IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
W.P.(S) No. 6448 of 2024

1. Mukesh Kumar Singh, aged about 38 years, son of Narendra Kumar Singh, resident of Village- Badwar, P.O.- Peltol, P.S.- Rajpur, District- Chatra.
2. Anand, aged about 35 years, son of Alakhdeo Singh, resident of Village- Mayurhand, P.O. & P.S.- Mayurhand, District- Chatra.

…. Petitioners

Versus

1. The State of Jharkhand through the Secretary, Department of School Education and Literacy, Ranchi.
2. The Director, Primary Education, School Education and Literacy Department, Govt. of Jharkhand, Ranchi.
3. The Deputy Commissioner-cum-Chairman, District Education Establishment Committee, Jamtara.
4. The District Education Officer, Jamtara.
5. The District Superintendent of Education, Jamtara.

…. Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE S.N. PATHAK

For the Petitioners : Mr. Shresth Gautam, Advocate
For the Resp-State : Ms. Moushmi Chatterjee, AC to GA-V

2/ 10.12.2024 The petitioners have approached this Court challenging the order of rejection, by which online application for Inter District Transfer under 'Other Special Circumstance' as per Clause-8(a)(iii) of the Transfer Policy has been rejected.

2. Learned counsel for the respondents draws the attention of the Court towards counter-affidavit and submits that no interference is warranted in the instant writ petition since the claim of the petitioners has rightly been rejected taking into consideration relevant rules and guidelines. Learned counsel further submits that if at all there is medical exigency, petitioners are at liberty to approach the respondents who shall consider in accordance with law.

3. Having gone through the rival submissions of the parties, across the bar, this Court is of the considered view that if the petitioners file fresh representation taking the medical exigency, the same shall be considered by the respondents in accordance with law considering the relevant rules and

guidelines, after giving personal hearing to the petitioners, within a period of four weeks from the date of such representation.

4. It goes without saying that if the petitioner is found entitled for the benefits, as prayed for, the same may be extended to him within a further period of four weeks. If any adverse order is passed, the same may also be communicated to the petitioner.

5. With the aforesaid observations and directions, this writ petition stands disposed of.

(Dr. S. N. Pathak, J.)

R.Kr.