



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

**W.P.(C) No.2363 of 2012**

**Sarita Nayak**

....

**Petitioner**

None

*-versus-*

**Bikram Kishore Nayak**

....

**Opp. Party**

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MRUGANKA SEKHAR SAHOO**

**Order**  
**No.**

**ORDER**  
**15.07.2026**  
*(Hybrid Mode)*

- 06.**     **1.**     The matter was presented before this Court on 08.02.2012. By order dated 29.03.2012 Division Bench, then having determination took up the matter. On the prayer made on behalf of the learned counsel for the petitioner, the name of opposite party no.2 was deleted. Before the Division Bench it was stated that address of the opposite party no.1 is “not known”, and the matter was adjourned directing to furnish the correct address of opposite party no.1.

Thereafter the matter was listed before 4<sup>th</sup> National Lok Adalat on 14.12.2024, 08.03.2025 and 10.05.2025.

- 2.**     On 09.07.2026 none had appeared for the petitioner and the following order was passed by this Bench:



*“1. None appears for the petitioner though the matter is called twice over, once when it reached and again after resumption of the proceeding post lunch. The matter is kept pending for the last more than 14 years after it was presented before this Court on 08.02.2012. The petitioner is also absent on repeated calls.*

*2. The matter shall be listed for ‘Fresh Admission’ on 15.07.2026 indicating in the cause list that the matter shall be disposed of.*

*Copy of this order shall be intimated by the Registry to the learned counsel for the petitioner on record.”*

**3.** Pursuant to order dated 09.07.2026 the Registry has intimated the learned counsel who is earlier on record on behalf of the petitioner. The efforts of the Registry has yielded result.

Mr. S.J. Nanda, learned counsel is present. The matter having been listed indicating that the matter shall be disposed of.

It is submitted by learned counsel Mr. Nanda that the brief was taken by the petitioner almost ten years back, as far as his memory goes, he filed the memo indicating no instruction from the petitioner.

**4.** Perusal of the case records indicates that the memo is not available.

Now learned counsel submits he files memo of date indicating the fact that the petitioner had taken back the brief almost ten years ago. The memo sates thus:

*“That, the above said case was transferred from my office about 10 years back. And the petitioner now taken the case record.” (sic)*



The memo filed by Mr. Nanda is taken on record.  
Scanned copy be updated.

5. Apparently the petitioner shows complete lack of interest in prosecuting the matter.
6. In considered view of this Court no purpose would be served in keeping the matter pending after 14 years it was presented.
7. The writ petition stands disposed of.

Copy of this order be shall be forwarded by the Registry to the learned Judge, Family Court, Cuttack to be kept in the records of Cr.P. No.654 of 2010. If the Cr.P. No.654 of 2010 has already been disposed of and the records have been consigned to the record room needful be done to keep the present order in accordance with the Rules.

**(Mruganka Sekhar Sahoo)**  
**Judge**

amit