



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK

WP(C) No. 2496 of 2026

Pradipta Kumar Swain

.....

Petitioner

Mr. J.R. Khuntia, Advocate

-versus-

State of Odisha & Ors.

.....

Opposite Parties

Mr. P.P. Behera, ASC

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE BIRAJA PRASANNA SATAPATHY

ORDER

24.02.2026

Order No. 01

1. This matter is taken up through hybrid mode.
2. Heard learned counsel for the Petitioner and learned counsel appearing for the Opp. Parties.
3. Petitioner has filed the present writ petition inter alia with the following prayer:-

*“Under the above circumstances, it is humbly prayed
that the writ petition may be allowed;*

And

(A) a writ of mandamus or an appropriate writ may be issued commanding the opposite parties particularly to Opposite Party Nos.1 and 2 to regularize the services of the petitioner against the post of as Driver (Crane Operator) by taking into account his long and continuous service both under Central Electricity Supply Utility of Odisha (CESU) and Tata Power Central Odisha Distribution Ltd (TPCODL), keeping in view the ratio decided by the Hon'ble Apex Court rendered in the case of Jaggo Vs. Union of India and others (S.L.P. (C) No.5580 of 2024 disposed of on 20.12.2024) reported in AIR 2025 SCC 296, in the case of Shripal and another Vs. Nagar Nigam, Ghaziabad (Civil Appeal No.8157 of 2024 disposed of on 31.01.2025) reported in 2025 SCC Online



SC 221 and in the case of Dharam Singh & Others Vrs. State of U.P. & Another (Civil Appeal No. 6558 of 2018, decided on 19.08.2025) as well as the recent judgment of this Hon'ble Court in the case of Pabitra Kumar Mallick and others v. Central Electricity Supply Utility of Odisha and others (W.P.(C) No.13753 of 2020, disposed of on 25.07.2025) and to grant all consequential service and financial benefits of the petitioner within a stipulated period as deemed fit and proper by this Hon'ble Court;

(B) And any other order direction/directions /orders or may be issued so as to give complete relief to the petitioner;

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

4. Learned counsel for the Petitioner submits that though highlighting his grievances, Petitioner has filed a representation at Annexure-11 to the Writ Petition before the Opp. Party No. 2, but till date nothing has been done in the matter. In such background, learned counsel for the Petitioner prays that a direction be issued to Opposite Party No. 2 to take a decision on the above noted Petition within a specific time period.

5. Considering the submissions made and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, this Court directs Opposite Party No. 2 to take a decision on the above noted petition in accordance with law, within a period of three (3) months from the date of receipt of this order and communicate the result of such exercise to the Petitioner.

6. The Writ Petition is disposed of accordingly.

(BIRAJA PRASANNA SATAPATHY)
Judge

Sneha