

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**WPS No. 4382 of 2018**

Smt. Digeshwari Norge W/o Shri Chhote Lal Norge, Aged About 40 Years  
R/o C/o Ashwani Kumar Khande, Pamgarh, Behind Block Office, Pamgarh.  
District Janjgir Champa Chhattisgarh

---- **Petitioner**

**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Department Of Agriculture, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Naya Raipur Chhattisgarh.
2. Dy. Director Of Agriculture, District Janjgir Champa Chhattisgarh., District : Janjgir-Champa
3. Collector, District Janjgir Champa Chhattisgarh

---- **Respondents**

---

|                |   |                                 |
|----------------|---|---------------------------------|
| For petitioner | : | Mr. Vineet K. Pandey, Advocate. |
| For State      | : | Mr. Chandresh Shrivastava, PL   |

---

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy

Order on Board

13/12/2018

1. The challenge in the present writ petition is to the order Annexure P-1 dated 15/05/2018. Vide impugned order, the petitioner has been transferred from Doga, Kahrod Block Pamgarh to Assistant Soil Examination Officer, Janjgir. The impugned order is dated 15/5/2018. The writ petition was filed on 24/06/2018, though more than seven months have passed, on a query being put to the petitioner, he says that order of transfer has not till date been complied with by the petitioner and the petitioner is continuously absent from duty.
2. According to the petitioner she is substantively holding the post of Rural Agricultural Extension Officer and now she is being posted as Assistant Soil Examination Officer. On another query being put by this Court, he fairly admits that petitioner's pay 2 allowances and other benefits would not be adversely affected vide impugned order.

3. Moreover, it is found that when the petitioner works in the field the work as Rural Agriculture Extension Officer and when they are posted in the laboratory, they are known as Assistant Soil Examination Officer.

4. Given the facts, this Court does not find any strong case made out by the petitioner calling for an interference with the impugned order.

5. The writ petition thus fails and is rejected. The rejection of the writ petition would not preclude the petitioner from approaching the respondents by making suitable representation in respect of change of posting.

Sd/-

**(P. Sam Koshy)**  
**JUDGE**

Rohit