



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK

W.P.(C) No.6086 of 2026

M/s FALCON Real Estate (P) Limited *Petitioner*
Represented by

Mr. S.S. Sahu, Advocate

-Versus-

State of Odisha & Others *Opp. Parties*
Represented by

A.S.C.

CORAM:

JUSTICE SASHIKANTA MISHRA

ORDER

25.2.2026.

Order No.
01.

1. This matter is taken up through hybrid mode.
2. The petitioner has approached this Court with the following prayer:-

“It is, therefore, prayed that the Hon'ble Court may

graciously be pleased to:

(i) Admit the writ petition;

(ii) Call for the Records.

(iii) Issue Rule NISI calling upon the Opp.Parties to show cause as to why the impugned order dated 18.09.2025 passed in Mutation Misc Case No.10291 of 2025 under Annexure-6 and the corrected Record of Right (ROR) under Annexure-7 prepared in pursuance to the impugned order under Annexure-6 shall not be quashed.

(iv) And if the Opp.Parties do not show cause or show insufficient cause issue a writ in the nature of Certiorari in quashing the impugned order under Annexure-6 as stated above and the impugned ROR under Annexure-7.

(v) And further pass an order directing the Opp.Party No.4 &



5 to correct the status of Hal KJiata No.474/2709, Plot No.392/1772/4320, area Ac.0.960 decs of Mouza-Patia from 'Pattadar' to "Stitiban" as was recorded under Annexure-4 in the name of the Petitioner within a reasonable time as would be fixed by this Hon'ble Court.

And pass all other order(s), direction(s), writ/ writs as would be deem fit and proper in the interest of justice; And for this act of kindness, the petitioner as in duty bound shall ever pray."

3. By a *suo motu* mutation case registered by the Additional Tahasildar, Bhubaneswar, the land in question recorded in the name of the petitioner under *Stitiban* status, was converted to *Pattadar* status purportedly on the basis of the Revenue and Disaster Management Department Circular dated 02.07.2025.

4. Mr. Sahu, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the initiation of proceeding as well as the order passed therein is entirely contrary to the law long settled that operation of a Government circular/notification shall always be prospective. Mr. Sahu refers to a judgment passed by a Coordinate Bench of this Court in the case of ***Chandra Prakash Rath V. State of Odisha & Others (W.P.(C) No.31150 of 2025)***, wherein the Coordinate Bench, after taking note of several Supreme Court judgments on the point, held as follows:-

"So, in view of the propositions of law enunciated in the ratio of the aforesaid decisions, the operation of all the notification and resolutions of the Government are prospective in nature, but the same will have no retrospective effect.

6. It is the judicial coronary that, when the initial order is held to be illegal, then the documents/orders prepared on the basis of the said initial orders shall be deemed to be non-est in the eye of law.

On this aspect, the propositions of law has already been clarified in the ratio of the following decisions:-

*(i)In a case between **Badrinath Vrs. Government of Tamilnadu & Others (2000) 8 SCC 395** that,*

Once the basis of a proceeding is gone, may be at a later point of time by order of superior authority, any intermediate



action taken in the meantime would fall to the ground. This principle of consequential orders which is applicable to judicial and quasi-judicial proceedings is equally applicable to administrative orders.

*(ii) In a case between **State of Kerala Vrs. Puthenkavu N.S.S. Karayogam and Another** reported in (2001) 10 SCC 191 that,*

Once the main impugned order is set aside any other consequential order made pursuant to the same would automatically become ineffective. (Para 9)

*(iii) In a case between **Mangal Prasad Tamoli (dead) by LRs Vrs. Narvadeshwar Mishra (dead) by LRs** reported in 2005 (3) SCC 422 that,*

If remand order was bad under law, then all further proceedings consequent thereto would be non-est and have to be necessarily set aside.

*(iv) In a case between **State of Pubjab Vrs. Davinder Pal Singh Bhullar & Others etc.**, reported in 2012 (51) OCR (SC) 220 that,*

If initial action is not in consonance with law, all subsequent and consequential proceedings would fall through for the reasons that illegality strikes at the root of the order.”

5. Learned State counsel fairly submits that the petitioner’s case is covered by the ratio decided in the cited case.

6. Since the law has been settled, the writ application is disposed of directing the Additional Tahasildar, Bhubaneswar to consider the matter strictly in light of the judgment of this Court referred above and pass appropriate orders within four weeks from today. Till such time, the order dated 18.9.2025 shall not be acted upon.

(Sashikanta Mishra)
Judge