

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK

WP(C) No.32273 of 2022

Dharmendra Behera* *Petitioner

*Mr.Akshaya Kumar Sahoo,
Advocate*

-versus-

State of Odisha & others* *Opp.Parties

*Mr. R.N. Mishra,
Addl. Government Advocate*

**CORAM:
JUSTICE S.K. SAHOO**

**ORDER
06.12.2022**

Order No.

01. This matter is taken up through Hybrid arrangement (video conferencing/physical mode).

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and learned counsel for the State.

The petitioner Dharmendra Behera has filed this writ petition challenging the advertisement dated 18.10.2022 under Annexure-10, which was issued for filling up of the post of Jogan Sahayak and with a further prayer for a direction for engaging him as Jogan Sahayak as per the guidelines of the Government dated 12.08.2013.

It is the contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner that as per the letter dated 12.08.2013 issued

by the Government of Odisha, Food Supplies & Consumer Welfare Department, under Annexure-9, for selection to the post of Jogan Sahayak, preference should be given to the salesman engaged by the Grama Panchayat for dealing with PDS over others due to their experience in the job. It is submitted that in the advertisement under Annexure-10, such things are missing and therefore, the petitioner has submitted a representation before the Collector-cum-District Magistrate, Nuapada highlighting his grievances.

Mr. R.N. Mishra, learned Addl. Government Advocate, on the other hand, submitted that Clause-6 of the advertisement under 'Eligibility Criteria', indicates about experience certificate wherein it is stipulated that an applicant desirous to apply as experienced Salesman (PDS) must submit, an experience certificate duly signed by the Sarpanch/PEO of the concerned Grampanchayat and counter signed by the MI/IS of the Block. It is further submitted that while putting such a clause under the Eligibility Criteria in the advertisement, the authority has kept in mind the notification of the Government dated 12.08.2013 and therefore, the writ petition being a premature one, should not be entertained at this stage.

Adverting to the contentions raised by the learned counsel for the respective parties, when the selection process is going on and no adverse order has been passed against the petitioner, I find no illegality or

impropriety in the advertisement and it seems that the prayer made in the writ petition is a premature one and therefore, I am not inclined to entertain the same. However, the petitioner is at liberty to raise his grievance at the appropriate stage, if necessity arises and he is so advised.

Accordingly, the writ petition stands disposed of.

(S.K. Sahoo)
Judge

PKSahoo

