



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK

WP(C) No.8644 of 2026

Satyabhama Kar

.....

Petitioner

Represented by Adv. -
Sangram Jena

-versus-

State Of Odisha and others

.....

Opposite Parties

Represented by Adv. –

Smt. S.Nayak, ASC

CORAM:

MR. JUSTICE ADITYA KUMAR MOHAPATRA

ORDER

24.03.2026

Order No.

01. 1. This matter is taken up through Hybrid Arrangement (Virtual /Physical Mode).
2. Heard learned counsel for the Petitioner as well as learned Additional Standing Counsel appearing for the State-Opposite Parties. Perused the writ petition as well as the documents annexed thereto.
3. The present writ petition has been filed by the Petitioner with the following prayers:-

“It is therefore, most humbly prayed that this Hon'ble Court be graciously pleased to:-

i) Admit the writ application.

ii) Call for the records.

iii) Issue a writ in the nature of Mandamus or any other writ/writs, direction/directions, directing the State-Opposite parties to extend the benefit of Family Pension and other retiral benefits in favour of the present petitioner on account of death of her husband namely Rabindra Kumar Behuria in terms of Rule-8(2)(b) of the



*Odisha Aided Educational Institution Employees Retirement Benefit Rule, 1981, keeping in view the principle decided by this Hon'ble court in the case of **Sarat Chandra Parida-vrs.-State of Odisha &Ors.** reported in (2015) (II) ILR-CTC page-94 so also the subsequent common judgment passed in the case of **Hemant Kumar Chhotaray -vrs.-State of Odisha & Ors.** reported in 2024(I)OLR-709, and the petitioner may be extended with all other consequential service and financial benefits as due and admissible within a reasonable time to be stipulated by this Hon'ble Court,*

iv) And/or pass any other order/orders, direction/directions as this Hon'ble Court deems fit and proper for the ends of justice.

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

4. The subject matter of this petition is substantially similar to the one in **Hemanta Kumar Chhotray v. State of Orissa and others, 2024 (1) OLR 709** and therefore, counsel for the Petitioner submits that the benefit given to litigants in the subject case should be extended his client as well.

5. Learned Additional Standing Counsel appearing for the State-Opposite Parties submits that the said matter is subjudice in Writ Appeal No.197 of 2024. However, on being asked, he tells that there is no interim order staying the judgment of the learned Single Judge. This Court in a number of similar matters has already ordered extension of the said benefits subject to outcome of the Writ Appeal and therefore, the same course needs to be adopted here also, if there are no other legal impediments.

6. Ordered accordingly, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the matter, the writ petition is disposed of subject to outcome of the writ appeal mentioned above. Compliance within



eight(8) weeks.

Web copy of order to be acted upon by all concerned.

(Aditya Kumar Mohapatra)
Judge

Sisir