



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK

W.P.(C) No.12449 of 2026

CNR No. ODHC010288212026

***Odisha Power
Transmission Engineers
Association (OPTRA),
Bhubaneswar & Anr.***

....

Petitioners

*Mr. B. Routray, Sr. Advocate along with
Mr. S.D. Routray, Advocate*

-versus-

***Odisha Power
Transmission corporation
Ltd., Bhubaneswar & Ors.***

Opposite Parties

*Mr. B.K. Dash, Sr. Advocate
for OPTCL along with Mr. S.R.
Dash, Advocate*

**CORAM:
JUSTICE BIRAJA PRASANNA SATAPATHY**

**ORDER
18.09.2026**

Order No.

- 09.** 1. This matter is taken up through Hybrid Arrangement (Virtual/Physical) Mode.
2. Pursuant to order dtd.10.09.2026, learned Senior Counsel appearing for the Opposite Party-Corporation produced the decision taken in the proceeding of the meeting held on 16.02.2026 in Court. The same be kept in record.



3. Heard learned counsel appearing for the Parties.

4. The present Writ Petition has been filed *inter alia* with the following prayer:-

“It is therefore, most humbly prayed that this Hon'ble Court be graciously pleased to:

i) Admit the Writ Petition;

ii) Call for the records;

iii) Issue RULE NISI calling upon the opposite parties more particularly opposite party No.3 & 4 to show cause as to why the impugned office No.AW-GE-VI-03/2022-4324 order dated 16.03.2026 under Annexure:7 shall not be quashed.

iv) If the opposite parties fail to show cause or show insufficient cause, issue a writ in the order nature of certiorari by quashing the impugned office No.AW-GE-VI-03/2022-4324 dated 16.03.2026 under Annexure:7.

v) Issue a writ in the nature of mandamus or any other writ/writs direction/directions directing the opposite parties to give promotion from E-8 to E-9 Grade in terms of Regulation 12 of GRIDCO Officers Service Regulations under Annexure:4.

vi) And pass any other order/orders, direction/directions as your Lordships deem fit and proper for the ends of justice.

vii) And further this Hon'ble Court may be pleased to quash the impugned Office Order dated 17.06.2026 under Annexure:9.

And for the said act of kindness, the petitioners as in duty bound shall ever pray.”

5. Learned Senior Counsel appearing for the Petitioners contended that without amending the relevant regulation, when Anneuxre-7 office order was issued on



16.03.2026, the same was challenged by filing the present Writ Petition.

5.1. It is contended that this Court when passed an interim order on 06.05.2026, *inter alia* directing that no further progress be made basing on the impugned office order dtd.16.03.2026, the relevant regulation was amended with issuance of office order on 17.06.2026 under Annexure-9. Accordingly, prayer for amendment was also allowed by this Court to incorporate and to challenge office order dtd.17.06.2026, on the ground that such an amendment has been made without following the provisions contained under Regulation-3(2) of the GRIDCO Officers Service Regulations, 1997 (in short 'Regulation').

6. Considering the submission made that the amendment to the Regulation so issued vide order dtd.17.06.2026 under Annexure-9 has been made without compliance of the provision contained under the proviso to Regulation 3(2) of the Regulation, this Court passed the following order on 10.09.2026:-

- "1.** *This matter is taken up through Hybrid Arrangement (Virtual/Physical) Mode.*
- 2.** *Heard learned counsel appearing for the Parties.*
- 3.** *Addl. Affidavit filed in Court be kept in record.*
- 4.** *Considering the stand taken in the Addl. Affidavit, learned Senior Counsel appearing for the Opposite Parties-OPTCL is directed to produce relevant*



document showing compliance of the provisions contained to the proviso to Regulation-3(2) of the GRIDCO Officers Service Regulations, 1997.

5. *On the request made by the learned Senior Counsel appearing for the OPTCL, list this matter on 18th September, 2026.*

6. *Interim order passed earlier shall continue till the next date”.*

7. Pursuant to such order, learned Senior Counsel appearing for the Corporation produced the decision taken in the minutes of the meeting held on 16.02.2026 and while producing the same contended that in view of the decision so taken on 16.02.2026, it amounts to compliance of the provisions contained under the proviso to Regulation-3(2) of the Regulation.

8. To the submissions made by the learned Senior Counsel appearing for the Corporation, learned Senior Counsel appearing for the Petitioners contended that since the decision taken in the proceeding of the meeting dtd.16.02.2026 has been taken prior to issuance of the impugned office order dtd.16.03.2026, it cannot be said that in compliance of the provision contained to the proviso to Regulation-3(2) of the Regulation, the amendment to the Regulation has been made vide office order dtd.17.06.2026 under Annexure-9.

8.1. Accordingly, it is contended that the impugned amendment has been made to the Regulation vide order dtd.17.06.2026 under Annexure-9 without complying the



aforesaid provision and accordingly such an amendment is also not sustainable in the eye of law. It is accordingly contended that order dtd.16.03.2026 under Annexure-7 and so also order dtd.17.06.2026 under Annexure-9 are liable for interference of this Court.

9. Having heard learned counsel appearing for the Parties and considering the submissions made, this Court finds that the present writ petition was filed initially challenging office order dtd.16.03.2026 under Annexure-7. This Court when passed an interim order on 06.05.2026, with a direction on the Opposite Party-Corporation not to take any further step basing on the order dtd.16.03.2026, in order to overcome the nature of order issued under Annexure-7, the Regulation was amended with issuance of office order dtd.17.06.2026 under Annexure-9.

9.1. When a submission was made by the learned Senior counsel appearing for the Petitioner that such an amendment has been made without complying the provision contained to the proviso to Regulation-3(2) of the Regulation, this Court passed an order on 10.09.2026, directing learned Senior Counsel appearing for the Opposite Party-Corporation to produce the relevant document showing compliance of the aforesaid provision.



9.2. Pursuant to such order, though the proceeding of the meeting held on 16.02.2026 was filed and submission was made that it is in compliance of the aforesaid provision, but this Court is of the view that since prior to amendment of the relevant regulation, the impugned office order dtd.16.03.2026 under Annexure-7 had already been issued, the decision taken on 16.02.2026, cannot be said to be in compliance of the aforesaid provision. Accordingly, this Court is of the view that amendment made vide the impugned order dtd.17.06.2026 under Annexure-9, is without compliance of the provision contained under the proviso to Regulation-3(2) of the Regulation.

9.3. In view of the aforesaid analysis, this Court while quashing order dtd.16.03.2026 under Annexure-7 and so also the amendment made vide office order dtd.17.06.2026 under Annexure-9, permits the Corporation to make necessary amendment if the Corporation so desires, in accordance with the provision contained under Regulation-3(2) of the Regulation.

10. Accordingly, the Writ Petition stands disposed of. Interim order passed earlier stands vacated.

(Biraja Prasanna Satapathy)
Judge