

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WRIT PETITION (S) NO.2032 OF 2019**

1. Bendicta Kerketta W/o Shri Devnish Kerketta Aged About 62 Years Occupation Service, Posted As Project Officer, Ekikrit Bal Vikas Pariyojana, Bilaigarh, District- Balodabajar-Bhatapara, Chhattisgarh.

...Petitioner(s)**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through-Secretary, Women And Child Development Department Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Capital Complex, Atal Nagar, District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh, District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Collector, Balodabajar, District- Balodabajar-Bhatapara, Chhattisgarh, District : Balodabazar-Bhathapara, Chhattisgarh
3. District Program Officer, Women And Child Development Department Balodabajar, District- Balodabazar-Bhatapara, Chhattisgarh, District : Balodabazar-Bhathapara, Chhattisgarh
4. Smt. Priyanka Kiran Project Officer Ekikrit Bal Vikas Pariyojana Bhatgaon, District- Balodabajar-Bhatapara, Chhattisgarh, District : Balodabazar-Bhathapara, Chhattisgarh

... Respondent(s)

For Petitioner	:	Shri Sumit Shrivastava, Advocate.
----------------	---	-----------------------------------

For Respondent-State	:	Shri Ishan Verma, Panel Lawyer.
----------------------	---	---------------------------------

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order on Board****20.03.2019**

1. The challenge in this petition is the order dated 26.02.2019 whereby the respondents had withdrawn drawing and disbursement powers from the petitioner while working on the post of Project Officer, Ekikrit Bal Vikas Pariyojna, Bilaigarh.
2. At the outset, this court is not inclined to entertain this petition for the reason that the impugned order does not in any manner adversely affect any of the service conditions conferred upon the petitioner in as much as there is no change of place of posting of the petitioner, no reduction of salary to the petitioner, no curtailment of emoluments payable to the petitioner. The administrative position of the petitioner would remain intact except of the drawing and disbursement powers.

3. Given the aforesaid facts and circumstances, this court is of the opinion that no case is made out calling for interference by this court invoking writ jurisdiction under Article, 226 of the Constitution of India. The writ petition could have been entertained only in case there is civil consequence or the order passed is detrimental to the interest of the petitioner. Withdrawing certain powers which are otherwise conferred upon the petitioner by itself cannot be said to be detrimental nor a stigmatic order having an adverse bearing on the petitioner's service condition.
4. The writ petition accordingly being devoid of merit deserves to be and is dismissed.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge