



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK**

**CRLREV No.89 of 2026**

**and**

**I.A. No.128 of 2026**

***Hrudaya Kumar Das***

***....***

***Petitioner***

Mr. P.S. Das, Advocate

***-versus-***

***1. State of Odisha***

***....***

***Opposite Parties***

***2. District Education***

***Officer-cum-District***

***Project Co-ordinator,***

***Samagra Skiksha,***

***Keonjhar***

Mr. M.R. Mohanty, AGA

**CORAM: JUSTICE V. NARASINGH**

**ORDER**

**25.03.2026**

**Order No.**

**01.**

1. Heard learned counsel for the Petitioner and learned counsel for the State.

2. The order dated 25.07.2024 passed by the learned J.M.F.C., Telkoi in G.R. Case No.210 of 2022 corresponding to Telkoi P.S. Case No.215 of 2022, thereby framing charge against the Petitioner for the offences under Sections 420/468/471 of IPC, is assailed in this Criminal Revision.

3. Admittedly, there is delay of 455 days in preferring this revision.



4. On going through the recitals in the I.A., it is seen that ground seeking condonation of delay has been stated in paragraph-2 thereof. For convenience of reference, the same is culled out hereunder;

"2. That, it is pertinent to mention here that the Order has been passed on 25.07.2024 in G.R. No.210 of 2022. Thereafter, the Petitioner in order to strengthen his case, he on 02.12.2025 submitted application under R.T.I., before the P.I.O., S.S.A., Keonjhar for specific details of his information, which was received on 26.12.2025 from P.I.O., S.S.A., Keonjhar and in this process, there is delay of 80 days in filing the above Crl. Revision. Hence, this I.A.."

5. On a bare perusal of the same and the submission made, in the light of the decision of the Apex Court in the case of **Shivamma (Dead) by Lrs vs. Karnataka Housing Board and Ors.** reported in **2025 SCC OnLine SC 1969**, this Court is not persuaded to hold that "sufficient cause" has been shown seeking condonation of delay of 455 days in assailing the order of framing of charge.

6. The I.A. for condonation of delay is accordingly rejected.



7. Hence, this Court does not delve into the merits of the criminal revision.

The same accordingly stands disposed of along with pending I.As..

**(V. Narasingh)**  
**Judge**

*Ayesha*