

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

**Letters Patent Appeal No.1117 of 2016
Arising out of
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 432 of 2016**

=====

Santosh Kumar Singh, Manager/officer Scale II(IT), Regional office, Madhya Bihar Gramin Bank, Ramanauj Bhawan, A.P. Colony, Gaya 823001

.... Appellant/s

Versus

1. Chairman, Madhya Bihar Gramin Bank, Head Office Mina Plaza, South of Museum, Patna 800001
2. Functional Manager, Madhya Bihar Gramin Bank, Head Office Mina Plaza, South of Museum, Patna 800001
3. Regional Manager, Regional office, Madhya Bihar Gramin Bank, Ramanauj Bhawan, A.P. Colony, Gaya 823001
4. Sanatan Kumar, Manager/officer Scale II, Madhya Bihar Gramin Bank, Head Office Mina Plaza, South of Museum, Patna 800001
5. Romil Rohit, Manager/officer Scale II (IT), Madhya Bihar Gramin Bank, Head Office Mina Plaza, South of Museum, Patna 800001
6. Dhananjay Kumar, Manager (HRD)/officer Scale II, Madhya Bihar Gramin Bank, Head Office Mina Plaza, South of Museum, Patna 800001
7. Om Prakash, Manager/officer Scale II (I.T.), Madhya Bihar Gramin Bank, Regional office, Ara

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance:

For the Appellant/s : Mr. Ravi Kumar, Advocate.
Mrs. Priya Choubey, Advocate.
Mr. Rajiv Ranjan Singh, Advocate.

For the M.B.G.B : Mr. Mahesh Narayan Parbat, Sr. Advocate.
Mr. Sanjay Kumar Jha, Advocate.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

and

HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR SINGH

ORAL JUDGMENT

(Per: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE)

Date: 16-03-2017

The petitioner has been transferred from Patna to Gaya.

Challenging the transfer, a writ petition was filed which was dismissed by the learned writ court, finding the transfer to be incidents of service and as the administrative discretion has been exercised in the matter by the Bank.



Having heard learned counsel for the parties, we find that in transferring the petitioner, no statutory rule or regulation has been violated nor any *mala fide* made out warranting reconsideration. However, after perusal of the representation of the petitioner, we find that the petitioner has ventilated his personal inconvenience which prevents him from carrying out the order of transfer. That being so, it is for the administrative authority to consider the aforesaid grievance ventilated in the representation and take a decision on the administrative side in accordance with law.

Accordingly, for the present, we find that no case is made out for making any further indulgence into the matter. However, liberty shall be available to the petitioner to file a representation afresh and it would be for the administrative authority to consider and take a decision in accordance with law with regard to the grievance of the petitioner.

With the aforesaid observation and liberty granted, the appeal stands disposed of.

(Rajendra Menon, CJ)

(Sudhir Singh, J)

Mishra/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	21.03.2017
Transmission Date	

