

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

WPS No. 2222 of 2020

S. C. Kachhwaha S/o Shri Ramdas Kachhwaha Aged About 58 Years
Occupation- Govt. Employee, Chief Executive Officer Posted At Janpad
Panchayat- Farsabahar, District- Jashpur (C.G.) Permanent R/o Siddhi
Vinayak Colony, Indira Nagar, Raigarh, Tahsil And District- Raigarh,
Chhattisgarh. **---- Petitioner**

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through- The Secretary, Department Of General Administration, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Nava Raipur, Atal Nagar, District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
2. The State Of Chhattisgarh Through- The Secretary, Department Of Scheduled Tribe And Scheduled Caste Development, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Nava Raipur, Atal Nagar, District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
3. The Commissioner Scheduled Tribe And Scheduled Caste Development, Indrawati Bhawan, Nava Raipur, Atal Nagar, District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
4. The Collector (Integrated Adiwas Development Project Branch), Jashpur, District- Jashpur, Chhattisgarh. **---- Respondents**

For Petitioner: : Shri Roop Naik, Adv.
For the State/Respondents No.1 to 4. : Shri Jitendra Kumar Pali, Dy.A.G.

Single Bench: Hon'ble Shri Sanjay S. Agrawal, J
Order On Board

03.12.2021

1. By virtue of this petition, the petitioner is questioning the legality and propriety of the order dated 28.05.2020 (Annexure P-1) passed by Respondent No.1, whereby Respondent No.5-Mrs. Ruchi Sharma, Deputy Collector, Mungeli, District-Mungeli has been posted as Chief Executive Officer at Janpad Panchayat-Farasabahar, District Jashpur, i.e., in place of the petitioner and directed the Respondent No.2 to issue a posting order of respective officers in this regard.
2. During the course of arguments, Shri Pali, counsel appearing for the

State/Respondents No. 1 to 4 at the outset submits that the alleged order impugned (Annexure P-1) has already been modified vide order dated 24.06.2020 (Annexure R-4) by Respondent No.1 by transferring the said Respondent-Mrs. Ruchi Sharma to different Janpad Panchayat and therefore the petition has now become infructuous.

3. Shri Naik, counsel for the Petitioner has also submitted that in view of the said order as passed by Respondent No.1 on 24.06.2020, the petition has become infructuous.
4. In view of the above, the petition is dismissed having been rendered infructuous.

No order as to costs.

Sd/-
(Sanjay S. Agrawal)
JUDGE

vivek