

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPS No. 9510 of 2019**

- Smt. Pramila Pandey W/o Late Shri Ashwani Kumar Pandey Aged About 57 Years Supervisor, Integrated Women And Child Development Department, Posted In Kota, Block - Kota, District - Bilaspur, Civil And Revenue District - Bilaspur Chhattisgarh.

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Women And Child Development Department, Mahanadi Bhavan, Mantralay, New Raipur Chhattisgarh.
2. The Director, Women And Child Development Department, Indrawati Bhavan, 4th Floor, New Raipur Chhattisgarh.
3. The District Program Officer, Integrated Women And Child Development Department, Bilaspur, District - Bilaspur Chhattisgarh.
4. The Project Officer, Block - Kota, District - Bilaspur Chhattisgarh.

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Shri Manoj Kumar Sinha, Advocate
For Respondents/ State	:	Shri Kunal Das, Panel Lawyer

Hon'ble Shri Justice Goutam Bhaduri**Order On Board****04/12/2019**

1. Heard.
2. This is second round of litigation. The petitioner was transferred from Integrated Women and Child Development Kota, Dist Bilaspur to the Integrated Women and Child development Kunda Dist Kabirdham. This was subject of challenge in the WPS No. 6955 of 2019 where in this Court on 03.09.2019 passed the following orders:-

2. The contention of the petitioner is that the

petitioner is a widow lady staying along with her old aged mother. At this juncture, if the petitioner is transferred to remote area, she would be facing great inconvenience. The petitioner has also referred to medical certificate issued so far as her illness is concerned and for which she require constant medical aid therefore she should not have been transferred.

3. Given the aforesaid facts, let the Petitioner make a detailed representation to the respondents in this regard within a period of 10 days from the date of receipt of copy of this order and respondents in turn shall take a decision within further period of 30 days from the date of receipt of representation of the petitioner.

4. Till the representation is decided, there shall be a stay of effect and operation of order so far as the petitioner is concerned.

5. The writ petition accordingly stands disposed off.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that subsequently the representation of the petitioner was decided on 11.11.2019, however, the grounds raised in the representation has not been considered while deciding the representation.

4. Perused the representation as also the order of dismissing the representation which shows that in the representation expect the personal and medical grounds nothing has been attributed and the representation has been decided on the ground that there is no violation of the transfer policy and nothing has been placed before this Court. Further, transfer being

incident of service, unless and until it is malafide or illegal on the face of it, the transfer do not call for any interference. In a result, I am not inclined to interfere with the order of dismissing the representation of the petitioner.

5. Accordingly, the petition stands dismissed.

Sd/-

Goutam Bhaduri
Judge

Jyoti