



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK
BLAPL No.5757 of 2026
CNR No. ODHCO10418712026

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

Prince Raj ... ***Petitioner***

-versus-

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

For Petitioner : ***Mr. B.R. Tripathy, Advocate***

For Opposite Party : ***Mr. S.C. Pradhan, Addl. PP***

CORAM: JUSTICE G. SATAPATHY

DATE OF HEARING & DATE OF JUDGMENT: 03.09.2026 (ORAL)

G. Satapathy, J.

1. This is the bail application U/S.483 of the BNSS by the petitioner for grant of bail in connection with Cyber Crime (CID) P.S. Case No. 11 of 2025 corresponding to C.T. Case No. 494 of 2025 pending in the Court of learned SDJM, Bhubaneswar, for commission of offence punishable U/Ss. 318(4)/ 319(2)/ 336(2)(3)/338/340(2)/61(2)/3(5) BNS read with Section 66(C)(D) of I.T. Act.

2. The background facts of the case in gist are that the complainant Sambhram Das was added by a



stranger to WhatsApp group named "F-31-Raushan VIP Investment Alliance" and then he joined a new group named "VIP 760 Raushan Kumar Exchange group". Accordingly, on the guidance and advice by the admin of said group, the petitioner invested money to the tune of Rs.2,06,07,500/-, but later he realized that he has been deceived by way of online financial fraud as he was not allowed to withdraw his investment.

Accordingly, Sambhram Das lodged an FIR which was registered in Cyber Crime (CID) P.S. Case No. 11 of 2025 and the matter was investigated into, but in the course of investigation, it was unearthed that out of such investment, a sum of Rs.40,32,500/- was found to be deposited to the Bandhan Bank account No. 10200001767490 of Maa Bhagabati Garments, whose proprietor is the petitioner from the account of the informant maintained at Development Bank of Singapore (DBS). On finding aforesaid incriminating materials, the petitioner was taken into custody, but he became unsuccessful in securing his liberty before the learned Sessions Court and thereby, he is before this Court in



this bail application. In the meantime, charge sheet has already been submitted.

3. In the course of hearing, Mr. Biwajit Ranjan Tripathy, learned counsel for the petitioner by placing the facts as stated in the FIR submits that there is nothing on record to suggest that the petitioner has ever allured the informant to invest money nor had he contacted the informant so as to invest money and thereby, the petitioner has no link in the investment made by the informant, but even for the sake for argument, considering the account of the Maa Bhagabati Garments to be involved in this case and the petitioner being the proprietor thereof, no case of forgery can be made out against the petitioner, since the petitioner has neither any knowledge nor has he made any transaction with such account of Maa Bhagabati Garments and thereby, the petitioner being innocent, he may kindly be granted bail.

3.1. On the other hand, Mr. S.C. Pradhan, learned Addl. PP by placing the facts of the case submits that not only the petitioner is involved in this case, but also five



complaints have been linked with the account of the Maa Bhagabati Garments, which stands in the name of the petitioner and thereby, the petitioner's bail application may kindly be rejected.

4. After having considered the rival submissions upon perusal of record, there appears allegation against the petitioner for receiving Rs.40,32,500/- in the account of Maa Bhagabati Garments whose proprietor is the present petitioner and such account of Maa Bhagabati Garments is linked with five complaints as per NCR Portal (Samanvaya Portal). No doubt, the charge sheet has already been filed in this case, but the transaction to the Maa Bhagabati Garments, whose proprietor is the present petitioner itself discloses the allegation against the petitioner.

5. In the aforesaid facts and circumstances and on consideration of materials placed on record together with complaint received against the account standing in the name of Maa Bhagabati Garments, whose proprietor is the present petitioner, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at this stage.



6. Hence, the bail application of the petitioners stands rejected. Accordingly, the bail application stands disposed of. In view of the alternative oral prayer as advanced for the petitioner, the petitioner is at liberty to renew his prayer for bail after examination of some witnesses. A soft copy of this judgment be immediately transmitted to the Court in seisin over the matter for reference.

(G. Satapathy)
Judge

*Orissa High Court, Cuttack,
Dated the 3rd day of September, 2026/S.Sasmal*