CGHC010414802026 2026:CGHC:44986

SOURABH BHILWAR
Digitally signed by SOURABH BHILWAR
Date: 2026.10.27 12:06:06 +0530

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPS No. 7630 of 2026

Pritam Kumar Sarwan S/o Chait Ram Aged About 43 Years Working As Sub-Engineer, Project Implementation Unit-1, Kanker District- North Bastar Kanker (C.G.)

... Petitioner

versus

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Panchayat And Rural Development Department, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Nawa Raipur, District- Raipur (C.G.)

2 - The Executive Engineer, Rural Engineering Services, Kanker, District- North Bastar Kanker (C.G.)

... Respondents

(Cause title is taken from Case Information System)

For Petitioner	: Mr. K. P. Sahu, Advocate
For Respondents/ State	: Mr. Vivek Verma, Govt. Advocate

(HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE BIBHU DATTA GURU)

Order on Board

26/10/2026

1. By the present writ petition, the petitioner seeks quashment of the impugned transfer order dated 01.10.2026 (Annexure P/1), insofar as it relates to the petitioner, whereby he has been transferred from Project Implementation Unit-1, Kanker to Project Implementation Unit-2, Bijapur.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner, who is working as a Sub-Engineer under the respondent department, has been transferred from one core Scheduled Area to another without any administrative exigency. He submits that the petitioner is taking care of his 70-year-old father and 85-year-old maternal grandmother, as his mother has passed away and no other female member is available in the family to look after them. Learned counsel further submits that the petitioner is suffering from cervical spine problems and hypertension, and has been advised by his doctor to avoid long-distance travel. It is contended that the impugned transfer causes undue hardship to the petitioner. He submits that though the petitioner has already submitted a representation before the respondent authority, the petition may be disposed of with liberty to pursue the said representation.

3. Learned State counsel has no objection to the above prayer and fairly submits that if the representation of the petitioner is pending consideration before the respondent authorities, the same shall be considered and decided in accordance with law.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the documents available on record.

5. Considering the nature of the grievance raised by the petitioner and the limited prayer made by him, this writ petition is disposed of with a direction to the respondent authorities to consider and decide the pending representation submitted by the petitioner and pass an appropriate order thereon, in accordance with law.

6. With the aforesaid direction, the present writ petition stands **disposed of**.

Sd/-
(BIBHU DATTA GURU)
JUDGE

$. Bhilwar