



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK

W.P.(C). No.18034 of 2026

Madhusudan Subudhi

....

Petitioner

Mr. Rohit Ranjan Ray, Advocate

-versus-

State of Odisha and Others

.... ***Opposite Parties***

Mr. Siba Narayan Biswal
(Additional Standing Counsel)

CORAM:

JUSTICE K.R. MOHAPATRA

JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR MISHRA

ORDER

30.06.2026

Order No.

- 02.
1. This matter is taken up through hybrid mode.
 2. Petitioner, in this writ petition, prays for the following relief:-

“It is therefore prayed that, this Hon'ble Court may graciously be pleased to admit the present petition and after hearing the parties may pass an appropriate order directing the Opp. Party No. 2 (The Collector, Khordha) to immediately consider, process, and dispose of the Petitioner's pending grievance petition dated 22.04.2026 under Annexure- 4 Series by passing a reasoned, speaking order within a strict, stipulated timeframe and may further be pleased to direct the Opp. Parties to disburse the verified differential compensation amount of Rs. 61,25,442.00 along with up-to-date statutory interest to the Petitioner, taking into account the decision of Hon'ble Apex Court passed in Union of India and Another Vrs. Tarsem Singh reported in 2019 (9) see 304.

And may pass any other order(s) or Direction(s) for the ends of justice.

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



3. In course of hearing, Mr. Ray, learned counsel for the Petitioner submits that the land has been acquired under the provisions of National Highways Act, 1956 (for brevity, 'the Act') and the award was passed on 28th July, 2021. It is submitted that the interest @ 12% was calculated and paid for 657 days, i.e., from 28th December, 2017 to 15th October, 2019. But the awarded amount was released in favour of the Petitioner on 28th July, 2021. Thus, the Petitioner is entitled to the interest for the interregnum period.

4. In course of hearing, Mr. Ray, learned counsel for the Petitioner submits that the Petitioner has a remedy under Section 3-G(5) of the Act to raise his grievance before the Arbitrator. He, therefore, prays for withdrawal of the writ petition to avail the remedy as aforesaid.

5. Mr. Biswal, learned Additional Standing Counsel does not have any objection to such prayer.

6. Accordingly, this Court without expressing any opinion on the merit of the case of the Petitioner disposes of the writ petition as withdrawn with an observation that if any application for arbitration under Section 3-G(5) is filed before the Arbitrator, the same shall be considered in accordance with law.

(K.R. Mohapatra)
Judge

(S.K. Mishra)
Judge