



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK
W.P.(C) No.8874 of 2026

Dattaram Bisoyi

.....

Petitioner

Represented by Adv. –
Mr. Ranjit Samal

-versus-

State of Odisha and others

.....

Opposite Parties

Represented by Adv. –
Mr. S.K. Parhi, ASC

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ADITYA KUMAR MOHAPATRA

ORDER

23.03.2026

Order No.

03. 1. This matter is taken up through Hybrid Arrangement (Virtual/Physical Mode).
2. The petitioner has sensitively stated his entire case in an appreciable way in the synopsis, which reads as under :-

“That petitioner, who was working as Reader (State Scale) in Mathematics in a fully aided educational institution is constrained to file this writ application challenging the inaction of the State-Opp. Parties in not extending the benefit for placement in Lecturer (Group-A) scale of pay, as well as Reader (State Scale) respectively w.e.f. dt.01.06.2002 & dt.01.06.2012 respectively i.e. after completion of 08 years and 18 years of service from the date of receipt of Grant-in-aid as per the law decided by this Hon'ble Court in the case of Chittaranjan Das Vrs. State of Odisha & Ors. reported in 2023 (II) ILR-Cut-1194, so also the similar judgment passed in the case of Dolamani Meher and batch Vrs. State of Odisha & Ors.(W.P.(C) No.4312 of 2016 and batch



disposed on 06.07.2023), keeping in view provision provided under Rule-4(1) of the Odisha Non-government aided college Lecturer's Placement Rules, 2014 (hereinafter referred as "2014 Rules") by modifying the Govt. Notification dt. 21.03.2017 & dt. 18.05.2020 in so far as it relates to the present petitioner is concerned. It is submitted that though this Hon'ble Court while adjudicating the similar issue in the case of Chittaranjan Das and Dolamani Meher & batch (supra) has already laid down the law which has been implemented in the meantime and the petitioner who stand on the same footing and also made several grievances before the authorities with a request to extend the similar benefits as per the aforesaid principle decided by this Hon'ble Court, but till date the State-Opp. Parties are sitting tight over the matter without any valid reason, for which the petitioner finding no other alternative, except to approach this Hon'ble Court by filing the present writ application. Hence this Writ Application."

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner draws attention of the Court to the representation dated 20.09.2024, a copy whereof avails at Annexure-9, ventilating his grievance. He submits that there is a constitutional mandate enacted in Article 350, which directs that the Public Authorities have to consider the grievances aired by the citizens in their representations and grant redressal in accordance with the extant Rules. Further he says that this having not happened inevitably, he is knocking at the doors of the Writ Court.

4. Learned ASC appearing for the official Opp. Parties opposed the writ petition for some time and now, he submits that he would instruct his client to look into the grievance of the



petitioner, as has been aired in the subject representation in accordance with law and in a time-bound way and this Court keeps open all contentions. Learned counsel for the petitioner is agreeable with the same. I too cotton with it.

5. In the above circumstances, the writ petition is disposed off. Time for consideration and communication of result of such consideration to the petitioner is three months. All contentions are kept open. It is open to the petitioner to give a copy of the representation afresh immediately.

6. It is open to Opp. Party No.1 to solicit any information or document from the side of the petitioner, as are required for due consideration of 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

Debasis