

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPS No. 6922 of 2019**

1. Santosh Kumar Khatel, S/o - Late Malik Ram Khatel, Aged About 29 Years, Occupation - Service, Posted As Rural Agriculture Extension Officer (R.A.E.O.) At Block Sarangarh District: Raigarh Under Office Of The Senior Agriculture Development Officer (S.A.D.O.) Sarangarh, District: Raigarh, Chhattisgarh, R/o - Government Quarter No. R-40, Dr. Chandrashekhar Chandel Colony, Sarangarh, District: Raigarh, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Department Of Agriculture And Farmer Welfare, State Of Chhattisgarh Mahanadi Bhawan Mantralaya, Nava Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Director, Directorate Agriculture And Farmer Welfare, State Of Chhattisgarh Raipur Chhattisgarh
3. Deputy Director Agriculture And Farmer Welfare, Department Of State Of Chhattisgarh Raigarh District Raigarh Chhattisgarh
4. Sub Divisional Officer Agriculture And Farmer Welfare, Department Of State Of Chhattisgarh At Sarangarh District Raigarh Chhattisgarh
5. Senior Agriculture Development Officer At Office Of The Senior Agriculture Development Officer, Sarangarh District Raigarh Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. S.N. Nande, Advocate
For State	:	Mr. Chandresh Shrivastava, Dy. A.G.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order On Board****05.09.2019**

1. The challenge in the present Writ Petition is to the order of transfer Annexure P-1 dated 21.08.2019 passed by the respondents

transferring the petitioner from Office of the Senior Agriculture Development Officer, Block: Sarangarh, Tehsil and District: Raigarh, (C.G.) to Office of the Senior Agriculture Development Officer, Block: Dabhra, District: Janjgir Champa, (C.G.).

2. The challenge to the transfer order is on the ground that the impugned order reflects the transfer of the petitioner to have been made at the request of the petitioner.
3. According to counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner has never moved any application nor has requested for any order of transfer, yet the authorities have shown the order of transfer to have been on its own cost.
4. Given the limited grievance that the petitioner has raised challenging the order of transfer, this Court is of the opinion that subject to verification of the fact that whether the petitioner has made a request for transfer, the impugned order so far as the petitioner is concerned, shall not be given effect to. However, on verification, if it is found that the petitioner has in fact made a request, then the impugned order would not stand interfered and the respondents would be at liberty to relieve the petitioner from the present place of posting.
5. Meanwhile, till the verification is done, the effect and operation of the impugned order, so far as the petitioner is concerned, shall not be given effect to.
6. The present Writ Petition, accordingly stands disposed off.

Sd/-
P. Sam Koshy
Judge