IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK
WP(C) No.34879 of 2026
CNR No. ODHC010818572026

Dhruba Charan Pati ..... **Petitioner**

Represented by Adv.
Mr. Sourav Suman
Bhuyan

-versus-

State of Odisha and Others ….. **Opposite Parties**

Represented by

Mr. A.R. Dash, AGA

CORAM:
MR. JUSTICE SASHIKANTA MISHRA

ORDER
10.11.2026

Order No. 01

1. This matter is taken up through hybrid mode.

2. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned Addl. Government Advocate for the State.

3. The petitioner, in the writ petition has explained the delay in approaching this Court against the impugned order, which was passed on 30.09.2024. The explanation is under paragraph-19 of the writ petition. After perusing, this Court is satisfied that the delay has been properly explained.

4. The petitioner is aggrieved by the impugned order, insofar as the operative portion is concerned. It is submitted by Mr. Bhuyan, learned counsel for the petitioner that because of a clerical error in depicting the land particulars correctly in the schedule to the revision petition filed by his client, the revision was allowed directing the Tahasildar, Dasarathpur to record Chaka No.221, Hal Plot No. 926 measuring area Ac.0.02 out of Ac.0.28 under Hal Khata No.214. It is

submitted that the extent of land is actually Ac.0.20, which was wrongly mentioned as Ac.0.02. The matter came to light after passing of the impugned order.

5. Learned State Counsel submits that the petitioner having depicted the land particulars in the schedule, the impugned order has been passed allowing the revision in his favour to such extent. The impugned order cannot therefore, be faulted.

6. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and on going through the certified copy of the revision petition handed over by Mr Bhuyan, this Court finds that in the schedule to the petition, the area has been mentioned as Ac.0.020 decimals. However, in ground No.4, the extent has been mentioned as Ac.0.20 decimal. Therefore, there is some force in the submission of learned counsel for the petitioner. However, it is a matter to be decided by the revisional Court basing on the records produced before him including the gift deed dated 27.05.1974, which is the source of the petitioner's title.

7. The writ petition is disposed of granting liberty to the petitioner to file an application to recall the impugned judgment only to the extent of correcting the land particulars. The petitioner shall also satisfy the Court as to the reason for such wrong depiction in the schedule to the revision petition and also file an application for its amendment. After hearing the parties, the Revisional Court, if satisfied, shall pass necessary orders.

(Sashikanta Mishra)
Judge

Signature Not Verified
Digitally Signed
Signed by: BHIGAL CHANDRA TUDU
Reason: Authentication
Location: Orissa HIgh Court, Cuttack
Date: 11-Nov-2026 17:58:44

B.C. Tudu