



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK

W.P.(C) No.19225 of 2026

Narayana Bhoi & Another

Petitioners

*Mr. L.K. Samantary,
Sr. Adv. on behalf of
Mr. A. Mishra, Adv.*

-versus-

State of Odisha & Others

Opposite Parties

Mr. S.P. Das, ASC

COROM:

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE BIRAJA PRASANNA SATAPATHY

ORDER

06.07.2026

Order No

1. 1. This matter is taken up through Hybrid Mode.
2. Heard learned counsel appearing for parties.
3. The present Writ Petition has been filed inter alia with the following prayer:

It is therefore prayed that your Lordship would graciously be pleased to admit this petition, issue notice to the Opp.Parties and after hearing the parties, this Hon'ble Court may be pleased to issue Rule NISI, calling upon the Opposite Parties to show cause as to why the appointment of the Opposite Party No.5 as Addl.Govt. Pleader in the district of Subarnapur pursuant to the Notification dtd.24.12.2025 under Annexure-3 shall not be cancelled and if the Opp.parties fail to explain the same with sufficient reason or reasons be pleased to make the rule nisi absolute and further be pleased to cancel the appointment of Opp.party No.5 pursuant to Notification dtd.24.12.2025 under Annexure-3 for the ends of justice;



And pleased to pass any other order(s) as this Hon'ble Court deem fit and proper.

And, for this act of kindness the petitioner shall as on duty bound ever pray.

4. While assailing the appointment of Opp. Party No.5 as a Government Pleader in Sonepur District, pursuant to the order issued by the Government in the Law Department vide notification dt.24.12.2025 under Annexure-3, learned Sr. Counsel appearing for the Petitioner contended that Opp. party No.5 is not eligible and entitled to get the benefit of appointment as a Law Officer, in view of the decision taken by the executive body of Rampur Bar Association so held on 07.12.2019 under Annexure-4 and the Decree passed against him by the learned Civil Judge (Sr. Divn.), Sonepur in C.S. No.83 of 2013 vide its judgment dt.13.08.2018 under Annexure-6. Accordingly, it is contended that in view of the decision taken by the executive body of the Bar under Annexure-4 and the Decree passed against Opp. Party No.5 under Annexure-6 and in view of the provisions contained under the Orissa Law Officers Rules, 1971, order of appointment of Opp. Party No.5 as a Law Officer in the district of Sonepur, so issued vide notification dt.24.12.2025 under Annexure-3, requires interference of this Court.

5. Learned Addl. Standing Counsel on the other hand placing reliance on the judgment delivered by this Court on 24.06.2026 in W.P.(C) No.37768 of 2025 and batch



contended that, in the said judgment, this Court has already held that Orissa Law Officers Rules, 1971 being not a statutory rule and only a guideline prescribing the mode of appointment of Law Officers in the State, reliance placed on the aforesaid Rule for holding the appointment of Opp. Party No.5 as a Law Officer vide order under Annexure-5 as illegal, requires no interference.

5.1. It is also contended that decision taken by the Bar Association under Annexure-4 and the Decree passed against Opp. Party No.5 under Annexure-6, has got no relevancy and effect with regard to appointment of Opp. party No.5 as a Law Officer, so issued vide notification dtd.24.12.2025 under Annexure-3. It is accordingly contended that in view of the nature of judgment delivered by this Court in W.P.(C) No.37768 of 2025 and batch on 24.06.2026, the Writ Petition with the prayer as made, is not entertainable.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties, considering the submission made and placing reliance on the judgment passed by this Court on 24.06.2026 in W.P(C) No.37768 of 2025 and batch, this Court is of the view that the ground on which challenge has been made to the appointment of Opp. Party No.5 as a Law Officer in the district of Sonapur vide notification dt.24.12.2025 under Annexure-3 is not entertainable. It is also the view of this Court that decision taken by the Bar



Association under Annexure-4 and the Decree passed under Annexure-6 has got no bearing with regard to appointment of Opp. Party No.5 as a Law Officer under Annexure-3. Accordingly, this Court is not inclined to entertain the Writ Petition with the prayer as made.

7. The Writ Petition accordingly stands dismissed.

(Biraja Prasanna Satapathy)
Judge

sangita