

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK

W.P.(C) No. 27193 of 2022

Subhashree Pattanaik

.....

Petitioner

Mr. B.K. Mohanty, Advocate

Vs.

**Principal Secy to Government
of Odisha, BBSR**

.....

Opposite parties

Mr. S. N. Nayak, ASC

CORAM:

DR. JUSTICE B.R. SARANGI

ORDER

31.10.2022

Order No.

01

This matter is taken up through hybrid mode.

2 Heard.

3. The petitioner has filed this writ petition seeking direction to opposite parties to regularize the service of the petitioner on the ground that he has been continuing in service for a quite long period.

4. In course of hearing, learned counsel for the petitioner states that the petitioner may be permitted to move a fresh representation highlighting his grievances before the authority so that the same can be considered in the light of the ratio decided in the case of *Secretary State of Karnataka v. Umadevi* (3), 2006(4) SCC 1, *State of Karnataka and others v. M.L.Keshari and others*, 2010(II) OLR (SC) 982, and *Amarkanti Rai v. State of Bihar and others*, (2015) 8 SCC 265, since her case is covered by the said ratio, to which learned counsel for the State has no objection.

5. Considering the limited nature of grievance of the petitioner, this Court gives liberty to the petitioner to file a fresh representation within a period of fifteen days from today ventilating her grievances before the authority. In the event the petitioner files such representation along with the copies of the aforementioned judgments, the authority shall

consider the case of the petitioner for regularization and pass appropriate order taking into consideration the ratio decided in the case of *Umadevi, M.L.Keshari* and *Amarkanti Rai (supra)* within a period of three months thereafter.

6. With the aforesaid observation and direction, the writ petition is disposed of.

Issue urgent certified copy as per rules.

Arun

(DR. B.R. SARANGI, J.)

