

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK

WPC(OAC) No. 2867 of 2014

Umakanta Dehury

....

Petitioner

Mr. B.K. Nayak along with Mr. A.K.
Sahoo, Advocate

-versus-

State of Odisha & others

....

Opp. Parties

Mr. T.K. Praharaj, Standing Counsel
for opposite parties 1 to 5

None for O.P. No.6

**CORAM:
JUSTICE M.S. SAHOO**

**ORDER
12.05.2022**

Order No.

- 02.
1. This matter is taken up through hybrid mode.
 2. When the matter was taken up on 12.04.2022, none had appeared for the petitioner and after considering the matter in some detail and the submissions of the learned Addl. Govt. Advocate for the State, the following order was passed:-

The writ petition has been renumbered and registered before this Court on 13.12.2021 after being transferred, upon abolition of Odisha Administrative Tribunal, Cuttack Bench, Cuttack.

2. On perusal of the available order sheet of the learned Tribunal, it is found that the matter was never taken-up/pursued after 30.03.2016.

3. The original application was filed by the petitioner in the year 2014, working as Checker in the Office of Range Officer (KL), Deogarh Range, Deogarh challenging the letter dated 03.03.2014 (enclosed to the writ petition) as well as Memo dated 14.05.2014 (Annexure-6).

4. By the said order, the decision of the DFO, Deogarh (KL) Division was communicated to the

petitioner regarding rejection of the petitioner's case form for promotion to the post of Circle Checker from the feeder post of Checker.

5. Learned Additional Government Advocate referring to the counter filed before the learned Tribunal dated 31.10.2013 submits that the order dated 14.05.2014 is just and proper and Departmental Promotion Committee considered the petitioner for promotion and he was found not suitable. It is further submitted that an employee can always claim a right of consideration for promotion but cannot claim promotion as a matter of right.

6. Having heard the learned Addl. Government Advocate, the matter is adjourned to 12.05.2022 to grant another opportunity to the petitioner."

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he has no up-to-date instruction to pursue the matter at present on behalf of the petitioner.

4. Learned Standing Counsel reiterates the submissions on behalf of the opposite party-State as noted in the order dated 12.04.2022.

5. Having heard learned counsel for the parties, the writ petition is disposed of for lack of up-to-date instruction from the petitioner to pursue the matter at present granting liberty to revive the same within sixty days for any surviving cause of action.

(M.S. Sahoo)
Judge