

**ODISHA HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION
ORDER SHEET**

Case No. _____ of 20____

Name of the Complainant _____

Sl. No.	Date	Order passed by the Commission	Office action taken with date
	05.02.2026	<p style="text-align: center;">BEFORE THE ODISHA HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>OHRC Case No.939 of 2025</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;">In the matter of: Bata Krushna Rout & Others, Residents of Narayan Basti, Gopabandhunagar, Bachelor Barrack, Unit-8, Bhubaneswar.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">..... Complainants</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Versus</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Bhubaneswar Municipal Corporation (BMC)2. Bhubaneswar Development Authority (BDA)3. State of Odisha (through the Chief Secretary)4. Other concerned authorities <p style="text-align: center;">..... Respondents</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>ORDER</u></p> <p>The case of complainants is that there are over 130 families residing in Narayan Basti, a recognized slum in Unit 8, Bhubaneswar, Odisha, on government land for an extended period. In 2011, they approached the Hon'ble High Court of Odisha vide Writ Petition No. 2556/2011 challenging illegal eviction attempts. The High Court disposed of the petition as infructuous, noting that the area had purportedly been cleared. However, the complainants continued their occupation. Subsequently, the land was deemed tenurable under relevant statutory provisions, and</p>	

**ODISHA HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION
ORDER SHEET**

Case No. _____ of 20 _____

939 OF 2025

Name of the Complainant _____

Bata Krushna Rout & Others

Sl. No.	Date	Order passed by the Commission	Office action taken with date
	<u>Contd.....</u> 05.02.2026	<p>the complainants were granted Land Rights Certificates (LRCs) by the BMC pursuant to the statutory provision of Chapter XXI of Odisha Municipal Corporation Act as amended up to 2022 taking note of vested rights over the occupied land.</p> <p>In 2025, the local Member of Parliament on the request of senior citizens of the locality made a representation to the Hon'ble Chief Minister, Odisha, requesting the construction of a Community Park which was being insisted since 2016. As such taking note of the heading therein as revealed from the forwarding letter to the Hon'ble Chief Minister of Odisha, the Principal Secretary to Government of Odisha was directed to complete the park at the earliest which was sent to the BMC to take necessary action. Pursuant thereto, the BMC, with assistance from the BDA, issued eviction notices and attempted to evict the complainants without apprising the Government in H & UD Department that the land in question was not vacant and people residing therein have been granted LRC right under Municipal Corporation Act.</p> <p>However, being aggrieved by such act of BMC and BDA, the complainants approached this Commission, alleging that such actions violate their human rights,</p>	

**ODISHA HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION
ORDER SHEET**

Case No. _____ of 20____

939 OF 2025

Name of the Complainant _____

Bata Krushna Rout & Others

Sl. No.	Date	Order passed by the Commission	Office action taken with date
	<p>Contd..... 05.02.2026</p>	<p>particularly the right to shelter and dignified living under Article 21 of the Constitution of India. This Commission granted an interim stay on the eviction proceedings.</p> <p>2. The respondents contend that the eviction is pursuant to the directives of the Hon'ble Chief Minister for developing a public amenity, 'Community Park' in response to local demands. They argue that the complainants are encroachers on government land required for public purpose, and no human rights violation occurs as they will be rehabilitated elsewhere by their displacement from the site. The respondents further submit that the prior High Court order supports clearance of the area, and the land's use for a park serves the broader public interest, negating any claim to protection.</p> <p>3. The complainants assert that the issuance of LRCs under the Odisha Municipal Corporation Act, has created vested rights in their favour, transforming their status from encroachers to legitimate occupants. They cannot be evicted without adherence to the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 (LARR Act). Moreover, the proposed park, based merely on demands from some senior citizens, does not qualify as a "public purpose" under law,</p>	

**ODISHA HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION
ORDER SHEET**

Case No. _____ of 20 _____

Name of the Complainant 939 OF 2025
Bata Krushna Rout & Others

Sl. No.	Date	Order passed by the Commission	Office action taken with date
	<u>Contd.....</u> 05.02.2026	<p>as it lacks broader societal necessity. Forced eviction without due process and adequate rehabilitation amounts to a violation of their human rights, including the right to life, shelter, and dignity under Article 21 of the Constitution.</p> <p>4. The primary issue before this Commission is whether the proposed eviction constitutes a violation of the human rights of the complainants, particularly in light of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">i. The legal status conferred by the LRCs.ii. The requirement of due process and rehabilitation in evictions.iii. The validity of the claimed "public purpose." <p>5. This Commission is empowered under Section 12 of the Protection of Human Rights Act, 1993, to inquire into complaints of human rights violations by public authorities. Human rights, as defined under Section 2(d) of the Act, include rights relating to life, liberty, equality, and dignity guaranteed by the Constitution or embodied in international covenants.</p> <p>The Supreme Court of India has consistently held that the right to shelter is an integral component of the right to life under Article 21. In <i>Olga Tellis v. Bombay Municipal Corporation</i> (1985) 3 SCC 545, the Apex Court ruled that eviction of pavement and slum dwellers without notice, hearing, and alternative accommodation deprives them of their livelihood and dignity, amounting to a constitutional</p>	

**ODISHA HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION
ORDER SHEET**

Case No. _____ of 20____

939 OF 2025

Name of the Complainant _____

Bata Krushna Rout & Others

Sl. No.	Date	Order passed by the Commission	Office action taken with date
<u>Contd.....</u> 05.02.2026	05.02.2026	<p>violation. Similarly, in <i>Chameli Singh v. State of U.P.</i> (1996) 2 SCC 549, the Court emphasized that the right to shelter includes adequate living space and protection from arbitrary deprivation. In <i>Ahmedabad Municipal Corporation v. Nawab Khan Gulab Khan</i> (1997) 11 SCC 121, while rehabilitation was not deemed mandatory in all cases, it was held desirable, especially for long-term occupants, and evictions must follow natural justice principles. More recent judgments, such as in <i>Sudama Singh v. Government of Delhi</i>, reported in 168 (2010) DLT 216, mandate rehabilitation surveys and in-situ or alternative housing before evictions.</p> <p>The Municipal Corporation Act in Chapter XXI was enacted to assign land rights for redevelopment, rehabilitation, and upgradation of slums. The rights conferred therein in tenable land confers on the slumdweller is heritable and mortgageable for housing purposes, not transferable. The same is otherwise known as "Jaga Mission" and aims to provide security of tenure to urban poor, preventing arbitrary evictions. Once LRCs are issued, the occupants are no longer "rank encroachers" but holders of statutory rights. The Act's provisions for redevelopment emphasize community participation and</p>	

**ODISHA HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION
ORDER SHEET**

Case No. _____ of 20 _____

Name of the Complainant 939 OF 2025
Bata Krushna Rout & Others

Sl. No.	Date	Order passed by the Commission	Office action taken with date
<u>Contd.....</u> 05.02.2026		<p>abatement of prior proceedings, underscoring protection against summary dispossession.</p> <p>Similarly, in Municipal Corporation area slumdweller are also given such rights, in Odisha Municipal Corporation Act Chapter XVI as amended up to 2022.</p> <p>While the land in question is government-owned, the grant of LRCs vests interest in the complainants, akin to property rights. Section 2(1) of the LARR Act defines "public purpose" broadly to include infrastructure, planned development, and public amenities like parks. A community park for senior citizens may arguably fall within this ambit as a recreational facility serving public welfare. However, the demand from "some senior citizens" does not automatically elevate it to a compelling public necessity overriding vested rights. Even assuming the same to be public purpose, eviction must comply with LARR's safeguards: social impact assessment, consent where applicable, fair compensation, and rehabilitation. Arbitrary eviction bypassing these violates due process and thereby 'human rights' of the residents having LRC.</p> <p>The respondents' reliance on rehabilitation "elsewhere" is vague and insufficient. Supreme Court</p>	

**ODISHA HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION
ORDER SHEET**

Case No. _____ of 20_____
939 OF 2025


Name of the Complainant _____
Bata Krushna Rout & Others

Sl. No.	Date	Order passed by the Commission	Office action taken with date
<u>Contd.....</u> 05.02.2026		<p>directives in eviction cases stress meaningful alternatives, including proximity to livelihoods, to avoid further marginalization. The prior High Court order of 2011, predating the LRC grant, does not bar current protections under Municipal Corporation Act. Forced eviction amid ongoing possession and without exhausting legal remedies constitutes a human rights violation, exacerbating vulnerability for these families.</p> <p>6. Taking into note of the aforesaid Act, this Commission finds that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">i. The complainants hold vested rights under LRCs issued pursuant to the Odisha Municipal Corporation Act entitling them to protection against arbitrary eviction.ii. The proposed eviction, without adherence to due process under the LARR Act, 2013, or provision of adequate, site-specific rehabilitation, violates the complainants' right to shelter, life, and dignity under Article 21.iii. While a community park may serve a public purpose, it cannot justify summary dispossession without legal safeguards, especially when based on limited local demands. <p>7. Pursuant to Sections 18 and 20 of the Protection of Human Rights Act, 1993 therefore, this Commission recommends the following:</p>	

**ODISHA HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION
ORDER SHEET**

Case No. _____ of 20 _____
939 OF 2025

Name of the Complainant _____
Bata Krushna Rout & Others

Sl. No.	Date	Order passed by the Commission	Office action taken with date
	Contd..... 05.02.2026	<p>i. The interim stay on eviction granted by this Commission shall continue until compliance with due process.</p> <p>ii. The respondents shall halt all eviction actions and conduct a social impact assessment, provide notice and hearing to the complainants, and ensure rehabilitation in accordance with the LARR Act, 2013.</p> <p>iii. The State Government is recommended to review the proposal for the community park, ensuring it aligns with broader public interest and does not disproportionately affect vulnerable groups.</p> <p>iv. The respondents shall submit a compliance report to this Commission within 60 days.</p> <p>The complaint is disposed of accordingly. No costs.</p> <p>Copy of the order be communicated to the Chief Secretary to Government of Odisha, A.C.S. to Government of Odisha in H & U.D. Department, the Commissioner, Bhubaneswar Municipal Corporation, Bhubaneswar and the Secretary, Bhubaneswar Development Authority so also the complainant.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"> JUSTICE S. PUJAHARI CHAIRPERSON</p>	