



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK

W.P.(C) No. 18292 of 2026

Hemanta @ Hemanta Kumar Senapati Petitioner

Mr. S.P. Misra, Senior Advocate

-versus-

- 1. State of Odisha***
- 2. Collector, Bhadrak***
- 3. Sub-Collector, Bhadrak***
- 4. Tahasildar, Basudevpur, District-Bhadrak***

.... Opp. Parties

Mr. Satyabrata Mohanty, AGA

CORAM:

HON'BLE MISS JUSTICE SAVITRI RATHO

ORDER

19.06.2026

Order No.

02.

(Through virtual mode)

1. This writ application has been filed with the following prayer;

“It is therefore, prayed that your Lordships may graciously be pleased to admit the writ petition, call for records, after hearing the parties issue writ/writs in the nature of certiorari/mandamus or any other writ/directions, by quashing the entire OPLE proceeding vide 572/25-26 vide Annexure - 1 Series and direct the Sub- Collector, Bhadrak to supply the certified copy of the final order dated 05.06.2026 passed in OPLE Appeal No. 70/2026 in order to enable to the petitioner to take appropriate recourse under the OPLE Act and



further direct the Tahasildar, Basudevpur to take steps for referring the matter to the SDO for settlement the land in question instead of carrying out the eviction.”

2. Mr. Mishra, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that although the petitioner had filed application for grant of certified copy of the order dated 05.06.2026 passed in OPLE Appeal No. 70 of 2026, it was not supplied to the petitioner, so he was unable to file a revision against the said order and has approached this Court. He also submits that while admitting the appeal, the parties had been directed to maintain status quo.

3. Mr. Mohanty, learned Additional Government Advocate on instruction submits that in view of the vacation, certified copy could not be supplied and the same should be supplied within a period of one week. He also submits that the case land is recorded as gochar and hence the petitioner cannot occupy the same nor can it be settled with him.

4. Considering the said submission and as under section 12 of the OPLE Act, the petitioner has the remedy of challenging the order passed in the Appeal by filing a revision, the writ application is disposed of granting the petitioner three weeks' time to



challenge the order passed by the Opposite Party No.2- Collector, Bhadrak in OPLE Appeal No. 70 of 2026 before the Revisional Authority. If the Revision is filed within three weeks along with an interim application, till the interim application for stay is taken up by the Revisional Authority, the petitioner shall not be evicted pursuant to the order passed in OPLE Appeal No. 70 of 2026.

5. The Opposite Party No.3- Sub-Collector, Bhadrak is directed to supply copy of the order passed in OPLE Appeal No. 70 of 2026 within a period of 10 days to the petitioner.

6. It is made clear that this Court has not gone into the merits of the case of the petitioner.

7. Urgent certified copy of this order be granted on proper application.

Subhalaxmi

(Savitri Ratho)
Vacation Judge