

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPS No. 5802 of 2017**

- Ram Bahadur Singh (Wrongly Written As Bahadur Singh In The Impugned Order) S/o Shri Lallan Singh, Aged About 45 Years Posted As Patwari At Sariya, P. H. No. 16, Tahsil Baramkela, District Raigarh, Chhattisgarh.

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Revenue And Disaster Management Department, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, New Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
2. Deputy Secretary, State Of Chhattisgarh, Revenue And Disaster Management Department, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, New Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
3. Collector, Raigarh, District Raigarh, Chhattisgarh.

---- Respondent

For Petitioner
For Respondent /State

Mrs. Hameeda Siddique, Advocate
Mr. R. Tripathi, Panel Lawyer

Hon'ble Shri Justice Prashant Kumar Mishra**Order On Board****3/11/2017**

(1) Heard.

(2) Challenge in this petition is to the order dated 14.8.2017, by which, he has been transferred from Patwari Halka No.16, Tehsil Baramkela, District Raigarh to Tehsil Gharghoda, District Raigarh on administrative grounds.

(3) The ground raised by the petitioner is that the petitioner, who

is working on the post of Patwari, is undergoing training for Revenue Inspector and subsequent to the impugned order, he has already been relieved from the present place of posting. After taking 4 months training, the petitioner will join as Revenue Inspector, therefore, his posting as Patwari vide the impugned order is bad in law.

(4) Considering the facts situation of the case, it would be appropriate to allow the petitioner to prefer a representation before the concerned competent authority raising his grievance against the impugned transfer order.

(5) Let the petitioner prefer representation within a period of 04 weeks from today and thereafter, the concerned competent authority shall consider and decide the same within the next 8 weeks, in accordance with law and on its own merits.

(6) For a period of 12 weeks or till the representation is decided, whichever is earlier, the *status quo*, as it exists today, in respect of the petitioner's posting, shall be maintained.

(7) The writ petition is accordingly disposed of.

(8) It is made clear that this Court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the case and the respondent authorities shall decide the matter, on its own merits, strictly in accordance with law, without treating any observation made in this order, as opinion on the merits of the case.

Sd/-

Judge

(Prashant Kumar Mishra)