



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK**

**W.P.(C) No.19841 of 2025**

***Balabhadra Mohanty***

....

***Petitioner***

***Mr. B. Barik, Adv.***

***-versus-***

***State of Odisha & Others***

....

***Opposite Parties***

***Mr. C.K. Pradhan, AGA***

**COROM:  
JUSTICE BIRAJA PRASANNA SATAPATHY**

**ORDER**

**28.07.2025**

**Order No**

**01.**

- 1.** This matter is taken up through Hybrid Mode.
- 2.** Heard learned counsel for Petitioner and learned counsel for the State-Opposite Parties.
- 3.** The present Writ Petition has been filed *inter alia* with the following prayer:-

*"In the circumstances, it is humbly prayed to this Hon'ble Court may be pleased to issue notice to the Opp. Parties as to why the case shall not be allowed and after hearing parties may kindly be directed to the opp. Parties to regularize/grant continuity the disengagement period of the petitioner i.e. from 23.03.2002 to 21.07.2012 with all financial benefits including promotion and all other benefits which has been granted to his counterpart employees, as "No work no pay" and "Last Come First Go" is not applicable to the petitioner's case for the interest of justice.*

*And further necessary directions may issued to the opp. parties to extend the benefits in favour of the petitioner in the light of law laid down by the Hon'ble High Court of Orissa in its judgment dtd.*



*19.04.2022 in W.P.C (C) No- 6277/2014 Madan Chandra Nayak Versus Principal Secretary to Govt.and batch which has been affirmed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India order dtd. 05.12.2024 in Special leave to Appeal (C) Nos- 1648516487/2023 wherein decided No work no pay concept is not applicable to the submerged people directed to grant back wages and case of Jugal Kishore Nayak oder passed in WPC NO-1065/2009 dtd.06.12.20211, which has been implemented by the state in a CONTC proceeding vide order dtd.01.10.2016 passed in CONTC No-2290/2012.*

*And pass any order/orders which the Hon'ble court may deem fit and proper.*

*And for this Act of kindness the petitioner as in duty bound shall ever pray.”*

4. In course of hearing, learned counsel for the Petitioner states that highlighting his grievances, the Petitioner has made a representation to Opposite Party No.2 vide Annexure-2 and the same may be directed to be considered within a stipulated time, to which learned Counsel for the State has no objection.

5. As agreed by learned counsel for the parties and after going through the records, this Court, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, disposes of the Writ Petition directing Opposite Party No.2 to consider the representation filed by the petitioner vide Annexure-2 within a period of three (3) months from the date of production of certified copy of this order.

Accordingly, the Writ Petition stands disposed of.

**(Biraja Prasanna Satapathy)**  
**Judge**