

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**WPS No. 3428 of 2021**

Bhupesh Kumar Netam S/o Kunwar Singh Netam Aged About 50 Years
R/o House No. 13, Shubhpalli, Pankhanjore Colony, Pakhanjore, District
Uttar Bastar Kanker Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Department Of Panchayat And Rural Development, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Nawa Raipur District Raipur Chhattisgarh
2. The Collector District Uttar Bastar Kanker Chhattisgarh
3. Chief Engineer Rural Engineering Service Development, Commissioner Officer, Vikas Bhavan, Civil Lines, Raipur Chhattisgarh
4. The Chief Executive Officer Jila Panchayat District Uttar Bastar Kanker Chhattisgarh
5. Shri Kiran Devangan Sub Engineer, Janpad Panchayat Antagarh, District Uttar Bastar Kanker Chhattisgarh

----Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Parag Kotecha, Advocate
For State	:	Ms. Akanksha Jain, Dy. G.A.

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

09/07/2021

1. The petitioner seems to have been aggrieved of the decision (Annexure P/3) dated 14.06.2021, whereby the petitioner has been shifted from Janpad Panchayat, Koilibeda to Janpad Panchayat Antagarh under District North Bastar, Kanker.
2. The petitioner primarily seems to be aggrieved of the action on the part of the respondents stating it to be an order which has been passed exclusively for accommodating the respondent No.5, who was earlier on a complaint shifted from Antagarh to Durgukondal

vide order dated 08.06.2014 and just about a week's time the order dated 08.06.2021 has been recalled and the petitioner has been shifted to the Janpad Panchayat Koilibeda and the petitioner has been shifted from Koilibeda to Antagarh.

3. The plain perusal of the orders passed in respect of the change of posting of the officers concerned purely reflect them to be administrative decisions taken by the respondents. Moreover, the distance between the two place from where the petitioner has been shifted also is too short a distance which could cause any substantial inconvenience or grievance to the petitioner.
4. In view of the same this Court does not find any strong case made out calling for an interference with the impugned order. However, the right of the petitioner stands reserved to approach the authorities, in case if he has any personal difficulties and inconvenience at the present place of posting.
5. With the aforesaid observations, the present writ petition stands rejected.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge