



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK

BLAPL NO.644 of 2025

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

Md. Abdur Raheman @ Md. ... Petitioner
Abdur Raheman Alli Khan
-versus-

State of Odisha ... Opposite Party

For Petitioner : Mr. S.R. Mulia, Advocate

For Opposite Party : Mr. A. Pradhan, Addl. PP

CORAM:

JUSTICE G. SATAPATHY

DATE OF HEARING & JUDGMENT:11.11.2025(ORAL)

G. Satapathy, J.

1. This is a bail application U/S.483 of BNSS by the petitioner for grant of bail in connection with STF PS Case No.3 of 2016 corresponding to ST Case No.103 of 2017 pending in the file of learned Sessions Judge, Cuttack, for commission of offences punishable U/Ss.16/ 17/ 18/ 18(B)/ 20/ 21/ 28/ 40 of Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act r/w Section 124(A) of IPC, on the main allegation of indulging in unlawful activities and propagating anti-national ideology in the minds of



innocent people with a view of engage them against anti-national campaign.

2. The criminal case against the petitioner in fact arise out of an FIR lodged by the IIC, Jagatpur PS to the effect that on receipt of credible information about the petitioner propagating anti-national campaign by influencing the local people, he conducted an enquiry and ascertained that the petitioner and his associates were running Madrasas in village Bilteruan and other places since three to four years and teaching 80 students from Jharkhand and other States, but he is mainly propagating anti-national ideology in the minds of innocent students with a view to engage them in anti-national activities. The informant further confidentially learned that the petitioner is in the process of recruiting the youths from this Madrasa for terrorist organization like Al-Qaeda in Indian Sub-continent, Indian Muzahiddin etc. and previously some youths have already been recruited by him for the terrorist organization to organize Jihad and he is also receiving money from foreign sources in the form of



donation in the name of Madrasa. Further, the petitioner was apprehended on 15.12.2015 in the night in connection with Special Cell, Lodhi Colony, Delhi Case No.67 dated 14.12.2015 for offences punishable U/Ss.18/18(B)/20 of UAPA Act. After registration of the case on the aforesaid background, the petitioner was remanded in the present case resulting in the trial, but petitioner being unsuccessful before the trial Court for his release on bail is again before this Court in the present bail application.

3. Heard, Mr. Satya Ranjan Mulia, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr. A. Pradhan, learned Additional Public Prosecutor in the matter and perused the record.

4. The only ground under which bail is sought for to the petitioner is his long detention in custody, but the allegation against the petitioner is not only serious, but also grave. True it is that in the meantime, 38 witnesses have already been examined, but trial is yet to be concluded. It is also not in dispute that the petitioner has been convicted by learned Addl. Sessions



Judge- 02, Patiala House Court, New-Delhi vide judgment dated 10.02.2023 in SC Case No.23 of 2016 and he has been sentenced on 14.02.2023 in the same case to undergo Rigorous Imprisonment (RI) for seven years and five months. In such view of the matter and taking into account the allegation leveled against the petitioner vis-à-vis the nature and gravity of the offences as alleged against him and keeping in view the materials placed on record together with the evidence of the witnesses so far examined, since there is allegation against the petitioner for his links with Al-Qaeda and the act alleged against the petitioner having ramification over national security and safety of local people at large and the petitioner being not found to have satisfied the conditions of Sec. 43-D(5), this Court does not consider it proper to grant bail to the petitioner, especially when he is found convicted in another case and sentenced to undergo RI for seven years and five months.

5. Hence, the bail application of the petitioner stands rejected. Looking at the custody period of the



petitioner, the learned trial Court is requested to expedite the trial and dispose of the case as expeditiously as possible.

6. Accordingly, the BLAPL stands disposed of. A copy of this order be immediately transmitted to the concerned Court.

(G. Satapathy)
Judge

*Orissa High Court, Cuttack,
Dated the 11th day of November, 2025/Subhasmita*