



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK

W.P.(C) No.14087 of 2026

Debasis Das Pattnaik

....

Petitioner

Represented by

Mr. D. Mohanty, Advocate

-Versus-

State of Odisha & Others

....

Opp. Parties

Represented by

Mr. A.R. Dash,

Additional Government Advocate

CORAM:

JUSTICE SASHIKANTA MISHRA

ORDER

07.05.2026

Order No.
01.

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

“The petitioners therefore, most humbly prays that this Hon’ble Court would graciously be pleased to admit this writ petition, call for the records and after hearing the parties, allow the same by issuing a writ/writs in the nature of certiorari/ mandamus quashing the order passed in Mutation Misc. Case No.7545 of 2025 (Annexure-1)) by the Additional Tahasildar, Bhubaneswar/ O.P. No.5 basing on which the revised Patta (Annexure-2) was issued in respect of Plot No.516/1769/4711 (Gharabari) under Khata No.474/3836 with area Ac.0.460 dec. in Mouza-Patia under Tahasil-Bhubaneswar in the district of Khurda and further be pleased to restore the ROR to Stitiban status as it was prior to issuance of the impugned revised ROR (Annexure-2) in the interest of justice;

And pass any other or further direction as this Hon’ble Court may deem fit and proper;

And for which act of kindness, the petitioner as in duty bound shall ever pray.”

4. By a *suo motu* mutation case registered by the Additional Tahasildar, Bhubaneswar, the land in question recorded in the name



of the petitioner under *Stitiban* status, was converted to *Pattadar* status purportedly on the basis of the Revenue and Disaster Management Department Circular dated 02.07.2025.

5. Mr. Mohanty, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the initiation of proceeding as well as the order passed therein is entirely contrary to the law long settled that operation of a Government circular/notification shall always be prospective. Mr. Mohanty refers to a judgment passed by a Coordinate Bench of this Court in the case of ***Chandra Prakash Rath V. State of Odisha & Others (W.P.(C) No.31150 of 2025***), wherein the Coordinate Bench, after taking note of several Supreme Court judgments on the point, held as follows:-

“So, in view of the propositions of law enunciated in the ratio of the aforesaid decisions, the operation of all the notification and resolutions of the Government are prospective in nature, but the same will have no retrospective effect.

6. It is the judicial coronary that, when the initial order is held to be illegal, then the documents/orders prepared on the basis of the said initial orders shall be deemed to be non-est in the eye of law.

On this aspect, the propositions of law has already been clarified in the ratio of the following decisions:-

*(i)In a case between **Badrinath Vrs. Government of Tamilnadu & Others (2000) 8 SCC 395** that,*

Once the basis of a proceeding is gone, may be at a later point of time by order of superior authority, any intermediate action taken in the meantime would fall to the ground. This principle of consequential orders which is applicable to judicial and quasi-judicial proceedings is equally applicable to administrative orders.

*(ii)In a case between **State of Kerala Vrs. Puthenkavu N.S.S. Karayogam and Another** reported in **(2001) 10 SCC 191** that,*

Once the main impugned order is set aside any other consequential order made pursuant to the same would automatically become ineffective. (Para 9)

*(iii)In a case between **Mangal Prasad Tamoli (dead) by LRs Vrs. Narvadeshwar Mishra (dead) by LRs** reported in **2005 (3) SCC 422** that,*



If remand order was bad under law, then all further proceedings consequent thereto would be non-est and have to be necessarily set aside.

*(iv) In a case between **State of Punjab Vrs. Davinder Pal Singh Bhullar & Others etc.**, reported in 2012 (51) OCR (SC) 220 that,*

If initial action is not in consonance with law, all subsequent and consequential proceedings would fall through for the reasons that illegality strikes at the root of the order.”

6. Learned State counsel fairly submits that the petitioner's case is covered by the ratio decided in the cited case.

7. Since the law has been settled, the Writ Petition is disposed of directing the Additional Tahasildar, Bhubaneswar to consider the matter strictly in light of the judgment of this Court referred above and pass appropriate orders within four weeks from today. Till such time, the order dated 22.08.2025 shall not be acted upon.

(Sashikanta Mishra)
Judge

Puspanjali

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed
Signed by: PUSPANJALI GHADAI
Designation: Junior Stenographer
Reason: Authentication
Location: High Court of Orissa, Cuttack.
Date: 07-May-2026 17:31:51

