

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**Writ Petition (S) No. 3103 of 2021**

Indraman Sahu S/o Late Shri Shobha Ram Sahu, Aged About 52 Years, R/o Dhamani Colony, Ward No. 3, Nawapara, Block Abhanpur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Department Of School Education, Mahanadi Bhawan, Post Office Mantralaya, P.S. Rakhi, Atal Nagar, Nawa Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. The Director, Public Instruction Department, Indrawati Bhawan, Post Office Mantralaya P.S. Rakhi, Atal Nagar Nawa Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh
3. The Joint Director, Public Instruction Department, Integrated Education Building, DEO Office Campus, Pensionbada, District Raipur Chhattisgarh
4. The District Education Officer, Raipur, DEO Office Campus, Pensionbada, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Vipin Tiwari, Advocate
For State	:	Ms. Binu Sharma, P.L.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order On Board****30.06.2021**

1. The petitioner in the present writ petition seems to be aggrieved of the change of posting that has been made upon revocation of his order of suspension.

2. The services of the petitioner were placed under suspension vide order dated 01.10.2018 passed by the respondent no.4. Subsequently, vide order dated 14.06.2020 the order of suspension seems to have been revoked by the then District Education Officer. However, the petitioner, on revocation of suspension, has been posted at a different Block in district Raipur.
3. The contention of the counsel for the petitioner is that since at the time of suspension the petitioner was posted somewhere else, he ought to have been reinstated at the same place and the place of posting could not have been changed.
4. The said contention of the petitioner is no longer res integra for the reason that the Division Bench of this Court in the case of **L. P. Saket Vs. Chhattisgarh State Civil Supplies Corporation Ltd., WPS 7269/2017** has already laid to rest the issue involved in the case and it has been categorically held by the Division Bench that upon revocation of suspension and also during the suspension it is only the lien of the employee which has to be protected and not the place of posting which would be protected.
5. Under the circumstances, this Court is of the opinion that no strong case for grant of interim relief has been made out nor any strong case calling for an interference to the impugned order is made out in the light of the Division Bench's order of this Court.
6. However, in case the petitioner has any personal inconvenience at the present place of posting, he would always be at liberty to approach the authorities concerned in the department ventilating his grievance and upon such representation being made, the authorities concerned are expected to take a decision in accordance with the policies

governing the field at the earliest.

7. With the aforesaid observation the writ petition stands disposed of.

Sd/-

P. Sam Koshy
Judge