



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK

**W.P.(C) Nos. 28672, 28674, 28675, 28676,
28677, 28678 & 28680 of 2022**

Prakash Behera

....

Petitioner

Mr. M.M. Patnaik, Advocate

-versus-

State of Odisha & Ors.

....

Opposite Parties

Mr. S.P. Das, ASC

Mr. S.N. Das, Adv. for O.P.2,3 & 5

CORAM:

JUSTICE BIRAJA PRASANNA SATAPATHY

ORDER

09.07.2026

Order No.

- 08.** 1. This matter is taken up through Hybrid Arrangement (Virtual/Physical) Mode.
- 2.** Heard learned counsel appearing for the Parties.
- 3.** Since the matter relates to rejection of the claim of the Petitioners to get the benefit of regularization on the face of the recommendation made by the Odisha Tourism Development Corporation, all the matters were heard analogously and disposed of by the present common order.
- 4.** Learned counsel appearing for the Petitioners contended that on the face of their long continuance under the Corporation and the Corporation when recommended their claim to the Government-Opposite Party No.1 to accord necessary approval for the



purpose of their regularization, the same was rejected vide the impugned order so impugned in all the present batch of Writ Petitions.

4.1. It is further contended that even after such rejection of their claim vide order issued by Opposite Party No.1, Petitioners as on date are continuing on daily wages basis.

4.2. It is further contended that since the Corporation is very much willing to regularize the services of the Petitioners and for that purpose only the approval of the Department is required, the ground on which such proposal was regretted declining to issue necessary approval is not sustainable in the eye of law, in view of the recent judgment delivered by this Court on 19.05.2026 in W.P.(C) No.42583 of 2023 and batch.

4.3. It is further contended that in view of the recent decisions of the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **Jaggo vs. Union of India & Ors., 2024 SCC OnLine SC 3826; Shripal & Anr. vs. Nagar Nigam, Ghaziabad, 2025 SCC OnLine SC 221**, as well as **Dharam Singh & Ors. vs. State of U.P. & Anr. (Civil Appeal No(s).8558 of 2018** and another decision of the Apex Court in the case of **Bhola Nath Vs. State of Jharkhand and Others, 2026 INSC 99**, Petitioners are also eligible and entitled to get the benefit of regularization.



4.4. Accordingly, it is contended that with quashing of the impugned order in each of the Writ Petitions, Opposite Party No.1 be directed to issue necessary approval so sought for by the Corporation, so that Petitioners can get the benefit of regularization.

5. Mr. S.N. Das, learned counsel appearing for the Corporation also fairly contended that even after rejection of the claim of the Petitioners, Petitioners as on date are continuing on daily wages basis.

5.1. It is also not disputed that such a recommendation was made by the Corporation seeking approval from the Government to regularize the services of the Petitioners, which was rejected by Opposite Party No.1 and subject matter of challenge in all these batch of Writ Petitions.

6. However, Mr. S.P. Das, learned Addl. Standing Counsel for the State on the other hand contended that since the Petitioners are not continuing against any sanctioned posts, recommendation made by the Corporation seeking approval to regularize the services of the Petitioners was regretted vide the impugned orders.

7. Having heard learned counsel appearing for the Parties, considering the submissions made and placing reliance on the judgment passed by this Court on 19.05.2026 in W.P.(C) No.42583 of 2023 and so also



the decision of the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **Jaggo, Shripal, Dharam Singh & Bhola Nath**, it is the view of this Court that claim of the Petitioners requires a fresh consideration by Opposite Party No.1.

7.1. Accordingly, while quashing the impugned orders in each of the Writ Petitions, this Court directs Opposite Party No.1 to take a fresh decision taking into account the decisions as cited (supra). Such a fresh decision be taken within a period of two (2) months from the date of receipt of this order. Petitioners are permitted to provide a copy of this order along with the decision in W.P.(C) No.42583 of 2023 and so also the decision of the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **Jaggo, Shripal, Dharam Singh & Bhola Nath** before Opposite Party No.1 for compliance.

8. Accordingly, all the Writ Petitions stand disposed of.

9. Photocopy of the order be placed in other connected Writ Petitions.

(Biraja Prasanna Satapathy)
Judge

Subrat