



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK
W.P.(C) No. 5909 of 2026

Minati Sethi

....

Petitioner

Mr. A.K. Biswal, Advocate

-versus-

- 1. State of Odisha.
Represented
through its
Secretary,
Department of
Panchayati Raj &
Drinking Water
Department,
Lokseva Bhawan.
Bhubaneswar,
Khurda***
- 2. Collector And
District Magistrate,
Ganjam***
- 3. Sub-Collector,
Berhampur, Ganjam***
- 4. Chairman,
Sanakhemundi
Panchayat Samiti,
Ganjam***
- 5. BDO,
Sanakhemundi,
Ganjam***

.... ***Opposite Parties***

Mr. M.R. Mohanty, AGA

CORAM: JUSTICE V. NARASINGH

ORDER
26.02.2026

Order No.

01. 1. Heard learned counsel for the Petitioner and
the learned counsel for the State.



2. Alleging infraction on conduct of meetings of the Panchayat Samiti in terms of the Odisha Panchayat Samiti (Conduct of Business) Rules, 1969 more particularly Rule 4 thereof, the present writ petition has been filed by Petitioner, who is the Sarpanch of Kankorada Gram Panchayat.

3. For convenience of reference, Rule 4 under the heading Rules of Business with the sub-heading meetings of Panchayat Samitis of the Odisha Panchayat Samiti (Conduct of Business) Rules, 1969 is extracted hereunder for convenience of reference;

"xxx

xxx

xxx

Rules of Business
Meetings of Panchayat Samitis

"3. xxx xxx xxx

4. Every Samiti shall meet at least once in every two months. An ordinary meeting of the Samiti shall usually be held on a fixed day of every alternate month, to be decided by it, in a meeting:

Provided that, if for any reason, it is deemed inconvenient to hold any such meeting on the day thus fixed, the Chairman may fix another day for that particular meeting."

4. It is stated that ventilating her grievance, the Petitioner has made representation to the Collector and District Magistrate, Ganjam and Chairman, Sanakhemundi Panchayat Samiti (Opposite Party Nos.2 and 4 respectively) but to no avail.

5. Hence, it is submitted that to protect her democratic right, the present writ petition has been preferred.



6. Heard learned counsel for the State in response, who submits that without awaiting the disposal of the representation, which has been submitted, the Petitioner has been rushed to this Court. Hence, the same ought not to be entertained at this stage being premature.

7. Per contra, it is submitted by the learned counsel for the Petitioner that since the rights of a democratically elected representative is being stifled, the Petitioner has no other alternative but to approach this Court.

8. Considering the rival submission, this Court is of the considered view that direction to the Opposite Party Nos.2 and 4 (Collector and District Magistrate, Ganjam and Chairman, Sanakhemundi Panchayat Samiti respectively) to consider the representation of the Petitioner, the latest one being on 22.01.2026, within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of copy of the order of this Court along with the writ petition, would sub-serve the interest of justice.

9. It is needless to state here that this Court has not expressed any views regarding the veracity of the assertions made in the writ petition.

10. Accordingly, the W.P.(C) stands disposed of.

11. UCC as per rules.

(V. Narasingh)
Judge