



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

**W.P.(C) No. 42432 of 2023**

CNR No. - ODHC011045262023

***Branch Manager, Bank of India, .... Petitioner  
Balasore***

Mr. B.S. Das, Advocate  
on behalf of Gurudutta Kar, Advocate

*-versus-*

***1. Secretary of the District Legal Service  
Authority, Balasore***

***2. Sashi Kanta Barik***

***.... Opp. Parties***

Mr. Amitabh Pradhan,  
Additional Standing Counsel  
Mr. Manoj Kumar Panda, Advocate  
(for Opposite Party No. 2)

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MISS JUSTICE SAVITRI RATHO**

**ORDER**

**02.09.2026**

**Order No.**

**11.**

(Through hybrid Mode)

1. Heard Mr. B.S. Das, learned counsel appearing on behalf of Mr. G. Kar, learned counsel for the Petitioner and Mr. M.K. Panda, learned counsel appearing on behalf of Opposite Party No.2.

2. This writ petition has been filed challenging the award dated 23.11.2023 passed in PLA Case No. 50 of 2023 and for



a direction for hearing of the matter afresh by the permanent Lok Adalat.

3. In support of his submissions that the prescribed procedure under Section 22-C (4) & (7) of the Legal Service Authorities Act, 1987, has not been followed while passing the impugned order dated 09.09.2023, he relies on the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of ***Canara Bank vs. G.S. Jayarama: (2022) 7 SCC 776***. He also relies on the decision of this Court in ***Shaswata Pratika Pradhan vs. State of Odisha : 2022 (Supp.) OLR 601***, where it has been held that where a statute prescribes a particular procedure to be followed the same has to be followed or not at all.

4. Mr. M.K. Panda, learned counsel appearing on behalf of Opposite Party No.2 submits that the petitioner has challenged the subsequent order dated 23.11.2023 confirming the original award dated 09.09.2023. A perusal of the impugned order would reveal that the petitioner has agreed to the settlement, but after the Opposite Party No.2 had complied



with the order dated 09.09.2023, filed an objection on 06.10.2023 for modification of the order dated 09.09.2023, which was misconceived and not maintainable. He also submits that the procedure under Section 22-C has been followed and there is no specific averment in the writ petition or in the objection regarding non-compliance or violence of any specific provision. He relies of the decision of this Court in the case of *ICICI Bank Limited, Bhubaneswar vs. Pratibha Bharati*, reported in *2024 (II) OLR 222* and submits that since there is no error apparent in the impugned order passed by the permanent Lok Adalat, this writ petition is liable to be dismissed.

5. The written notes of submission filed on behalf of the Petitioner and the Opposite Party No.2 are taken on record.

6. Hearing is **concluded**.

7. Order is **reserved**.

*(Savitri Ratho)*  
**Judge**

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed  
Signed by: SUBHALAXMI PRIYADARSHANI  
SAHOO  
Reason: Authentication  
Location: Orissa High Court, Cuttack  
Date: 02-Sep-2026 19:27:17

