

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**WPS No. 9514 of 2019**

Smt. Neeta Verma, W/o. Roshan Lal Verma, Aged About 38 Years, R/o. K-15, Rajdhani Vihar, Saddu, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh, Through The Secretary, Women And Child Development Department, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Nava Raipur, Atal Nagar, District - Raipur Chhattisgarh.
2. Collector, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
3. Smt. Chitralkha Sirmour, Working As Supervisor, Integrated Child Development Services Simga, District - Balaudabazar Chhattisgarh.

---- Respondents

For Petitioner : Mr. Pranjal Shukla, Advocates

For State : Mr. Avinash Singh, Panel Lawyer

Hon'ble Shri Justice Goutam Bhaduri**Order on Board****20.11.2019**

1. Grievance of the petitioner is that the petitioner was earlier transferred from Integrated Child Development Project, Mandir Hasaud, Aarang, District Raipur to Integrated Child Development Project Koyalibeda, District Kanker and the representation having been made, the said transfer was amended and from Koyalibeda, Kanker she has been transferred to Integrated Child Development Project Kurud, District Dhamtari.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the husband of the petitioner is also working in the Revenue Department and he has also been transferred to Abhanpur. He further submits that as per the policy of the State Government, normally the husband & wife are kept in the same place, therefore, the petitioner may be transferred to nearby place or the transfer may be canceled.

3. Considering the fact that already the transfer of the petitioner made to Kanker has been amended on a representation filed by the petitioner. It is the prerogative of the Government to keep a person in a particular place, the employee will not get the right to choose the particular place of work and unless and until the transfer is tainted with malafide or arbitrary, normally the same do not warrant any interference. However, considering the fact that the husband of the petitioner is also working in the Revenue Department, the petitioner is given liberty to make a representation to the Grievance Redressal Committee who may decide the same within a reasonable time.

4. With the aforesaid observation, the writ petition stands disposed of.

Sd/-
(Goutam Bhaduri)
Judge

Ashok