



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK

W.P.(C) No. 9731 of 2026

Priyabrata Srichandan

.....

Petitioner (s)

Mr. Bibhu Prasad Das, Adv., Adv.

-Versus-

State of Odisha & Ors.

..... *Opposite Party (s)*

Mr. Bibekananda Nayak, AGA

Mr. Pronoy Mohanty, Adv.

(for O.P.5)

Mr. Alok Kumar Panda, Adv.

(for O.P.6)

CORAM:

DR. JUSTICE SANJEEB K PANIGRAHI

ORDER

09.07.2026

Order No.

02.

1. This matter is taken up through hybrid arrangement.
2. In filing the present Writ Petition, the Petitioner has made the following prayer:-

“Under the aforesaid facts and circumstances, it is therefore humbly prayed that this Hon'ble Court may graciously be pleased to direct the Opposite Parties, more specifically Opposite Party No.5 to proceed further for removing the unauthorized constructions taken place deviating from the original approval building plan under Annexure -1 above, in the interest of justice;

And further be pleased to issue necessary directions to the Opposite Party No. 10 to disconnect the electricity connection supplied on the 4th Floor of 'Ghansyam Villa' situated at Plot No. 40, Khata No.55, Mouza Gadhighat, Unit No.25 under Puri Town P.S. Dist. Puri as the said floor has been constructed deviating from the original approval plan under Annexure - 1 above in the interest of justice;”



3. Heard learned counsel for the parties.
4. Learned counsel for the Petitioner submits that the Petitioner is the registered owner of Flat No.301 in Ghansyam Villa, situated over Plot No.40, Khata No.55, Mouza-Gandhighat, Unit No.25, under Puri Town P.S. in the district of Puri. He further submits that permission for construction of the said residential apartment was accorded by the Puri Konark Development Authority (PKDA) vide Letter No.1421/PKDA, Puri dated 21.04.2006, whereby construction of a G+3 residential building, namely Ghansyam Villa, was duly approved.
5. Learned counsel for the Petitioner further contends that Opposite Party No.7 has violated the approved building plan by making an unauthorized construction of additional fourth floor. He further submits that on account of such unauthorized construction, the Petitioner and the other residents of the said residential apartment are facing hardship. It is further submitted that although the Petitioner has approached the competent authority by ventilating his grievance, no action has been taken against the Opposite Party No.7.
6. Learned counsel for the Opposite Party No.5/Puri Municipal Corporation submits that a show cause notice under Section 91(1) and 92(1) of O.D.A. Act has been issued against the Opposite Party No.7 for violating of Section 15 of the O.D.A. Act, 1982, and



the matter is in active consideration. He further contends that due to Car Festival at Puri, the proceedings could not progress as expected. Accordingly, he prays for one month's time to dispose of the Petitioner's case.

7. In view of the aforesaid submissions and considering the assurance given by the learned counsel for the Opposite Party No.5/Puri Municipal Corporation that the proceeding initiated against the Opposite Party No.7 shall be disposed of within four weeks from today, this Court does not deem it appropriate to keep the present Writ Petition pending. Accordingly, the Writ Petition stands disposed of with an observation that the competent authority shall conclude the proceedings against the Opposite Party No.7, in accordance with law, within the aforesaid period.
8. It is made clear that the Opposite Party No.7 shall restrain from making any further construction over the residential apartment in question until disposal of the aforesaid proceeding by the Puri Municipal Corporation.
9. Urgent certified copy of this order be granted as per rules.

(*Dr. Sanjeeb K Panigrahi*)
Judge