



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK

W.P.(C) No.19970 of 2026

Dhirendra Kumar Dash

....

Petitioner

Mr. A.K. Panda, Advocate

-versus-

State of Odisha & others

....

Opp. Parties

Mr. S.K. Jee, AGA

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE CHITTARANJAN DASH

ORDER

09.07.2026

Order No.

01. 1. Heard learned counsel for the Parties.
2. By means of this application, the Petitioner seeks the following prayer:-

“It is therefore prayed that this Hon'ble Court may graciously be pleased to admit the writ petition, issue notice to the Opp. Parties and after hearing may direct the Opp. Party No.4 to issue ROR in respect of Khata No.768, Plot No.4273(Ac0.016dec) & Plot No.4274(Ac0.025dec), Mouza-Bhawanipatna Nazul, Dist.- Kalahandi in favour of the petitioner pursuant to the order passed in Nazul Settlement Case No. 1036/2012 for the interest of justice”

3. Learned counsel for the Petitioner, in course of the hearing in the application drew the attention of this Court to the fact that the Petitioner made an application before the appropriate authority for settlement of Nazul Plot as detailed in his application under Annexure-2. Pursuant to the said application, the appropriate authority conducted an enquiry and upon proceeding thereto, passed an order directing the aforesaid land to be settled in favour of the Petitioner and accordingly, the Tahasildar endorsed the order to the Sub-Collector for approval. The Sub-Collector,



Kalahandi, Bhawanipatna vide his order dated 04.02.2013 also found the proceeding of the Tahasildar having recommended for settlement of the land to be correct and in accordance with law and submitted the same before the Collector, Kalahandi for approval finally. The Collector, Kalahandi vide order dated 08.03.2013 found the proceeding to have been maintained in accordance with law recommending the land in Plot Nos.2473, 2474 under Khata No.768 with Kisam “Ghara” and “Baripani” to be settled in favour of the Petitioner. Subsequently, as the authority did not proceed to record the name of the Petitioner and issue the RoR, he moved an application before the Tahasildar on 30.08.2022. Pursuant whereof, the Tahasildar, Kalahandi passed order directing correction of the RoR. However, the aforesaid direction of the Tahasildar dated 30.08.2022 having not acted upon, the Petitioner moved the Tahasildar, Kalahandi at Bhawanipatana once again praying to issue RoR in his favour effecting the correction as already approved by the appropriate authority in connection with Nazul Settlement Case No.1036 of 2012. A copy whereof has been placed at Annexure-5. Learned counsel for the Petitioner drew the attention of this Court that in his application, while he moved the authority for settlement of the Plot Nos.4273 and 4274 pertaining to Khata No.768 in Mouza-Bhawanipatana Nazul, Thana No.152/326, in his order dated 08.08.2012, the Tahasildar, Kalahandi inadvertently mention the plot numbers to be “2473 and 2474” in place of “4273 and 4274”. The aforesaid plot numbers having been carried forward for approval before the Sub-Collector and the Collector as well, the plot numbers remained as “2473 and 2474”. However, having pointed the



mistake, the Petitioner moved the authority in his application dated 30.08.2022, where the Tahasildar also directed for correction of the RoR in respect to the aforesaid Plot Nos.4273 & 4274. However, the same has not been carried as on date. It apparently appears there is laxity on the part of the authority having not brought the name of the Petitioner in RoR in order to bring necessary corrections.

4. Learned AGA, Mr. Jee, while did not have any serious objection, also subscribes that apparently some mistakes crept in the order of the Tahasildar and the subsequent authorities while according the approval for settlement of the land in question, in favour of the Petitioner. However, such mistake being one on the part of the authority in the proceeding, the same cannot be attributed to the Petitioner nor the Petitioner can be held responsible for the same. Be that as it may, there is a long lapse on the part of the authority in bringing the correction and further, there is nothing on record to dispute the correctness of the order passed by the Tahasildar or the approval granted by the Sub-Collector or Collector as well, hence, this Court directs the Tahasildar, Kalahandi to see that the order passed on 30.08.2022 be brought on record forthwith within a period of one month, failing which the authority shall be held responsible besides a proceeding under the contempt.

5. In view of the above, the Writ Petition is dispose of.

(Chittaranjan Dash)
Judge