

<sup>1</sup>  
**W.P.No. 2624/2013** Smt. Poonam Sharma v. State of M.P. & Ors.  
**27/05/2013.**

Petitioner by Shri Shishir Saxena, Advocate.

Respondents No.1 to 4/State by Shri Praveen Newaskar, Dy. Government Advocate.

Heard.

Petitioner is aggrieved by the order dated 18.03.2013, whereby petitioner's attachment is cancelled and she has been sent to original place of posting, i.e., Primary Health Centre, Markhi Mahu.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner submitted a series of complaints against the Block Medical Officer and despite that, the same officer has passed the aforesaid order which is bad in law. However, learned counsel has not disputed that the petitioner was attached to the present place of posting at Ukabad and her original place of posting was Markhi Mahu.

The administrative orders like Annexure P-1 cannot be called in question unless it runs contrary to the statutory provision, proved to be malafide one, changes service conditions of an employee to his detriment or issued by an incompetent authority. The petitioner has no lien at the place where she was attached. The respondents are well within their right

**W.P.No. 2624/2013** Smt. Poonam Sharma v. State of M.P. & Ors.  
to change the place of posting or discontinue the attachment in absence of showing the aforesaid ingredients. I find no reason to interfere in the present matter. However, it is observed that if petitioner prefers a fresh representation against Annexure P-1, it will be proper for respondent No.3 to decide it in accordance with law expeditiously, preferably within three weeks.

With the aforesaid and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case petition is disposed of.

**(SUJOY PAUL)**  
**V. Judge**

(ra)