



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

**WP(C) No.4344 of 2026**

***Rohit Kumar Sethy***

***.... Petitioners***

**Mr. Sudhir Kumar Mallick, Advocate**

***-versus-***

***State of Odisha and others***

***.... Opposite Parties***

**Mr. Saswat Das, AGA**

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MURAHARI SRI RAMAN**

**Order No.**

**01.**

**ORDER**

**09.04.2026**

- 1.** With a prayer to direct the Tahasildar, Bhubaneswar-opposite party no.4 to correct the Hal Record of Rights by deleting the names of the vendors and carry out the mutation of the subject land in favour of the petitioner, this writ petition has been filed.
- 2.** Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that a representation dated 23<sup>rd</sup> May, 2025 was filed before the Tahasildar, Bhubaneswar, which is stated to be pending for consideration.
- 3.** At this stage, learned Additional Government Advocate appears and waives service of notice on behalf of opposite parties and drew attention of this Court to the paragraph-9 of the writ petition, wherein the following averments are made:-  
*“9. That after purchase the said Sangram Keshari Rout mutated the case land in his name vide Mutation Case No.8842/1992 vide Mutation Khata No.725/481, Mutation Plot No.1684/6623. Thereafter Sangram Keshari Rout died on 21.05.2005 leaving behind his widow Anita Rout and son Sidharth Rout. Thereafter Anita Rout and Sidharth Rout Mutation the case land in their*



*name vide Mutation Case No.17881/2021 and conversion the case land from Sarad three to Homestead vide OLR U/s.8(A) Case No.898/2020 and thereafter the L.R. of Sangram Keshari Rout sold the present petitioner vide Document No.11132109940, dt.02.11.2021. Since the date of the sale deed the petitioner is in peaceful possession over the case land till date.”*

- 3.1. He submitted that in view of the said averment, the petitioner having not approached the competent authority with appropriate application, there is no scope for consideration of such representation.
4. Heard learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and learned Additional Government Advocate appearing for the State-opposite parties. On the consent of the learned counsel appearing for the parties, this matter is taken up for disposal.
5. Considered the submissions made by the learned counsel appearing for the parties. This Court, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, disposes of the writ petition granting liberty to the petitioner to approach the appropriate authority for mutation of property, which is claimed to have been purchased from Smt. Amita Rout and Sidharth Rout, wife and son of late Sangram Keshari Rout respectively by virtue of registered sale deed (Annexure-5).

**(M.S. Raman)**  
**Judge**