



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK

W.P.(C) No.20779 of 2026

CNR No.ODHC010478362026

Maa Tarini Rice Mill, Budhapada, ... Petitioner
Khurda

Mr. T.K. Mishra, Advocate

-versus-

State of Odisha and Others Opp. Parties

Mr. J.K. Bal, AGA

CORAM:
THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE CHITTARANJAN DASH

ORDER
08.09.2026

Order No.

01. 1. Heard learned counsel for the Parties.
2. By means of this application, the Petitioner seeks for the following prayer:-

“1. Why the order dated 21.04.2026 passed in Land Sale application No. 20/JAT/2026 by the Collector, Khurda-cum-Chairman DLLSC, Khurda under Annexure-11 shall not be quashed.

2. Why the sale application of land of the petitioner in respect of purchase of land area Ac5.030 dec. arising out of area A8,030 dec. of plot No. 450 Kliata No. 149/3 of Mozua-Budhapada. Tahsil - Jatani, Dist. Khurda shall not be executed in pursuance to the uniform policy.”

3. In the course of the hearing, Mr. Mishra, learned counsel for the Petitioner, took this Court through various documents placed before the authorities, seeking to substantiate her case that the same had not been considered in accordance with the Uniform Policy,



2019, thereby depriving her of the benefit available under the said Policy.

4. It further came to the notice of the Court, without any objection from Mr. Mishra, learned counsel appearing for the Petitioner, that the establishment in question, which had sought permission from the Administrator to purchase the land in its favour, had undergone several changes in its status. Initially, the establishment was shown as a partnership firm, which was subsequently converted into a proprietorship concern, and the Petitioner herein was declared to be one of the occupiers under the Factories Act, 1948.

5. On perusal of the order passed by the Administrator, as placed under Annexure-8, it is revealed that the Petitioner was not an applicant in Land Sale Case No.41 of 2013. The said case was filed by the Petitioner along with Bipin Bihari Sahu and Prakash Kumar Das, representing the establishment as a partnership firm. Subsequently, the status of the firm was changed to that of a proprietorship concern, and the proprietor not being one of the applicants in the said Land Sale Case No.41 of 2013, the learned Chief Administrator did not consider the application of the Petitioner on its merits.

6. Learned counsel for the Petitioner, therefore, gracefully submits that the Petitioner may be permitted to approach the authority afresh, placing Subhasini Sahoo's status as the proprietor of Maa Tarini Rice Mill at Budhapada for consideration by the authority in accordance with law.



7. Needless to mention that any observation made herein shall not influence the consideration of any subsequent application filed by the Petitioner.

8. Accordingly, the Writ Petition stands disposed of.

(Chittaranjan Dash)
Judge

Sarbani

