

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**WPS No. 7343 of 2019**

Nehru Singh Maravi @ Nehru Singh Meravi S/o Late Shri Tehari Singh Maravi @ Tehari Singh Meravi Aged About 52 Years Occupation Service (Draughtsman/ Manchitrakar), In The Office Of Assistant Soil Conservation Officer, Ramanujganj, District Balrampur Ramanujganj Chhattisgarh., District : Balrampur, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. The State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Department Of Agriculture, New Mantralaya, Atal Nagar, Raipur Chhattisgarh., District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. The Secretary Department Of General Administration, New Mantralaya, Atal Nagar, Raipur Chhattisgarh., District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. The Director Department Of Agriculture, Atal Nagar, Raipur Chhattisgarh., District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh
4. The Collector Balrampur, Ramanujganj Chhattisgarh., District : Balrampur, Chhattisgarh
5. The Collector (Kawardha), Kabirdham Chhattisgarh., District : Kawardha (Kabirdham), Chhattisgarh
6. Assistant Soil Conservation Officer Ramanujganj, District Balrampur Ramanujganj Chhattisgarh., District : Balrampur, Chhattisgarh
7. Assistant Soil Conservation Officer Kawardha (Kabirdham), District Kabirdham Chhattisgarh., District : Kawardha (Kabirdham), Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Vivek Bhakta, Advocate
For State	:	Mr. Chandresh Shrivastava, Dy. A.G.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order on Board****11/09/2019**

1. The challenge in the present writ petition is to the impugned order Annexure P/1 dated 21.08.2019 whereby the services of the petitioner has been transferred from the office of Assistant Soil Conservation Officer Ramanujganj District Balrampur, Ramanujganj to the office of Assistant Soil Conservation Officer, Kabirdham.

2. The challenge in the transfer order is on the ground that the impugned order reflects 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 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 facts 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, in case 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

Ved