



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK

WP(C) No.6249 of 2026

Dillip Kumar Das

.....

Petitioner

Represented by Adv. -
Deba Kumar Rath

-versus-

The State Of Odisha and others

.....

Opposite Parties

Mr. C.M. Singh, ASC

CORAM:

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

ORDER

26.02.2026

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:

“Under the facts and circumstances as narrated above, the petitioner therefore prays that, this Hon'ble Court may graciously be pleased to;

a. Admit the present writ petition and, upon hearing the parties, be pleased to quash the departmental proceeding initiated against the Petitioner vide Memorandum No. 1077 dated 29.01.2026 under Rule-15 of the Odisha Civil Services (Classification, Control & Appeal) Rules, 1962 by Opposite Party No.3, the District



Education Officer, Balasore, on the untenable allegation of submission of a fake B.Ed. certificate, the same being arbitrary, procedurally flawed, and violative of the principles of natural justice and the safeguards enshrined under Article 311(2) of the Constitution of India;

b. Direct the Opposite Parties, particularly Opposite Party No.3, the District Education Officer, Balasore, to furnish the complete records and the purported verification report allegedly obtained from Bundelkhand University, Jhansi, on the basis of which the Petitioner's B.Ed. certificate bearing Roll No. 2145962 and Enrolment No. 2012/34682 (Session 2012-2013) has been termed "not genuine," and to ensure that any such verification is duly authenticated, sealed, and formally certified by the competent authority of the issuing University before taking any further coercive action against the Petitioner.

c. Direct the Opposite Parties to keep in abeyance the impugned departmental proceeding initiated under Rule 15 of the OCS (CC&A) Rules, 1962) until the authenticity of the petitioner's educational certificates is conclusively verified by the competent authority of Bundelkhand University, Jhansi, through proper official correspondence;

d. Issue a writ of mandamus restraining the Opposite Parties from taking any adverse or punitive action, including suspension, removal, or termination, against the petitioner during the pendency of this writ petition or until completion of the genuine verification process; and



*e. Pass any other order(s) or direction(s) as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case, in the interest of justice, equity, and fair play.
And pass any other order(s), direction(s) as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper."*

4. Learned counsel for the Petitioner at the outset contended that the sole grievance of the Petitioner in the present writ petition is that although the Petitioner was appointed on the basis of valid B.Ed. certificate furnished by him. However, later on, the Opposite Parties have alleged that the same is a fake one. Accordingly, a proceeding has been drawn up against the present Petitioner under Rule-15 of the OCS (CCA) Rules, 1962. Learned counsel for the Petitioner at this juncture contended that the sole grievance of the Petitioner is that although a proceeding was initiated, however, he has not been supplied with the relevant documents. As a result of which, he is unable to defend himself and to know what are the allegations against the present Petitioner and the basis of such allegations. Being aggrieved by such conduct of the Opposite Parties, the Petitioner has approached this Court by filing the present writ petition for quashing of the entire departmental proceeding.

5. Learned counsel for the State on the other hand contended that although he has no specific instruction in the matter, however, the prayer made in the present writ petition is legally unsustainable. He further submitted that in the event the Petitioner wants certain document, which is to be relied by the department against him, he is entitled to the copies thereof. Therefore, the Petitioner should approach the disciplinary authority for copies of such document. On



such ground learned counsel for the State contended that the present writ petition is premature, and accordingly, the same should be dismissed.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsels appearing for the respective parties, on a careful examination of the background facts, further taking note of the limited nature of the grievance involved in the present writ petition, this Court deems it proper to dispose of the writ petition at the stage of admission by granting liberty to the Petitioner to approach the disciplinary authority for supply of the copies of the documents relied upon by the department against the Petitioner in the above noted disciplinary proceeding. In such view of the matter, the Petitioner is directed to approach the Opposite Party No.3 along with a copy of today's order and a list of documents which the department wants to use against the present Petitioner. In such eventuality, the Opposite Party No.3 shall do well to provide copies of such documents to the Petitioner within four weeks from the date the Petitioner approaches the Opposite Party No.3 along with a copy of today's order.

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