

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**WPS No. 540 of 2021**

Pankaj Kumar Shukla S/o Shri Narendra Nath Shukla Aged About 39 Years
Presently Posted And Working As Additional Superintendent Of Police,
District- Korea, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Department Of Home Affairs, Mahanadi Mantralaya, Naya Raipur, Atal Nagar, Post Office And Police Station Naya Raipur, Atal Nagar, District Raipur (Chhattisgarh)
2. Director General Of Police Police Head Quarter, Sector-19 Naya Raipur (Chhattisgarh), District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. Superintendent Of Police Korea, District Korea (Chhattisgarh)
4. Smt. Madhulika Singh Additional Superintendent Of Police, Janjgir Champa (Chhattisgarh)

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. P. N. Bharat with Mr. R. K. Jha, Advocates
For State	:	Mr. Shakti Singh Thakur, PL

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy
Order on Board

25/01/2021

1. The grievance of the petitioner in the present writ petition is that right from the time his appointment the petitioner has been twice posted in Surguja District and has also been posted in Bijapur, Sukma, Balrampur and Koriya. And now vide the impugned order the petitioner again being sent to Bijapur at which he has already discharged his duties in the past.
2. Contention of the petitioner is that the guidelines of the State Government is that having worked in a scheduled area and difficult scheduled area the

employees should be posted in a non scheduled area which in the instant case is not being considered by the respondents. Contention of the petitioner is that the present impugned order has now been passed in order to accommodate some other candidate elsewhere and petitioner has become victim of the accommodation of the some other officers by the Department.

3. All said and done, so far as the posting of an employee is concerned, it is always within the domain of the employer or the State Government for deciding the place of posting and the tenure of posting and the only recourse that petitioner or similarly aggrieved persons is that in case if they are not satisfied with the place of posting, they have the liberty of approaching the authorities by way of representation which should be considered by the authorities in accordance with law. The petitioner in the instant case has already made a representation vide Annexure P-6 dated 14.01.2021, the same is still pending consideration.
4. In view of the fact, the writ petition at this juncture stands disposed of directing the State Authorities to ensure that the representation of the petitioner is decided taking into consideration the Policy and the Guidelines of the State Government in this regard within a period of 30 days.
5. With the aforesaid directions and observations, the present writ petition stands disposed of.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge