



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK

WP(C)NO.18452 of 2026

Dambarudhar Marandi

....

Petitioner

*Mr. A.K. Biswal,
Adv.*

-versus-

State of Odisha & Others

....

Opposite Parties

*Mr. P.K. Panda,
ASC*

COROM:

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE BIRAJA PRASANNA SATAPATHY

ORDER

19.06.2026

WP(C)NO.18452 of 2026 & I.A. No.11242 of 2026

Order No

1. 1. This matter is taken up through Hybrid Mode.
2. 2. Heard learned counsel appearing for the parties.
3. 3. The present Writ Petition has been filed inter alia challenging the order of transfer issued on 12.06.2026 under Annexure-5. Vide the said order, so issued by Opp. Party No.1, Petitioner has been put under transfer from Katuria Girls High School situated in the district of Mayurbhanj to Matkambeda High School in the district of Keonjhar.
4. 4. While assailing the impugned order of transfer, learned counsel appearing for the Petitioner contended



that considering the fact that Petitioner is continuing in the district of Mayurbhanj, while considering the claim of his wife, who is also in Government employment, she was transferred as BEO, Kaptipada in the district of Mayurbhanj, while working as Headmistress, Zilla School, Bhadrak vide notification dt.25.05.2026 of the School and Mass Education Deptt. But immediately after being put under transfer to the district of Mayurbhanj, Petitioner has been transferred to Keonjhar district vide the impugned order dt.12.06.2026.

4.1. It is contended that since the Petitioner's wife was given a posting in the district of Mayurbhanj so that she can reside with the Petitioner, after allowing such benefit in favour of the Petitioner's wife, Petitioner could not have been put under transfer to another district and thereby frustrating the order of transfer issued in favour of his wife. It is also contended that no substitute has been posted as against the Petitioner and Petitioner has not yet been relieved, with due handing over of the charge.

5. Mr. P.K. Panda, learned Addl. Standing Counsel on the other hand contended that since seeking cancellation/modification of the order of transfer, Petitioner has not yet made any grievance before the authority who has passed the order under Annexure-5, the Writ Petition is not maintainable.



6. Having heard learned counsel appearing for the parties, considering the submission made and taking into account the claim raised in the present Writ Petition, liberty is granted to the Petitioner to make a fresh representation before Opp. Party No.1 by enclosing all the relevant documents and citations in support of his claim, if any, within a period of two (2) weeks hence.

6.1. It is observed that if such representation is filed within the aforesaid time period, Opp. Party No. 1 shall do well to take a lawful decision on the same within a period of two (2) weeks from the date of receipt of such representation. The order so passed by Opp. Party No. 1 be communicated to the Petitioner.

7. Till a decision is taken as directed, status quo as on today with regard to continuance of the Petitioner be maintained.

8. The Writ Petition accordingly stands disposed of.

(Biraja Prasanna Satapathy)
Vacation Judge

sangita