



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK
W.P.(C) No.20996 of 2025

Chittaranjan Guru

.....

Petitioner

Represented by Adv. –

Mr. Amit Kumar Saa

-versus-

State of Odisha and others

.....

Opposite Parties

Mr. Aurobinda Mohanty, ASC

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ADITYA KUMAR MOHAPATRA

ORDER

23.02.2026

Order No.

- 03.
1. This matter is taken up through Hybrid mode.
 2. Heard the learned counsel for the Petitioner as well as learned counsel for the State. 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 prayer:-

“Under the above circumstance, it is therefore humbly prayed that this Hon’ble Court may be graciously pleased to issue a writ in the nature of writ of mandamus or any other appropriate writ, direction or order by directing the opp. Parties to grant pension and other retiral benefits to the petitioner with effect from the date of his retirement from service as per Orissa Aided Educational Institutions Employees Retirement Benefit Rules, 1981 keeping in view the ratio decided in the case of **Sarat Chandra Parida -vs.- State of Orissa and others reported in 2015 (II) ILR (CUT) 94** and W.P.(C) No.17067/2023 **Hemanta Kumar Chhotaray-vrs.-State Odisha & others** disposed of on



12.01.2024;

And this Hon'ble Court be pleased to pass any further order or orders as would be deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case.”

4. Learned counsel for the Petitioner, at the outset, contended that initially a coordinate Bench of this Court was pleased to issue notice to the Opposite Party No.3 by registered post with A.D. vide order dated 31.07.2025. He further submitted that the case of the Petitioner is squarely covered by the ratio laid down in ***Hemanta Kumar Chhotray v. State of Orissa and others***, 2024 (1) OLR 709.

5. In such view of the matter, this Court is of the view that no notice is required to be issued to the Opposite Party No.3 as directed by this Court vide order dated 31.07.2025.

6. Taking into consideration the submission made by the learned counsel for the Petitioner as well as the learned Additional Standing Counsel appearing for the State-Opposite Parties, this Court is of the view that the matter can be disposed of in the light of the judgment in ***Hemant Kumar Chhotray's*** case (supra).

7. The subject matter of this petition is substantially similar to ***Hemanta Kumar Chhotray's*** case (supra) and therefore, counsel for the Petitioner submits that the benefit given to litigants in the subject case should be extended his client as well.

8. 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.

9. 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

Debasis