

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

WPS No. 5502 of 2016

Gyan Dev Pandey S/o Shri Muniram Pandey, Aged About 48 Years
Posted As Cooperative Inspector At Office Of The Deputy Registrar
Cooperative Societies Bilaspur R/o Vaishyapuram Colony Face 1,
H. No D -3, Seepat Road Bilaspur, Distirct Bilaspur Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Cooperative Department, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Naya Raipur, Raipur Chhattisgarh
2. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Its Secretary General Administration Department, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Naya Raipur, Raipur Chhattisgarh
3. Under Secretary Cooperative Department, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Naya Raipur, Raipur Chhattisgarh
4. Committee Of Senior Secretary, Mahanadi Bhawan Naya Raipur District Raipur Chhattisgarh
5. Registrar, Cooperative Societies, Indrawati Bhawan, Mantralaya Naya Raipur Raipur Chhattisgarh
6. Deputy Registrar, Cooperative Societies, Old Composite Building Bilaspur Chhattisgarh
7. D.K. Patil Presently Posted As Cooperative Inspector At Office Of The Deputy Registrar, Cooperative Societies, Bilaspur District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Mateen Siddiqui, Advocate
For State/Respondent	:	Mr. B. Gop Kumar, Dy. A.G.

S.B.:Hon'ble Shri Justice Manindra Mohan Shrivastava

Order On Board

26/10/2016

Heard on admission.

1. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that representation has been rejected on the ground that in the transfer policy of 2016-17, there is

no specific guidelines with regard to posting of employees suffering from disability.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner draws attention of this Court to a circular dated 30.08.2010 issued by the State Government in the matter of their posting.

3. Learned State counsel submits that this is a policy of 2010 and it cannot be said that today also, it is applicable.

4. Be that as it may, it appears that in the policy of 2016-17, there was no specific clause, therefore, the representation has been rejected, therefore, the matter does not call for any interference by this Court as a representation has been rejected and considering the nature and extent of disability as also the place where the petitioner has been transferred. However, the respondents may consider whether the earlier policy dated 30.08.2010 should be considered in respect of persons suffering with disability and any policy decision is taken, it will be open for them to again take into consideration the petitioner's case as early as possible.

5. The petition is accordingly disposed off.

Sd/-
(Manindra Mohan Shrivastava)
Judge