



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK
CRLREV No.219 of 2026

Kanta Bharasagar

....

Petitioner

Mr. P.R. Pattnaik, Advocate

-versus-

1. Manoranjan Singh Deo ***Opposite Parties***

2. Jayant Kumar Singh

Deo

3. Biswajit Singh Deo

4. Prakash Kumar Singh

Deo

5. Akash Singh Deo

CORAM: JUSTICE V. NARASINGH

ORDER

22.06.2026

Order No.

01.

1. Heard learned counsel for the Petitioner.
2. Assailing the order dated 17.02.2026 passed by the learned P.O., Excl. Spl. Court under S.C. & S.T. (POA) Act, Balangir in 1CC No.01 of 2025 whereby the prayer of the Petitioner has been rejected for continuance of the proceeding in the light of final form having been submitted by the Investigating Agency absolving the Opposite Parties for commission of offence under Section 294/506/34 of IPC r/w 3(1)(r)/3(1)(s)/3(2)(va) of SC & ST (POA) Act, the present Revision has been preferred.
3. Learned counsel for the Petitioner referring to the complaint petition along with the initial statement



of the complainant submits that a clear case under the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 (Amendment 2015) is made out. Hence, the finding of the learned Court in seisin that primarily the allegations are civil in nature for which protest petition in the nature of complaint case was not entertained, is liable to be interfered with.

4. This Court finds force in the submission of the learned counsel for the Petitioner that even assuming the stand taken by the defence, civil and criminal cases can continue simultaneously.

5. On perusal of the statement of the complainant recorded under Section 202 Cr.P.C. in its entirety, it is seen that there is nothing on record to support the stand of the Petitioner that the alleged occurrence for which the Opposite Parties are liable for committing an offence under the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 (Amendment 2015) was committed in public view.

6. Law in this regard is no longer res integra and reference can be made in this context to the judgment of the Apex Court in the case of ***Gunjan alias Girija Kumari and Ors. vs. State (NCT of Delhi) and Anr.*** reported in **2026 SCC OnLine SC 834** more particularly paragraph-9.1 thereof.



7. Considering the submissions of the learned counsel for the Petitioner, Mr. Pattnaik, on the anvil of law laid down as above, this Court does not find any infirmity in the order passed by the learned Court in seisin.

8. It is made clear that non-entertainment of this Revision will not have any effect on the rights of the parties which is being agitated in CS No.235 of 2021 where the Petitioner is the defendant.

9. Accordingly, the CRLREV stands disposed of.

(V. Narasingh)
Judge

Ayesha