

**IN THE COURT OF 2ND ADDL. SENIOR CIVIL JUDGE,
BHUBANESWAR, DISTRICT-KHURDA.**

PRESENT:- **Shri S.K. Pattanaik, M.A., LL.,M,**
2nd Addl. Senior Civil Judge, Bhubaneswar.

C.S. No. 17/685 of 2010/2004

Smt. Sarita Sahoo, aged about 42 years,
W/o. Hrudananda Atibudhi, Vill/PO/PS. Baideswar,
Dist : Cuttack, At present Plot No. 210,
Mouza-Patrapada, PS. Khandagiri, Bhubaneswar,
Dist : Khurda.

Plaintiff

-Versus-

1. State of Orissa, represented through
Special Secretary, G.A. Department,
Govt. of Orissa, Orissa Secretariate,
Bhubaneswar, Dist : Khurda.
2. The Collector, Khurda,
At/PO/PS/Dist : Khurda.
3. The Tahasildar, Bhubaneswar,
Dist : Khurda.
4. The Addl. Tahasildar, Bhubaneswar,
(in Charge of Lease Cases),
Bhubaneswar, Dist : Khurda.

..... Defendants

COUNSELS APPEARED FOR THE PARTIES:

For the Plaintiff: M/s P.K. Mahapatra & Associates

For Defendants : M/s. R.P. Nanda, G.P.

DATE OF ARGUMENT: 28.11.2013

DATE OF JUDGMENT: 11.12.2013

J U D G M E N T

This is a suit for declaration and permanent injunction.

2. The plaintiff's case in nutshell is that the suit plot area Ac.0.100 decimals was originally allotted to one Rama Nayak, S/o. Ananda

Nayak of village Patrapada from Sabik Plot No. 210, Khata No. 550 by the Tahasildar, Bhubaneswar (defendant No.3) in Waste Land Lease Case No. 507/1966-67. The suit land was settled in favour of Rama Nayak under the provisions of Orissa Government Land Settlement Act (in short, 'OGLS Act 1962'). After lease was granted the lessee was delivered with physical possession and he was in peaceful possession by constructing his residential house over the suit land since 1973 as an occupancy raiyat under the State of Orissa with record of right bearing Khata No. 575/141, Plot No. 55/2014. Accordingly consolidation ROR was issued in favour of the original lessee as per the provisions of OCH & PFL Act, 1972 bearing Consolidation Khata No. 550, Plot No. 210, area Ac. 0.100 decimals under Sthitiban status.

It is further case of the plaintiff is that the original lessee Rama Nayak for his legal necessity alienated the suit property to the plaintiff after taking consideration amount of Rs. 10,000/- and executed sale deed bearing Registration No. 6119 dated 17.10.1984. After purchase the plaintiff mutated the suit land vide Mutation Case No. 835/86 on 30.06.1988 and mutation ROR was issued in favour of the plaintiff as Sthitiban status. The plaintiff is residing in the suit plot by constructing his residential house, planting fruit bearing trees and has been paying land rent to the Government obtained receipts.

It is the further case of the plaintiff is that while plaintiff is in physical possession over the suit property, the defendant No.3 published notice U/s. 3(B) of OGLS Act, 1962 to resume the suit property in daily Newspaper 'The Samaj' as if the same has been used for any other purpose than that for it was settled. The plaintiff appeared before the defendant No.4 on 09.08.2002 submitted her case about the fact of purchase from the original lessee Rama Nayak. Thereafter she has got mutated the land in her favour and residing in the suit house by constructing a residential house having a boundary wall. The defendant No.4 reflected such fact in the order sheet dated 09.08.2002 of Misc. Case No. 187/2000 arising out of Waste Land

Lease Case No. 507/1966-67. The defendant No.4 did not intimate the husband of the plaintiff regarding said enquiry on 09.08.2002 but the order sheet dated 12.11.2002 clearly reveals that the defendant No.4 had visited the schedule property on 17.08.2002 without the knowledge of the plaintiff. Subsequently it was ascertained that the defendant No.4 had resumed the schedule property vide order dated 12.11.2002 in Misc. Case No. 187/2000. The defendant No.4 has wrongly relied upon an order dated 29.01.1996 in OJC No. 9449/1993 as because there is no direction to the State Government to resume the schedule of property U/s. 3 (B) of the OGLS Act, 1962. The provision of law stipulates that an occupancy raiyat holding a land for a period of 12 years become a Sthitiban tenant under the provisions of Orissa Tenancy Act. In this case the original lessee as a Sthitiban tenant under the provisions of OCH & PFL Act, 1972. The plaintiff purchased the suit land from the original lessee and as such she became a Sthitiban tenant under the State of Orissa, thereby the plaintiff is not entitled to be evicted or for that matter schedule of property cannot be resumed U/s. 3(B) of OGLS Act.

It is also the case of the plaintiff is that the order dated 29.01.1996 passed in OJC No. 9449/93 stipulated a probe is necessary to enquire into the matter through a Senior Officer in the rank of Secretary in order to misuse of power of the Tahasildar. In the instant case, there is no such enquiry by the State Government through a Senior Officer in the rank of Secretary regarding misuse of power committed by the then Tahasildar in the settlement of schedule land in favour of Rama Nayak. The said enquiry dated 17.08.2002 was conducted without intimating the plaintiff and the order sheet was reflected in Misc. Case No. 187/2000 was also made behind the back of the plaintiff. The provision U/s. 3(B) of OGLS Act, 1962 is not maintainable as because the OGLS Rules does not provide any procedure for effective adjudication of a proceeding U/s. 3(B) of the said Act. So the order dated 12.11.2002 is illegal, wrong and nonest in the eye of law. The resumption of the suit property under the aforesaid

Act is grossly barred by law of limitation which was made after a long lapse of 31 years. So the resumption order and threat of defendant No.4 cast a cloud over the title of the plaintiff for which the plaintiff without finding any alternative approached this Court with a prayer to declare the plaintiff as a Sthitiban tenant over the suit property on the basis of valid lease granted to her vendor in Waste Land Lease Case No. 507/1966-67 and permanent injunction.

3. The contesting defendants filed written statement challenging about its maintainability, cause of action, non-servicing of statutory notice, barred by law of limitation, grossly under valued and jurisdiction as the Civil Court is barred U/s. 7(B) of the OGLS Act. The plaintiff has no manner of right, title, interest and possession over the suit land. Originally the suit land under Khata No. 550, Plot No. 210, area Ac. 0.100 decimals, Kissam-gharabari in mouza-Patrapada was settled in favour of one Rama Nayak, S/o. Ananda Nayak as per order passed in Waste Land Lease Case No. 507/1966-67 by the then Tahasildar, Bhubaneswar and accordingly the ROR bearing Khata No. 575/141, Plot No. 55/2014 was opened in the name of lessee. The Hon'ble Court while disposing OJC No. 9449/1993 in its order dated 29.01.1996 had directed the State Government to enquire into the matter relating to lease of land in Bhubaneswar through a Senior rank of Secretary and to enquire whether Tahasildar, had settled the land by misuse of power, Hon'ble High Court further in its order dated 15.10.1998 had directed to Government to examine whether the cases were covered under Section 3(B) of OGLS Act 1962. In obedience to the direction of the Hon'ble High Court a resumption proceeding was initiated U/s. 3(B) of the OGLS Act, 1962, notice was issued to the original lessee and affected parties through the Newspaper 'The Samaj' dated 25.06.2002. The present plaintiff was also present on 12.11.2002 in the Court of Addl. Tahasildar, Bhubaneswar. Due field enquiry was made by the Addl. Tahasildar, it was revealed from the spot visit that the suit land was lying vacant. Neither the lessee Rama Nayak nor the subsequent purchaser the present plaintiff was in

possession over the suit land. As the lessee and subsequent purchaser violated the condition of lease, the lease hold land resumed U/s. 3(B) of the OGLS Act, 1962 and again recorded in Government khata. The said Section 3(B) of OGLS Act, 1962 empowers the Tahasildar/Addl. Tahasildar to resume the land if it is used for the purpose than the purpose for which the land was settled. The lessee violated the condition as he was not in possession, so the order was passed resuming the land as per Section 3(B) of the said Act.

It is the further case of the defendants that no appeal has been filed U/s. 7 of OGLS Act against the order of resumption passed U/s. 3(B) of the said Act before the competent authority, so the civil suit is not maintainable and the order passed by the Addl. Tahasildar is as per Section 3(B) of OGLS Act, 1962. As the original lessee and the present plaintiff were given an opportunity of hearing over the subject and thereafter the suit land was resumed in accordance with the provisions U/s. 3(B) of the OGLS Act and in this process prayed for dismissal of the suit.

4. On the basis of the pleadings of the parties, following issues are settled for adjudication.

ISSUES

1. Is the suit maintainable in the eye of law ?
2. Is there any cause of action to bring this suit ?
3. Whether the plaintiff is Sthitiban tenant over the suit schedule property under the State of Orissa on the basis of valid lease granted to her vendor in W.L. Case No. 507/66-67 ?
4. Whether the resumption order passed by Additional Tahasildar as per Section 3(B) of OGLS Act is illegal ?
5. Whether the Civil Court has jurisdiction to entertain the suit and to decide the matter in controversy ?
6. To what any other relief the plaintiff is entitled ?

5. In order to establish her claim, the plaintiff has examined three witnesses. P.W.1 is the plaintiff Sarita Sahoo, P.W.2 is her husband Hrudananda Atibudhi and P.W.3 Umakanta Raj, Addl. Tahasildar, Bhubaneswar and relied upon Ext.1 to 15/a in support of her stand. The Defendants have examined the Addl. Tahasildar, Bhubaneswar as D.W.1 on their behalf and relied on Ext.A to G/2 in support of their stand.

FINDINGS

ISSUE NO. 3, 4 & 5:

6. These issues are interlinked and interdependent to each other and need common evidence for discussion for which these issues have been taken up together for discussion. This is a suit for declaration and permanent injunction. The plaintiff Sarita Sahoo examined as P.W.1 in this case. She has fully corroborated her evidence as to the plaint story. She relied the original ROR vide Khata No. 575/141 of mouza-Patrapada published in the name of her vendor Rama Nayak vide Ext.1. Ext.2 is the rent receipt of the year 1984, Ext.3 is the consolidation ROR granted in favour of Rama Nayak, Ext.4 is the OLR permission letter issued by Revenue Officer, Bhubaneswar, Ext.5 is the objection certificate of BDA issued in her favour. Ext.6 is the Regd. Sale Deed bearing No. 6119 dated 17.10.1984, Ext.7 is the order in Mutation Case No. 835/86 dated 30.06.1988, Ext.8 is the Mutation ROR, Ext.9 to 9/b are the rent receipts, Ext.10 is the order dated 12.11.2002 in Misc. Case No. 187/2000 arising out of Waste Land Lease Case No. 507/66-67, Ext.11 is the 80 CPC notice. In cross examination she has stated that Ext.1 has been mutated and swata of lease holder mentioned as Dakhal Swata Sunya since 1973. In respect of the suit land one case has been filed before the Additional Tahasildar, Bhubaneswar U/s. 3 (B) of OGLS Act. She has personally appeared before the Addl. Tahasildar, Bhubaneswar in the suit case on 12.11.2002. She has also admitted that the Addl. Tahasildar has made field enquiry and in the said OGLS case was disposed of by Addl. Tahasildar and lease was cancelled. It is also stated that she has not

filed any appeal before the Sub-Collector U/s. 7 of OGLS Act against the order of resumption passed by the Addl. Tahasildar. She has not filed any building plan in the present suit in respect of the suit land nor has filed any holding tax receipt to that effect. It is admitted that on 09.08.2007 her husband was present in the Court of Addl. Tahasildar and filed hazira and on 09.08.2007 in presence of her husband the Tahasildar has told that on 17.08.2002 he will make a spot enquiry and next date of hearing of the case was also posted to 17.08.2002. On 12.11.2002 her husband was appeared before Tahasildar and on the said date Addl. Tahasildar passed final order.

P.W.2 Hrudananda Atibudhi, the husband of P.W.1 corroborated the evidence of P.W.1 stating inter alia that he was present in the Court of Addl. Tahasildar, Bhubaneswar for and on behalf of the plaintiff on 09.08.2002 neither the defendant No.4 nor the R.I. or Amin visited the suit plot on 17.08.2002. The plaintiff constructed outhouse and boundary wall over the suit land. In cross examination he has admitted that the Court of Addl. Tahasildar itself order was pronounced that he will go to spot on 17.08.2002 for an enquiry.

P.W.3 the Additional Tahasildar, Bhubaneswar Umakanta Raj in his evidence has stated that he is producing the W.L. Case No. 507/66-67 containing 22 sheets marked as Ext.15. The Sheet No. 21 marked as Ext.15/a. No sketch map is found inside the case record. Field enquiry has been made in W.L. Case No. 507/66-67. There is no field enquiry report in respect of the present suit property. No measurement sheet available basing on which spot report prepared.

7. D.W.1 Radhanath Sahoo in his evidence has stated that he was working as Addl. Tahasildar from the year 2002-2003 and looking after the lease files of mouza Patrapada during his incumbency. As per order of Hon'ble High Court of Orissa in OJC No. 9449 of 1993 in its order dated 29.01.1996 directed the State Government to enquire into the matter relating to the lease land in Bhubaneswar Tahasil through a Senior Officer in the rank of Secretary and to enquire whether the

Tahasildar has settled the land by misuse of power. In obedience to the direction a resumption proceeding was initiated against a lessee Rama Nayak S/o. of Ananda Nayak of village Patrapada in respect of the suit land on the ground that the purpose for which the lease granted was not maintained. The W.L. Case No. 507/66-67 the purpose of lease was for homestead purpose but the lessee did not use the same as specified and the same is lying vacant. So resumption Misc. Case No. 187/2000 was initiated to resume the land. The notice was published in the Newspaper 'The Samaj' dated 25.06.2002 calling upon the lessee to appear for show cause. Further stated that in pursuance to the publication of notice P.W.2 appeared before him on 09.08.2002 filed his written submission stating that he has purchased the land from Rama Nayak through Regd. Sale Deed No. 6119 dated 17.10.1984. D.W.1 recorded the statement of P.W.2 and obtained his signature at the margin of order sheet dated 09.08.2002 then the D.W.1 passed order for conducting spot enquiry on 17.08.2002 and on the said date he along with R.I. and Revenue Supervisor and Amin had been to the spot for enquiry where the husband of the plaintiff Hrudananda Atibudhi was present on behalf of the plaintiff. The spot enquiry was conducted by D.W.1 and in presence of other staffs he found that the suit land was lying vacant and no construction was on the suit land. The spot enquiry report is available in the case record. The lessee and the present plaintiff have violated the terms and conditions of the original lease and not using the suit land for homestead purpose for which he passed the order of resumption as per the provisions U/s. 3(B) of OGLS Act under the ownership of Government by exercising his jurisdiction. He further directed to Record Keeper for correction of ROR. In cross examination he has stated that when he initiated the proceeding on 09.08.2002 by then consolidation ROR was published over the suit mouza. The consolidation ROR was recorded in the name of original lessee under Sthitiban status. He has not intimated the neighbouring owners at the time of spot enquiry. Except Ext.15/a there is no other document to establish that he was conducted spot enquiry on 17.08.2002. The

Amin was measured the suit land at the time of spot enquiry. The ROR issued in favour of vendor of plaintiff was described his status as non-occupancy raiyat. The final order dated 12.11.2002 is a cyclostyle copy and he has corrected over the same at his hand though it has not been authenticated.

8. Learned counsel for the plaintiff during course of argument submitted that the vendor of the plaintiff was allotted the suit land in his favour on lease in Waste Land Lease Case No. 507/66-67 under status of non-occupancy raiyat and later came occupancy raiyat with Sthitiban tenant. After 40 years of allotment of lease the State initiated the proceeding U/s. 3(B) of the OGLS Act. There is no enquiry as per the decision of Hon'ble High Court vide OJC No. 9449/93. So the proceeding cannot be maintainable. That apart the Civil Court has jurisdiction to entertain and to decide the matter in controversy and prayed for to declare the plaintiff is the Sthitiban status over the schedule property. He relied on the decisions reported in **AIR 1992 Calcutta 179 (State of West Bengal & others-vrs.-Nripendra Nath Banerjee and others)**, **AIR 1970 SC 1727 (Smt. Munni Devi and another-vrs.-Gokal Chand and another)**, **AIR 1964 SC 807 (Addanki Tiruvenkata Thata Desika Charyulu-vrs.-State of Andhra Pradesh and another)**, **1998 (II) OLR 36 (Madhuchhanda Das-vrs.-State of Orissa & others)**, **1997 (I) OLR 52 (Chandra-vrs.-State)**, **2006 (II) OLR 544 (Lokanath-vrs.-State)** and **1993 (II) OLR 194 (Gulzar Khan-vrs.-Commissioner of Consolidation and others)**.

9. Learned counsel for the Government Pleader on contrary during course of argument submitted that as the lessee was not in possession over the suit land violated the conditions of the lease and the order was passed resuming the land as per Section 3(B) of OGLS Act. The plaintiff has not preferred any appeal U/s. 7 of the said Act before the competent authority, so the civil suit is not maintainable in the eye of law.

10. Now let me advert the real exercise with oral and documentary evidence relating to the fact in issue. The plaintiff's pleading in para 3 and 4 of the plaint is that the suit land originally allotted to one Rama Nayak in Waste Land Lease Case No. 507/66-67, consolidation ROR was published in the name of Rama Nayak vide Khata No. 550, Plot No. 210, area Ac. 0.100 decimals under Sthitiban status. The said Rama Nayak sold the suit land to plaintiff vide Regd. Sale Deed No. 6119 dated 17.10.1984 vide Ext.6. While the plaintiff is in physical possession over the suit land the defendant No.3 published notice U/s. 3(B) of OGLS Act, 1962 to resume the suit property in daily Newspaper 'The Samaj'. The plaintiff appeared before the Defendant No.4 on 09.08.2002 described her purchase and the same was reflected in the order sheet in Misc. Case No. 187/2000. But the order sheet dated 12.11.2002 clearly reveals that the defendant No.4 had visited the schedule property on 17.08.2002 which is without her knowledge. She subsequently knew that the suit property was resumed vide order dated 12.11.2002 in Misc. Case No. 187/2000 arising out of W.L. Case No. 507/66-67. The plaintiff has filed all the documents stands in the name of her vendor Rama Nayak vide Ext.1 to 5. Her sale deed vide Ext.6, mutation ROR vide Ext.7, stands recorded in her name along with Waste Land Lease Case No. 507/66-67 vide Ext.15. P.W.2 the husband of P.W.1 admitted his presence before defendant No.4 on dated 09.08.2002 but he denied any spot visit made by the defendant No.4 staff on 17.08.2002. P.W.3 the Additional Tahasildar who submitted the Waste Land Lease Case No. 507/66-67 which is marked as Ext.15.

11. Before entering into the prayer of the plaintiff, the first question before me to see whether the order passed by the Additional Tahasildar in Misc. Case No. 187/2000 is legal or illegal. The Additional Tahasildar examined as D.W.1 who in his evidence has stated that as per the order of Hon'ble High Court passed in OJC No. 9449/1993, he initiated the resumption proceeding against the lessee Rama Nayak in respect of the suit land which was allotted to him in

Waste Land Lease Case No. 507/66-67. In the resumption Misc. Case he stated that due notice was published on the Newspaper 'The Samaj' dated 25.06.2002. Pursuant to the notice P.W.2, the husband of P.W.1 appeared before him on 09.08.2002 filed his written submission stating about the fact of purchase of suit land from the original lessee Rama Nayak and the signature of P.W.2 was obtained in the order sheet marked as Ext.F/1. D.W.1 passed order of spot enquiry on 17.08.2002 in presence of P.W.2. It is also revealed from the evidence of D.W.1 that P.W.2 was present at the time of spot enquiry. D.W.1 conducted enquiry in presence of P.W.2, Revenue Supervisor and Amin. It is ascertained that the suit land was lying vacant and no construction was made over the suit land. D.W.1 on enquiry, satisfied that the original lessee as well as the plaintiff who claimed to have purchased the suit land were not in possession over the case land and there was no construction over the same. As the lessee and the present plaintiff violated the terms and conditions of original lease by not using the suit land for homestead purpose, so in exercise of his jurisdiction as per Section 3(B) of OGLS Act passed order directing the Record Keeper for correction of ROR and bring the suit land to Government khata by deleting the name of lessee from the ROR. The D.W.1 has cross examined by the plaintiff exhaustively but nothing substantial has been brought out to demolish the truthful version of D.W.1.

12. It is pertinent to discuss here that the Civil Court lacks jurisdiction where its jurisdiction expressly or impliedly barred. As per Section 7-B of OGLS Act, 1962, the jurisdiction of a Civil Court expressly barred. Now a question arises whether the Civil Court lacks jurisdiction even in a case where its jurisdiction expressly barred. As per Section 9 of CPC there are two rider clauses which are as follows :

- (a) Whether the authority has jurisdiction to deal with the dispute in a special statute ?
- (b) If at all the authority has jurisdiction whether he has acted in consonance with law laid down in that statute ?

Applying the principles in the present suit it is found that as per Section 3 (B) of OGLS Act the Additional Tahasildar is competent to decide the dispute. The entire case record in Misc. Case No. 187/2000 vide Ext.15 the Additional Tahasildar D.W.1 has exhaustively dealt with the dispute by following all the procedures laid down in OGLS Act, 1962. In other words, there is no room left by Additional Tahasildar for the Civil Court to make an in-road in that appreciation by him. The D.W.1 after complying all the paraphernalia passed the order of resumption on dated 12.11.2002 which is within the knowledge of the plaintiff and her husband. Therefore, the rider clause of Section 9 of CPC will no way help to the plaintiff. Hence, the Civil Court lacks its jurisdiction to deal with the decision given by the competent authority, Additional Tahasildar D.W.1 while discussing/determining the controversy between the parties within the ambit of OGLS Act, 1962. More so, the competent /statutory authority has acted in conformity with the fundamental principles of judicial procedure. As per discussion made supra, the Civil Court has no jurisdiction to entertain the suit, so the point raised by the defence counsel as regards to the limitation and other factors relating to the Sthitiban status of the lessee which needs no elaboration So these issues are answered accordingly.

ISSUE NO.1, 2 & 6 :

13. These issues are formal in nature, need no elaboration. As per discussion, supra, the suit is not maintainable in the eye of law and there exists no cause of action to bring the suit. There is no other evidence with regard to any other relief. So these issues are answered accordingly.

Hence, it is ordered

ORDER

The suit be and the same is dismissed on contest against the defendants without cost.

Lawyer's fee at contested scale.

2nd Addl. Senior Civil Judge,
Bhubaneswar

Judgment is typed out to my dictation, corrected and pronounced in open court, on this the 11th day of December, 2013 under the signature and seal of this court.

2nd Addl. Senior Civil Judge,
Bhubaneswar.

LIST OF WITNESSES EXAMINED FOR THE PLAINTIFF:

P.W.1 : Sarita Sahu
P.W.2 : Hrudananda Atibudhi
P.W.3 : Umakanta Raj

LIST OF WITNESSES EXAMINED FOR THE DEFENDANTS:

D.W.1 : Radhanath Sahoo

LIST OF DOCUMENTS ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE ON BEHALF OF PLAINTIFF:

Ext.1 : Original Record of Right
Ext.2 : Rent receipt of the year 1984
Ext.3 : Consolidation ROR
Ext.4 : OLR permission letter
Ext.5 : No objection certificate of BDA.
Ext.6 : Regd. Sale Deed No. 6119 dated 17.10.1984.
Ext.6/a: Signature of P.W.1, S. Sahu
Ext.7 : Order of mutation case No. 535/86 dated 30.06.1988
Ext.8 : Mutation ROR of Khata No. 703/44
Ext.9 to 9/b: Rent receipts
Ext.10 : Order dated 12.11.2002 in M.C. Case No.187/2000.
Ext.11 : Office copy of 80 CPC notice.
Ext.12 to 12/c:Postal receipts.

Ext.13 to 13/c: Postal AD

Ext.14 to 14/b: Accounts statement from May 2000 to August 2000

Ext.15 : W.L. Case No. 507 of 1966/67 containing 22 sheets.

Ext.15/a: Page 21 of Ext.15

LIST OF DOCUMENTS FILED ON BEHALF OF DEFENDANTS:

Ext.A : Signature of Hrudananda Atibudhi on Ext.15/a

Ext.B : Application filed before Tahasildar.

Ext.B/1: Signature of husband of P.W.1.

Ext.C : First page cover of Lease Resumption Case tagged with
W.L. Case No. 507/66-67

Ext.D : Original lease order granted in favour of Rama Nayak.

Ext.E : Public notice issued for resumption of land.

Ext.F : Order sheet.

Ext.F/1: Signature of Hrudananda Atibudhi.

Ext.G : Final order of resumption passed on dated 12.11.2002.

Ext.G/1 & G/2 :Signatures of D.W.1.

2nd Addl. Senior Civil Judge,
Bhubaneswar.