

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPS No. 9332 of 2019**

Smt. Sevati Sahu, W/o Late Shri Lekhram Sahu, Aged About 52 Years,
Working As Rural Health Coordinator (Female), Sub Health Center, Kusmi,
Block Dongargarh, District : Rajnandgaon, Chhattisgarh --- **Petitioner**

Versus

1. State of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Health And Family Welfare Department, Mantralaya, Atal Nagar, Nawa Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. The Director Health Services, Chhattisgarh, Raipur Chhattisgarh
3. The Collector, District : Rajnandgaon, Chhattisgarh
4. The Chief Medical and Health Officer, District : Rajnandgaon, Chhattisgarh
5. The Grievance Redressal Committee through its Principal Secretary, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Nawa Raipur, Chhattisgarh -- **Respondents**

For Petitioner	:	Shri D.N. Prajapati, Advocate
For Respondents/ State	:	Shri Amrito Das, Additional A.G.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Goutam Bhaduri**Order On Board****14-11-2019**

1. The grievance of the petitioner is that the petitioner has been transferred from Sub Health Centre, Kusmi, Block Dongargarh, District – Rajnandgaon to Sub Health Centre, Bagdongri, Block Manpur, District – Rajnandgaon vide order dated 12.07.2019.
2. In earlier round of litigation the petitioner has filed WPS No.5707/2019 against her transfer whereby this Court vide order dated 31.07.2019, granted liberty to make a representation before the Grievance Redressal Committee. Pursuant to which, the Committee has passed the order on 01.10.2019, whereby, the representation made by the petitioner was considered and rejected.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the Committee has failed to take into account the facts that the petitioner is a Widow, she has a child and her mother-in-law and father-in-law are dependent on her, therefore, the transfer order may be cancelled.
4. Learned counsel for the State opposed the argument.
5. Perusal of the said order of Grievance Redressal Committee would show that while considering the application of the petitioner as also the report received from the Collector, the Committee has held that the Collector has expressed his dissent to the reasons mentioned in the representation of the petitioner against her transfer, as such, the Committee came to a conclusion that the transfer was made on administrative ground and the Transfer Policy of 2019 has not been deviated.
6. Under these circumstances, no scope is left for reconsideration as the transfer is an incident of service, and the personal problem of the petitioner as has been adjudicated cannot be amalgamated with the administrative exigency. It is prerogative of the government to place a certain employee to a certain place, therefore, I am not inclined to interfere with the transfer of the petitioner in the second round of litigation.
7. Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed.

Sd/-
Goutam Bhaduri)
Judge