



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK

CRLMP No. 786 of 2026

Nilima Pradhan

....

Petitioner

Mr. Partha Sarathi Das, Advocate

-versus-

***1. State of Odisha represented through
the Principal Secretary to Govt. Home
Department, Bhubaneswar***

2. Superintendent of Police, Rourkela

***3. Officer-in-Charge, Chandiposh
Police Station, Sundargarh***

....

Opp. Parties

Mr. Saroj Kumar Rout,
Additional Standing Counsel

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE MISS JUSTICE SAVITRI RATHO

ORDER

30.06.2026

Order No.

(Through Hybrid Mode)

01. 1. This CRLMP has been filed for registering a case on the written report of the Petitioner at Annexure-3.
2. On 09.11.2025, the Petitioner came to learn that his son Dinesh Kumar Pradhan who was studying in +3 Arts second year in Municipal College, Rourkela and was staying Sunshine Academic Hostel at Civil Township Rourkela, had died. On enquiry it was found out that he along with other students had gone for a picnic at Darjing and drowned in the river Brahmani. Chandiposh P.S. U.D. Case No. 20 of 2025 was registered on 10.11.2025 on the MLC of Dr. Aswin Kumar Minz, Medical Officer, CHC, Lahunipada. But without conducting any post



mortem examination, the dead body of the son of the Petitioner was handed over to them. As the husband of the Petitioner was not satisfied that the cause of death was drowning, he submits a complaint before the O.I.C., Chandiposh Police Station on 02.05.2026. As no case was registered in the Police Station on his FIR, a grievance was sent on the S.P., Rourkela.

3. Since it is a case of unnatural death and U.D. Case has been registered, the dead body could not be handed over to the family of the deceased without conducting post mortem examination.

4. List this case on 21.07.2026 to enable Mr. Saroj Kumar Rout, learned Additional Standing Counsel to obtain instructions as well as the case diary in Chandiposh P.S. UD Case No. 20 of 2025.

5. If on verification of the case diary and documents, it is found that the post mortem examination of the deceased has been conducted, this Court may consider imposing cost on the Petitioner for making false averments/allegations.

(Savitri Ratho)
Judge

Sukanta