



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK

CRLMP No.922 of 2024

Susree Subinita

....

Petitioner

*Mr. D. Panda, Advocate
& Ms. Sucheta Gumansingh, Advocate*

-versus-

**1. State of Odisha
2. Inspector General of Police,
CID, Crime Branch, Cuttack
3. Bank of Baroda, PFS Nayapalli
Branch, Bhubaneswar
4. Reserve Bank of India,
Bengaluru**

....

Opposite Party

*Mr. Saroj Kumar Rout,
Additional Standing Counsel
(For Opposite Parties No.1 and 2)*

*Mr. K.M.H. Niamati, Advocate
(For Opposite Party No. 3)*

*Mr. Parsuram Mohapatra, Advocate
(For Opposite Party No. 4)*

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE MISS JUSTICE SAVITRI RATHO

ORDER

02.07.2026

Order No.

03.

(Through Hybrid Mode)

1. Pursuant to order of this Court on 18.10.2023, CID CB PS Case No.17 of 2023 has been registered on 22.12.2023. Since the matter is pending before this Court since 20.06.2024, Mr. S.K.



Rout, learned Additional Standing Counsel was directed to obtain instructions from the I.O. including the copy of the case diary for the period from 20.06.2026 till date.

2. Perused the instructions dated 20.05.2026 of Ms. Nilema Rani Panda (OPS-1), Additional SP, CID CB, Cuttack, the I.O. in the case.

3. After she giving details of the case, has stated as follows:

“Despite being asked repeatedly the complainant could not produce any specific forged document or substantiate allegations of forgery and fraudulent use of her signature.”

4. It is also stated that investigation is in its final stage. The final opinion regarding submission of final report / supplementary charge-sheet / closure report shall be submitted before the concerned Court shortly after receipt of remaining documents from the DRT and completion of formalities.

IA No.60 of 2026

5. This IA has been filed by one Smt. Rekharani Panda stating that pursuant to letter dated 26.06.2026, the Petitioner has deposited the entire sales price i.e. Rs.81,03,000/- and has been



issued sale certificate by Opposite Party No.3 on 23.09.2024 but the property has not been handed over to her and on enquiry she learnt that an account of pendency of this CRLMP, the property has not been handed over to her. It is also stated that she has availed loan to a tune of Rs.58,96,800/- from the Bank of Baroda, which she has to repay through monthly instalment, but she is not able to enjoy the property purchased by her.

6. Ms. S. Gumansingh, learned counsel for the Petitioner submits that objection to the I.A. has been prepared and shall filed today.

7. Almost two months have elapsed in the meanwhile but objection is not filed. By order dated 08.05.2026 learned counsel for the Petitioner had prayed two weeks' time to file objection to the I.A.

8. As Ms. Gumansingh, learned counsel for the Petitioner prays for pass over, the matter is passed over.

Later

9. Mr. D. Panda, learned counsel for the Petitioner appears on virtual mode and submits that the third party who is the



intervenor here does not have any locus standi to be arrayed as an Opposite Party in this CRLMP. In support of his submission, he relies upon the decisions of the Supreme Court in the case of ***Sanjai Tiwari vs. State of Uttar Pradesh & Another : (2021) 15 SCC 660***. (paras 12, 13, 14 and 15). He submits that there is no provision in the Cr.P.C. or the BNSS regarding impletion of a third party in a criminal proceeding and for that he relies on the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of –1. ***Subrata Roy Sahara vs. Pramod Kumar Saini & Others : 2022 SCC Online SC 2033***. (paras 7 and 13). 2. ***P.V. Narasimharao vs. State : 1997 (42) DRF***. (paras 4, 5 and 6). He also submits that the private party has no role in the case instituted in the FIR by the State. He ultimately submits that the I.A. has been filed under Order 1 Rule 10 of the CPC, for which it should be dismissed.

10. Since there is no time today, list this case on 07.07.2026 for further hearing.

(Savitri Ratho)
Judge

RKS/Sukanta