

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**Writ Petition (S) No. 4818 of 2019**

Sudhir Soni S/o Shri Ramnath Soni, Aged About 39 Years, Posted As
Cadre Officer Grade III, Apex Bank, Sharda Chowk Branch, Raipur,
District Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Principal Secretary, Cooperative Department, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Naya Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. The Managing Director, Apex Bank Raipur, Head Office Indra Gandhi Vyavsayik Parisar, Pandri, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. The Branch Manager, Apex Bank Sharda Chowk Branch Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Shri Rakesh Pandey, Advocate
For State	:	Shri Jitendra Pali, Dy. A.G.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order On Board****01.07.2019**

1. The challenge in the present writ petition is to the order Annexure P-1 dated 25.06.2019 whereby the services of the petitioner have been transferred from Raipur to Raigarh.
2. The only ground which the petitioner has raised is that the petitioner on previous occasion was transferred on 29.03.2017 which was challenged before this Court vide WPS No.2018/17. This Court while disposing of the

said writ petition on 27.04.2017 only permitted the petitioner to make a representation against the said transfer order and on such representation being made, the respondents were directed to decide the same.

3. According to the counsel for the petitioner, till date there has been no decision taken on the said representation and therefore, the petitioner could not have been transferred again vide impugned order dated 25.06.2019
4. All said and done, the petitioner did not get an interim protection when the earlier writ petition was filed in 2017 and in spite of that the Department has not relieved the petitioner and now the petitioner has been transferred after about 3 years of service at the present place of posting.
5. Given the said fact, this Court does not find any strong case made out by the petitioner calling for an interference with the impugned order at this juncture. However, if the petitioner still feels aggrieved by the order, the only remedy left for the petitioner is to make a representation to the respondents.
6. The writ petition fails and is accordingly dismissed.

**Sd/-
P. Sam Koshy
Judge**