

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK
WPC(OA) No.2395 of 2018

Bibhuti Ranjan Rout

....

Petitioner

Mr. Niroj Kumar Mahapatra, Advocate

-versus-

State of Odisha & Others

....

Opposite Parties

Mr. L. Samantaray, AGA

CORAM:
JUSTICE M.S. RAMAN

Order No.

ORDER
20.09.2022

- 01.** 1. This matter is taken up by virtual/physical mode.
2. The Original Application No.2395 (C) of 2018 was filed before the Odisha Administrative Tribunal, Cuttack Bench, Cuttack. After its abolition, the same has been transferred to this Court which is renumbered as WPC(OA) No.2395 of 2018.
3. The Petitioner, Assistant Fishery Officer, having joined in Govt. service on 26th August, 1991 claims to have completed 20 years of service on 26th August, 2011 and accordingly, he claims entitlement for 2nd Revised Assured Career Progression in terms of Govt. of Odisha Finance Department Resolution bearing No. 3560/PCC(A)-49/2012/F dated 6th February, 2013.
4. Counsel for the Petitioner submitted that the case of the Petitioner was recommended by District Fisheries Officer-cum-CEO, BFDA & FFDA, Puri. The said recommendation reflected as follows:-

“XXX

XXX

XXX

With reference to above, I am to submit herewith the proposal for grant of 3rd Revised Assured Career Progression Scheme (RACPS) in favour of Sri Bibhuti Ranjan Raut, AFO on completion of 20 years of service. “

Counsel for the Petitioner further submitted that due to typographical error crept in, the recommendation, there arose confusion and hence, the Petitioner was not granted the desired benefit. He further clarified that since the Petitioner has completed 20 years of service, he is entitled for 2nd Revised Assured Career Progression, the recommending authority instead of 3rd RACP should have mentioned “2nd Revised Assured Career Progression Scheme”.

5. Mr. L. Samantaray, learned Addl. Govt. Advocate does not dispute the said fact.

6. Mr. Mahapatra, learned counsel for the Petitioner at this juncture submitted that this matter can be disposed of with the direction to the authority concerned to consider the case of the Petitioner with the aforesaid modification in the recommendation.

7. Since the fact of completion of 20 years of service of the Petitioner is not disputed and both the counsel conceded that the Petitioner is entitled to 2nd RACP, the authority concerned shall verify the records and allow the Petitioner the required RACP. Such decision may be taken within a period of two months from the date of production of certified copy of this order.

8. With the above observation and direction, the writ petition stands disposed of.

(M.S. Raman)
Judge

Aks

