



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK
W.P.(C) No. 6216 of 2026

Sanjeeb Kumar Mohanty

.....

Petitioner

Mr. M.K. Panda, Advocate

-versus-

State of Odisha & Ors.

.....

Opposite Parties

Mr. S.P. Das, ASC

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE BIRAJA PRASANNA SATAPATHY

ORDER

24.03.2026

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:-

“The petitioner therefore, humbly prayed that this Hon'ble Court be graciously pleased to admit the writ application, issue Rule 'Nisi' calling upon the Opp.

Parties to show cause, as to why the Bhubaneswar UPD Proceeding No.02/2019 initiated against the petitioner shall not be stayed till conclusion of the trial in V.G.R. Case No.44/2018 arising out of Cuttack Vigilance Cell P.S. Case No.10/2018 pending in the Court of the Special Judge (Vigilance), Bhubaneswar in the interest of justice.,

And/if the Opp. Parties fail to show cause of show insufficient cause, then make the said 'Rule' absolute by issuing appropriate Writ(s) in the facts and circumstances of the present case;



And/or pass such other order(s)/direction(s) as this Hon'ble Court deems just and proper;

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

4. It is contended that though on self-same charges, petitioner is facing a Vigilance Proceeding in Cuttack Vigilance P.S. Case No.10 of 2018 corresponding to Vigilance G.R. Case No.44 of 2018, pending in the Court of Special Judge (Vigilance), Bhubaneswar, but the authorities are proceeding with the Disciplinary Proceeding so initiated Bhubaneswar UPD proceeding No.02 of 2019 under Annexure-2-series.

4.1. It is contended that prior to disposal of the Vigilance Proceeding if the Departmental Proceeding is finalized, petitioner will be seriously prejudiced as he has to disclose all the defences available with him. It is accordingly contended that the Departmental Proceeding be stayed till conclusion and disposal of the Vigilance Proceeding.

5. Learned Addl. Govt. Advocate on the other hand contended that even though the charges are same in both the proceedings, but there is no bar to proceed in the Departmental Proceeding during pendency of the Vigilance Proceeding.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and considering the submissions made, this Court while disposing the Writ Petition, permits the Disciplinary Authority to proceed with the proceeding initiated vide Bhubaneswar UPD Proceeding No.02 of 2019 in accordance with law, but no final order be passed prior to disposal of the Vigilance Proceeding. Learned Special Judge (Vigilance),



Bhubaneswar is directed to take expeditious steps for disposal of the Vigilance Proceeding within a period of one year from today.

7. The Writ Petition stands disposed of.

(BIRAJA PRASANNA SATAPATHY)
Judge

Jyoti