

IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WRIT PETITION No. 5880 /2005

**Single Bench**

PETITIONER

VIRENDRA NATH SINGH @ V.N. SINGH, SON OF SANT PRASAD SINGH, AGED ABOUT 52 YEARS, HEAD-MASTER, RESIDENT OF P.W.D., QTR.NO.C-2, BLOCK COLONY, BASTAR, DISTRICT JAGDALPUR (C.G.)

*P.R. No. 5702/05  
Presented by sh. A.K. Shukla  
Dated - 28-10-05*

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS

1. THE STATE OF CHHATTISGARH, THROUGH SECRETARY & MINISTRY OF S.T.S.C. & BACKWARD CLASSES DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT, D.K.S BHAWAN, RAIPUR (C.G.)
2. THE GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT, THROUGH THE SECRETARY, D.K.S. BHAWAN RAIPUR (C.G.)
3. THE COLLECTOR, DISTRICT JAGDALPUR, BASTAR (C.G.)
4. THE ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER, TRIBAL DEVELOPMENT JAGDALPUR, BASTGAR (C.G.)
5. THE DISTRICT EDUCATION OFFICER, BASTAR, DISTRICT JAGDALPUR (C.G.)
6. THE PRINCIPAL HIGHER SECONDARY BOYS SCHOOL, BASTAR, JAGDALPUR (C.G.)



**RECEIVED-COPY**  
*28/10/05*  
CLERK to A. G. BILASPUR

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226/227 OF THE  
CONSTITUTION OF INDIA

PARTICULARS OF THE PETITIONER

(52)

**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**

**SINGLE BENCH : HON'BLE MR. SATISH K. AGNIHOTRI, J.**

**WRIT PETITION NO.5880 OF 2005**

**Petitioner** : Virendra Nath Singh @ V.N.Singh

**Versus**

**Respondents** : The State of Chhattisgarh and  
others

**Present** : Mr. Ashok Kumar Shukla, counsel for the petitioner.  
Mr. Utkarsh Verma, Deputy Government Advocate for the  
State/respondents.

**ORDER**

(Passed on 28<sup>th</sup> Day of February, 2007)

The petitioner while working as Head Master in Higher Secondary School (Girls), Bastar has been transferred to Middle School, Kodhenar, vide order dated 16-09-2005 (P-4). The petitioner impugns the order dated 16-09-2005 (P-4).

2. This Court, vide interim order dated 09-12-2005, stayed the order dated 16-09-2005 (P-4) and the petitioner was ordered to be allowed to continue at his present place of posting till the next date of hearing.

3. With the passage of time, the writ petition has become infructuous, to which learned counsel appearing for the State/respondents has no objection.

4. Thus, the writ petition is dismissed as having become infructuous. No order as to costs.

Sd/-  
Satish K. Agnihotri  
Judge