

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**WPS No. 857 of 2021**

1. Rohit Kumar Yadav S/o Late Raghunandan Singh Yadav Aged About 46 Years Working As Assistant Grade - III, Land Records, Korba, District Korba Chhattisgarh. **---- Petitioner**

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Revenue And Disaster Management Department, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Nawa Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh.
2. Deputy Secretary Revenue And Disaster Management Department, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Nawa Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh.
3. Collector Land Records, Korba, District Korba Chhattisgarh.

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. C. Jayant K. Rao, Advocate.
For State	:	Mr. Sudeep Verma, Dy. G.A.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order on Board****01/03/2021**

1. The case of the petitioner in the present writ petition is in-respect-of the alleged inaction on the part of the respondents in not relieving the petitioner pursuant to an order of transfer that was issued almost about five years back i.e. 21.07.2016.
2. Perusal of the records would show that the petitioner stood transferred from District Korba to District Dhamtari vide order dated 21.07.2016. However, since the petitioner was facing disciplinary proceedings, the order of transfer could not be given effect to. The counsel for the petitioner submits that down the line the disciplinary proceedings has been concluded and the petitioner has been inflicted with a minor punishment which the petitioner has not

questioned further and as such the disciplinary proceeding has attained finality. The impugned order of transfer now can be implemented so far as the petitioner is concerned. The Counsel for the petitioner further submits that the reliever who was coming in place of the petitioner has also assumed the transferred place i.e. the place where the petitioner was working at Korba and as such on this ground also the petitioner can now be relieved in-terms-of the order of transfer dated 21.07.2016.

3. Given the facts and circumstances of the case, considering the period that has lapsed from the date the order of transfer has been passed, this Court is of the opinion that the interest of justice would serve if the writ petition is disposed of directing the respondents No. 1 & 3 to take an appropriate steps in deciding whether the order of transfer dated 21.07.2016 so far as the petitioner is concerned has to be implemented now or not and if not whether the order of transfer dated 21.07.2016 needs recalling, modification or amendment as the case may be.
4. Let an appropriate decision be taken by the authorities within a period of 60 days from the date of receipt of copy of this order.
5. The writ petition accordingly stands disposed of

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge