



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK
WP(C) No.12066 of 2026

Gangadhar Bidika

.....

Petitioner

Represented by Adv. -
Sourav Das

-versus-

State Of Odisha and others

.....

Opposite Parties

Mr. U.C. Jena, ASC

CORAM:

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

ORDER

23.04.2026

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:

“It is therefore prayed that this Hon'ble Court may be graciously pleased to admit the present writ application/ petition, issue notice to the Opposite Parties and after hearing both the parties be pleased to issue a writ in the nature of mandamus or any other appropriate writ/ writs & direct the Opposite Parties i.e. more particularly Opposite Party no.02 & Opposite Party no.04 to promote the Petitioner as a Matric CT Teacher at the Opposite Party no.05 School;

And may pass any other appropriate



Writ/Writs and order/orders which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit, just and proper; ”

4. Learned counsel for the Petitioner at the outset contended that the Petitioner was initially engaged by the District Welfare Officer, Rayagada on 29.12.1999 as a CCA on daily-ways basis. Thereafter, according to the posting of the second selection committee meeting of the Inspector of the School held on 29.08.2006, the Petitioner was selected as a regular CCA. The sole dispute in the present writ petition is that although in the meantime the Petitioner has acquired Matric C.T. qualification, however, his case has not been considered for promotion to the post of Matric C.T. Teacher/ Sebak.

5. In course of his argument, learned counsel for the Petitioner contended that the Petitioner passed his H.S.E. Examination in the year 1992 and his Senior Secondary Examination in the 2019. He further contended that while in service, the Petitioner had obtained specific permission from the Inspector of School, Koraput vide letter dated 21.10.2006 to undergo C.T. Training at Govt. D.A.V. Secondary Training School, Kalinga and he has successfully completed two years of Secondary Teachers Training. Thereafter, the Petitioner appeared in the C.T. Examination and successfully completed the same in December, 2015 in the Compartmental category.

6. While this was the position, a circular letter was issued by the Collector, Sundargarh on 16.07.2011 pursuant to the Resolution of the Government in S.C. & S.T. Department, thereby promoting some of the CCAs to the post of Matric C.T. Teacher. However, such order does not include the name of the present Petitioner. Learned counsel for the Petitioner at this juncture contended that



although the Petitioner has acquired the Matric C.T. qualification since December, 2015, however, his case has not been considered for promotion to the post of MCT/ Sebak. Learned counsel for the Petitioner further submitted that although the Petitioner had approached the Opposite Party No.2-Joint Director, S.C. & S.T. Development Department, Government of Odisha ventilating his grievance, however, no final decision has been taken with regard to the promotion of the Petitioner to the post of Matric C.T. Teacher/ Sebak. Being aggrieved by such conduct of the Opposite Party No.2, the Petitioner has approached this Court by filing the present writ petition.

7. Learned counsel for the State on the other hand contended that although he has no specific instruction in the matter, however, it appears that the Petitioner has already approached the Opposite Party No.2, who is the competent authority for redressal of his grievance before approaching this Court directs by filing the present writ petition. In such view of the matter, learned counsel for the State contended that the present writ petition is not maintainable. He further contended that in the event this Court grants liberty to the Petitioner to approach the Opposite Party No.2 for redressal of his grievance in accordance with law, he will have no objection to the same. Learned counsel for the State contended further that the Petitioner is not eligible to be promoted to the post of MCT/Sebak in view of the Resolution of the Government dated 30.10.2012 at Annexure-5 to the writ petition.

8. In reply to the submission made by the learned counsel for the State regarding eligibility of the present Petitioner as per the Resolution dated 30.10.2012 at Annexure-5, learned counsel for the



Petitioner contended that such Resolution is prospective in nature and that the same would not be applicable to the case of the present Petitioner. He further submitted that much prior to the Resolution dated 30.10.2012 the Opposite Parties had permitted the Petitioner to undergo the C.T. course.

10. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsels appearing for the respective parties, on a careful analysis of their submission and on a close scrutiny of the document annexed to the writ petition, this Court, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the matter, deems it proper to dispose of the writ petition by granting liberty to the Petitioner to approach the Opposite Party No.2 by filing a detailed representation taking therein all the grounds along with all supporting documents within two weeks from today. In such eventuality the Opposite Party No.2 shall do well to consider the grievance of the Petitioner and dispose of the representation of the Petitioner within a period of eight weeks by passing a speaking and reasoned order. The final decision so taken be communicated to the Petitioner within ten days thereafter.

11. 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