



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK

W.P.(C) No.8678 of 2022

Bauri Bandhu Parija

....

Petitioner

Mr. S. Patra, Advocate

-versus-

State of Odisha & Ors.

....

Opposite Parties

Mr. S.P. Das, ASC

CORAM:

JUSTICE BIRAJA PRASANNA SATAPATHY

ORDER

05.05.2026

Order No.

- 14.** 1. This matter is taken up through Hybrid Arrangement (Virtual/Physical) Mode.
- 2.** Heard learned counsel appearing for the Parties.
- 3.** Learned counsel appearing for the Petitioner contended that the stand taken in the instruction that in terms of the provisions contained under Book Circular No.46, there is no requirement to communicate the CCR of an employee where it is treated at Good or Very Good, but the same is contrary to the provisions contained under Para-XIV of Book Circular 46. Para-XIV of the Circular reads as follows:-

“(xiv) Communication of adverse remarks :- The C.Rs. on receipt, will be scrutinized in the office of the appointing authority and all adverse remarks will be communicated to the employee by the officer



entrusted with the maintenance of C.Rs. The pur pose of communication is to ensure that the employee rectifies the defects at the earliest. Hence, the utmost priority should be given to communication of adverse remarks. All such communications should normally be issued before 31st December immediately following the report period.”

4. Learned Addl. Standing Counsel for the State prays for some time to obtain further instruction in the matter so far as the decision rendered by the Apex Court in the case of ***Sukhdev Singh vs. Union of India & Ors.*** and ***R.K. Jibanlata Devi vs. High Court of Manipur through its Registrar General & Ors.*** so reflected in order dtd.31.03.2026.

5. On the request made by Mr. S.P. Das, learned ASC, list this matter on 19th May, 2026 along with the records of W.P.(C) No.17517 of 2021.

(Biraja Prasanna Satapathy)
Judge

Subrat