



CGHC010399252026



2026:CGHC:44149

NAFR**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR****WPS No. 7483 of 2026**

Vishnu Narayan Nath Singh Rathore S/o. Shri Rang Nath Rathore
Aged About 52 Years R/o. Village And Post - Gatora, Tehsil - Masturi,
P.S. Masturi, District - Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh.

... Petitioner(s)**versus**

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Department Of
Panchayat And Rural Development, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bahwan,
Atal Nagar, Naya Raipur, District - Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

2 - The Director Directorate Of Panchayat And Rural Development,
Mantralaya, Indrawati Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Naya Raipur, District -
Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

3 - The Chief Executive Officer Zila Panchayat Mahasamund, District
- Mahasamund, C.G.

4 - The Chief Executive Officer Janpad Panchayat Basna, District -
Mahasamund, C.G.

5 - The Chief Executive Officer Zila Panchayat Bijapur, District - Bijapur, C.G.

6 - The Chief Executive Officer Janpad Panchayat Bhopalpatnam, District - Bijapur, C.G.

7 - The Collector District - Mahasamund, C.G.

... Respondent(s)

(Cause title taken from CIS)

For Petitioner(s) : Shri Vivek Kumar Agrawal, Advocate

For Respondent(s) : Shri S.S. Baghel, Govt. Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Bibhu Datta Guru, Judge

Order on Board

13.10.2026

1. The petitioner has filed the present writ petition challenging the transfer order dated 01.10.2026 (Annexure P/1), whereby he has been transferred from Janpad Panchayat Basna, District Mahasamund, to Janpad Panchayat Bhopalpatnam, District Bijapur, while working as a Sub-Engineer under the Rural Engineering Services.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the impugned transfer order is contrary to the Chhattisgarh Transfer Policy, 2025, as the petitioner, being a Class-III employee, could not

have been transferred from Raipur Division to Bastar Division without any administrative exigency or special circumstances. It is further submitted that vacant posts are available at Mahasamund and that the petitioner is suffering from medical ailments requiring regular medical treatment. According to the petitioner, the transfer place is situated at a distance of about 500 kms from the present place of posting, which is scheduled area. He would submit that the order impugned has been passed without his consent. It is also contended that the representation dated 02.10.2026 submitted by the petitioner has not been decided.

3. Per contra, learned State counsel opposes the petition and submits that transfer is an incidence of service and the petitioner has no vested right to remain posted at a particular place. It is further submitted that the transfer order has been issued in the administrative interest and no illegality or statutory violation warranting interference by this Court has been demonstrated.
4. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material available on record.

5. It is well settled that an employee has no vested right to remain posted at a particular place. The petitioner has failed to establish that the impugned transfer order violates any statutory provision or is vitiated by mala fides or arbitrariness. The mere availability of vacant posts at the present place of posting or the personal and medical difficulties pleaded by the petitioner does not, by itself, render the transfer order illegal. Further, no consent of the petitioner is ordinarily required for effecting a transfer unless mandated by a specific statutory provision or service rule, which has not been demonstrated in the present case. The pendency of the petitioner's representation also does not, by itself, invalidate the impugned order. The petitioner failed to establish any plausible ground to interfere with the order impugned.
6. In view of the foregoing, this Court finds that no ground for interference with the impugned transfer order is made out. Accordingly, the writ petition is **dismissed**.

Sd/-

(Bibhu Datta Guru)

JUDGE