



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK

W.P.(C). No.9182 of 2026

Shloke Sen

....

Petitioner

Represented by

Dr.J.K.Lenka, Advocate

-Versus -

State of Odisha & Ors

....

Opposite Parties

Represented by

Ms. J.Sahoo,

Additional Standing Counsel

CORAM:

JUSTICE SASHIKANTA MISHRA

ORDER

29.04.2026

Order No.

01.

1. This matter is taken up through hybrid mode.
2. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned Additional Standing counsel for the State.
3. The petitioner has approached this Court with the following prayer:

“In the aforesaid facts and circumstances, it is therefore most humbly prayed that this Hon’ble Court may graciously be pleased to:

(i) Issue a writ in the nature of Mandamus or any other appropriate writ(s), order/(s) or direction(s) by quashing the impugned order dated 17.03.2026 passed by the Tahasildar, Cuttack Sadar in Misc. Case No. 234 of 2025 under Anenxure-7.

(ii) Direct the Opposite Parties to correct and record



*the Record of Rights (ROR) in respect of the land of the petitioner pertaining to Sabik Mouza-Tulasipur, Sabik Plot Nos. 111,118 & 119 under Sabik Khata No. 29 of Cuttack Sadar Tahasil, corresponding to present settlement Mouza-Cuttack Sadar, Unit No.17 (Machhua Bazar), P.S.-Mangalabag, Plot No. 682 (Ac. 0.068 Dec) and Plot No. 683 (Ac.0.285 Dec), total area Ac. 0.0353 Dec., under Khata No. 71/184, by recording the status of the said land as Sthitiban instead of Pattadar;
(iii) Pass such other order(s) or direction(s) as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the interest of justice.
And for this act of kindness, the petitioner as in duty bound shall ever pray.”*

4. Dr. J.K.Lenka, learned counsel for the petitioner draws attention of this Court to the Yadast prepared during settlement operation, wherein there is a clear recommendation to record the land in the name of the petitioner in Sthitiban status. However, the ROR was published recording the land in Pattadar status. The petitioner never challenged such ROR. Dr. Lenka submits that this is a mistake committed by the settlement authority as the recommendation made in the Yadast was never considered.
5. Learned State counsel fairly submits that the Yadast, in fact, acknowledges the Sthitiban Satwa/status of the petitioner.
6. This Court, however, observes that final publication having been made, the Settlement Authority has no further jurisdiction in the matter. The petitioner, if so advised, may seek the remedy available under Section 15(b) of the OSS Act by filing revision.
7. The writ application is therefore, disposed of granting liberty to the petitioner to prefer revision within ten days from today. If such



revision is preferred along with an application seeking condonation of delay, the same shall be considered liberally having regard to the fact that the settlement ROR was published apparently without taking note of the endorsement made in the Yadast. The revision shall be disposed of thereafter on merit as early as possible.

(Sashikanta Mishra)
Judge

Deepak