



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK

**W.P.(C) Nos.8483/2026, 8485/2026,
8564/2026 & 16431 of 2026**

In W.P.(C) No.8483/2026
ODHC010181962026

Manjulata Mohanty ... Petitioner

-versus-

State of Odisha & others ... Opposite Parties

For Petitioner : Mr. B.Tripathy, Advocate

For Opposite Parties : Mr. S.N.Patnaik, A.G.A

In W.P.(C) No.8485/2026
ODHC010182142026

R.K.Suvendu ... Petitioner

-versus-

State of Odisha & others ... Opposite Parties

For Petitioner : Mr. B.Tripathy, Advocate

For Opposite Parties : Mr. S.N. Patnaik, A.G.A.



2. Since all these writ petitions involve similar facts, they were heard together and are being disposed of by this common order. For the sake of convenience, the facts of W.P.(C). No. 8485 of 2026 is taken up for consideration.

3. The brief facts of the case is that Ac. 5.00 out of Sabik Plot No. 2076 under Sabik Khata No. 805 of Mouza-Andharua, District-Khurda, was settled in favour of Hata Kishore Nayak, predecessor-in-interest of the petitioner, as a Jawan lease in (Jawan) W.L. Case No. 1860 of 1974 by the Tahasildar, Bhubaneswar. The settlement was subsequently cancelled by the ADM, Bhubaneswar in Lease Revision Case No. 155 of 1983, which was challenged by Hata Kishore Nayak before this Court in O.J.C. No. 1689 of 1987.

4. This Court, vide judgment dated 07.05.1991 passed in O.J.C. No. 1689 of 1987, quashed the order



cancelling the settlement and restored the same in favour of Hata Kishore Nayak. Thereafter, in O.J.C. No. 9812 of 1993, this Court vide order dated 18.04.1994 directed implementation of the said Judgment, including correction of the R.O.R., delivery of possession and acceptance of rent. Pursuant thereto, the R.O.R. was restored in favour of Hata Kishore Nayak and rent was accepted by the authorities. He thereafter transferred portions of the settled land, from whom the petitioner derives her title. During the subsequent settlement operation, however, the case land was recorded in favour of the State Government. The petitioner's challenge before the settlement authorities ultimately failed and the revision in OSS Case No. 757 of 2016 was dismissed by the learned Additional Commissioner, Additional Revisional Court No.-1, Bhubaneswar vide order dated 04.09.2024. Said order has been challenged in this writ petition.



5. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned Additional Government Advocate for the State.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the cases are squarely covered by the decision of this Court in the case of ***Prashanta Kumar Sahu vs. State of Odisha and others (W.P.(C). No. 18609 of 2025)***, concerning Jawan lease and subsequent correction of the R.O.R.

7. Learned State counsel fairly submits that the facts in the present batch of cases are similar to the case of ***Prashanta Kumar Sahu vs. State of Odisha and others (W.P.(C). No. 18609 of 2025)***.

8. The writ applications are therefore, disposed of directing the Tahasildar, Bhubaneswar to consider the case of the petitioners for correction of record in their favour in light of the ratio decided in the case of ***Prashanta Kumar Sahu*** (supra) particularly referring to Paragraph 18 thereof. The Tahasildar shall make an endeavour to dispose of the case within eight weeks



from the date of production of certified copy of this order by the petitioners.

.....
Sashikanta Mishra,
Judge

Deepak