



CGHC010396912026



2026:CGHC:43921

NAFR

## HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

GOURI  
MUDALIAR

Digitally signed by  
GOURI MUDALIAR  
Date: 2026.10.09  
18:49:14 +0530

### WPS No. 7410 of 2026

Kanhaiya Lal Sahu S/o Shri Dhanau Ram Sahu Aged About 44 Years  
Working As Sub Engineer, At Project Implementation Unit, Raipur,  
Chhattisgarh Rural Road Development Agency (Rural Engineering  
Services), Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh

... **Petitioner**

**versus**

**1** - State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Department Of  
Panchayat And Rural Development, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya,  
Naya Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh

**2** - Development Commissioner, Office Of Development Commissioner,  
Vikas Bhawan, North Block Sector 19, Nava Raipur, Atal Nagar, District  
Raipur Chhattisgarh

**3** - Chief Executive Officer, Chhattisgarh Rural Road Development  
Agency, Vikas Bhawan Civil Lines, Raipur, Chhattisgarh

**4** - Engineer In Chief, Office Of Development Commissioner, Vikas  
Bhawan, Nava Raipur, Atal Nagar, District Raipur Chhattisgarh

**5** - Chief Executive Officer, Zila Panchayat Raipur, District Raipur  
Chhattisgarh

**6** - Executive Engineer, Rural Engineering Services, Division Raipur,  
District Raipur Chhattisgarh

**7** - Chief Executive Officer, Zila Panchayat Naryanpur, District  
Narayanpur Chhattisgarh

**8**-Collector, District Raipur Chhattisgarh

**9** - Sandeep Kumar Sonboir, Working as Sub Engineer, At Project  
Implementation Unit, Balod Chhattisgarh

**... Respondents**

---

For Petitioner : Shri Jeet Ram Patel, Advocate.

For : Shri Vivek Verma, G.A.

Respondent/State

---

**SB: Hon'ble Shri Ravindra Kumar Agrawal, Judge**

**Order on Board**

**09/10/2026**

1. Challenge in this present writ petition is to the order dated 01/10/2026 passed by the respondent No.1 by which the petitioner's services have been transferred from Project Implementation Unit, Raipur to Project Implementation Unit, Narayanpur.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is working as Sub Engineer and posted at Project Implementation Unit, Raipur. By the impugned order of transfer dated 01/10/2026, his services have been transferred to

Naranyanpur and his name finds place at serial number 134 of the transfer list. The petitioner underwent a heart surgery in the year 2016 and is under supervision and regular care of the doctors at Doctor B.R. Ambedkar Memorial Hospital, Raipur. There is no advance medical facility at Narayanpur, therefore in view of the clause 1.10 of transfer policy dated 05/06/2025 the order of his transfer may quashed. He would also submit that the petitioner has already made his representation on 05/10/2026 to the authorities concerned as per clause 8 of the transfer policy dated 05/06/2025 which is pending for it's consideration, therefore the impugned order of his transfer may be quashed.

3. On the other hand, learned counsel appearing for the State opposes the submission made by learned counsel for the petitioner and submitted that the petitioner underwent the surgery in the year 2016 and as per their own document of periodical visit to the hospital, the doctor has opined that there is no fresh complication in the body of the petitioner. He would also submit that the petitioner has already made his representation which is pending for it's consideration before the authorities concerned and therefore there is no need to interfere in the impugned order.
4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the documents annexed with the petition.

5. The main grievance of the petitioner is that he is suffering from heart disease and he has been transferred from Raipur to Narayanpur where no proper medical facility is available and therefore the transfer of the petitioner might prejudice his health status and therefore his transfer order may be quashed. In support of the submission of learned counsel for the petitioner, he referred the medical treatment documents of the petitioner Annexure P-2.
6. Clause 1.10 of the transfer policy dated 05/06/2025 provided that if the employee requires continuous treatment or follow up routine check up, on the recommendation of the medical board he may be transferred at his desired place. The petitioner has already made his representation to the authorities concerned under clause 8 of the transfer policy for quashing of his transfer order on the basis that he is suffering from heart disease. Since the representation of the petitioner is already pending before the authorities concerned, this Court deems it appropriate to dispose of the present writ petition directing the authorities to decide the representation of the petitioner within a stipulated time frame.
7. Accordingly, the present writ petition is disposed of and such transfer redressal committee is directed to decide the representation of the petitioner within a period of 15 days from today.

8. Considering the medical condition of the petitioner and the medical ground raised by him in the petition, it is directed that till the decision of the representation of the petitioner by the transfer redressal committee, no coercive steps shall be taken against the petitioner pursuant to the transfer order dated 01/10/2026.

**Sd/-  
(Ravindra Kumar Agrawal)  
Judge**