



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK

WP(C) No.19125 of 2026

Deepak Ranjan Ojha

.....

Petitioner

Represented by Adv. –
Mr. Bikash Mishra

-versus-

State Of Odisha and others

.....

Opposite Parties

Mr. A. Mohanty, ASC

CORAM:

**THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ADITYA KUMAR
MOHAPATRA**

ORDER

29.06.2026

Order No.

01. 1. This matter is taken up through Hybrid mode.
2. Heard learned counsel for the Petitioner as well as learned counsel for the State-Opposite Parties. Perused the writ application as well as the documents annexed thereto.
3. The Petitioner has filed the present writ application with the following prayer:

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

I) Admit the writ application.

ii) Call for the records.

iii) Issue a writ in the nature of Mandamus or any other appropriate writ/writs, direction/directions, directing the opposite parties. Particularly Opp. Party Nos.1 &2 to approve/regularize the service of the Petitioner as against the post of lecturer in Physics in N.S.M. City Degree College, Rajabagicha, in the district of Cuttack and to release the salary component in his favour with effect from his eligibility under the G.I.A Order 1994, keeping in view the ratio decided by this Hon'ble Court in the case of State of Odisha &



another Vrs. Ratnakar Mohapatra & another (F.A.O. No.5Q9 of 2014 & batch disposed of on 19.03.2025) which has been made confirmed by the Hon'ble Apex court in SLP(C) No. 6943 of 2026 disposed of on 25.03.2026 and further the Petitioner may be extended with all other consequential, service and financial benefits as due and admissible as has been extended in favour of similarly placed employees under Annexure-5 series, by taking into consideration the principle decided by the Hon'ble Apex court in the case of State of U.P and others Versus Arvind Ku. Srivastava reported in (2015) 1 see. Page 347, so also the judgment passed in the case of State of Karnataka Other Vs. C Lalitha reported in 2006(2) SCC-747 within a reasonable time to be stipulated by this Hon'ble Court.

iv) And/or pass any other order/orders, direction/directions as this Hon'ble Court deems fit and proper for the ends of justice.

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

4. Learned counsel for the Petitioner at the outset contended that the present Petitioner who stand in a similar footing with the Appellant in FAO No.509 of 2014, which was disposed of by a Coordinate Bench on 19.03.2025 and eventually upheld by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, claims similar benefits at par with the Appellant in FAO No.509 of 2014. He further contended that claiming similar benefits the Petitioner has already approached the Opposite Party No.2 by filing a detailed representation dated 07.04.2026 at Annexure-4 to the writ petition. He further submitted that since no decision has been taken on the representation of the Petitioner even though several months have elapsed in the meantime. Challenging such inaction of the Opposite Party No.2 the Petitioners



have approached this Court by filing the present writ petition.

5. Learned counsel for the State on the other hand contended that since the issue involved in the present writ petition is release of GIA, the present writ petition is not maintainable. He further contended that in the event the Petitioner has approached the Opposite Party No.2 and their grievance is still pending before the Opposite Party No.2, he will have no objection if this Court directs the Opposite Party No.2 to take a lawful decision on such representation within a stipulated period of time.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsels appearing for the respective parties, on a careful analysis of their submission and on a close scrutiny of the document annexed to the writ petition, this Court observes that the sole grievance of the Petitioner in the present writ petition is the inaction of the Opposite Party No.2 to take a decision on their representation dated 07.04.2026 which is stated to be pending before the Opposite Party No.2 for consideration. Taking into consideration the aforesaid factual scenario, this Court deems it proper to dispose of the writ petition by directing the Opposite Party No.2 to consider and dispose of the representation of the Petitioner in view of the judgments of this Court as well as the Hon'ble Supreme Court within a period of eight weeks from the date of communication of a certified copy of today's order. It is needless to mention here that the claim of the Petitioners shall be governed by the judgment of this Court as has been affirmed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court. It is further directed that the Opposite Party No.2 shall do well to dispose of the representation of the Petitioner by passing a speaking and reasoned



order. The final decision so taken be communicated to the Petitioner within ten days thereafter.

7. With the aforesaid observations/directions, the writ application stands disposed of.

Issue urgent certified copy of this order as per Rules.

(Aditya Kumar Mohapatra)
Judge

Sisir