



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK

W.P.(C) No. 14592 of 2025

Tahasildar, Raghunathpur* *Petitioner(s)
Mr. A.K. Apat, AGA

-versus-

Sarat Chandra Khuntia* *Opposite
Mr. Hemanta Kumar Ratsingh, Advocate
Party(s)

CORAM:
THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SIBO SANKAR MISHRA

ORDER
29.07.2026

Order No.

06. 1. Heard.
2. The opposite party had initiated a complaint case being C.C. No.59 of 2023 against the present petitioner before the District Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission, Jagatsinghpur. The President, Disputes Redressal Commission, vide judgment dated 28.03.2024 allowed the complaint and directed the petitioner to pay Rs.5,000/- as mental agony and Rs.2,000/- as cost of litigation and interest which comes to about Rs.12,000/-. The said judgment of the District Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission, Jagatsinghpur was challenged by the petitioner by filing first appeal being FAO No. 576 of 2024 before the State Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission, Cuttack. However, the appeal suffered delay of 93 days. Therefore, an application for



condonation of delay being I.A. No. 116 of 2024 was also moved. The State Consumer Commission rejected the application for condonation of delay and consequentially the appeal was dismissed vide order dated 02.04.2025. Against the said order of dismissal of appeal as well as dismissal of the application for condonation of delay, the present writ petition has been filed.

3. Notice was issued to the opposite party in the present writ petition on 28.07.2025. During pendency of the writ petition, it appears that the opposite party initiated an execution proceeding being E.A. No. 32 of 2024 before the District Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission, Jagatsinghpur. In the said execution proceeding, the order of the District Consumer Forum has been complied by the petitioner.

4. Learned counsel for the State has placed on record the order dated 13.05.2026 passed by the District Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission, Jagatsinghpur in E.A. No. 32 of 2024, which shows that the judgment of the District Consumer Forum has already been complied with. Therefore, nothing survives in the writ petition.

5. Accordingly, the writ petition stands disposed of.

(S.S. Mishra)
Judge