



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK

CONTC No.1863 of 2026

Pravakar Mohapatra

....

Petitioner

Mr.Sanjib Mohanty, Advocate

-Versus-

Dr. Swati Mishra, OAS, Registrar,

OPP. Parties

U.U & others

Mrs.Suman Pattanaiak, AGA

Mr.Dayananda Mohapatra, Sr. Advocate

Along with Mr.A.K. Pradhan, Advocate for the University

CORAM:

JUSTICE KRISHNA S. DIXIT

ORDER

08.05.2026

Order No.

02.

The operative portion of the order dated 28.11.2025 entered in complainant's WP(C) No.28471 of 2024 reads as under:

“In the above circumstances, this petition succeeds; a Writ of Certiorari issues quashing the impugned orders Annexure-14 dated 20.09.2024 & Annexure-16 dated 06.02.2014 to the extent it fixes petitioner's effective date of regularization as 18.03.2011 coupled with a direction to fix "01.11.1990" as the date of his regularization. Further, the petitioner shall be given notional benefit of retrospective regularization till 11.09.2017 and the monetary benefits only with effect from 12.09.2017. So far as the financial aspects are concerned, it hardly needs to be stated that the opposite party no.4 has to make appropriate budgetary allocation in this regard. Compliance within three (3) months, to be reckoned from this day...”

It is in plain English and even a non-matriculate can understand. Fortunately, there is no dispute as to what the order means. However, that order has not been complied with in letter



& spirit although a partial compliance is reported. Partial compliance is no compliance, hardly needs to be stated.

Learned counsel for the contemnors submits that the payment part of the order needs to be complied with and that it would be complied with within an outer limit of three weeks from this day. For making this payment, the allocation of funds from the State shall not be awaited and the payment shall be done from the Bank Accounts of the University or else by pledging their goods or mortgaging their property in accordance with law.

In the above circumstances, this proceeding is dropped with liberty to the complainant to seek revival of the same by moving a simple memo, should assurance of compliance fail in which event the Vice-Chancellor & Registrar of Utkal University run the risk hauled up for contempt.

It is made clear that till payment part is complied with, as has been assured now, both the Vice-Chancellor & the Registrar of the Utkal University shall not draw their salaries. The pining of the advocate appearing for the contemnors to remove this order is rejected. It is obvious that in the event the payment is made to the poor employees in terms of the order, whose violation is complained of, there would no difficulty for the contemnors to draw their regular salary in accordance with law.

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

(Krishna S. Dixit)
Judge