



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK

W.P.(C) NO.20662 OF 2025

Surath Chandra Sahoo

.... Petitioner

Mr. A.K.Saa, Advocate

-versus-

State of Odisha & Others

.... Opp.Parties

Mr. U.C. Behura, AGA

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DIXIT KRISHNA SHRIPAD

ORDER

31.07.2025

Order No.
01.

1. Heard learned counsel-Mr. Saa appearing for Petitioner and learned AGA-Mr.Behura appearing for the Opposite Parties.
2. The prayer of the Petitioner is innocuous and the subject matter of the writ Petition is substantially similar to one in W.P.(C) No.4847 of 2025 between Jayaram Pradhan v. State of Odisha disposed of by a Coordinate Bench of this Court on 18.02.2025.
3. Paragraphs 5, 6 & 7 of the Coordinate Bench decision read as under:

“5. It is also contended that similar issue was before this Court in W.P.(C) Nos.20713 of 2016 and 22554 of 2017 and this Court vide judgment dated 14.03.2023 while disposing the matter held that such a stipulation is not permissible. The view expressed by this Court in Para-11 & 12 of the judgment is quoted hereunder.

“11. A bare reading of the afore quoted observations of the Apex Court would make it clear that if the case relates to re-fixation of pay and such like benefits may be granted in spite of delay as it does not affect the rights of third parties. There is no dispute that the benefit in question being basically re-fixation of pay in terms of the GIA Order, 1994 is in the nature of an



individual benefit granted to an eligible employee on fulfillment of certain conditions and as such, does not apply to all employee at large. A co-ordinate Bench of this Court in the case of Swarnalata Sahoo v. State of Orissa and others (W.P.(C) No. 19445/2016) analyzed vide ratio decided in the case of Tarsem Singh (supra) and held that there was no justification on the part of the opposite parties in issuing the impugned orders in supersession of the earlier orders purportedly in terms of the judgment in Tarsem Singh (supra). This Court is therefore of the considered view that the ratio of Tarsem Singh (supra) has been wrongly applied to the case of the petitioner for which the impugned order is rendered unsustainable in the eye of law.

12. Thus, on a conspectus of the analysis of facts and law involved in the case and the discussion made hereinbefore, this Court finds that the petitioners have made out a good case for interference. Resultantly, the Writ Petitions succeed and are therefore, allowed. The impugned order under Annexure 5 is hereby quashed. The opposite party-authorities are directed to extend the benefits to the petitioners as granted by order dated 14th May, 2015 under Annexure-4 within a period of three months.”

6. Learned State Counsel does not dispute the issue decided by this Court in the above noted cases.

7. Having heard learned counsels for the Parties and placing reliance on the judgment in W.P.(C) No.20713 of 2016, which has been confirmed in W.A. No.3221 of 2023 and SLP(C) Diary No.18952 of 2024 and on being satisfied that the issue involved in the writ petition is similar to the issue decided, this Court while disposing the Writ Petition directs that the Petitioner will be entitled to get the benefit of the arrear claim from the date of his entitlement as indicated in his order of approval so issued by the Government in the present writ petition. Such entitlement of the Petitioner as due and admissible be released with due calculation within a period of four (4) months from the date of receipt of this order.”

In view of the above, Petitioner being similarly circumstanced, the writ petition is disposed of in the same terms



and condition of the Coordinate Bench decision mutatis-mutandis.

All contentions are kept open.

Now, no costs.

(Dixit Krishna Shripad)
Judge

Madhusmita