



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK
WP(C) No.27992 of 2025

1) Narottam Sahoo

.....

Petitioners

2) Ramesh Chandra Sahoo

Represented by Adv. -

3) Binoda Kumar Sahoo

Sidheswar Mallik

4) Lokanath Sahoo

5) Akshya Kumar Sahu

6) Iswar Chandra Sahu

7) Akshaya Kumar Sahu

8) Parsuram Sahu

-versus-

1) State Of Odisha

.....

Opposite Parties

2) Director Of Secondary Education,

Represented by Adv. –

Bbsr

3) D.e.o., Dhenkanal

Mr. S. Behera, AGA

CORAM:

MR. JUSTICE ADITYA KUMAR MOHAPATRA

ORDER

26.02.2026

Order No.

- 02.
1. This matter is taken up through Hybrid mode.
 2. Petitioners short grievance is reflected in the prayer column, which reads as under:

“Under the aforesaid facts and circumstance the petitioner humbly prays that this Hon'ble court may graciously be pleased to,

1. Quash the resolution No.25148 dt.19.12.17 as at annexure-2.

2. Direct/Order that the arrear differential salary due to the petitioners w.e.f. 1.1.16 to 30.9.17 consequence upon the revision of scale of pay w.e.f. 1.1.16 shall be paid to the petitioners within a stipulated period with admissible interest thereon.



3. *Pass such other orders as may be deemed fit and proper in the interest of justice.*”

2. Counsel for the Petitioner submits that in the light of decision of this Court in ***Dipti Roy v. State of Orissa, 2004(II) OLR 718***, the relief in terms of prayer column ought to have been accorded to his clients by OP Nos.2 & 3.

3. Learned AGA-Mr. Behera appearing for the OPs resists the petition contending that there are multiple Petitioners and no representations are also made and therefore, no relief can be granted, as sought for. Having so stated, he suggests to the Petitioners to make appropriate representations in the light of the decision in ***Dipti Roy v. State of Orissa 2004(II) OLR 918*** and ***Dr. Yudhisthir Patnaik v. State of Orissa 2008 (I) OLR 890***. He also assures that if one be made, the same shall be considered in a time bound manner and in accordance with law.

4. In the above circumstances, writ petition is disposed off reserving liberty to the Petitioners to make individual representations to OP Nos.2 & 3; if made, the said OPs shall take decision thereon and inform result of such consideration to the Petitioners individually within an outer limit of eight weeks. It hardly needs to be stated that the decision has to be taken in the light of ***Dipti Roy*** and ***Dr. Yudhistir Patnaik*** (supra). All contentions are kept open.

It is open to the answering Opposite Parties to solicit any information or documents from the side of the Petitioner, as required for taking a decision on the subject representation. However, in that guise delay shall not be brooked.



Now, no costs.

Web copy of this order to be acted upon by all concerned.

(Aditya Kumar Mohapatra)
Judge

Sisir