



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK

W.P.(C) No.36606 OF 2025

Nimain Charan Pradhan and Another Petitioners

Mr.Gopal Charan Moharana, Advocate

-versus-

State of Odisha and Others Opp. Parties

Mr.Swayambhu Mishra,
Additional Standing Counsel for O.P. 1 to 4

**CORAM:
JUSTICE K.R. MOHAPATRA
JUSTICE SAVITRI RATHO**

**ORDER
24.02.2026**

**Order No.
02.**

1. This matter is taken up through hybrid mode.
2. This writ petition has been filed alleging inaction on the part of the Tahasildar, Erasama in disposing of OEA Case No.716 of 2001 pursuant to the order dated 21st December, 2021 of the Additional District Magistrate, Jagatsinghpur in OEA Appeal No.14 of 2021.
3. Taking note of the grievance of the Petitioners, this Court vide order dated 7th January, 2026 directed the State Counsel to take instruction with regard to present status of OEA Case No.716 of 2001 pending before the Tahasildar, Erasama (Opposite Party No.4).
4. Mr. Mishra, learned Additional Standing Counsel receiving instruction from the Tahasildar, Erasama produced the entire order-sheet in OEA Case No.716 of 2001.
- 4.1. On perusal of the order-sheet, it appears that OEA Case No.716 of 2001 was disposed of on 18th December, 2025 with the following order:-



“The Case is put up today. Notice has been duly served and SR back. The petitioner’s present and file hazira. Opposite Parties are found absent. On perusal of the case records and documents attached to OEA Appeal No.14/2021 it is revealed that as per the order dtd.31.10.2022 of learned Sub-Collector, Jagatsinghpur the order passed by the Tahasildar, Erasama dtd.18.06.2024 has been set-aside and further on verification of R.S.D. bearing no.1829 dt.24.03.1969 submitted by the appellant that sabik plot no.110 corresponding M.S.khata no.352, M.S. plot No.107 was recorded in the Be-Bandobasta status and the case land relates to RSD executed before settlement. Hence it needs to no interference, as court of Tahasildar is not a competent court to deal with pre-settlement cases. The case is hereby rejected.”

5. Written instruction along with order-sheet of OEA Case No.716 of 2001 is taken on record.

6. Since the OEA case has already been disposed of, no further order is required to be passed in this writ petition.

6.1. A copy of the order is also handed over to Mr. Moharana, learned counsel for the Petitioners in Court.

7. In view of the above, the writ petition is disposed of as infructuous.

(K.R. Mohapatra)
Judge

(Savitri Ratho)
Judge

Himansu