



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK
RVWPET No.40 of 2026

Avinash Rout and others *Petitioners*

Mr. M. Kanungo, Sr. Advocate along with
Mr. S.R. Mohanty, Advocate

-versus-

State of Orissa and another *Opposite Parties*

Mr. S. Mohanty, AGA

CORAM:

DR. JUSTICE S.K. PANIGRAHI

MR JUSTICE G. SATAPATHY

ORDER

09.07.2026

Order No.

03. 1. This matter is taken up through hybrid arrangement.
2. Heard learned counsels for the parties.
3. The present RVWPET has been filed by the Petitioners with the following prayer:

“It is prayed that the Hon’ble Court may graciously be pleased;

(a) To admit the review petition.

(b) And after hearing the parties, the judgement dated 13.05.2024 may kindly be reviewed in view of the ground taken in the review petition.

(c) And the prayer of the petitioner as made out in the writ petition regarding equalisation of pay (Rs. 5200-20200/-, Grade Pay 2400) instead of (Rs. 5200-20200/-, Grade Pay 1900) be refixed in favour of the petitioners in view of Rule 7(1) under High Court of Orissa (Appointment of staff and conditions of service) Rules 1963 and Rule 45, 36 & 56 of Orissa Service Code. Further keeping in view of office order of Home Department dated 16.02.1949 (Annexure-9 of the writ petition) for having the concept of equalising the pay



between the High Court establishment and State Secretariat.

And may pass any other order/orders as deem fit and proper.

And for which act of kindness the petitioners as in duty bound ever pray.”

4. Learned counsel for the Petitioners submits that this Court has earlier decided the similar issue in the judgment dated 08.08.2025 passed in RVWPET No.215 of 2024 (*Syed Mahtab Jamal and others –vrs.- State of Orissa & Another*). Hence, he submits that this RVWPET may be disposed of in the light of the judgment passed in the case of *Syed Mahtab Jamal and others* (supra).

5. Learned counsel for the Opposite Parties submits that he has no objection, if this matter is disposed of in the light of the judgment passed in the case of *Syed Mahtab Jamal and others* (supra).

6. On perusal of the records and the judgment passed in the case of *Syed Mahtab Jamal and others* (supra), it appears that similar issue has already been decided by this Court in the said judgment which was disposed of on 08.08.2025. The ordering portion of the said judgment is as follows:

“21. In view of the foregoing discussion, we hold that the Review Petition lacks merit. The Petitioners have not demonstrated any error apparent on the face of the record that would justify reopening the concluded judgment of the Division Bench. The attempt to re-argue the issue of



pay scale parity is outside the limited scope of review jurisdiction.

22. The findings in the judgment dated 13.05.2024 are well-supported by reasoning that is consistent with precedent and the materials on record. There is no miscarriage of justice or material oversight that compels the Court to intervene.

23. Accordingly, the Review Petition is dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs."

7. Accordingly, the findings of the judgment dated 13.05.2024 are well-supported by reasoning that is consistent with precedent and the materials on record. There is no miscarriage of justice or material oversight that compels the Court to intervene.

8. Accordingly, the Review Petition is dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

(Dr.S.K.Panigrahi)
Judge

(G.Satapathy)
Judge

Kishore