



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK

WP(C) No.17755 of 2026

Kamala Kumari Mohanty

.....

Petitioner

Represented by Adv. -
Prafulla Kumar
Mohapatra

-versus-

State Of Odisha & Ors.

.....

Opposite Parties

Represented by Adv. –
Sasmita Nayak, A.S.C.

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:

“Under the above circumstances, it is therefore humbly prayed that the Hon'ble Court may graciously be pleased to direct the opp. Parties to approve the appointment of the petitioner and release the grant in aid under the provision of GIA Order, 1994 as recommended by the institution as her case is squarely covered by the ratio decided in FAQ No. 509 of 2014 which was disposed of on 19.03.2025 within a stipulated period;

And/or pass any other appropriate writ/writs, order/



orders and direction/directions in the fitness of the case.”

4. Learned counsel for the Petitioner, at the outset, contended that the present Petitioner who stand in a similar footing with the Appellant in FAO No.509 of 2014, which was disposed of by a Coordinate Bench on 19.03.2025 and eventually upheld by the Hon’ble Supreme Court, claims similar benefits at par with the Appellant in FAO No.509 of 2014. He further contended that claiming similar benefits, the Petitioner has already approached the Opposite Party No.2 by filing a detailed representation dated 24.11.2025 at Annexure-4 to the writ petition. He further submitted that since no decision has been taken on the representation of the Petitioner even though several months have elapsed in the meantime. Challenging such inaction of the Opposite Party No.2 the Petitioner has approached this Court by filing the present writ petition.

5. Learned counsel for the State, on the other hand, contended that since the issue involved in the present writ petition is release of GIA, the present writ petition is not maintainable. He further contended that in the event the Petitioner has approached the Opposite Party No.2 and her grievance is still pending before the Opposite Party No.2, she will have no objection if this Court directs the Opposite Party No.2 to take a lawful decision on such representation within a stipulated period of time.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsels appearing for the respective parties, on a careful analysis of their submissions and on a close scrutiny of the documents annexed to the writ petition, this Court observes that the sole grievance of the



Petitioner in the present writ petition is the inaction of the Opposite Party No.2 to take a decision on her representation dated 24.11.2025 which is stated to be pending before the Opposite Party No.2 for consideration. Taking into consideration the aforesaid factual scenario, this Court deems it proper to dispose of the writ petition by directing the Opposite Party No.2 to consider and dispose of the representation of the Petitioner in view of the judgments of this Court as well as the Hon'ble Supreme Court within a period of eight weeks from the date of communication of a certified copy of today's order. It is needless to mention here that the claim of the Petitioner shall be governed by the judgment of this Court as has been affirmed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court. It is further directed that the Opposite Party No.2 shall do well to dispose of the representation of the Petitioner by passing a speaking and reasoned order. The final decision so taken be communicated to the Petitioner within ten days thereafter.

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

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

(A.K. Mohapatra)
Judge