



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK**  
**CONTC No.2865 of 2025**

**1) Siba Prasad Parida @**  
**Mahesh Kumar Parida**

.....

**Petitioners**

2) Sankarsan Parida

Represented by Adv. -  
Nirod Kumar Sahu

-versus-

**Muralidhar**

.....

**Opposite**

**Urmal, Tahasildar, Lathikata, Sundergarh**

**Parties**

Represented by  
Adv. –

Gyanaloka  
Mohanty, SC

**CORAM:**

**MR. JUSTICE ANANDA CHANDRA BEHERA**

**ORDER**

**23.03.2026**

**Order No.**

06. 1. This matter is taken up through hybrid mode.
2. This CONTC was listed today for hearing.
3. Learned senior counsel for the petitioners and learned Standing Counsel for the alleged contemnor are present.
4. This CONTC was filed by the petitioners against the alleged contemnor (Muralidhar Urmal, Tahasildar, Lathikata) alleging violation of the direction given by this Court in the order dated 09.04.2025 passed in W.P.(C) No.2270 of 2025.

In the said order dated 09.04.2025 passed in  
W.P.(C) No.2270 of 2025, the contemnor was directed



to decide the Mutation Case No.723 of 2018 on the basis of the judgment and decree passed by the Civil Court in T.S. No.46 of 1998 following the principles enunciated in the ratio of the decision between *Sanatan Acharya Vrs. Tahasildar, Panposh and Ors* reported in **2016 (II) OLR 290** within a period of one month from the date of communication of that order.

5. It appears from the judgment and decree passed in T.S. No.46 of 1998 (Annexure-4 in W.P.(C) No.2270 of 2025) that, the right, title and interest of the of the plaintiff (predecessors of the petitioners) in respect of the disputed land which forms a part of plot No.19/70 an area of Ac.2.67 decimals was declared and the plaintiff's possession thereto was confirmed, the land appertaining to plot No.19/70 as per the finally published record of right be demarcated by a Map through the process of law and the settlement Map be corrected in accordance with the said observation.

6. When, in spite of the above directions given by this Court as per the order dated 09.04.2025 passed in WPC No.2270 of 2025, the alleged contemnor i.e. Muralidhar Urmal, Tahasildar, Lathikata did not comply the said directions, then the petitioners filed this CONTC against Muralidhar Urmal, Tahasildar, Lathikata praying for initiation of appropriate proceedings against him under the provisions of Section 14 of the Contempt of Court's Act, 1971 and to punish him appropriately for his disobedience to the



order/direction dated 09.04.2025 passed in W.P. (C) No.2270 of 2025.

7. After filing of this CONTC, the alleged contemnor filed a compliance affidavit through learned SC for the State annexing the copy of the final disposal order of the Mutation Case No.723 of 2018 disallowing the said Mutation Case No.723 of 2018 of the petitioners assigning the reasons in that order for the dismissal of Mutation Case No.723 of 2018 of the petitioners that,

*“the land in question is neither in possession of the petitioners Balunkeswar Parida nor any of his successors, which is confirmed from the joint field verification report of Revenue Supervisor & Revenue Inspector, Brahmanitarang vide letter No.155 dated 14.08.2025 of R.I. Brahmanitarang. Out of Ac.0.680, one Dasarathi Kisan & Duba Ekka of Kalokudar area in possession of area of Ac0.070 & 0.030 by constructing market complex and Dhaba respectively and the balance area is lying vacant.*

*Therefore, in view of the facts and circumstances discussed in the foregoing paragraphs, it was held by him (alleged contemnor) that, the petitioner is not in possession over the suit land. Hence, the mutation application of the petitioners for mutation is disallowed.”*

8. Learned senior counsel for the petitioners submitted that, dismissal to the mutation case of the petitioners as per the order dated 16.08.2025 passed in



Mutation Case No.723 of 2018 by the alleged contemnor i.e. Tahasildar, Lathikata is not in compliance to the direction given by this Court in the order dated 09.04.2025 passed in W.P.(C) No.2270 of 2025. In the said order passed in WP(C) No.2270 of 2025, specific direction was given to the Tahasildar, Lathikata (alleged contemnor) to dispose of the Mutation Case No.723 of 2018 of the petitioners following guidelines made in the ratio of the decision between ***Sanatan Acharya Vrs. Tahasildar, Panposh and Ors*** reported in ***2016 (II) OLR 290*** on the basis of the judgment and decree passed in the suit vide T.S. No.46 of 1998. But, the Tahasildar, Lathikata has violated the said directions of this Court in the Order dated 09.04.2025 passed in WP(C) No.2270 of 2025 deliberately and intentionally.

On the contrary, learned SC for the alleged contemnor submitted that, the order dated 09.04.2025 passed in W.P.(C) No.2270 of 2025 has already been complied with by disposing of the Mutation Case No.723 of 2018 of the petitioners on dated 16.08.2025 in dismissing the same. For which, the CONTC filed by the petitioners cannot be entertainable under law.

9. When, the specific direction was given to the Tahasildar, Lathikata in the order dated 09.04.2025 passed in W.P.(C) No.2270 of 2025 for deciding and disposing of the Mutation Case No.723 of 2018 of the petitioners following the guidelines in the decision



between *Sanatan Acharya Vrs. Tahasildar, Panposh and Ors* reported in *2016 (II) OLR 290* and when as per the ratio of the said decision, it is the duty of the Revenue Officer like the alleged contemnor i.e. Muralidhar Urmal, Tahasildar, Lathikata to respect the decision of the Civil Court passed in the civil suit and he cannot ignore the judgment and decree passed by the Civil Court and when the right, title and interest of the plaintiff (predecessors of the petitioners) was declared in respect of the disputed case land, then, at this juncture, notice is required to be issued to the alleged contemnor (Muralidhar Urmal, Tahasildar, Lathikata) asking him to show cause in writing about the cause and reason of non-compliance of the above directions given in the order dated 09.04.2025 passed by this Court in W.P.(C) No.2270 of 2025 by filing the said show-cause in the Court remaining present personally and to explain the show-cause if it requires by the Court.

10. Registry is to transmit the copy of this order to Muralidhar Urmal, Tahasildar, Lathikata for submission of the written show cause being present in person on the next date and to explain about the same if the same requires by the Court.

11. List this matter four weeks after.

**(ANANDA CHANDRA BEHERA)**  
**Judge**