



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK
W.P.(C) No.20017 of 2025

Jyotsnarani Pradhan

.....

Petitioner

Represented by Adv. –

Mr. Soubhagya Chandra Dev
Dash

-versus-

State of Odisha and others

.....

Opposite Parties

Smt. Sasmita Nayak, ASC

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ADITYA KUMAR MOHAPATRA

ORDER

23.02.2026

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:-

“Under the above circumstances, it is humbly prayed
that the writ petition may be allowed;

And

(a) A writ of mandamus or an appropriate writ may be issued to commanding the Opp. Parties to the petitioner in terms of the Orissa Aided Educational Institutions Employees Retirement Benefit Rules, 1981 keeping in view the ratio decided in the case of Sarat Chandra Parida -vrs. State of Odisha and Ors., reported in 2015 (11) ILR Cuttack 94, which has been upheld by the Hon'ble Apex Court in SLP(C) CC No(s).761 of 2016 disposed of on 19.01.2016 (State of Odisha and Ors. Vrs. Sri Sarat Chandra Parida) and also keeping in view the



ratio decided in the case of Hemant Kumar Chhotaray Vrs State of Odisha and Others W.P(C) No. 17067 of 2023, disposed of on 12.01.2024) and pension may be released in favour of the petitioner forthwith within a time to be stipulated by this Court w.e.f. 30.04.2023 and his arrear pension may also be calculated and paid to her forthwith.

And

(b) any other order/orders or direction/directions may be issued so as to give complete relief to the petitioner.”

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