

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**WPS No. 5228 of 2018**

Panchram Salaame S/o Shri Kanhaiya Lal Salaame Aged About 38 Years Posted Naib Tahsildar, Tahsil Office Nagri, District Dhamtari Chhattisgarh., District : Dhamtari, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner**Versus**

The State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Department Of Revenue And Disaster Management, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhavan, New Raipur Chhattisgarh.

----Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Devershi Thakur, Advocate
For State	:	Mr. R.K. Gupta, Dy. A.G.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order on Board****14/08/2018**

1. The challenge in the present writ petition is to the impugned order (Annexure P/1) dated 31.07.2018, whereby the services of the petitioner working as a Naib Tahsildar have been transferred from Nagri, Dhamtari to Balrampur.
2. The ground of challenge is the personal inconveniences, which the petitioner would face, if the order of transfer is acted upon, like he would have to be away from the family who are settled at Balod, which is his home station, where his wife and children are staying. The inconvenience also is that he would not be able to take care of his aged mother, who is staying along with him. Moreover the petitioner also submits that the petitioner's duty is unblemished and that the respondents have without any administrative exigency posted the petitioner at Balrampur.
3. All the grounds raised by the petitioner are all personal inconveniences which the petitioner may face in the course of

transfer. The law by now is well settled that the transfer is an incident of service and if the petitioner has chosen to work in government employment he is suppose to work at any of the places where the employer i.e. the State Government decides to post him. The employee for that matter cannot choose so far as the place of posting is concerned, neither can he as a matter of right claim of being posted only in or around 200 KMs from his home district Balod, so that he can meet his family regularly.

4. All these personal inconveniences cannot be a ground for the High Court in exercise of its writ jurisdiction to interfere with an order of transfer, which otherwise has been issued under administrative exigencies.
5. This Court is not inclined to interfere with the impugned order of transfer dated 31.07.2018. However, the petitioner would be at liberty to represent before the higher authorities in the department for reconsideration of his place of posting.
6. The writ petition thus stands dismissed with the aforesaid liberty.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge