

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK

BLAPL No. 6518 of 2021

***Prasant Das @ Pratap Kumar
Satpathy***

....

Petitioner

*Mr. S. B. Mohanty,
Advocate*

-Versus -

State of Odisha

....

Opposite Party

*Mr. S.K. Mishra,
Additional Standing Counsel*

CORAM:

JUSTICE SASHIKANTA MISHRA

ORDER

01.08.2022

Order No.

3.

1. This matter is taken up through hybrid mode.
2. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned Additional Standing Counsel for the State.
3. The petitioner is in custody in connection with NALCO P.S. Case No. 132 of 2021 corresponding to G.R. Case No.675 of 2021 pending in the Court of learned J.M.F.C., Banarpali for the alleged commission of offence under Sections 120(B)/419/420 of IPC.
4. It is alleged that the informant paid substantial amount of money to one Deepika Banarjee@Chaitali Mukharjee for arranging a job for him in TATA Company, but subsequently it was revealed that as per a conspiracy hatched by several persons including the present petitioner, students from Odisha and several other States were duped by making them undergo a purported training

programme at Jamshedpur. The money so paid by the students was thereafter misappropriated by the conspirators and shared among themselves, while the students were left high and dry. In so far as the present petitioner is concerned he is said to have impersonated as faculty member of the training institute by utilizing forged ID card, logo and seal of TATA Company. As such, the petitioner is a part of the group that indulged in cheating several innocent students including the informant.

5. It is submitted that the petitioner has not been named in the FIR and he is a bonafide faculty lecturer in a career institute being engaged on remuneration. It is further submitted that most of the students have in the meantime been provided job as promised including in TATA Company and the FIR was lodged only because they could not be given employment immediately after the training programme. It is also submitted that the money so paid by the students has been utilized for their necessary expenses like lodging, boarding, tuition fees and study material etc.

6. Learned Addl. Standing Counsel has opposed the prayer for bail by submitting that the petitioner is an active member of the group that cheated several innocent students and therefore, no leniency should be shown to him.

7. Considering the submissions as above, the materials on record and the period of detention of the petitioner in custody, I am inclined to allow the prayer for bail. Let the petitioner be released on bail on such terms and conditions as the Court in seisin over the matter may deem fit and proper to impose including the condition that he shall personally appear before the trial Court on each date of

posting of the case without fail and in case of even a single default, necessary orders shall be passed by the court below to take him to custody again.

8. BLAPL is accordingly disposed of.
9. Issue urgent certified copy as per rules.

(Sashikanta Mishra)
Judge



B.C. Tudu