

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPS No. 6878 of 2019

1. Jogeshwar Prasad Pande, S/o - Kondand Dhar Pande, Aged About 61 Years, Presently Working As Ranger, Range Darbha, Bastar Forest Division, Jagdalpur, District: Bastar, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Forest Department, Mantralaya Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar Raipur, District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Chief Conservator Of Forest, Jagdalpur, Circle: Jagdalpur, District: Bastar, Chhattisgarh
3. Divisional Forest Officer, Bastar, Forest Division, Jagdalpur District: Bastar, Chhattisgarh
4. N.K. Sinha, Forest Guard, Circle Officer, Chaitma Forest Division, Katghora, District: Korba, Chhattisgarh

---Respondent

For Applicant	:	Mr. C. Jayant K. Rao, Advocate.
For State	:	Mr. Ayaz Naved, Govt. Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy

Order on Board

03.09.2019

1. The challenge in the present Writ Petition is to the impugned order Annexure P-1 dated 23.08.2019, in the impugned order the name of the petitioner is not reflected.
2. The grievance of the petitioner is that, the name of the Respondent No. 04 has been reflected in the impugned order at two places, one at Sr. No. 04 as well as at Sr. No. 72 and the place of transfer to both

these places are different and the place on which the respondent is being transferred at Sr. No. 04 is the place, where the petitioner is presently working.

3. The contention of the petitioner is that, the petitioner is going to retire in the month of February, 2020. According to the petitioner, in case if the Respondent No. 4 stands relieved to the place shown at Sr. No. 4 then the petitioner is likely to get disturbed.
4. This Court is of the firm opinion that, the writ petition at this stage may not be maintainable for the reason that, the impugned order does not bear the name of the petitioner nor does the impugned order show any dislodging of the petitioner from the present place of posting, until and unless the petitioner himself gets disturbed by a specific order pertaining to the petitioner, the writ petition challenging the order which does not bear the name of the petitioner would not be maintainable.
5. Reserving the right of the petitioner to approach the respondent authorities, so far as the grievance of the petitioner is concerned and also to approach this Court in the event of any adverse order being passed against him. The present Writ Petition is not maintainable and stands disposed off.

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