IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK
BLAPL No.11669 of 2026
CNR No. ODHC010852802026

Prasanna Kumar Patra **.....** ***Petitioner***

Represented by Adv. -
Mr. Bidyadhar Mansingh

-versus-

STATE OF ODISHA(VIG.) **.....** ***Opposite Parties***

Represented by Adv. –

Mr. Sanjay Kumar Das,
Standing Counsel for
(Vigilance Deptt.)

CORAM:
MR. JUSTICE ADITYA KUMAR MOHAPATRA

ORDER
13.11.2026

Order No.

02. 1. This matter is taken up through Hybrid Arrangement (Virtual /Physical Mode).

I.A. No.806 of 2026

2. Though this I.A. has been filed with a prayer for interim release of the Petitioner on the ground of illness of his mother, however, with the consent of learned counsel appearing for both sides, the bail application was taken up for final hearing.

3. Learned counsel for the Petitioner does not want to press this I.A.No.806 of 2026.

4. Accordingly, the I.A. No.806 of 2026 stands disposed of as not pressed.

5. Heard learned counsel appearing for the Petitioner and Mr. S.K. Das, learned Standing Counsel appearing for the Vigilance Department. Perused the bail application.

6. The present bail application under Section 483 of B.N.S.S., 2023 has been filed by the Petitioner for regular bail in connection with V.G.R. Case No.11 of 2026, arising out of Rourkela Vigilance P.S. Case No.13 of 2026, pending in the Court of learned Special Judge (Vigilance), Sundargarh for alleged commission of offence punishable under Sections section13 (2) read with section 13(1)(b)/12 of Prevention of Corruption (Amendment) Act, 2018.

7. It is stated by the learned counsel for the Petitioner that the Petitioner is languishing in custody since 10.10.2026.He further submitted that in the meantime, the investigation has progressed substantially though the final charge-sheet has not been filed. Learned counsel for the Petitioner further contended that the Petitioner has been implicated in the present Vigilance case on the allegation of possessing assets disproportionate to his known sources of income. He further submitted that no further custodial interrogation of the Petitioner is necessary. Learned counsel for the Petitioner further submitted that since the Petitioner is a government employee there is no chance of his absconding. On such ground, learned counsel for the Petitioner prayed for release of the Petitioner on bail.

8. Mr. Das, learned Standing Counsel for the Vigilance Department, on the basis of instruction dated 07.11.2026 received from DSP, Vigilance of Rourkela Division, submitted before this Court that although no further custodial interrogation of the Petitioner is necessary, however in the event the Petitioner is released

on bail there is every likelihood that he might tamper with the prosecution evidence. On such ground, learned Standing Counsel for the Vigilance Department objected to the release the Petitioner on bail.

9. Having regard to the submissions made by learned counsels for both sides, on a careful examination of the background facts and circumstances and further taking note of the instruction dated 07.11.2026, this Court observes that the department has indicated no further custodial interrogation as necessary. With regard to allegation of destruction of evidence, it can be seen that the present case arises out of an allegation of Petitioner possessing disproportionate asset, therefore the case is basically based on documentary evidence, and such documents must have been seized in the meantime. Considering such submissions, this Court is inclined to release the Petitioner on regular bail in the aforesaid case subject to the Petitioner furnishing a bail bond of Rs.50,000/- (Rupees Fifty thousand) with two solvent sureties each for the like amount to the satisfaction of the learned court in seisin over the matter. The Release of the petitioner shall also be subject to such other conditions as would be deemed just and proper by the Court in seisin over the matter. Violation of any of the conditions shall entail cancellation of the bail application.

10. The release of the petitioner shall also be subject to the following terms and conditions:-

I. The Petitioner shall appear before the learned trial Court as and when his presence should be required for the purpose of trial;

II. The Petitioner shall cooperate with the investigation and appear before the Investigating Officer as and when his

presence should be required;

Violation of any other conditions either imposed by this Court or in the learned trial Court shall entail cancellation of the bail application.

11. The BLAPL is, accordingly, disposed of.

(A.K. Mohapatra)
Judge

Sisir

Signature Not Verified
Digitally Signed
Signed by: SISIR KUMAR SETHI
Designation: Personal Assistant
Reason: Authentication
Location: ORISSA HIGH COURT
Date: 13-Nov-2026 19:13:33