

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR
Writ Petition (S) No.10869 of 2019

D.K. Dashabhratar S/o Shri Karuna Dashabhratar, aged about 60 years,
 Occupation – Assistant Engineer म.ज.प. (महानदी जलाशय परियोजना) डिसनेट
 Sub Division No.11, Bangoli, District Raipur, C.G. R/o Katora Talab
 Raipur, District Raipur C.G.

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. State of Chhattisgarh through the Secretary, Water Resources Department, New Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar Raipur, District Raipur C.G.
2. Engineer in Chief, Water Resources Department, Shivnath Bhawan, New Raipur, District Raipur C.G.
3. Chief Engineer, Water Resources Department, Mahanadi Pariyojna Raipur Chhattisgarh, Shahid Bhagat Singh Chowk, Civil Line Shankar Nagar, Raipur, District Raipur C.G.
4. Executive Engineer, Resources Department, म.ज.प. (महानदी जलाशय परियोजना) डिसनेट Division No.3, Tilda, Raipur, District Raipur C.G.

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr.Suresh Kumar Verma, Advocate
For Respondents	:	Mr.Alok Bakshi, Addl. A.G.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Rajendra Chandra Singh Samant

Order on Board

24/12/2019

Heard.

1. It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner was originally posted at Mahanadi Jalashay Pariyojna Disnet, Sub-Division No.11, Bangoli, District Raipur and by order dated 9.8.2019 (Annexure P-2) he was transferred to the post of Sub-Divisional Officer, Bhatapara, Nahar Nirman Sub-Division No.3, Tilda, Raipur, however, the order dated 9.8.2019 was amended and deleted by corrigendum letter dated 23.8.2019 (Annexure P/4) and the petitioner was directed to join and give his services to the original place of posting, according to which, the petitioner has joined his services at Mahanadi Jalashay Pariyojna, Sub-Division No.11, Bangoli, District Raipur on 23.9.2019. It is submitted

that subsequent to that, the petitioner has made a representation on 29.11.2019 (Annexure P/1) before the respondent No.1 making a prayer for his transfer to Bhatapara, Nahar Nirman Sub-Division No.3, Tilda, Raipur. Hence, a direction be issued to the respondents-authorities to consider the representation of the petitioner.

2. On the other hand, learned Additional Advocate General for the respondents/State opposes the prayer and submits that the petitioner cannot make a demand of transfer/posting as it is made in the representation.
3. Considering the submissions made learned counsel for the parties and further considering the documents appended with the writ petition, the respondents-authorities are directed to consider the representation given by the petitioner and take a decision within 45 days from today.
4. It is made clear that this Court has not made any observation on the representation filed by the petitioner.
5. With the aforesaid observation/direction, the writ petition finally stands disposed of. No cost(s).

Sd/-

(Rajendra Chandra Singh Samant)
Vacation Judge