

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

WPS No. 2164 of 2017

- Pradeep Kumar Saxena, S/o Late J. P. Saxena, Aged About 60 Years, Posted As Senior Assistant (Marketing Federation), R/o Kelo Vihar Colony, Behind Collectorate Office, Raigarh, District Raigarh (Chhattisgarh)

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Department of Cooperative Societies, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya New Raipur, Post Office & Police Station Naya Raipur, District Raipur (Chhattisgarh)
2. Chhattisgarh State Cooperative Marketing Federation Limited, Through The Managing Director, Civil Lines, Head Office, Raipur (Chhattisgarh).
3. The Secretary, Chhattisgarh State Cooperative Marketing Federation Limited, 880, Civil Lines, Head Office, Raipur, (Chhattisgarh).
4. The Manager (Establishment), Chhattisgarh State Cooperative Marketing Federation Limited, 880, Civil Lines, Head Office, Raipur, (Chhattisgarh).

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	Shri D. P. Mishra, Advocate
For Respondent-State	Ms. Sunita Jain, PL

Hon'ble Shri Justice Prashant Kumar Mishra

Order On Board

08/05/2017

1. Petitioner is aggrieved by the order dated 14.10.2016, whereby he has been transferred from Baramkela, District Raigarh to Bharni, District Bilaspur.

2. Petitioner's earlier writ petition bearing WPS No.246/2017 was disposed of with liberty to the petitioner to prefer representation. It is mentioned in the order that the petitioner has already been relieved by giving effect to the transfer order. Merely because the representation has not yet been decided, the petitioner would not get a fresh cause of action to challenge the same order, which was under assail in the earlier writ petition. Moreover, the petitioner had preferred yet another writ petition bearing WPS No.1264/2017, in which some interim protection was allowed, however, since thereafter the representation has already been rejected vide Annexure-P-13.
3. Having seen the order rejecting petitioner's representation, there appears strong administrative exigency for petitioner's shifting to Bharni in the commercial interest of the respondents. Therefore, there is no scope for interference in this petition, it deserves to be and is hereby dismissed.

Sd/-

JUDGE

PRASHANT KUMAR MISHRA

Nirala