

NAFR**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR****Writ Petition (S) No. 5564 of 2016**

Mohammad Ayub Shekh S/o Mohammad Shafee Shekh, aged about 52 years, presently posted as Forester Range Assistant at Manpur, North Manpur Division Rajnandgaon, R/o Forest Colony, Manpur, Tahsil Manpur, District Rajnandgaon, (Chhattisgarh)

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State of Chhattisgarh through the Secretary, Forest Department, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Naya Raipur, Raipur, (Chhattisgarh)
2. Under Secretary, Forest Department, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Naya Raipur, Raipur, (Chhattisgarh)
3. Principal Chief Conservator of Forest, Raipur, District Raipur, (Chhattisgarh)
4. Divisional Forest Officer, Rajnandgaon, District Rajnandgaon, (Chhattisgarh)
5. Forest Ranger Officer North Manpur Division Rajnandgaon, District Rajnandgaon, (Chhattisgarh)
6. Pawan Singh Sahare, Deputy Ranger, Sub Zone Joab, Baghnadi, Forest Division, Rajnandgaon, District Rajnandgaon, (Chhattisgarh)

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Shri Mateen Siddiqui, Advocate
For State/R-1 to 5	:	Shri Majid Ali, Panel Lawyer
For Respondent no.6	:	Shri M. K. Jaiswal, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order On Board****23/03/2017**

Challenge in the present writ petition is Annexure P-1 dated 30.07.2016.

2. The petitioner who is said to be posted as Forester Range Assistant at Manpur, North Manpur Division Rajnandgaon is going to be affected by the impugned order in as much as the person whose name is reflected at serial no.11 i.e. respondent no.6 also has been transferred at the same place where the petitioner is working.

3. The respondents have filed their reply stating that the substantive posting of the petitioner shall not be affected in any manner in compliance of the impugned order so far as respondent no.6 is concerned. The reply of the State also does not reflect that the petitioner's service would be adversely affected if respondent no.6 is permitted to join his place of posting at North Manpur Range under Sub Range Manpur, Forest Division, Rajnandgaon.

4. Be that as it may, this Court is not inclined to keep the petition pending any further. The petitioner has been given an interim protection of continuing his services at his place of posting by virtue of the order passed by this Court on 16.10.2016. Since the impugned order does not reflect the name of the petitioner, that means, the petitioner has been permitted to continue discharge of his duties at the place where he was working before passing of the impugned order.

5. The disposal of the Writ Petition should not come in the way of the Respondent State in issuing appropriate orders on administrative exigency including the posting of the petitioner.

6. However, till then the petitioner is entitled to continue at his present substantive place of posting and it is ordered accordingly.

7. Thus, the present writ petition stands disposed of.

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