

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK

WPC(OAC) No. 798 of 2012

Saudamini Mishra **Petitioner**
Mr. Aurovinda Mohanty, Advocate

-versus-

State of Odisha and others **Opp. Parties**
Mr. Rajesh Kumar Tripathy, ASC

CORAM:
JUSTICE M.S.SAHOO

ORDER
11.4.2022

Order No.

2.

1. This matter is taken up by hybrid mode.
2. When the matter was taken up on 22.2.2022, following order was passed :

“This matter is taken up by hybrid mode.

The writ petition is registered on 26.11.2021 before this Court after the O.A. was transferred from the learned Orissa Administrative Tribunal, Bhubaneswar upon its abolition.

On perusal of the available order sheets of the learned Tribunal it is indicated that the matter was never taken up after 15.7.2016.

Mr. Swain, learned counsel appearing along with Mr. A. Mohanty submits that they have instruction to appear on behalf of the petitioner as the earlier learned counsel for the petitioner Mr. Khuntia has withdrawn his power having become Additional Government Advocate, for the O.P.-State.

Accordingly list on 11.4.2022.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that due to long pendency of the O.A./writ petition for ten years, several subsequent events have happened which need to be brought

on record and petitioner may be permitted to withdraw the writ petition with liberty to file a better petition.

4. Learned Additional Standing Counsel submits that in view of the long pendency, nothing would survive in the present writ petition, considering the nature of grievance raised in the writ petition, i.e., challenge to order dated 12.3.2012 passed by the Collector, Cuttack withdrawing the drawing and disbursing power in respect of Integrated Child Development Scheme Project, Banki, Damapada from the petitioner who was then working as Child Development Project Officer (CDPO) and vesting the same with the Block Development Officer, Banki.

5. It is further submitted by learned Additional Government Advocate that the Block Development Officer being superior authority, the petitioner cannot have any grievance against the same.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties, the writ petition is allowed to be withdrawn with liberty to file a better petition afresh.

(M.S.Sahoo)
Judge

dutta