



2026:CGHC:21325

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPS No. 3938 of 2026

Naresh Kumar Patel S/o Ghanshyam Singh Patel Aged About 55 Years Presently Working As Teacher (L.B.) At Govt. Schedule Tribe Ashram Middle School, Dhaurabhata, Block- Dabhara, District- Sakti (C.G.)

... **Petitioner**

versus

1 - State of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Department Of School Education, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar Naya Raipur, District Raipur (C.G.)

2 - Director Directorate Of Public Instruction, Indrawati Bhawan, Atal Nagar Naya Raipur, District Raipur (C.G.)

3 - Joint Director Education Division Bilaspur, District Bilaspur (C.G.)

4 - Collector District Sakti (C.G.)

5 - District Education Officer Sakti, District Sakti (C.G.)

6 - Block Education Officer Baloda District Sakti (C.G.)

7 - Head Master Govt. Schedule Tribe Boys Ashram Middle School, Dhaurabhata, Block- Dabhara, District- Sakti (C.G.)

8 - District Education Officer Gaurela Pendra, District Gaurela Pendra Marwahi (C.G.)

--- **Respondents**

For Petitioner : Mr. Tapan Kumar Chandra, Advocate.
For State/Respondent : Mr. Avinash Singh, G.A.

Hon'ble Shri Bibhu Datta Guru, Judge
Judgment on Board

07.05.2026

1. By the present petition, the petitioner is questioning the transfer order dated 20/06/2025 and reliving order dated 25/06/2025 Annexure P-1, by which, the petitioner has been transferred from Government Scheduled Tribe Boys Ashram Middle School, Dhaurabhata, Block-Dabhara, District Sakti to Government Middle School Tikathi, Block Marwahi, District:Gaurela-Pendra-Marwahi.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that on 22/10/2025, the petitioner submitted an appeal/representation before the State Level Committee; however, the same has not been decided till date. Learned counsel further submits that the name of the petitioner was not in the list of surplus teachers which was issued on 06/06/2025, by the respondent No.3. Learned counsel submits that failure of the respondent authorities to consider and decide the petitioner's appeal/representation is arbitrary, illegal, and unjustified.
3. Learned counsel for the State submits that the petitioner had earlier preferred a petition bearing WPS No. 11839/2025 & other connected matter, which was dismissed as withdrawn on 14/10/2025 with a liberty to prefer an appeal/representation before the State Level Committee. Thereafter, the petitioner preferred an appeal/representation, which is still pending

consideration before the said Committee, hence, the present petition is not maintainable at this stage.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties, perused the pleadings and documents.
5. In view of the submissions made by learned State counsel, it appears that the petitioner had earlier filed a writ petition arising out of the same cause of action and the said writ petition was dismissed as withdrawn at the instance of the petitioner, with liberty to prefer an appeal/representation before the State Level Committee. Pursuant thereto, the petitioner preferred an appeal/representation before the State Level Committee, which is still pending consideration. Hence, at this stage, the present writ petition is not maintainable. However, if the petitioner wishes to pursue the pending appeal/representation before the State Level Committee, he is at liberty to do so.
6. With the aforesaid observations, the writ petition stands **dismissed**.

SD/-

(Bibhu Datta Guru)
Judge

Amardeep