

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPS No. 2802 of 2020**

- Smt.Kiran Khedkar W/o Shri Suresh Khedkar Aged About 51 Years Working As Supervisor, Project Bilha, Office Of The Project Officer Integrated Child Development Scheme, Tahsil- Bilha, Distt.- Bilaspur, (C.G.)
---- Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Women And Child Development Department, Secretariat, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, New Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. The Secretary And Organiser (Transfer Committee) General Administration Department (Gad) Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, New Raipur, (C.G.)
3. Director/commissioner Women And Child Development Department, Directorate, Indrawati Bhawan, Atal Nagar, New Raipur, (C.G.),
4. The Collector Distt.- Bilaspur, (C.G.)
5. The Program Officer Women And Child Development Department District- Bilaspur, (C.G.),
6. The Project Officer Integrated Child Development Scheme, Women And Child Development Department, Tahsil- Bilha, Distt.- Bilaspur, (C.G.)
---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Sameer Behar, Advocate
For State	:	Mr. Amrito Das, Addl. A.G.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Goutam Bhaduri**Order****17.07.2020**

1. Heard
2. The challenge in the present writ petition is to the order dated 18.10.2019 (Annexure P/1) wherein the representation of the petitioner has been rejected against her transfer.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been transferred from the Office of the Project Officer Integrated Child Development Scheme, Bilha to the Office of the Project Officer Integrated Child Development Scheme, Khairagarh Distt.

Rajnandgaon by an order dated 21.08.2019 (Annexure P/2). Against such transfer, the petitioner moved a representation on the ground that the husband of the petitioner is working at the Office of the CSPDCL, Tifra, Distt. Bilaspur and as per Clause 2.11 of the Transfer Policy, the husband and wife are normally to be kept at one place however, without referring to such Transfer Policy the representation has been rejected on the wrong premises that no such policy exists.

4. Learned State counsel would submit that much time has been passed after the rejection order dated 18.10.2019. As against this, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was on medical leave lastly upto 03.03.2020 and thereafter, she could not join at the place of transfer due to pandemic situation which prevailed.
5. Perused the order of the rejection of the representation dated 18.10.2019 (Annexure P/1). The representation has been rejected on the ground that the transfer has been made on the administrative exigencies. Clause 2.11 of the Transfer Policy purport that normally when the husband and wife are in the Government Department, then the effort shall be made to keep their posting at the same place.
6. Considering the same, the petitioner is given the liberty to make a representation along with her relevant documents to the Secretary, Women and Child Development Department i.e. respondent no. 1 within a period of three weeks and if such representation is filed, then the same shall be decided within a further period of 45 days.
7. With the aforesaid directions/ observations, the present writ petition stands disposed off.

Sd/-

(Goutam Bhaduri)
Judge