



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK
WP(C) No.19845 of 2025

Ranjan Kumar Sahoo

.....

Petitioner

Represented By Adv. –
Mr. Jyoti Ranjan Khuntia

-versus-

State of Odisha and others

.....

Opposite Parties

Represented By Adv. –

Mr. J.K. Bal, AGA

Mr. L.K. Moharana,
Advocate for the
TPCODL.

CORAM:
THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ADITYA KUMAR MOHAPATRA

ORDER
22.07.2025

Order No.

01. 1. This matter is taken up through Hybrid mode.
2. Heard learned counsel for the Petitioner, learned counsel for the State and learned counsel for the TPCODL. Perused the writ application as well as the documents annexed thereto.
3. The Petitioner has filed the present writ application 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 commanding the opposite
parties more particularly to opposite party
Nos.1 and 2 to regularize the services of the*



*petitioner against the post of Non-ITI (Official Work and Revenue Collection) by taking into account his long and continuous service both under Central Electricity Supply Utility of Odisha (CESU) and Tata Power Central Odisha Distribution Ltd. and keeping in view the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Jaggo Vs. Union of India and others** (S.L.P. (C) No.5580 of 2024 disposed of on 20.12.2024) reported in **AIR 2025 SCC 296** and the subsequent judgment in the case of **Shripal and another Vs. Nagar Nigam, Ghaziabad** (Civil Appeal No.8157 of 2024 disposed of on 31.01.2025) reported in **2025 SCC Online SC 221** and to grant all consequential service and financial benefits of the petitioner within a stipulated period as deemed fit and proper by this Hon'ble Court;*

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

4. In course of hearing of the writ application, learned counsel for the Petitioner submits that the Petitioner ventilating his grievance has submitted representation before the Chief Executive Officer, TPCODL, Opposite Party No.2 under Annexure-13. It is also submitted by the learned counsel for the Petitioner that the said representation is pending as of now. It is also submitted by the learned counsel for the Petitioner that a direction be issued to the Opposite Party No.2 to consider the representation of the Petitioner under Annexure-13 within a stipulated period of time.

5. Learned counsel for the Opposite Party Nos.2 & 3 submits that



he has no objection if the representation of the Petitioner is considered by the Opposite Party No.2, which is stated to be pending, in accordance with law and within a stipulated period of time.

6. Considering the limited nature of grievance of the Petitioner, the writ application is disposed of at the stage of admission with a direction to the Opposite Party No.2 to consider the representation of the Petitioner under Annexure-13 keeping in view the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Jaggo vs. Union of India and Others***, reported in ***2024 SCC Online SC 3826***, in ***Sripal and Anr. vs. Nagar Nigam, Gaziabad*** (decided on 31st January, 2025 in ***Civil Appeal No.8158-8179 of 2024***) within a period of three months from the date of production of certified copy of this order. The Opposite Party No.2 shall do well to dispose of the representation of the Petitioner under Annexure-13 by passing a speaking and reasoned order. The decision so taken by the Opposite Party No.2 be also communicated to the Petitioner within ten days thereafter.

7. With the aforesaid observation/ direction, the writ application stands disposed of.

8. Issue urgent certified copy of this order as per Rules.

(***Aditya Kumar Mohapatra***)
Judge

Debasis

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed
Signed by: DEBASIS AECH
Reason: Authentication
Location: ORISSA HIGH COURT
Date: 24-Jul-2025 15:02:58

