Signature Not Verified
Digitally Signed
Signed by: MADHUSMITA SAHOO
Designation: SENIOR STENOGRAPHER
Reason: Authentication
Location: High Court of Orissa, Cuttack
Date: 10-Apr-2026 12:20:37

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK

W.P.(C) No. 29384 OF 2025

Ramesh Chandra Sahoo .... ***Petitioner***

Mr. Prasanta Kumar Nanda, Advocate

-versus-

State of Odisha and others .... ***Opp. Parties***

Mr. Manmaya Kumar Dash,
Additional Standing Counsel

CORAM:
JUSTICE K.R. MOHAPATRA
JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR MISHRA

ORDER

Order No. **09.04.2026**

5. 1. This matter is taken up through hybrid mode.

2. This writ petition has been filed assailing the order dated 23rd July, 1987 (Annexure-4) passed by learned Additional District Magistrate, Bhubaneswar in Revision Case No.230 of 1986 in a revision under Section 7-A(3) of the Odisha Government Land Settlement Act, 1962.

3. It is submitted by Mr. Nanda, learned counsel for the Petitioner that in W.L. Case No. 555 of 1974, the lease was granted in favour of one, Rajan Naik. Said Rajan Naik, during subsistence of lease, sold a part of the leasehold property, more particularly, described in the writ petition to the vendors of the present Petitioner, namely, Subal Khatei and Bidyadhar Mangaraj. But, the impugned order was passed without affording the vendors of the Petitioner an opportunity of hearing. They sold the property to the Petitioner vide RSD No.1153 dated 8th February, 1988. When the Petitioner approached the Tahasildar, Bhubaneswar to mutate the land in his name and to accept the

Signature Not Verified
Digitally Signed
Signed by: MADHUSMITA SAHOO
Designation: SENIOR STENOGRAPHER
Reason: Authentication
Location: High Court of Orissa, Cuttack
Date: 10-Apr-2026 12:20:37

rent, he came to know that the lease granted in favour of the lessee, namely, Rajan Naik, had already been cancelled since 23rd July, 1987. As such, this writ petition has been filed.

4. In course of hearing, Mr. Nanda, learned counsel for the Petitioner submits that the Petitioner may not alone maintain the writ petition as he had purchased the property after cancellation of lease. He, therefore, prays for withdrawal of the writ petition seeking liberty to file a fresh one along with his vendors.

5. Mr. Dash, learned Additional Standing Counsel does not have any objection to such prayer.

6. In view of the above, the writ petition is disposed of as withdrawn with a liberty to the Petitioner to file a fresh one with better particulars within a period of one month hence.

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

(K.R. Mohapatra)
Judge

(S.K. Mishra)
Judge

ms