

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK

W.P.C. (OAC) No.2239 of 2017

Rama Chandra Rana & Others ***Petitioners***
None

-versus-

State of Odisha and Others ***Opposite Parties***
Mr. H.K. Panigrahi, ASC

CORAM:
JUSTICE M.S. RAMAN

ORDER
19.09.2022

Order No.

- 03.
1. This matter is taken up through virtual/physical mode.
 2. The Original Application No.2239 of 2017 (C) 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 (OAC) No.2239 of 2017.
 3. Thirteen applicants working as office Co-ordinator under District Urban Development Agency, Sundargarh joined together by filing Original Application before the Odisha State Administrative Tribunal prayed for the following reliefs:-
 - “i. The letter dt-12th July, 2017 issued by the Addl. Director SUDA, H & UD Department Govt. of Odisha, under Annexure-7 may be quashed.
 - ii- The respondents may be directed to allow the applicants to continue in their services smoothly without any hindrance what so ever.
 - iii- And further may pass any other order/s direction/s as this Hon’ble court deems just and proper.”
 4. None appears for the petitioners.

5. Heard Mr. H.K. Panigrahi, learned Additional Standing Counsel.

6. Vide order dated 10.08.2017 while issuing notice, the learned Tribunal directed that any appointment pursuant to Annexure-7 dated 12.07.2017 would be subject to the result of Original Application.

7. It is the case of the petitioner as is revealed from the Original Application now converted to the Writ Petition is that the office Co-ordinators and Data Entry Operators were engaged in the office of respective District Collectorates pursuant to advertisements whereby they were required to face "***Walk In Interview***". The office order issued engaging the petitioners as Office Co-ordinator/Data Entry Operator clearly stipulated terms and conditions. Said terms and conditions appended to office order *inter alia* envisaged that the engagement was purely temporary and contractual and the petitioner (s) would get the consolidated remuneration. It is also stipulated that the engagement would be for a period of 1 year.

8. It is submitted by Mr. H.K. Panigrahi, learned Additional Standing Counsel that vide letter dated 22.04.2017 (Annexure-6), Addl. Secretary to Government, Housing and Urban Development Department instructed the Collectors-cum-Chairmen, District Urban Development Agency to disengage office Co-ordinator and Data Entry Operator in Backward Region Grant Fund Programme (BRGF) as the said programme has been discontinued by Ministry of Government of India and has since stopped releasing funds. However, the Government of Odisha in Housing and Urban Development Department has invited bid from the agencies for establishment and

operationalsation of 20-District Project Management Unit in thirty districts to assist District Urban Development Agency and one finance expert at State Urban Development Agency (SUDA) under Capacity Building Programme.

9. Mr. Panigrahi submitted that there arises no cause of action for the petitioner to question such invitation by way of bid vide Annexure-7 as on the date of engagement the petitioners were well aware of the terms and conditions. Furthermore, since the Central Government has stopped such a programme, the disengagement of the office co-ordinator and Data Entry Operator in respective district is justified.

10. This court finds force in the submission of Mr. Panigrahi, learned Addl. Standing Counsel and there is no warrant to grant relief as claimed for by the petitioners. Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed.

Basudev

(M.S. Raman)
Judge