

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**Writ Petition (S) No. 5242 of 2020**

Ganpat Rao Karhade S/o Late Shri Tameshwar Rao Karhade, Aged About 57 Years, R/o Ramnagar, Jangalpara, Ward No. 6, Nagari, District Dhamtari Chhattisgarh. Presently Posted As - Forest Guard (Vanrakkhask) At Ghotgaon Beat, Birgudi Range, Dhamtari Vanmandal, District Dhamtari, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. The State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Department Of Forest Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Nava Raipur, Atal Nagar, Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. The Chief Conservative Of Forest (C.C.F.) Raipur Circle, Raipur Chhattisgarh
3. The Divisional Forest Officer (D.F.O.) Dhamtari Vanmandal, Dhamtari, Chhattisgarh
4. The Forest Range Officer Nagari (Samanya), District Dhamtari, Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Kalyan Kalamkar, Advocate
For State	:	Mr. Amit Buxy, P.L.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order On Board****19.01.2021**

1. The challenge in the present writ petition is to the order of transfer dated 07.11.2020.

2. Counsel for the petitioner submits that in the last about one year period of time the petitioner has been shifted on 4 different occasions at 4 different places. He submits that Annexure P-1 reflects that the transfer of the petitioner has been made at his own request whereas the petitioner has never made any such application to the respondents for transferring him to a different place at his own expenses and therefore the impugned order of transfer is per se illegal to the extent of saying that it has been issued at the request of the petitioner at his own expenses.
3. Given the aforesaid submission by the counsel for the petitioner, let the petitioner make a detailed representation in addition to the representation that he has already made to the respondent no.2 within a period of 15 days from today and the respondent no.2 in turn shall consider the same and take an appropriate decision within a further period of 45 days from the date of receipt of the representation of the petitioner.
4. Counsel for the petitioner at this juncture submits that since the impugned order was passed on 07.11.2020, the petitioner till date has not been relieved from the present place of posting. Under the circumstances, let status quo, as it exists today, so far as the posting of the petitioner is concerned, be maintained till the representation of the petitioner is decided by the respondent no.2 by a speaking order.
5. With the aforesaid direction the writ petition stands disposed of.

Sd/-
P. Sam Koshy
Judge