



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK

WP(C) No.17721 of 2026

Susanta Sekhar Das

.....

Petitioner

Represented by Adv. -
Sangram Jena

-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 Mode.
2. Heard learned counsel for the Petitioner as well as learned
 Additional Standing Counsel appearing for the State-Opposite
 Parties. Perused the writ petition as well as the documents annexed
 thereto.
3. The present writ petition has been filed by the Petitioner with
 the following prayers:-

*“It is therefore, most humbly prayed that this
Hon’ble Court be graciously pleased to:-*

- i) Admit the writ application.*
ii) Call for the records.
iii) Issue a writ in the nature of Mandamus or any other



*writ/writs, direction/directions, directing the State- Opposite parties to extend the benefit of pension and other retiral benefits in favour of the present petitioner on account of his retirement in terms of the Odisha Aided Educational Institution Employees Retirement Benefit Rule, 1981, keeping in view the ratio decided in the case of **Sarat Chandra Parida Vrs. State of Odisha & Ors., reported in 2015 (II) ILR-CUT-94** so also the subsequent common judgment passed in the case of **Hemant Kumar Chhotray Vrs State of Odisha & Others** reported in 2024 (I) OLR-709 within a reasonable time to be stipulated by this Hon'ble Court.*

iv) And/or pass such other order/orders, direction/ directions as this Hon'ble Court may think fit and proper for the ends of justice.”

4. The subject matter of this petition is substantially similar to the one in **Hemanta Kumar Chhotray v. State of Orissa and others**, 2024 (1) OLR 709 and therefore, counsel for the Petitioner submits that the benefit given to litigants in the subject case should be extended his client as well.

5. Learned Additional Standing Counsel appearing for the State-Opposite Parties submits that the said matter is subjudice in Writ Appeal No.197 of 2024. However, on being asked, he tells that there is no interim order staying the judgment of the learned Single Judge. This Court in a number of similar matters has already ordered extension of the said benefits subject to outcome of the Writ Appeal and therefore, the same course needs to be adopted here also, if there are no other legal impediments.

6. Ordered accordingly, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the matter, the writ petition is disposed of subject to outcome of the writ appeal mentioned above. Compliance within



eight(8) weeks.

Web copy of order to be acted upon by all concerned.

(Aditya Kumar Mohapatra)
Judge

Anil