

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WA No. 530 of 2017***(Arising out of order dated 24/08/2017 in WPS No.4010/2017 of the learned Single Judge of this Court)*

Rohit Lal Verma S/o Shri Tulsi Ram Verma, Aged About 49 Years Working As Revenue Inspector, Abhanpur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh.

---- Appellant

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Department Of Revenue And Disaster Management, Mantralaya, Naya Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh.
2. Collector, Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh.

---- Respondents.

For Appellant	: Shri Aditya Tiwari, Advocate
For State	: Shri R.K. Gupta, Deputy Advocate General

Hon'ble Shri Thottathil B. Radhakrishnan, Chief Justice**Hon'ble Shri Sharad Kumar Gupta, Judge****Order On Board****Per Thottathil B. Radhakrishnan, Chief Justice****14/12/2017**

1. The petitioner is the appellant.
2. Heard the learned counsel for the appellant and the learned Deputy Advocate General.
3. While working as Patwari in Raipur, the petitioner was promoted as Revenue Inspector and posted at Raipur. That promotion/posting was on 10/05/2016. Petitioner took charge on 19/08/2016. On 14/08/2017 he was transferred from Raipur to Bijapur. By virtue of the transfer policy which was amended on 24/07/2017, an employee was eligible to be protected in a particular station for one year after being transfer to that station. The petitioner tries to seek the protection of continuity in Raipur as a Revenue

Inspector for the period of one year. The transfer policy only enables a person to be protected from transfer from a station to which he has been posted, thus, insulating him from transfer for one year from that station, unless administrative exigencies require otherwise. But, here the fact of the matter remains that the petitioner had been working in Raipur as a Patwari and he was promoted and posted at the same station. That obviously does not amount to a transfer, but a mere promotion without transfer from station. Therefore, his further transfer from Raipur to Bijapur cannot be questioned on the foundation that he became a Revenue Officer in Raipur only within one year. Raipur became his station even when he was Patwari and therefore his subsequent transfer to Bijapur while he was a Revenue Inspector does not in any manner violate the transfer policy. Hence, we do not find any error in the order of the learned Single Judge. This Writ Appeal is only to be dismissed. At the request of the learned counsel for the appellant we clarify that the dismissal of this writ appeal will not stand in the way of appellant making any representation to the executive authorities seeking any relief that may be available to him at that end.

4. Subject to what is said in the immediately preceding paragraph, this Writ Appeal is dismissed.

Sd/-

(Thottathil B. Radhakrishnan)
Chief Justice

Sd/-

(Sharad Kumar Gupta)
Judge