

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPS. No. 8261 of 2018**

Rajib Sinha S/o Late Shri Sudhir Kumar Sinha Aged About 43 Years R/o House No. 196-197, Lig Deendayal Awas, Village Gatapar, Abhanpur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh.

---- **Petitioner****Versus**

1. Corporation Bank Through The Managing Director, Head Office, P.B. No. 88, Mangaladevi Temple Road, Pandeshwar, Mangalore - 575001, District Mangaluru, Karnataka.
2. The Chief Manager (Pad) Bhopal Zone, Corporation Bank Zonal Office At R-11, Hardev Complex, F F Zone II, Mp Nagar Bhopal, District Bhopal Madhya Pradesh.
3. The Branch Manager, Corporation Bank, Branch - Urla, Abhanpur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh.

---- **Respondents**

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Manish Upadhyay, Advocate.
For State	:	Ms. Sunita Jai, PL.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order on Board****13.12.2018**

1. The limited grievance which the petitioner raises in this writ petition is that though after the order passed by this Court on 07.09.2018 in WPS No.5879/2018, the authorities concerned have till date not taken a decision on the representation of the petitioner.
2. The facts of the case in brief is that in WPS No.5879/2018 the petitioner had challenged the order of transferred dated 03.07.2018 this Court while deciding the said writ petition had dismissed the writ petition. However, this Court has given the liberty to the petitioner to approach the respondents for ventilating his grievances by making suitable representation. The grievance now the petitioner is that though after the order of this Court, he has made representation to the respondent but till date respondents has not taken any decision on the said representation and, therefore, an appropriate order be passed

directing the respondents to take a decision on the representation at the earliest.

3. The grievance of the petitioner seems to be a genuine for the reason that though this Court was not inclined to entertain the writ petition at the first instance, but this Court has made it clear that for redressal of his grievance, the petitioner has to approach the authorities in the department by making suitable representation. It is always expected that when an employee approaches the employer by way of representation, the same has to be decided as expeditiously as possible in accordance with the rules. The respondents cannot sit over the representation when they have been made by an employee particularly on the observation made by the high Court.
4. Given the said facts this Court is of the opinion that ends of the justice would be served if the petitioner is permitted to make a fresh representation to the respondent No.2 ventilating his grievance and on such representation being made, the respondents shall positively take a decision on the said representation within a period of three months from the date of receipt of representation of the petitioner.
5. With the aforesaid, observation the writ petition stands disposed off.

Sd /-

(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge