

**HIGH COURT OF TRIPURA
AGARTALA
WP(C) 331/2024**

Sri Karma Bhutia, son of Gomchen Bhutia, permanent resident of Atisha Road, PO & PS-Kalimpong, Sub-division-Kalimpong, District-Kalimpong, West Bengal, PIN-734301, aged about 59 years.

.....Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

- 1. The Union of India**, represented by the Secretary, Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India, having his office at NDCC-II Building, Jai Singh Road, Near Jantar Mantar, 110001.
 - 2. The Union of India**, represented by the Secretary, Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India, having his office at NDCC-II Building, Jai Singh Road, Near Jantar Mantar, 110001.
 - 3. The Director General of Police**, Central Reserve Police Force, Block-1, Central Government Office Complex, Lodhi Road, New Delhi, 110003.
 - 4. The Inspector General of Police (Pers)**, Central Reserve Police Force, Central Government Office Complex, Lodhi Road, New Delhi, 110003.
- Respondent(s)**

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Somik Deb, Sr. Advocate Mr. P. Chakraborty, Advocate
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. B. Majumder, Dy. SGI
Date of hearing & delivery of judgment & order	:	01.07.2024
Whether fit for reporting	:	Yes

**HON’BLE MR. JUSTICE ARINDAM LODH
JUDGMENT & ORDER (ORAL)**

By way of filing the present writ petition, the petitioner has prayed for quashing the impugned order dated 28.03.2024 issued by the competent authority of the Central Reserve Police Force, DTE-GEN, New Delhi(*Annexure-1* to the writ petition) whereby and whereunder the petitioner has been transferred to the office of Inspector General(IG, for short), MP Sector on promotion to the post of DIG (GD) from the office of IG, Tripura Sector.

2. Facts:

2.1. Since 09.08.2021, the petitioner was posted as Commandant in the office of the IG, Central Reserve Police Force(for short, CRPF), Tripura Sector.

Pursuant to a Ministry of Home Affairs Order No.I-45020202/2023-Pers.II dated 30.08.2023, the petitioner has been promoted to the rank of DIG and transferred to the O/o IG, Madhya Pradesh Sector vide order dated 28.03.2024. On receipt of the said order of promotion and transfer, the petitioner submitted representation to the concerned authority stating *inter alia* that he is having aged parents suffering from various old-age ailments. Besides, his daughter is studying at class X and the final examination is scheduled to be held in the month of March, 2025. It is further stated in his representation that as per the transfer policy prevalent in the organization, terminal posting of 02 years to the requested place is available to an Officer at the rank of Commandant or DIG. Furthermore, the petitioner's superannuation is due in the month of July, 2025. But, his representation was not considered by the competent authority. The representation being rejected, the petitioner has filed the present writ petition.

2.2. This Court vide order dated 07.05.2024 has stayed the operation of the impugned order dated 28.03.2024 with a direction to the petitioner to submit a fresh representation. The respondents were simultaneously directed to consider the representation of the petitioner and dispose of the same with a reasoned order. Accordingly, the representation was duly considered by **“Transfer Representation Standing Committee”**. The said committee after due consideration of all the pleas taken by the petitioner has thought it not fit to interfere the transfer of the petitioner to the office of the IG, MP Sector. The said decision of the “Transfer Representation Standing Committee” was placed before the Director General of CRPF who approved the recommendation. IG (Pers) CRPF communicated the order of rejection and asked the petitioner to join his new place of posting as DIG, MP Sector.

2.3. The respondents have filed an application for vacating the interim order passed by this Court in IA No.1 of 2024 arising out of this writ petition. While considering the application for vacating the interim order, it is urged to dispose of the matter finally.

3. On being agreed, I have taken up the instant writ petition for final disposal at this stage and heard Mr. Somik Deb, learned senior counsel assisted by Mr. P. Chakraborty, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner as well as Mr. B. Majumder, learned Dy. SGI appearing for the respondents.

4. Submissions on behalf of the petitioner:

4.1. Mr. Deb, learned senior counsel for the petitioner mainly emphasized on the violation of Clause 3(C) of the Standing Order No.05/2022 dated 27th September, 2022. Clause 3(C) deals with “Terminal Posting”. Since the term “Terminal Posting” has not been defined under Standing Order No.05/2022, Mr. Deb, learned senior counsel has drawn the attention of this Court to the definition of “Terminal Posting” as found in the Standing Order No.07/2014 dated 24th November, 2014(*Annexure-8* to the writ petition).

4.2. Second fold of submission of learned senior counsel is that the respondents have not duly considered the fact that the daughter of the petitioner would appear in the final examination of Class X scheduled to be held in the month of March, 2025 as well as the illness of his old-aged parents.

4.3. Thirdly, Mr. Deb, learned senior counsel has challenged the authority of the “Transfer Representation Standing Committee” to act as decision-making authority to consider the representation of the petitioner relating to his transfer.

4.4. Mr. Deb, learned senior counsel has pressed into service the following judgments:

- i. (2004) 12 SCC 299 titled as *Kendriya Vidyalaya Sangathan vs. Damodar Prasad Pandey and Ors.* (para 4)
- ii. (2022) 14 SCC 187 titled as *Ms X vs. Registrar General, High Court of Madhya Pradesh and Anr.* (para 40-75)

5. Submissions on behalf of the respondents:

5.1. Firstly, Mr. Majumder, learned Dy. SGI has submitted that transfer is an incidental to service. Secondly, learned Dy. SGI has submitted that the first representation submitted by the petitioner has been considered by the competent authority and the IG (Pers), CRPF communicated the decision regarding rejection of the representation to the petitioner. Being directed by this Court, the petitioner submitted representation afresh to the Director General of CRPF through proper channel. On receipt of the second representation, the Director General himself had taken into consideration the various pleas taken by the petitioner in his representation. Thereafter, the Director General held that the grounds taken by the petitioner in his representation cannot be acceded to. The Director General has further held that the post of DIG is vacant at the office of the IG, MP Sector which is necessary to be filled up immediately for administrative exigencies.

5.2. To defend the transfer order of the petitioner, learned Dy. SGI has pressed into service the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *State of U.P. and Ors. vs. Gobardhan Lal*, (2004) 11 SCC 402: AIR 2004 SC 2165, para 8.

6. Analysis and Conclusion:

6.1. I have considered the submissions advanced by learned counsel appearing for the parties and also have perused the documents and the ratio laid down in the cited judgments placed before this Court.

6.2. There is no quarrel at the bar that transfer is an incidental to service. At this juncture, I may take note of the law in regard to the scope of interference by the Constitutional Courts relating to transfer of employees, particularly, the personnel to the Force. The Apex Court in case of ***Kendriya Vidyalaya Sangathan(supra)*** has held that:

“4. Transfer which is an incidence of service is not to be interfered with by courts unless it is shown to be clearly arbitrary or visited by mala fide or infraction of any prescribed norms of principles governing the transfer (see Abani Kanta Ray v. State of Orissa [1995 Supp (4) SCC 169 : 1996 SCC (L&S) 175 : (1996) 32 ATC 107] . Unless the order of transfer is visited by mala fide or is made in violation of operative guidelines, the court cannot interfere with it (see Union of India v. S.L. Abbas [(1993) 4 SCC 357 : 1994 SCC (L&S) 230 : (1993) 25 ATC 844 : AIR 1993 SC 2444]). Who should be transferred and posted where is a matter for the administrative authority to decide. Unless the order of transfer is vitiated by mala fides or is made in violation of any operative guidelines or rules the courts should not ordinarily interfere with it. In Union of India v. Janardhan Debanath [(2004) 4 SCC 245 : 2004 SCC (L&S) 631] it was observed as follows : (SCC p. 250, para 9)

“No government servant or employee of a public undertaking has any legal right to be posted forever at any one particular place or place of his choice since transfer of a particular employee appointed to the class or category of transferable posts from one place to another is not only an incident, but a condition of service, necessary too in public interest and efficiency in the public administration. Unless an order of transfer is shown to be an outcome of mala fide exercise or stated to be in violation of statutory provisions prohibiting any such transfer, the courts or the tribunals normally cannot interfere with such orders as a matter of routine, as though they were the appellate authorities substituting their own decision for that of the employer/management, as against such orders passed in the interest of administrative exigencies of the service concerned. This position was highlighted by this Court in National Hydroelectric Power Corpn. Ltd. v. Shri Bhagwan [(2001) 8 SCC 574 : 2002 SCC (L&S) 21] .”

6.3. Again, reiterating the parameters of judicial interference in the matters of transfer, Hon’ble Supreme Court in the case of ***Rajendra Singh vs. State of Uttar Pradesh***, reported in **(2009) 15 SCC 178** has held thus:

“9. The courts are always reluctant in interfering with the transfer of an employee unless such transfer is vitiated by violation of some statutory provisions or suffers from mala fides.”

6.4. In case of ***J.K. Bansal vs. Union of India***, **(2005) 7 SCC 227**, the Hon’ble Supreme Court held that matters of transfers are best left to the

discretion of the competent authority, and should not be tinkered with, in the absence of a demonstrable violation of statutory rules, or an instance of mala fides on the part of the competent authority. The relevant observation may be reproduced hereunder:[SCC p.223, para 12]

“12. The scope of interference by the courts in regard to members of armed forces is far more limited and narrow. It is for the higher authorities to decide when and where a member of the armed forces should be posted. The courts should be extremely slow in interfering with an order of transfer of such category of persons and unless an exceptionally strong case is made out, no interference should be made.”

6.5. Here, I may profitably make a reference to the case of *Union of India vs. S.L. Abbas, (1993) 4 SCC 357:AIR 1993 SC 2444*, wherein the Apex Court has dealt with the scope of enforceability of the right of a Government employee mentioned in a guideline relating to transfer. At para 7, the Hon’ble Supreme Court observed thus:

“7. Who should be transferred where, is a matter for the appropriate authority to decide. Unless the order of transfer is vitiated by mala fides or is made in violation of any statutory provisions, the court cannot interfere with it. While ordering the transfer, there is no doubt, the authority must keep in mind the guidelines issued by the Government on the subject. Similarly if a person makes any representation with respect to his transfer, the appropriate authority must consider the same having regard to the exigencies of administration. The guidelines say that as far as possible, husband and wife must be posted at the same place. The said guideline however does not confer upon the Government employee a legally enforceable right.”

6.6. Having regard to the aforesaid principles laid down by the Apex Court, it can easily be concluded that all Government servants or employees have to serve at any place at the desire or discretion of the employer in the exigencies of public interest. There is very little room to exercise the power of judicial review as regards the order of transfers issued by a competent authority. However, it is equally well-settled that Courts will definitely interfere with a transfer order if it is found to be passed on extraneous

consideration or it is an instance of mala fide or if statutory guidelines are ignored arbitrarily.

7. Keeping in mind the aforesaid principle, I will decide the merits of the present writ petition where the transfer order has been challenged. The petitioner has accepted his promotion to the rank of DIG which is found in the same impugned order.

7.1. Having regard to the submissions advanced by learned senior counsel for the petitioner, at the outset, I have gone through the source of power of the establishment of the “Transfer Standing Committee” as well as “Transfer Representation Standing Committee”.

The Office of the Director General, CRPF issued an addendum to Standing Order No.05/2022 on the subject of transfer policy of officers dated 28.02.2024. Under para 12 of the said addendum, “Transfer Standing Committee” as well as “Transfer Representation Standing Committee” were formed by the following methods.

The constitution of the above Standing Committees may be reproduced hereunder, for convenience, in extenso:

Para : 12

(a) *In order to bring more transparency to deal with the transfer cases of officers from Second-in-Command to DIG, including Specialist Medical Officers/GDMOs with PG whose cases are being decided manually, a **Transfer Standing Committee** of Officers is hereby constituted as under:*

Chairman : ADG (Ops)

Member-I : IG (Pers)

Member-II : IG (Ops)

Member-III : DIG (Wel)

Convener : DIG (Pers)

Note: IG (Comn) and Director(Medical) will be co-opted members for the transfers of Comn. Officers and Specialist Medical Officers/GDMOs with PG respectively.

- (b) *The Board of Officers will propose/suggest the transfer of officers after considering all aspects viz administrative and operational feasibility of the Force, vacancy position and nature of requests etc and submit their recommendations for approval of the Competent Authority.*
- (c) *The above constituted Standing Committee will also submit their recommendations while deciding the cases of transfer on promotions, transfer on administrative/operational grounds, compassionate grounds etc.*

Para : 13

- (a) *The following **Transfer Representation Standing Committee** is hereby constituted to examine the representations relating to transfers of officers from Second-in-Command to DIG including Specialist Medical Officers/GDMOs with PG :-*

<i>Chairman</i>	<i>:</i>	<i>ADG (Hqrs)</i>
<i>Member-I</i>	<i>:</i>	<i>IG (Int)</i>
<i>Member-II</i>	<i>:</i>	<i>IG (Trg)</i>
<i>Member-III</i>	<i>:</i>	<i>DIG (Ord)</i>

- (b) *The above Committee will critically scrutinize the representations of the officers considering the vacancy position, ground of request of the officers, Adm/Ops feasibility of the Force etc and submit their recommendations for approval of the Competent Authority.”*

7.2. On a conjoint reading of Para-12 and Para-13 of the said addendum, it becomes apparent that the addendum issued on 28.02.2024 flows from the original Standing Order No.05/2022 dated 27th September, 2022, and establishment of “Transfer Standing Committee of Officers” and “Transfer Representation Standing Committee” is an internal mechanism adopted by the respondent organization. Keeping in view the existing complexities in the efficient governance consistent with the administrative and operational requirements, the organization needs to protect the security and sovereignty of the nation. Furthermore, Standing Committees are constituted to secure the transparency in the system of consideration of representations relating to transfer of CRPF officers. The power is vested upon the Standing Committee to critically scrutinize various aspects or any of the grievances raised or agitated

in one's representation, considering the vacancy position, grounds of request of the officers, administrative and operational feasibilities of the respondent organization, and, after such careful examination of the merits of the representation, recommendations are made to the competent authority for approval. So, in the opinion of this Court, the entire process of consideration of representations relating to transfer of designated officers has been made more healthy in the Force. As such, in the opinion of this Court, challenge to the authority of the establishment of the "Transfer Representation Standing Committee" is bereft of any merit.

7.3. In the instant case, the first representation made by the petitioner had been forwarded to the "Transfer Representation Standing Committee", which on consideration of the grievances raised by the petitioner, held not to interfere with the transfer order. Accordingly, it was communicated to the petitioner. The second representation which was made by the petitioner in terms of the direction of this Court was taken up and considered by the Director General, CRPF himself and it was disposed of vide order dated 28.05.2024. I have perused the said order.

7.4. Now, this Court will look into the fact whether the "Transfer Representation Standing Committee" had examined the grievances the petitioner made in his representation fairly and scrupulously. It appears that the competent authority has taken up all the points while disposing of the representation of the petitioner. The 3(three) points, the petitioner raised have been recapitulated at para 2 of the order dated 28.05.2024. Those 3(three) points are:

"a) Need to care for his ailing parents, being the only male child.

- b) His daughter's education in Class-X at Agartala-based school, and the potential disruption caused by a school change.*
- c) His impending superannuation on 31/07/2025."*

7.5. It was also observed in the said order that the representation of the petitioner was forwarded to the "Transfer Representation Standing Committee" constituted under Standing Order No.05/2022 for consideration and decision. It is observed in para 5 of the said order that the "Transfer Representation Standing Committee" considered his request sympathetically but could not accommodate it due to existing transfer policies. The decision of the Director General of CRPF was communicated to the officer through IG, Tripura Sector, vide Directorate Signal dated 24/04/2024. Thereafter, the said order concluded in the manner as under:

"10. Upon reviewing the officer's representation dated 13/05/2024, it is observed that the requests and grounds presented are identical to those in his earlier representation dated 08/04/2024. Moreover, the reasons provided lack merit and do not warrant consideration, as they are general in nature and do not offer any new or compelling arguments. Regarding the officer's request for cancellation of his transfer to MP Sector Headquarters and retention in Tripura Sector Headquarters as a terminal posting, it is noted that Standing Order No.05/2022 supersedes the earlier guidelines in Standing Order No.07/2014. As per Standing Order No.05/2022, paragraph 3(C), requests for transfer on compassionate grounds, including terminal posting, are considered based on merit, posting particulars, attached documents, available vacancies, and administrative and operational requirements. Shri Karma Bhutia, DIG is posted in Tripura Sector Hqr w.e.f. 09/08/2021 and completed over 2 years and 9 months period there. Besides, he had spent over 20 years in the North East Region in various postings throughout his career. Further, no document in support of illness of parents is submitted by the officer alongwith his representation. Shri Dinesh Singh, DIG (IRLA-3999) has reported on his transfer from O/O IG NES, Shillong to O/O IG Tripura Sector on 21/05/2024 (AN), therefore presently no post of DIG is vacant in the O/O IG Tripura Sector or anywhere in Tripura. Hence request of officer for his retention in Tripura Sector until superannuation, could not be accommodated on administrative and operational requirements.

11. The officer's earlier request for retention in Tripura Sector until superannuation, made on 08/04/2024, was considered sympathetically by the Transfer Representation Standing Committee but could not be accommodated due to existing transfer policies."

7.6. This decision of the Director General of CRPF was communicated by the Inspector General(Pers.) of the office of the Directorate General of CRPF to the petitioner.

8. Now, to consider the submission of learned senior counsel for the petitioner as regards the enforceability of rights conferred under Clause 3(C) of the Standing Order No.05/2022 dated 27th September, 2022, it is necessary to reproduce the said Clause, which reads as under:

"3(C) On Compassionate/Administrative/Operational Grounds:

*If an officer approaches for transfer on compassionate grounds, like medical ground, for couple posting, **terminal posting** or for any other reasons, concerned Unit/Sector will examine his case and if finds merit, case will be forwarded to Dte with the recommendations of appropriate authority. Decision in such cases will be taken based on posting particulars, attached documents, available vacancies and administrative, operational requirements.*

Similarly, if it is found that an officer needs to be transferred before completion of normal tenure due to administrative/operational requirements, his case will be similarly forwarded to Dte with reasons."

8.1. Terminal Posting is not defined in the Standing order No.05/2022. However, we may take the assistance of Standing Order No.07/2014 where Clause 4 deals with the terminal posting, which reads as under:

"4. Terminal Posting:

Terminal posting of 02 years to the requested place will be considered on case to case basis, if vacancy is available and posting at such place not availed during last four years."

8.2. On plain reading of Clause 3(C) of Standing Order No.05/2022 as referred to by learned senior counsel for the petitioner, it is gathered that the Terminal Posting can be a ground to consider the transfer of an officer in the

rank of Commandant or DIG. However, it is subject to availability of vacancies vis-à-vis the administrative and operational requirements. As discussed in the preceding paragraphs, the competent authority, in the instant case, has dealt with the grievances of the petitioner he raised in his representation and considered the case of the petitioner sympathetically. It is further held that there is no vacancy in Tripura Sector since another officer who also has been promoted to the rank of DIG has already joined as DIG in Tripura Sector. That apart, the transfer of the petitioner to MP Sector as DIG has been made on the basis of availability of vacancy therein and also on consideration of administrative exigencies.

9. In this situation, in my opinion, the exercise of power of judicial review conferred upon this Court under Article 226 of Constitution of India does not call for.

10. I have taken into consideration the decision as referred to by Mr. Deb, learned senior counsel for the petitioner in the case of *Kendriya Vidyalaya Sangathan (supra)*. It is said that though transfer is incidental to service and cannot be interfered ordinarily, however, it can be interfered if it is at the instance of any mala fide or if it is passed in violation of any statutory guidelines or any extraneous reasons. Similar observation has been made in the case of *Registrar General(supra)*. In the case of *Registrar General(supra)*, at para 71, the Hon'ble supreme Court held that "*The then Judge on the Transfer Committee, in his deposition before JIC, had clearly admitted that he had not gone into the annexures, which were attached with the representation of the petitioner.*" In that circumstance, the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that "*Non-consideration of the relevant material and consideration of the extraneous material would come into the realm of irrationality. An action which is*

arbitrary, irrational and unreasonable would be hit by Article 14 of the Constitution of India. We, therefore, find that the rejection of the representations of the petitioner dated 9-7-2014 and 11-7-2014, would also not stand the scrutiny of law.”

11. From the above observation of the Hon’ble Supreme Court in the case of **Registrar General(supra)** it is clear that while considering the representation of the petitioner of the said case, the Transfer Standing Committee could not consider all the documents enclosed to the representation. Furthermore, it considered some extraneous material which was definitely an arbitrary exercise of the jurisdiction vested upon the Transfer Standing Committee. True it is, when a responsibility is given to a Committee to consider each and every aspect of the representation, then, it is reasonable and legitimately expected that the said Committee would consider all the grievances raised and mentioned by a person in his representation. Moreover, in the case of **Registrar General (supra)**, the Transfer Standing Committee had considered some extraneous materials which formed the decision making process arbitrary, irrational and unreasonable. It is not the case here.

12. In the instant case, what this Court finds that the respondents have considered each and every point raised by the petitioner in his representation. All the points were considered and dealt with by the Transfer Representation Standing Committee. As I have already stated that the second representation which was submitted at the direction of the Court, was considered and decided by the Director General of CRPF himself. He meticulously perused and considered the grievances raised by the petitioner in his representation as regards the education of his daughter as well as illness of his old-aged parents. The Director General also had observed that no supporting documents of illness

and treatment of his parents had been enclosed with the representation. The Director General also took into consideration the recommendation made by the Standing Committee. On being analyzed each and every factors and keeping in mind the administrative requirements, the Director General had taken a conscious view to reject the representation of the petitioner directing him to join his new place of posting at MP Sector as DIG. In this circumstance, in my opinion, it will not be proper for this Court to sit as an appellate authority over the decision of the competent authority and interfere with the impugned order of transfer.

13. Though not referred to, there is yet another important aspect to be noticed. Clause 5 of Standing Order No.05/2022 plays a vital role to decide the merits of the present writ petition, which reads as under:

“5. Tenure of Posting:

- (a) The normal tenure of all officers under this policy will be 03 years subject to the provisions of para 5(b) of this S.O.*
- (b) As CRPF is Central Armed Police Force of GoI constituted under Special Act and is tasked with important operational duties regarding maintenance of security of the nation, therefore there are certain operational and administrative requirements of the Force. In view of such requirements, any officer may be posted to any Unit or office at any point of time. The above policy does not create any right for any officer for posting to a particular place or for a particular tenure as mentioned in Para-5(a).*

If during the posting of any officer it comes to the notice of the supervisory/senior authorities that officer needs to be transferred out at any time from present place due to administrative or operational reasons, then the concerned authority may transfer such officer at any time to a suitable place.”

14. On bare perusal of the above clause, it comes to fore that CRPF Organization is a Central Armed Police Force of Government of India and is vested with solemn duties and responsibilities in regard to maintenance of security of the nation and certainly there would be requirements of posting of

any officer to any Unit or office at any point of time to meet the exigencies of the Force. It is clearly stated under Clause 5 that the policy under the aforesaid Standing Order laying down the guidelines for transfer does not create any right for any officer for posting to a particular place or for a particular tenure. In other words, no officer can claim transfer at a place of his choice as a matter of right. That apart, the framers of the guidelines have given specific right or power upon the supervisory or senior authorities of the Force to transfer any officer at any point of time to any place keeping in view the administrative and operational requirements.

15. In my opinion, Clause 5 gives a power to the concerned authority to pass necessary order in regard to all matters incidental or ancillary to the provisions laid down in the Standing Order No.05/2022 to enhance or to bring efficiency in the administration of the CRPF Organization. The doctrine of incidental or ancillary powers is well recognized in the Indian Law. The said doctrine postulates that statutory authority is endowed with ancillary and incidental powers which are necessary to discharge the functions effectively for the purpose of doing justice to the parties.

16. In the considered view of this Court, incidental and ancillary power can be exercised to subvert or abrogate any statutory rules or guidelines. Such power is exercised to enforce a provision effectively, but not to usurp.

17. From the aforesaid discussions, it can easily be said that the competent authority i.e., Director General of CRPF has not exercised his discretionary power arbitrarily. He has considered each and every aspects, the petitioner has agitated in his representation. However, considering the administrative and operational exigencies the competent authority i.e. the

Director General has become unable to accede to the request made by the petitioner.

18. In the instant case, the petitioner has not alleged mala fides. In view of the aforesaid discussions and the reasons recorded here-in-above, the challenge to the decision of the respondents, rejecting the prayer of the petitioner not to give effect to the impugned transfer order to the office of the IG, MP Sector is found to be not legally tenable and thus, is bereft of merit.

19. As sequel, the instant writ petition stands dismissed. However, there shall be no order as to costs.

The interim order passed on 07.05.2024 stands vacated.

Pending application(s), if any, also stands dismissed.

The related files containing various notes of the respondents placed before this Court are returned to learned Dy. SGI.

JUDGE

Snigdha

**SANJAY
GHOSH** Digitally signed by
SANJAY GHOSH
Date: 2024.07.18
16:27:46 +05'30'