considers it proper to advert to the conduct of the petitioner, which is also equally important, even if the same cannot validate the illegal arrest and remand of an accused for non-compliance of Sec.47 of BNSS as claimed by the petitioner in this case. On coming to the conduct of the petitioner, it appears that the petitioner has partially disclosed his criminal antecedents in the bail application by stating therein that he is implicated in Bhadrak Town P.S. Case No. 264 dated 25.09.2016, but that too, without disclosing the details of the said case, however, the petitioner is implicated in five criminal



cases, which was subsequently disclosed by him very recently on 02.07.2026 by way of comprehensive affidavit, but the learned State counsel has taken objection against the petitioner for not disclosing his antecedent on 19.02.2026 in I.A. No. 127 of 2026, which was filed for extension interim bail to the petitioner. When this Court in the course of hearing of bail application sought for clarification with regard to true disclosure/partial disclosure of criminal antecedent of the petitioner in his bail application by confronting the principle laid down by the Apex Court in ***Munnesh Vrs. State of Uttar Pradesh; 2025 SCC OnLine SC 1319*** and ***Zeba Khan Vrs. State of UP and others; 2026 SCC OnLine 188***, Mr. Siddharth Luthra, learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner has tried to explain that the details of the antecedents or implication of the petitioner as known to the petitioner's *paikar* at the time of filing of bail petition was set out therein, but such explanation does not appeal to the conscience of the Court, more particularly when one out of five criminal antecedent of



the petitioner was only disclosed in the bail application and all the criminal antecedents of the petitioner were disclosed just a little more than one month before on 03.07.2026 by way of a comprehensive affidavit, even though the State has taken objection to it on 19.02.2026. On the other hand, in **Munnesh (supra)** the Apex Court at paragraph-9 has held thus:-

"9. since the petitioner has suppressed material facts with regard to his involvement in criminal cases, he is not entitled to the discretionary relief of bail." XXXX xxx xx xx."

In **Zeba Khan (supra)**, the Apex Court at paragraphs-42, 43, 47 & 48 has been pleased to hold as under:-

"42. It has been consistently emphasized by this Court that an accused or applicant seeking bail is under a solemn obligation to make a fair, complete and candid disclosure of all material facts having a direct bearing on the exercise of judicial discretion. Any suppression, concealment or selective disclosure of such material facts amounts to an abuse of the process of law and strikes at the very root of the administration of criminal justice."

43. In the present case, Respondent No. 2 deliberately concealed his criminal antecedents before the High Court, both in the petition for quashing FIR as well as in successive bail applications. Even before this Court, only partial disclosure was made in the counter-affidavit, despite the existence of multiple criminal cases on record. This conduct cannot be viewed as an isolated lapse but reflects a growing and



disturbing trend of accused persons securing discretionary relief by suppressing material facts.

47. As repeatedly observed by this Court, bail applications are examined at multiple stages - from the trial Court to the High Court and ultimately this Court - where courts are often constrained to take a prima facie view on incomplete or selectively presented records. ***Non-disclosure of material aspects such as criminal antecedents, prior bail rejections, duration of custody, compliance with constitutional and statutory safeguards, and the progress of trial may result in the unwarranted grant of bail,*** or conversely, the prolonged incarceration of accused persons despite substantial custody having already been undergone.

48. Thus, this Court is of the view that ***every petitioner or applicant seeking bail, at any stage of proceedings, is under an obligation to disclose all material particulars, including criminal antecedents*** and the existence of any coercive processes such as issuance of non-bailable warrants, declaration as a proclaimed offender, or similar proceedings, duly supported by an affidavit, so as to promote uniformity, transparency and integrity in bail adjudication."

5. Be that as it may, the petitioner by way of comprehensive affidavit has disclosed his implication in the following five criminal cases:-

(i) Bhadrak Town P.S. Case No. 264 of 2016 corresponding to G.R. Case No.1773 of 2016 pending in the Court of Learned JMFC, Bhadrak, for the alleged commission of the



offences U/Ss. 381/406/408/420 of the I.P.C.,

(ii) Baisinga P.S. Case No. 103 of 2019, corresponding to C.T. Case No. 258 of 2019 pending in the Court of learned JMFC, Betnoti, for the alleged commission of the offences U/S.408/420 of the IPC,

(iii) Colliery P.S. Case No. 372 of 2024, corresponding to G.R. Case No. 980 of 2024 pending in the Court of learned JMFC(C.T.), Talcher, for the alleged commission of the offences U/S. 318(4)/336(2)/336(3)/340(2)/3(5) of the BNS,

(iv) Bhadrak Town P.S. Case No. 567 of 2025, corresponding to G.R. Case No. 2247 of 2025 pending in the Court of learned SDJM, Bhadrak, for the alleged commission of the offences U/S.292/296/221/3(5) of the BNS read with Sec. 3 of the Orissa Fire Works & Loud Speaker Regulation Act, 1938 & Sec. 182(A) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 &

(v) Mancheswar P.S. Case No. 49 of 2026, corresponding to C.T. Case No. 165 of 2026 pending in the Court of learned JMFC-II, Bhubaneswar, for the alleged commission of the offences U/S. 316(2)/318(4)/336(2)/61(2) of BNS.

6. No doubt, Mr.Luthra, learned Senior Counsel has tried to distinguish the objection of suppression of material facts of implication of the petitioner in other cases by submitting that the fact as known to the petitioner's wife was stated in the bail application at the



relevant time, but subsequently after knowing the antecedent of the petitioner it was disclosed by way of comprehensive affidavit and thereby, the disclosure of antecedent by the petitioner is fair, complete and candid. Even accepting such submission, this Court when perused the order sheets of the cases shown as an antecedent as supplied by the petitioner, it appears that although the petitioner claims to have not been shown as an absconder in C.T. Case No. 258 of 2019 arising out of Baisingha PS Case No. 103 of 2019, but such claim is found to be incorrect as not only NBWA was issued against the petitioner on 18.12.2020 in the said case, but also the charge sheet submitted in that case on 09.02.2021, the petitioner was shown as an absconder, no matter he was granted bail subsequently after issuance of NBWA pursuant to an order passed by a coordinate Bench of this Court in ABLAPL No. 11964 of 2022. The sequence of events as referred to above with regard to partial disclosure of criminal antecedents by the petitioner together with submission of charge sheet



in Baisinga PS Case No. 103 of 2019 by showing the petitioner as an absconder, which was accepted by the learned Court in seisin over the matter, but the same having not been challenged in any forum and claiming the contrary to it for not being shown as an absconder in the charge sheet, the only ultimate conclusion is that the latin Maxim "*suppressio veri, expressio falsi*" which means "the suppression of the truth is equivalent to the expression of a falsehood" fits against the petitioner in this case.

7. Adverting to the plea of non-compliance of Sec.47 of BNSS r/w. Article 22(1) of the Constitution of India as raised by the petitioner, this Court has no hesitation to agree with the argument advanced by Mr. Luthra, learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner can be admitted to bail for non-compliance of these provisions which are mandatory in nature, but it is a case where the State has contended that there is sufficient compliance of these provisions of Section 47 of BNSS r/w. Article 22(1) of the Constitution of India,



however, these provisions make it amply clear that no person can be detained in custody without informing him as soon as may be, of the grounds of his arrest, but the mode of communication of such grounds of arrest has neither been prescribed in Article 22(1) of the Constitution of India nor has it been described in Sec.47 of the BNSS, however, the same has been prescribed by judgment law. For grant of bail to the petitioner due to non-compliance of these provisions resulting in vitiation of his arrest and remand, Mr. Luthra, learned Senior Counsel has argued that the representation of petitioner by a counsel at the time of remand of the petitioner would not dispense with the compliance of these provisions and the constitutional scheme has made it mandatory for conveying the grounds of arrest to the arrestee in writing expeditiously, but there is a significant difference between “reasons for arrest” and “grounds of arrest”, out of which the former is formal, whereas the latter is mandatory and in this case, the copy of remand application even does not contain the



specific grounds of arrest and the same cannot be considered as due compliance of these provisions. It is further argued by Mr.Luthra that the requirement of informing the arrestee of the grounds of arrest is not an empty formality, but a mandatory constitutional requirement and non-compliance thereof is clear violation of fundamental right and accepting the objection of the informant about petitioner not taking the plea of non-compliance of these provisions at the earliest would amount to nullify the provision of Article 22(1) of Constitution of India, even though the petitioner has not taken such plea during his remand to custody on various dates since it was the duty of the Presiding Officer of the concerned Court to ensure compliance of these provisions before remanding the petitioner to custody in this case, but that having not done and the petitioner having remanded to custody without the compliance of these provisions with charge sheet not disclosing the compliance of Sec. 47 of BNSS read with Article 22(1) of Constitution of India, the



arrest of the petitioner stands vitiated, so also his subsequent remands in this case, which can only be rectified by releasing the petitioner from custody on bail and in support of his contention, Mr.Luthra extensively relies on the decisions in ***Vihaan Kumar vs. State of Haryana & Another; (2025) 5 SCC 799*** & ***Prabir Purkayastha vs. State (NCT of Delhi); (2024) 8 SCC 254***. This Court has no hesitation in accepting the law laid down by the Apex Court in these decisions, but in ***Mihir Rajesh Shah Vrs. State of Maharashtra; (2026) 1 SCC 500***, the Apex Court has laid down the principle that the grounds of arrest must be communicated to the arrestee in writing in the language he understands and such communication of grounds of arrest in writing has been made applicable to the arrest prospectively, which is evident from the relevant observation of the Apex Court in ***Mihir Rajesh Shah (supra)*** at paragraph-68 which is reiterated as under:-

"68. We are cognizant that there existed no consistent or binding requirement **mandating written communication of the grounds of arrest for all the offences**. Holding as above,



*in our view, would ensure implementation of the constitutional rights provided to an arrestee as engrafted under Article 22 of the Constitution of India in an effective manner. Such clarity on obligation would avoid uncertainty in the administration of criminal justice. The ends of fairness and legal discipline therefore demand that **this procedure as affirmed above shall govern arrests "henceforth."***

8. The above issue of informing the arrestee of his "grounds of arrest" to apply to the arrest prospectively has been reiterated in a very recent decision in **State of Meghalaya Vrs. Sonam Raghuvanshi @ Bitti @ Bittu in SLP (CRL.) No.11944 of 2026, disposed of on 23.07.2026**, wherein the Apex Court at paragraph-9 has held thus:-

*"9. Law is quite settled that serving of the grounds of arrest is mandatory. This has been introduced as a Judge made law vide a judgment of this Court in the case of **Mihir Rajesh Shah (supra)**. That is the precise reason why this Court was pleased to hold that though such a procedure is not contemplated, nonetheless, it is so required in order to give effect to Article 22(1) of the Constitution of India. **For the said reason, the decision was made to apply prospectively.** Admittedly, in the case on hand, the respondent was arrested on 09.06.2025 much before the date of pronouncement of **Mihir Rajesh Shah (supra)**."*



It is, therefore, very clear that the Apex Court in ***Sonam Raghuvanshi(supra)*** by relying upon the precedent in ***Mihir Rajesh Shah (supra)*** has reiterated that the decision in ***Mihir Rajesh Shah (supra)*** was made to apply prospectively to the arrest and thereby, rejected the plea of the accused-respondent therein for grant of bail on the simple reason of the arrest being made much prior to the date of pronouncement of judgment in ***Mihir Rajesh Shah (supra)***. In the present case, the petitioner was arrested on 29.10.2025 which is before the date of pronouncement of judgment in ***Mihir Rajesh Shah (supra)*** which was delivered on 06.11.2025.

9. Another distinguished and significant issue involved in this case is that the petitioner has never taken such plea of non-compliance of Sec.47 of BNSS till it was taken for the first time in this bail application by way of I.A. No. 199 of 2026 which was basically filed for extending the interim bail to the petitioner, however, such application of the petitioner was in fact dismissed by a co-ordinate Bench of this Court, but without



adverting to such issue, however, the said order having not been challenged by the petitioner attains finality. This Court not only strongly believes, but also has no doubt in the mind that the total non-compliance of Sec.47 of BNSS r/w. Article 22(1) of the Constitution of India is not permissible being violative of constitutional mandate, but inadequate compliance of such provisions can only enure to the benefit of the arrestee, if he establishes prejudice for such inadequate compliance which is in fact laid down in ***Sonam Raghuvanshi (supra)***, wherein in paragraph-11, the Apex Court has held thus:-

*"11. xx xxx xxx xxx There is a fundamental difference between **nonservice of grounds of arrest and non-furnishing of adequate reasons thereunder**. While the first category might vitiate the arrest, **in the second category, one has to see the prejudice caused to the accused**. In the facts of the instant case, it is not as if the respondent was not served with the grounds of arrest. Hence, the case of the respondent falls within the second category discussed above."*

On examining the plea of non-compliance of these provisions in the light of aforesaid principle of the



Apex Court, it appears that the petitioner was arrested on 29.10.2025 at 4.50A.M. from his residence with a memo of arrest being prepared by the Arresting Officer, wherein the circumstance of arrest in brief (grounds of arrest) has been described "as prima facie evidence well established U/S.318(4)/ 319(2)/ 338/ 336(3)/ 340(2)/341(1)/61(2) of the BNS" and such memo of arrest was not only signed by the wife of the petitioner, but also by the petitioner himself and counter signed by the Arresting Officer. Besides, the certified copy of the first remand report submitted by the IO as produced reveals the details of the allegation levelled against the petitioner and his arrest by informing him the grounds of his arrest and observing all the arrest formalities. Further, it is found from the copy of order sheet produced by the petitioner that on 29.10.2025, the petitioner was produced before the concerned Court and the concerned Court has also asked about any ill-treatment meted out to the petitioner, but the petitioner has complained of no ill-treatment in custody



and such remand proceeding was also held in presence of the counsel appearing for the petitioner and the order of the remand was also signed by the petitioner himself, but he has not raised any prejudice nor his counsel raised about non-compliance of these provisions, however, the remand order also reveals that the Investigating Officer has also submitted arrest and inspection memo, medical examination report of the petitioner, original CD, statement of witnesses along with other documents including the seizure list. The main object and purpose of these provisions is to prevent arbitrary arrest and to ensure that the accused be made aware of the allegation against him so that he can protect his liberty in the Court of law, but at this stage, it cannot be said that the petitioner was not aware of the allegation against him, more particularly when his bail application has been rejected by the Court in seisin over the matter after thorough discussion and his application in I.A. No. 199 of 2026, which was filed before this Court earlier taking the plea



of non-compliance of these provisions has already been rejected and he has failed to demonstrate any prejudice caused to him, even if his plea for non-compliance is accepted for a moment. This Court firmly believes that there must be a meaningful compliance of the provision, but inadequate compliance is a question of fact that has to be ascertained by perusing the materials on record and although the learned Senior Counsel has argued that there is total non-compliance of the aforesaid provision of Sec.47 of BNSS r/w. Article 22(1) of the Constitution of India, but the discussion made hereinabove makes it a case of inadequate compliance inasmuch as, the petitioner was arrested and the details of his arrest has been described in the arrest memo, wherein not only the provisions of law for which the petitioner was forwarded to the Court has been stated, but also it contains the date & time of arrest, the signature of the petitioner and his wife and that of Arresting Officer in English.



10. Be that as it may, the petitioner albeit has taken the plea of non-compliance subsequently in this bail application on 16.03.2026 by way of I.A. No. 199 of 2026 which was already dismissed, of course the plea of law can be taken at any point of time, but the petitioner must have been produced before the Court in *seisin* of the case on many occasions in the interregnum since he was arrested on 29.10.2025, however, he has not raised any prejudice caused to him in those remand proceedings before the Court in *seisin* over the matter. Further, the bail application of the petitioner was extensively heard and disposed of by the learned Court in *seisin* over the matter on 07.11.2025, but he has not raised any prejudice caused to him on the ground of non-compliance of these provisions. In the context of subsequent challenge of such plea, this Court, however, considers it relevant to refer to the decision in ***Sonam Raghuvarshi (supra)***, wherein the Apex Court at paragraph-12 therein has held as under:-

"12. Xxx xxx xxx we would only clarify that when an accused person files a bail application,



*the stage might become irrelevant. However, **when the accused person warranted a finding on merits on the earlier occasions, it is not open for him/her to go back and raise the plea on the issue pertaining to the grounds of arrest thereafter.***"

It is not in dispute that the investigation in this case is kept pending U/S.193(9) of BNSS and in **Sonam Raghuvanshi (supra)**, the Apex Court at paragraph-10 has held thus:-

"10. Apart from the fact that the respondent was conspicuously absent and, thus, could not be traced after the occurrence, the law does not restrain the prosecuting agency from re-arresting a person. In other words, non-compliance of the service of grounds of arrest to an accused and consequent enlargement on bail, will not act as a fetter to re-arrest the said accused for the purpose of investigation."

11. In view of the discussions made hereinabove coupled with the position of law as expounded by the Apex Court with regard to non-compliance of Sec.47 of BNSS r/w. Article 22(1) of the Constitution of India, but the claim of the petitioner being found to be inadequate compliance, however, no prejudice having been



demonstrated by the petitioner, even the plea of non-compliance of Sec.47 of BNSS r/w. Article 22(1) of the Constitution of India is taken into consideration and the arrest of the petitioner being prior to date of pronouncement of judgment in ***Mihir Rajesh Shah (supra)***, which prescribes service of grounds of arrest to the arrestee to apply to the arrest prospectively and the same being reiterated by the Apex Court in ***Sonam Raghuvanshi (supra)*** and keeping in view the disposal of I.A. No. 199 of 2026, which has been filed by the petitioner to challenge his arrest to be vitiated on account of non-compliance, but the petitioner having not challenged such order passed in the I.A. No. 199 of 2026, this Court does not find any merit in the plea of the petitioner for non-compliance of Sec.47 of BNSS r/w. Article 22(1) of the Constitution of India.

12. Even otherwise, considering the bail application of the petitioner on merits, it appears that Mr. Luthra, learned Senior Counsel has brought to the notice of the Court that this case is based on



documentary evidence, which has already been collected by the Investigating Agency and there are 56 charge sheeted witnesses whose examination would definitely take considerable time, but the petitioner being not a flight risk, he still can be admitted to bail on merits. It is, however, found from the record that the petitioner has not only four criminal antecedents prior to registration of this case, but also he is subsequently implicated in another case after registration of this case, but in the four cases, the petitioner has been implicated for similar type of offences, however, NBWA was issued against the petitioner in Baisingha P.S. Case No. 103 of 2019 as the Investigating Officer has not only obtained such NBWA during pendency of the investigation, but also has shown the petitioner as an absconder in the charge sheet and the aforesaid conduct is definitely an adverse circumstance against the petitioner, no matter he was granted bail in the aforesaid case subsequently. It cannot be forgotten that the paramount consideration



in granting bail is securing attendance of the accused at the trial, but the conduct of the petitioner in this case appears to be not in consonance with the legal principle, more particularly when he has not disclosed his criminal antecedents in the bail application, but subsequently disclosed the same once objection is raised by the learned State Counsel. Besides, there appears allegation against the petitioner for impersonating himself as an employee of the Bank to induce the informant-company and it's Directors to purchase the mortgaged property of the Bank and accordingly, received Rs.14,01,83,039/- by executing allegedly fake documents with forged signatures of Authority of the Bank. Even though the allegation against him is denied, but the petitioner himself has stated in the bail application to have received Rs.14,01,83,039/- in his personal account from the company, however, he has failed to give any satisfactory explanation for receiving such an amount from the informant company. Not only the allegation



against the petitioner is serious, but also, he is allegedly involved in other cases for similar offences, which are in fact adverse circumstances for considering his bail application positively. In the context of criminal antecedents, this Court considers it relevant to refer to the decision in **Azwar Vrs. Waseen; 2024 10 SCC 768**, wherein in Paragraph 26 the Apex Court has held as under:-

*"26.while considering as to whether, bail ought to be granted in a matter involving a serious criminal offence, the Court must consider relevant factors like the nature of accusations made against the accused, the manner in which crime to have been committed, the gravity of the offence, the role attributed to the accused, **the criminal antecedents of the accused**, the probability of tempering of the witnesses and repeating the offence, if the accused are released on bail, the likelihood of the accused being unavailable in the event bail is granted, the possibility of obstructing the proceedings and evading the Court of justice and the overall desirability of releasing the accused on bail."*

In view of the discussions made hereinabove, this Court, therefore, does not consider it proper to extend the discretionary relief of bail to the petitioner on merits.



13. In the result, the petitioner is not entitled to bail, either on merits or on technicality of non-compliance of mandatory provision of law. Accordingly, the BLAPL stands disposed of. A copy of this order be immediately transmitted to the learned Court in seisin over the matter.

(G. Satapathy)
Judge

*Orissa High Court, Cuttack,
Dated the 14th day of August, 2026/S.Sasmal*