



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK

W.P.(C). NO.17296 OF 2023

M/s. Rameswar Agro Industries Private Limited, Bhubaneswar* *Petitioner

Mr. Jagamohan Pattanaik, Advocate

-versus-

State of Odisha and others* *Opp. Parties

Mr. Swayambhu Mishra, Advocate
(For Opp. Party No.1)

Mr. Pronoy Mohanty, Advocate
(For Opp. Party Nos.2 to 5-IDCO)

Mr. Prafulla Rath, Senior Advocate
being assisted by Mr. Saibrata Rath, Advocate &
Mr. Animesh Singh, Advocate
(For Opposite Party No.6)

CORAM:

JUSTICE K.R. MOHAPATRA

JUSTICE SAVITRI RATHO

ORDER

10.09.2025

Order No.

- 09.
1. This matter is taken up through hybrid mode.
 2. The main contention of Mr. Pattanaik, learned counsel for the Petitioner is that the industrial plot allotted in his favour was subsequently allotted to Opposite Party No.6 without cancelling the allotment made in its favour.
 3. Mr. Mohanty, learned counsel for IDCO referring to the counter affidavit submits that since the Petitioner did not deposit the dues in respect of the industrial plot provisionally allotted under Annexure-1, the said order was superseded vide Letter dated 12th July, 2006 under Annexure-C/4. He further submits that the Petitioner, although made an application for allotment of additional land, which was acquired on payment of cost of the land by the IDCO, but the Petitioner did not deposit the said amount inspite of repeated requests.



4. Mr. Rath, learned Senior Advocate appearing for Opposite Party No.6 submits that the land allotted in favour of Opposite Party No.6 is a different plot than that provisionally allotted to the Petitioner. Further, the Petitioner having not deposited the cost of the land as directed in the provisional allotment order under Annexure-1, the said provisional allotment was superseded vide Letter dated 12th July, 2006 (Annexure-C/4). He, therefore, submits that the Petitioner should not have any claim over the land allotted to the Opposite Party No.6. But, the Petitioner unnecessarily made the Opposite Party No.6 as a party, for which it is suffering a lot.

5. Mr. Pattanaik, learned counsel for the Petitioner, however, draws attention of this Court to Annexure-11 and submits that the Petitioner did not deposit the entire cost as it was not encroachment free as per the report of the Land Inspector, MSME-I. Further, the co-relation between the industrial plot under Annexure-1 and Annexure-11 has to be ascertained. He, therefore, prays for an adjournment.

6. Mr. Rath, learned Senior Advocate appearing for Opposite Party No.6 vehemently objects to the submission of Mr. Pattanaik, learned counsel for the Petitioner and submits that the description of the land at Annexure-11 is clear and unambiguous. Hence, the writ petition should be dismissed at once.

7. Since Mr. Pattanaik, learned counsel for the Petitioner prays for an adjournment, this matter stands adjourned to be listed on 17th October, 2025.

(K.R. Mohapatra)
Judge

(Savitri Ratho)
Judge