

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**WPS No. 6385 of 2019**

Rakesh Kumar Shrivastav S/o Shri Ram Prasad Shrivastav Aged About 61 Years Presently Posted As Draughtsman (Civil) At Office Of Chief Engineer, Mahanadi Project, Water Resources Department Raipur, R/o Lal Bahadur Shashtri Ward, Bhatapara, District Baloda Bazar Bhatapara, Chhattisgarh., District : Balodabazar-Bhathapara, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Water Resources Department, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Naya Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh., District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Under Secretary Water Resources Department, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Naya Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh., District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. Engineer In Chief Water Resources Department Shivnath Bhawan, North Block Sector 19, Atal Nagar Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh., District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh
4. Chief Engineer Mahanadi Project, Water Resources Department, Shahis Bhagat Singh Chowk, Civil Line G.E. Road Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh., District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh
5. Superintendent Engineer Water Resources Department Atal Nagar Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh., District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Ishan Verma, Advocate
For State	:	Mr. Chandresh Shrivastava, Dy. AG

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order on Board****26/08/2019**

1. The challenge in the present writ petition is to the order Annexure P-1 dated 13.08.2019. Vide the said impugned order the respondent No. 2 is said to have deleted the name of petitioner from the proposed transfer

order Annexure P-5 whereby the petitioner on his request was transferred from Raipur to Tilda.

2. Considering the fact that impugned order is only deleting the name of petitioner, this Court does not find any substantive right of the petitioner infringed which can be subjected to judicial review under service jurisprudence before this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. The writ petition thus totally being devoid of merits stands rejected.
3. The petitioner would always have the liberty to approach the authorities for an appropriate relief. In case, if the petitioner makes suitable representation, it is expected that authorities would consider the case of the petitioner in terms of policy governing the field.
4. With the aforesaid directions, the writ petition stands rejected.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge

Rohit