

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK

W.P (C) No. 24563 of 2012

State of Odisha & Others

.....

Petitioner

Mr. S. Jena, S.C.,

S & ME Deptt.

Vs.

Umakant Senapati

.....

Opposite party

Mr. L.K. Mohanty, Adv.

CORAM:

DR. JUSTICE B.R. SARANGI

MISS JUSTICE SAVITRI RATHO

ORDER

31.03.2022

Order No.

06.

This matter is taken up through hybrid mode.

2. Heard Mr. S. Jena, learned Standing Counsel for School and Mass Education Department appearing for the State-petitioners and Mr. L.K. Mohanty, learned counsel for the opp. party.

3. The State-petitioners have filed this writ petition challenging the order dated 10.02.2012 passed by the State Administrative Tribunal, Cuttack Bench, Cuttack, so far as it relates to O.A. No.130(C) of 2011. The tribunal, by the said order, which was passed in respect of O.A. No.123(C) of 2011 and O.A. No.130(C) of 2011 filed by two different applicants, including the present opposite party, has directed that if the applicants' name found place in the select list as against the 50% of the vacancies meant for the general category and other respondents, whose name found place below the applicants in the select list, have been favoured with the appointment order, so also the vacancies meant for appointment for the year 2009-10 in respect of general category are still available to be filled up by the applicants out of the posts advertised in 2009 in respect of selection test for 2009-

2010, petitioner no.3 shall take appropriate steps for issuance of appointment orders in favour of the applicants in both the OAs as early as practicable, preferably within a period of three months from the date of communication of the order.

4. This Court while entertaining the writ petition, vide order dated 01.07.2013, passed interim order to the effect that “if the posts of contractual Hindi Teachers lying vacant in the District of Dhenkanal, which according to the writ petitioners was meant for reserved category, it is directed that the applicants in the original applications shall be given appointment, but such appointment shall be subject to final result of the writ application.” Whether such order has been complied with or not, nobody has got such instructions. As such, in the meantime, the recruitment process must have been completed.

5. In that view of the matter, this Court is not inclined to entertain this writ petition.

6. Accordingly, the writ petition stands disposed of.

(DR. B.R. SARANGI)
JUDGE

Alok/Sukanta

(SAVITRI RATHO)
JUDGE