



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK
W.P.(C) No.8584 of 2026

Ratnakar Pani

.....

Petitioner

Represented by Adv. –
Mr. Ramesh Kumar Mukhi

-versus-

State of Odisha and another

.....

Opposite Parties

Represented by Adv. –
Smt. Sasmita Nayak, ASC

CORAM:
THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ADITYA KUMAR MOHAPATRA
ORDER
23.03.2026

Order No.

01. 1. This matter is taken up through Hybrid mode.
2. Heard learned counsel for the Petitioner as well as learned Additional Standing Counsel for the State-Opposite Parties. Perused the writ petition as well as the documents annexed thereto.
3. The Petitioner has filed the present writ petition with the following prayers:-

“Under the aforesaid circumstances more fully narrated herein above the petitioner most humbly prays that this Hon'ble Court may graciously be pleased to issue Rule NISI calling upon the Opposite Party No.2 to show cause as to why they shall not be directed to sanction and disburse final pension, gratuity, GPF, unutilized leave salary and other retiral benefits along with interest @ 18% from the date of the retirement of the petitioner. If the Opposite Party fail to show cause or show insufficient cause the Rule be made absolute.”



4. Learned counsel for the Petitioner, at the outset, contended that the Petitioner on being appointed initially joined as Headmaster at Panchagada Ananga Narendra M.E. School, Hatabasta on 22.07.1985. While working as such, the Petitioner was promoted to the post of ABEO w.e.f. 12.11.2013. Thereafter, the Petitioner was again promoted to the post of B.E.O. w.e.f. 04.02.2021. He further submitted that while working as B.E.O. of Ranpur Block on attaining the age of superannuation, the Petitioner has retired from service w.e.f. 31.12.2021.

5. Learned counsel for the Petitioner, at this juncture contended that the sole grievance of the Petitioner is that although the Petitioner has retired from service, however, he has not been paid his retiral dues as well as financial benefits. He further contended that no departmental proceeding or a judicial proceeding is pending against the Petitioner. He further contended that due to the inaction of the Opposite Parties, the Petitioner has been deprived of his retiral dues. Challenging such inaction of the Opposite Parties, the Petitioner approached this Court by filing the present writ petition.

6. Learned counsel for the State, on the other hand, contended that although he has no specific instruction in the matter, however on perusal of the record, it appears that the Petitioner has not approached the competent authority for redressal of his grievance before approaching this Court by filing the present writ petition. In such view of the matter, learned counsel for the State contended that she will have no objection in the event this Court directs the Petitioner to approach the Opposite Party No.2, who is the competent authority, for redressal of his grievance.

7. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsels



appearing for both the sides, on a careful examination of the background facts, further taking note of the fact that the Petitioner is entitled to the retiral dues as stated by the learned counsel for the Petitioner and that no proceeding whatsoever is pending against the Petitioner, 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 Opposite Party No.2 by filing a fresh detailed representation taking therein all the grounds along with the supporting documents within three weeks from today. In such eventuality, the Opposite Party No.2 shall do well to consider the representation of the Petitioner in accordance with law and dispose of same by passing a speaking and reasoned order within a period of eight weeks from the date of filing such representation. It is further made clear that in the event it is found that the Petitioner is entitled to the retiral dues and the same has not been disbursed, then necessary follow up steps be taken by the Opposite Parties to ensure that the retiral dues as is due and admissible to the Petitioner is released in his favour as expeditiously as possible, if there are no other legal impediments.

8. With the aforesaid observation and direction, the writ petition stands disposed of.

(Aditya Kumar Mohapatra)
Judge

Debasis