



IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CRIMINAL APPEAL NO. _____ OF 2026
(@ SLP(CRL.) No.14974/2026)

SUDHANSU SEKHAR ROUT

APPELLANT(S)

VERSUS

STATE OF ODISHA

RESPONDENT(S)

O R D E R

1. Leave granted.
2. We have heard the learned Senior Counsel appearing for the appellant, and the learned counsel appearing for the respondent-State.
3. The appellant apprehends his arrest in connection with FIR No.561 of 2026, registered at Capital Police Station – Bhubaneswar, for the offences punishable under Sections 353, 196 and 356 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short, ‘the BNS’).
4. Learned Senior counsel appearing for the appellant submitted that *prima facie* charge under Section 196 of the BNS is not made out, and in that eventuality, the remaining charges would not warrant custodial interrogation of the

appellant. The antecedents in which the appellant is stated to be involved are not relevant insofar as the present case is concerned. The appellant has also joined the investigation.

5. The learned counsel appearing for the respondent-State substantially relied upon the counter affidavit to submit that there are numerous criminal antecedents in which the appellant has been involved. The learned counsel also placed reliance upon the statements made by the witnesses in support of the said submission.
6. Upon hearing the learned Senior counsel appearing for the appellant and the learned counsel appearing for the State, and after going through the allegations made in the FIR, it is suffice to state that the appellant is entitled for anticipatory bail, as on a *prima facie* view, the charge under Section 196 of the BNS, may not be made out.
7. We are conscious in making the said observation while making it clear that our observations will not have any bearing in the further proceedings before the Trial Court and, therefore, is only confined to the present appeal.
8. In such view of the matter, the remaining

charges levelled against the appellant would not warrant the custodial interrogation. The fact that the appellant is involved in numerous other criminal cases cannot be a ground to decline the relief of anticipatory bail.

9. In such view of the matter, we are inclined to set aside the impugned order passed by the High Court, and grant anticipatory bail to the appellant.
10. Accordingly, the impugned order stands set aside, and the appellant is granted anticipatory bail, subject to the terms and conditions that may be imposed by the concerned Trial Court.
11. Needless to state that the appellant shall cooperate with the pending investigation.
12. The appeal stands allowed, accordingly.
13. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

.....J.
[M.M. SUNDRESH]

.....J.
[PRASANNA B. VARALE]

NEW DELHI;
15th SEPTEMBER, 2026

ITEM NO.15

COURT NO.4

SECTION II-B

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (CrI.) No(s).
14974/2026

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated
06-08-2026 in ABLAPL No. 8997/2026 passed by the High
Court of Orissa at Cuttack]

SUDHANSU SEKHAR ROUT

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF ODISHA

Respondent(s)

FOR ADMISSION

IA No. 241131/2026 - PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL
DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ANNEXURES

Date : 25-09-2026 This matter was called on for hearing
today.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.M. SUNDRESH
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRASANNA B. VARALE

For Petitioner(s) Mr. Shoeb Alam, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Avijit Patnaik, Adv.
Ms. Shuvra Mohapatra, Adv.
Mr. Shreyan Das, Adv.
Ms. Mohini Priya, AOR

For Respondent(s) Ms. Mithu Jain, AOR
Ms. Diksha Arora, Adv.
Ms. Oorja Goel, Adv.

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the
following
O R D E R

Leave granted.

The appeal is allowed in terms of the signed order.

Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed

of.

(SWETA BALODI) (POONAM VAID)
ASTT. REGISTRAR-cum-PS ASSISTANT REGISTRAR
(Signed order is placed on the file)