



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK

W.P.(C) No.17751 of 2026

Chaitanya Dhir

....

Petitioner

Mr. Pabitra Kumar Nayak, Advocate

-versus-

The Collector, Angul and Another

....

Opposite Parties

Ms. Suman Pattanayak,
Additional Government Advocate

CORAM:

JUSTICE K.R. MOHAPATRA

JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR MISHRA

ORDER

21.07.2026

Order No.

- 03.
1. This matter is taken up through hybrid mode.
 2. Petitioner, in this writ petition, prayed for a direction to the Tahasildar, Kania, (Opposite Party No.2), who is also the competent Authority for land acquisition under the National Highways Act, 1956, for disbursement of the compensation in favour of the Petitioner and other recorded co-sharer within a stipulated time.
 3. Upon hearing Mr.Nayak, learned counsel for the Petitioner and on perusal of the record, it appears that the Competent Authority (Opposite Party No.2) vide Process No.67 dated 22nd August, 2023 (Annexure-4) issued notice to the recorded tenant, namely, Baisnab Dhir, Susama Dhir and Baigeni Dhir to appear before him on 31st August, 2023 and produce documents in respect of their claim to receive compensation. However, on the date of issuance of such notice, Baisnab Dhir was dead. He died on 15th September, 2021 as



would reveal from Annexure-3 leaving behind the Petitioner and other three legal heirs.

4. It is submitted by Mr. Nayak, learned counsel for the Petitioner that although the Petitioner along with other co-sharers appeared on 31st August, 2023 before the Competent Authority (Opposite Party No.2) with all relevant documents in support of their claim to receive compensation but the same has not yet been disbursed in their favour. The Petitioner along with other co-sharers have also submitted a representation to the Competent Authority on 24th April, 2026 under Annexure-5. But no response to the same has yet been received.

5. Since the claim of the Petitioner to receive compensation has not yet been adhered to, this Court presumes that there might be a dispute with regard to the apportionment of compensation. As such the Petitioner has remedy before the Competent Authority for redressal of his grievances.

6. In view of the above, we are not inclined to entertain the writ petition. Accordingly, the writ petition is disposed of with an observation that the Petitioner, if so advised, may work out remedy in accordance with law.

6. Issue urgent certified copy of this order on proper application.

(K.R. Mohapatra)
Judge

(S.K. Mishra)
Judge