IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK

ABLAPL No. 1779 of 2026
CNR No. ODHC010090962026

Amiya Ranjan Mallik .... ***Petitioner***

Mr. S.K. Nayak, Advocate

-versus-

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

Mr. S.K. Mund, Spl. Public Prosecutor

CORAM: JUSTICE V. NARASINGH

ORDER

13.11.2026

Order No.

07. 1. Heard learned counsel for the Petitioner and learned Special Public Prosecutor for the N.I..

2. The Petitioner is seeking pre-arrest bail in connection with C.T. Case No.102 of 2026 pending on the file of learned S.D.J.M., Bhubaneswar, arising out of Airfield P.S. Case No.34 of 2026 for commission of offences punishable under Section 118(1)/ 125(b)/ 61(2) of BNS read with Section 3/4/9(b) of Indian Explosive Act.

3. It is submitted by the learned counsel for the Petitioner that so far as the allegation qua the Petitioner is concerned, they ought to be viewed in the light of the Petitioner not being identified by CCTV

footage, which was the primary source of identification of other co-accused.

4. It is his further submission that merely because the Petitioner got injured and other injured have succumbed to the injuries, that cannot be a ground to implicate the Petitioner and it is the further submission of the learned counsel that since Petitioner, who is a B. Tech student, is the first offender and in fact got an employment in a leading tech company that ought to weigh with this Court in considering his prayer for pre-arrest bail.

5. Learned Special Public Prosecutor, Mr. Mund, on the other hand submits that ex-facie there is no explanation as to how the Petitioner got injured and referring to the materials on record and the recitals in the counter affidavit, which says that there are materials, which unequivocally points to the active involvement of the Petitioner and also referring to the punishment prescribed and nature of the offence, it is his submission that the contention that the Petitioner, who is a B.Tech graduate, is a first offender and got a job in tech company ought not to weigh with this Court.

6. On considering the rival submission and taking into account the materials on record, this Court is

persuaded to hold that the Petitioner is not to be insulated by the "exceptional remedy" of pre-arrest bail.

Hence, this Court is not inclined to entertain this application for pre-arrest bail.

7. Accordingly, the ABLAPL stands dismissed.

(V. NARASINGH)
Judge

Santoshi

Signature Not Verified
Digitally Signed
Signed by: SANTOSHI LENKA
Designation: Sr. Stenographer
Reason: Authentication
Location: High Court of Orissa, Cuttack
Date: 13-Nov-2026 18:15:37