



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK
WP(C) No.17316 of 2026

Smruti Ranjan Jena

.....

Petitioner

Represented by Adv. -
Manoja Kumar Khuntia
B.K.Pattanaik

-versus-

State Of Odisha & Ors.

.....

Opposite Parties

Represented by Adv. –
S.Behera, A.G.A.

CORAM:
THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ADITYA KUMAR
MOHAPATRA

ORDER
22.06.2026

Order No.

01.

1. This matter is taken up through Hybrid Arrangement (Virtual /Physical Mode).
2. Heard learned counsel appearing for the Petitioner as well as learned counsel appearing 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 humbly prayed that this Hon’ble Court may be graciously pleased to admit the case, call for the records and after hearing both the parties pass the following reliefs

- i) *To direct the opposite Parties to regularize the service of the petitioner w.e.f. 9.9.2011 with all financial and consequential benefits by modifying the order dtd.29.07.2024 under Annexure-5.*

And pass such other order/orders as may be deemed



fit and proper for the interest of justice.”

4. Learned counsel for the Petitioner, at the outset, contended that the Petitioner was initially appointed as a Technical Consultant in the District Project Office, Mayurbhanj, on contractual basis, with effect from 09.09.2005. She further submitted that, while the Petitioner was continuing in service, the Works Department, Government of Odisha, issued a Resolution formulating the guidelines for absorption of junior engineers engaged on contractual basis in the regular establishment. Such Resolution was published on 22.09.2008. Further, referring to aforesaid Resolution at Annexure-2, learned counsel for the Petitioner contended that the engineers, who were continuing on contractual basis, were to be regularised in service on completion of six years of uninterrupted service.

5. On a perusal of the Resolution dated 22.09.2008 at Annexure-2 to the writ application, it appears that the Government of Odisha, Works Department has decided that upon satisfactory completion of six years of uninterrupted engagement, the J.E. appointed on contractual basis out of the panel sponsored by the Committee of the Chief Engineer, maintained by the E.I.C. (Civil), may be considered for absorption in regular establishment with regular scale of pay attached to the post of Junior Engineer, subject to availability of sanctioned vacant posts in the cadre of the respective departments. In view of the aforesaid Resolution of the Government, the Petitioner claims regularisation on completion of six years of service from the initial date of appointment on contractual basis vide notification dated 23.07.2005 at Annexure-1.



6. In course of argument, learned counsel for the Petitioner, further referred to the order dated 16.10.2017 passed in O.A. No.1309 of 2016 by the learned Odisha Administrative Tribunal. Referring to such order, learned counsel for the Petitioner contended that the Tribunal had earlier disposed of the O.A. directing the State-Respondent to take steps pursuant to the Resolution dated 22.09.2018 within a period of two months. Despite such direction, the Opposite Parties have regularised the services of the Petitioner with effect from 29.07.2024 at Annexure-5 to the present writ application. Being aggrieved by such conduct of the opposite parties, which is contrary to the Resolution dated 22.09.2008 at Annexure-2, the Petitioner has approached this court by filing the present writ application with a prayer for a direction to the opposite parties to regularise the services of the Petitioner pursuant to the Resolution dated 22.09.2008, on successful completion of six years of uninterrupted service. She further contended that although the Petitioner has approached the State Project Director, OSEPA, Bhubaneswar, by filing a representation dated 18.10.2024 at Annexure-7, no decision has been taken on such representation. Being aggrieved by such inaction of the Opposite Party No.3, the Petitioner was compelled to approach this court by filing the present writ application.

7. Learned counsel for the State, on the other hand, contended that it appears that the Petitioner had earlier approached the Opposite Party No.3 for redressal of his grievance. However, the fate of such representation is not known to the learned counsel for the State. Learned counsel for the State further contended that in



the event this court grants liberty to the Petitioner to approach the Opposite Party No.3 for redressal of his grievance in terms of the resolution and strictly in accordance with law, he will no objection to the same.

8. Considering the submissions made by learned counsels appearing for the respective parties, on a careful examination of the background facts as well as the documents annexed to the present writ application, this Court deems it proper to dispose of the writ petition at the stage of admission by granting liberty to the Petitioner to approach the Opposite Party No.3 by filing a fresh and detailed representation taking therein all the grounds along with all supporting documents, within three weeks from today. In such eventuality, the Opposite Party No.3 shall consider the case of the Petitioner in terms of the Resolution dated 22.09.2008 at Annexure-2 and pass necessary consequential orders within a period of eight weeks from the date of filing of such representation. The final decision so taken be communicated to the Petitioner within a week thereafter.

9. With the aforesaid observations/ directions, the writ application stands disposed of.

10. Issue urgent certified copy of this order as per Rules.

(A.K. Mohapatra)
Judge