

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

WPS No. 2806 of 2016

1. Rajesh Kumar Dixit S/o Late Revti Prasad Dixit, Aged About 59 Years R/o Kanya Parisar Road, Behind, Sheetal Kirana Store, Namnakala, Ambikapur, Police Station And Post Ambikapur, Civil And Revenue District Surguja, (Chhattisgarh)

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through: Secretary, Panchayat & Gramin Vikas Vibhag, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, Capital Complex, Naya Raipur, District Raipur, (Chhattisgarh)
2. Director, Panchayat & Gramin Vikas Vibhag, Directorate, Indrawati Bhawan, Naya Raipur, District Raipur, (Chhattisgarh)
3. Chief Executive Officer, Zila Panchayat, Balrampur, District Balrampur Ramanujganj, (Chhattisgarh)
4. Chief Executive Officer , Janpad Panchayat, Rajpur, District Balrampur- Ramanujganj, (Chhattisgarh)
5. S. L. Gupta, Assistant Grade- II, Janpad Panchayat, Ramchandrapur, Police Station And Post, Ramchandrapur, Civil District Surguja, Revenue District Balrampur- Ramanujganj, (Chhattisgarh)

---- Respondent

For Petitioner	Shri Manoj Paranjape, Advocate
For Respondent/State	Shri Satish Gupta, Govt. Advocate
For Respondent No.3&4	Shri R.S. Baghel, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice Prashant Kumar Mishra

Order On Board

28/04/2017

1. By order dated 22-8-2015 the petitioner was transferred from Janpad Panchayat Ramanujganj to Janpad Panchayat Rajpur. The petitioner

complied with the order and joined at Rajpur on 2-9-2015, however, on 29-6-2016 the order was cancelled and the petitioner was posted at Janpad Panchayat, Ramchandrapur.

2. The order dated 29-6-2016 has been stayed by this Court on 12-7-2016. Thus, the petitioner is continuing at Rajpur from 2-9-2015 including the period when the interim order passed by this Court is operative.
3. There is some dispute as to whether the petitioner wants to continue with this petition or not, however, without entering into that aspect of the matter, since the interim order is operative for last more than 9 months, ends of justice would be sub-served if the petition is disposed of with a direction that the respondents shall not insist upon implementation of the impugned order, however, they would be at liberty to pass fresh order depending upon the administrative exigency or on the application of the petitioner, if any such application is moved by him.
4. Accordingly, with the aforesaid observations the writ petition stands disposed of.
5. There shall be no order as to costs.

Sd/-

Judge

Prashant Kumar Mishra