

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO

WRIT PETITION No.27489 OF 2018

DATED :06.08.2018

Between :

Smt P.Sunitha, W/o.B.Shankar,
Aged 36 yrs, LFL, HM, MPPS,
Res.H.No.6744, Bank Colony,
PR Pally, Sangareddy,
Sangareddy District.

.. Petitioner

And

The Commissioner & Director of School Education,
State of Telangana, Hyderabad & others.

... Respondents



This court made the following :

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO

WRIT PETITION No.27489 OF 2018

ORDER :

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned Government pleader for Services-I (TG).

2. Petitioner is working as Low Female Literacy (LFL) Head Master, MPPS School at Hathinoora, Sanga Reddy District from 20.12.2012. Consequent to lifting of ban on transfers the School Education Department notified transfer Rules vide G.O.Ms.No.16 dated 06.06.2018 of Telangana Teachers (Regulation of Transfers) Rules, 2018 (for short 'the Rules, 2018'). In accordance with the Rules, 2018, as petitioner has completed five years of service, she participated in the transfer counseling process and chosen five options including retention in the present place. In the transfer exercise undertaken by the respondents, petitioner is now identified as liable for transfer to MPPS, Peddapur in Sadasivapet Mandal, Medak District, which is the third option given by the petitioner.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner sought to contend that as petitioner was not liable for transfer, under mis-conception she applied for transfer. As it was a mistake on her part to apply for transfer, immediately she submitted representation. But ignoring her representation, the impugned order is passed.

4. As per the facts noted above, petitioner has completed even five years of service and opted for transfer and the place of posting given to her is one of the places opted by her. Thus, I do not see

any error in transferring the petitioner. It cannot be appreciated that after the transfer exercise is completed to claim that erroneously petitioner applied for transfer though she is not liable for transfer and therefore, she should not be transferred and should be retained at the present place of posting.

5. No manner of right vests in the petitioner to claim continuation in the same place, more so, when she has completed more than five years of service and has opted for transfer in the transfer counseling. There is no merit in the writ petition and the writ petition is liable to be dismissed.

6. Accordingly, the Writ Petition is dismissed. Pending miscellaneous petitions, if any, shall stand closed.

6th August, 2018
Rds

P.NAVEEN RAO,J

