

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPS No. 3039 of 2020**

- Narendra Kumar Sinha S/o Girja Nand Prasad Sinha Aged About 50 Years R/o Kadam Toli, Jashpur, Nagar, Ward No. 1, Jashpur, District- Jashpur, C.G., District : Jashpur, Chhattisgarh

---- **Petitioner****Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, School Education Department, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, Atal Nagar, New Raipur, C.G., District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. The Divisional Joint Director Public Instructions, Surguja Division, Ambikapur, District- Surguja, C.G., District : Surguja (Ambikapur), Chhattisgarh
3. The District Education Officer Jashpur, District- Jashpur, C.G., District : Jashpur, Chhattisgarh
4. Laxman Sharma Substantially Posted As Lecturer (Incharge Block Education Officer), Manora, District- Jashpur, C.G., District : Jashpur, Chhattisgarh

---- **Respondents**

For Petitioner	:	Mr. J.K. Saxena, Advocate
For State	:	Mr. Amrito Das, AAG.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Goutam Bhaduri**Order****10-8-2020**

1. Heard.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner was transferred from Block Education Officer, Vikaskhand Sitapur, District Sitapur to

Vikaskhand Manora, District Jashpur by order dated 4-5-2020 (Annexure P/1) and thereafter the petitioner was relieved by order dated 6-5-2020 (Annexure P/2). It is further contended that the petitioner thereafter gave his joining by Annexure P/3 at Jashpur on 8-3-2020; however, the respondent No.3 – District Education Officer, Jashpur, is not giving him charge of Block Education Officer. Therefore, the petitioner may be directed to be given the charge of Block Education Officer.

3. On a specific query having been made as to whether the salary is being paid to the petitioner or not, it is submitted that the salary is being paid to the petitioner. In view of this, it appears that it is purely an administrative function which is within the domain of the respondent authorities and it is not the matter where the High Court shall interfere in exercise of power under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.
4. Accordingly, the petition being devoid of merit is liable to be and is hereby dismissed. However, the petitioner shall be at liberty to make a suitable representation before the appropriate authority, if so advised.

Sd/-
(Goutam Bhaduri)
Judge

Raju