

NAFR**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR****Writ Petition (S) No. 2844 of 2017**

Ram Chandra Joshi S/o Shri Bhagat Ram Joshi, aged about 54 years,
 Hostel Supreintendent Post Matric Aadiwashi Balak Hostel, Tahsil
 Chhuikhadan, District Rajnandgaon, Chhattisgarh.

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State of Chhattisgarh through the Secretary, Department of School Education, Ministry, Mahanadi Bhawan, P. S. Rakhi, Naya Raipur, District Raipur (Chhattisgarh)
2. Commissioner, Aadim Jati Tatha Anusuchit Jati Vikas, Raipur, District Raipur (Chhattisgarh).
3. District Education Officer, Rajnandgaon, Chhattisgarh.
4. Sahayak Aayukt Adivashi Vikas Rajnandgaon, Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Shri Vinod Kumar Sharma, Advocate
For Respondent/State	:	Shri A. S. Kachhwaha, Additional Advocate General

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order On Board****05/07/2017**

The challenge in the present writ petition is the order dated 20.04.2017 whereby the petitioner has been transferred from Post Matric Tribal Boys Hostel, Chhuikhadan to Madhyamik Aashram, Bakarkata, Chhuikhadan.

2. A bare perusal of the impugned order itself reflects that the transfer of the petitioner has been made within the same Block. The petitioner substantively is a teacher who incidentally during the intervening period was assigned the responsibility of Hostel Superintendant, Post Matric Tribal Boys Hostel, Chhuikhadan.

3. At this juncture, counsel for the petitioner submits that the transfer of the petitioner as teacher would cause a great inconvenience to him in discharging his duty on account of not having worked as a teacher for quite sometime in the recent past.

4. It is settled position of law so far as transfer and posting are concerned. It is exclusively prerogative of the employer who has the right to decide the place of posting of an employee. The scope of judicial review by the High Court in exercise of its writ jurisdiction in the matter of transfer is very minimal. Accordingly, this Court does not find any strong case for interfering with the impugned order. The petition thus fails. As a consequence it stands rejected.

5. However, it would be left open for the petitioner to approach the concerned respondent by moving an appropriate representation for redressal of his grievances in accordance with the policy of the State Govt.

6. With the aforesaid observation, the present writ petition stands dismissed.

**Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
JUDGE**