

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.11590 of 2018

=====

Deo Chandra Jha S/o Late Anantdhari Jha R/o Village- Somnaha, Police Station- Chakmehsi, District- Samastipur, at present Posted as an Office Attendant in the Office of the BDO, Shivajinagar, District Samastipur
... .. Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
 2. The Assitant Director, Revenue and Land Reforms, Government of Bihar, Patna
 3. The Collector, Samastipur
 4. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Samastipur
 5. The Circle Officer, Kalyanpur, Samastipur
 6. The Block Development Officer, Shivajinagar, Samastipur
- Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Surya Kant Mishra
For the Respondent/s : Mr.Md.Nadeem Seraj -Gp5

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE CHAKRADHARI SHARAN SINGH

ORAL ORDER

2 11-06-2020 The petitioner has put to challenge an order dated 28.04.2018 passed by the District Magistrate, Samastipur, whereby his representation, preferred to reconsider the matter of his transfer from Anchal Office, Kalyanpur to the Block Office, Shivajinagar in the district of Samastipur, has been rejected.

From the impugned order, which has been brought on record by way of Annexure-4 series, it transpires that the petitioner had approached this Court by filing a writ application, giving rise to C.W.J.C. No. 12034 of 2017, putting to challenge the order of his transfer dated 30.06.2016 passed by the Collector, Samastipur. The writ application was disposed of by



an order dated 21.09.2017.

From the said order of this Court dated 21.09.2017, it transpires that the petitioner had already joined the place of posting. It was on a prayer made on behalf of the petitioner that liberty was granted for the petitioner to file representation before the District Magistrate/Collector, Samastipur, raising his grievance in respect of his transfer. The Court desired the petitioner's representation to be disposed of within six weeks from filing of representation. The impugned order dated 28.04.2018 has been passed on the petitioner's representation.

The Collector, Samastipur, has recorded in his impugned order that the petitioner had taken a plea that without his consent, the transfer could not have been effected. It has further been mentioned in the impugned order that though the petitioner was given opportunity to present his case personally, he did not appear. The Collector has rejected the ground on which the petitioner wanted reconsideration of the order of his transfer.

I do not find any illegality in the impugned order. This application is accordingly dismissed.

(Chakradhari Sharan Singh, J)

Pawan/-

U			
---	--	--	--

