



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK
W.P.(C) No. 18157 of 2026

Nirupama Nayak

....

Petitioner

Mr. S.N. Mishra 4, Advocate
-versus-

- 1. State of Odisha,
represented through
the Principal
Secretary to
Government,
Panchayati Raj and
Drinking Water
Department, Lok
Seva Bhawan,
Bhubaneswar,
Odisha***
- 2. The Collector and
District Magistrate,
Bhadrak***
- 3. Additional District
Magistrate,
Collectorate, Bhadrak***
- 4. Chief Development
Officer-cum-
Executive Officer,
Zilla Parishad,
Bhadrak, Chargharia,
Bhadrak***
- 5. Additional Executive
Officer, Zilla
Parishad, Bhadrak,
Chargharia, Bhadrak***
- 6. Block Development
Officer, Basudevpur
Block, Bhadrak***
- 7. Executive Engineer,
Rural Works Division,
Bhadrak***

....

Opposite Parties

Mr. P.K. Ray, AGA



And, referring to the same, it is submitted that the writ petition does not merit intervention.

5. Per contra, it is submitted by the learned counsel for the Petitioner that the modality as adopted in selecting the projects undermines the participation of the community which also has constitutional sanctity under Article 243-G of Constitution of India.

6. It is on record that ventilating their grievance, the Petitioner has submitted a representation dated 20.04.2026 to the Collector & District Magistrate, Bhadrak (Opposite Party No.2), which is at Annexure-6.

7. Considering the rival submissions, since the writ petition has been filed alleging inaction in the matter of consideration of such representation, interest of justice will be subserved in the event Opposite Party No.2 (Collector & District Magistrate, Bhadrak) is directed to consider such representation at Annexure-6 if the Petitioner submit a copy of the writ petition along with this order within a period of one week from the order being uploaded.

8. Taking into account the urgency involved, the Opposite Party No.2 (Collector & District Magistrate, Bhadrak) is called upon to take a decision on the representation of the Petitioner within a period of four weeks of receipt of order of this Court along with the writ petition, if the aforementioned timeline is adhered to after giving all the stake holders or their representatives an opportunity of hearing.



9. It is made clear that consideration of Opposite Party No.2 shall not be impeded by issuance of any work order in the meanwhile.

10. Accordingly, the writ petition stand disposed of.

(V. Narasingh)
Judge

Santoshi