

**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**  
**WPS No. 2458 of 2018**

- Gopal Das Manikpuri S/o Johan Das Manikpuri, Aged About 53 Years Posted As Assistant Revenue Inspector, Nagar Panchayat, Simga, District Balodabazar Bhatapara Chhattisgarh.

---- **Petitioner**

**Versus**

1. State of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Urban Administration And Development Department, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, New Raipur Chhattisgarh.
2. The Under Secretary, Government Of Chhattisgarh, Department Of Urban Administration And Development, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, New Raipur Chhattisgarh.
3. The Chief Municipal Officer Nagar Panchayat, Simga, District Balodabazar Bhatapara Chhattisgarh.

---- **Respondents**

---

|                |   |                                            |
|----------------|---|--------------------------------------------|
| For Petitioner | : | Shri Vivek Ranjan Tiwari, Advocate         |
| For State      | : | Shri Dheeraj Wankhede, Government Advocate |

---

**Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**  
**Order on Board**

**21.03.2018**

1. Challenge in this petition is to the order dated 12.03.2018 by which he has been transferred from Nagar Panchayat, Simga to Nagar Panchayat, Fingeshwar on the ground of administrative exigency.
2. The ground raised by the petitioner is that the impugned order has been passed without their being any administrative exigency and as such, the same is in violation of the transfer policy issued by the State Government.
3. 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.
4. Let the petitioner prefer representation within a period of 03 weeks from today and thereafter, the concerned competent authority shall consider and decide the same within the next 7 weeks, in accordance with law and on its own merits.

5. For a period of 10 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.
6. The writ petition is accordingly disposed of.
7. 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/-  
**(P. Sam Koshy)**  
**JUDGE**