



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK

W.P.(C) No.32352 of 2025

Simanchal Panigrahi* *Petitioner

Mr. Dayanidhi Mishra, Advocate

-versus-

Union of India and others* *Opp. Parties

*Mr. P.K. Parhi, D.S.G.I. along
with Mr. S.K. Samantaray,
C.G.C.*

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S.K. SAHOO

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S.S. MISHRA

ORDER

26.11.2025

Order No.

01. This matter is taken up through Hybrid arrangement (video conferencing/physical mode).

This writ petition has been filed by the petitioner Simanchal Panigrahi with a prayer to set aside the order dated 09.09.2019 passed by the learned Central Administrative Tribunal, Cuttack Bench, Cuttack (hereinafter, 'Tribunal') in O.A. No.260/200 of 2014 under Annexure-5 so also the order dated 06.05.2025 passed in R.A. No.260/0008 of 2021 under Annexure-8.

The contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner is that when the petitioner earlier approached the learned Tribunal in O.A. No.94 of 1994 seeking regularization of his service, the prayer was allowed by the



learned Tribunal and vide order dated 05.12.1994, the opposite parties were directed to regularize the service of the petitioner in the vacancy existing and if there is no such vacancy, then it may be kept in view of the seniority of the petitioner is maintained in the waiting list. Learned counsel submits that the order of the learned Tribunal was not complied with and the opposite parties regularized the service of the petitioner in a Part Time Post of Farash-cum- Water Carrier w.e.f. 01.03.1994, but the service conditions as mentioned in the office order dated 09.02.1996 were made applicable to the petitioner. Learned counsel further submits that the petitioner filed the second O.A. before the learned Tribunal, which was registered as O.A. No.260/200 of 2014 and the learned Tribunal in a cryptic order dismissed the Original Application holding erroneously that the petitioner's claim for seniority w.e.f. 10.02.1991 was rejected in O.A. No.17 of 2003 and that the petitioner's seniority was fixed w.e.f. 01.03.1994 after regularization of his service and the decision passed in O.A. No.17 of 2003 has been challenged in W.P.(C) No.3605 of 2005, which is under consideration before this Court. Learned counsel further submits that neither the said O.A. No.17 of 2003 belonged to the petitioner nor any such writ petition as has been mentioned in the impugned order relates to the petitioner. Therefore, the petitioner filed review application before the learned Tribunal pointing out the illegality committed by passing the order dated 09.09.2019 in the Original



Application, however the learned Tribunal has been pleased to dismiss the review application holding that in view of the limited scope of power of review, the order cannot be reviewed.

Issue notice on the question of admission indicating therein that the matter shall be disposed of finally at the stage of admission.

Since Mr. Parhi, learned Deputy Solicitor General along with Mr. S.K. Samantaray, learned Central Government Counsel have already entered appearance on behalf of all the opposite parties, five extra copies of the writ petition be served on the learned Deputy Solicitor General of India within a week.

Learned counsel for the petitioner shall file the copy of the O.A. No.260/200 of 2014.

List this matter in the week commencing from 12.01.2026.

Counter affidavit, if any, be filed in the meantime.

(S.K. Sahoo)
Judge

(S.S. Mishra)
Judge

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed
Signed by: RABINDRA KUMAR MISHRA
Designation: Personal Assistant
Reason: Authentication
Location: HIGH COURT OF ORISSA, CUTTACK
Date: 27-Nov-2025 18:35:08

