



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK**

**W.A. No.1570 of 2025**

**State of Odisha**

....

**Appellant**

Mr. S.B. Mohanty, AGA

-Versus-

**Snigdha Dash & Others**

....

**Respondents**

Mr. G.K. Nanda, Advocate

**CORAM:**

**JUSTICE KRISHNA SHRIPAD DIXIT**

**JUSTICE CHITTARANJAN DASH**

**ORDER**

**24.03.2026**

**Order No.**

**02.**

**W.A. No.1570 of 2025 & I.A. No.3971 of 2025**

Heard learned counsel for the Appellants.

2. This Intra-Court Appeal by the State and its functionaries calls in question a learned Single Judge's order dated 24.01.2025, whereby the Respondent-employee's W.P.(C) No.29151 of 2022 along with other companion petitions having been favoured, relief of regularization with financial benefit has been accorded to her. The operative portion of the order, as reflected in paragraphs 7.3 & 7.4 read as under:

*"7.3. In the counter affidavit so filed by O.P. No.1, no document as also been enclosed showing that for appointment/engagement against vacant sanctioned post, any prior permission is required to be taken by the University from the Govt. In absence of any such document enclosed to the counter affidavit, this Court is unable to accept the contention raised in the counter affidavit.*

*7.4. In view of the aforesaid analysis, this Court is inclined to quash the rejection so available vide the impugned communication dated 18.10.2022 under Annexure-6. While quashing the same, this Court directs O.P. No.1 to regularize the services of the petitioners with passing of appropriate orders in that regard, within a period of 2 (two) months from the date of receipt of this order. Order of dismissal/termination which is the subject matter of challenge in W.P.(C) No.30095 of 2022 and W.P.(C) No.30100 of 2022 also stands quashed."*



3. Having heard learned AGA-Mr. Mohanty for the Appellant and learned private counsel representing the Respondents, we are convinced that the subject matter of this appeal is substantially similar to the one treated by us in W.A. No.1381 of 2025 between *State of Odisha and Others vs. Tapan Kumar Sahu* disposed off by us vide order dated 17.02.2026 rejecting the Appeal. Therefore, this appeal too meets the same fate.

4. Added to the above, there is a long delay of 208 days in filing the appeal & application in I.A. No.3971 of 2025, supported by an affidavit, accompanies the appeal memo. A perusal of the application, coupled with the affidavit, would show that the grounds taken for seeking condonation of delay are almost verbatim similar, as have been taken in other connected matters. Such duplication of ground is not desirable to say the least. They do not constitute a plausible explanation for the delay brooked. Therefore, the I.A. is rejected.

In the above circumstances, the Writ Appeal is dismissed, costs having been made easy. The Appellant shall implement the impugned order of the learned Single Judge within an outer limit of three months without giving scope of contempt action.

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

**(Krishna Shripad Dixit)**  
**Judge**

**(Chittaranjan Dash)**  
**Judge**