



2026:CGHC:24626



2026:CGHC:24626

NAFR**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR****WPS No. 4541 of 2026**

Seema Tembhare W/o Ajay Tembhare Aged About 51 Years Presently Working As Teacher (L. B.) At Govt. Girls Middle School, Ambagarh Chowki, Block Ambagarh Chowki, District Mohla - Manpur - Ambagarh Chowki (C.G.)

... Petitioner**versus**

- 1** - State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Department Of School Education, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, Atal Nagar, Nawa Raipur, District - Raipur (C.G.)
- 2** - Director Directorate Of Public Instructions, Indrawati Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Nawa Raipur, District - Raipur (C.G.)
- 3** - Commissioner Durg Division And Chairman, Divisional Level Rationalization Committee, Durg Division, District - Durg (C.G.)
- 4** - Divisional Joint Director Education Division, Durg And Secretary, Divisional, Level Rationalization Committee, Durg Division, District - Durg (C.G.)
- 5** - Collector And Chairman, District Level Rationalization Committee, District - Mohla - Manpur - Ambagarh Chowki (C.G.)
- 6** - District Education Officer And Secretary, District Level Rationalization Committee, District - Mohla - Manpur - Ambagarh Chowki (C.G.)
- 7** - Block Education Officer Ambagarh Chowki, District - Mohla - Manpur - Ambagarh Chowki (C.G.)

... Respondents

**(Cause title is taken from Case Information System)**

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Pramod Ramteke, Advocate
For Respondent/ State	:	Mr. Vivek Verma, Govt. Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Bibhu Datta Guru, Judge**Order on Board****18.06.2026**

1. The present writ petition has been filed by the petitioner seeking quashment of his impugned transfer order dated 03.06.2025 (Annexure P-1) and also seeking quashment of order dated 12/12/2025 (Annexure P-2) and 23/12/2025 (Annexure P-3).
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the impugned orders, whereby the petitioner has been transferred from Govt. Girls Middle School, Ambagarh Chowki to Govt. Middle School, Patankhas, Block-Mohla, District-Mohla-Manpur-Ambagarh Chowki, C.G., have been passed by the respondent authorities in an illegal and arbitrary manner and are contrary to the provisions of the rationalization policy. He further submits that the petitioner has been transferred without proper justification and in disregard of the norms prescribed under the applicable policy governing rationalization and transfer of teachers. He also submits that the impugned transfer order has caused serious hardship to the petitioner.
3. On the other hand, learned counsel appearing for the State would submit that the issue involved in this writ petition has already been considered and decided by this Court vide judgment dated **18.09.2025** passed in **WA No.674 of 2025 (Shashi Shrivastava**



vs. State of Chhattisgarh & Others), wherein the Division

Bench of this Court held as under:-

“8. From perusal of the record, it transpires that the main grievance of the appellant is that she is the Lecturer (Chemistry), but she has been considered as Lecturer (Science) and has been declared surplus. It is grievance of the appellant that she was not provided any opportunity to participate in the counselling on the ground that she is the Lecturer (Chemistry) and there are no surplus Lecturers in the Chemistry subject, and the Respondent No. 5 has been allotted to Ambikapur School. From perusal of the order dated 11.05.2021 (Annexure P-7), it transpires that the appellant and one Snehlata Pathak, were the Lecturers (Chemistry) and they have been adjusted against the vacant post of Lecturer (Biology) and (Maths), for the purposes of their salary. The District Level list of Lecturers shows only two categories, i.e. (1) Biology and (2) Science. In the District Level list of surplus Lecturers, the appellant is considered as the Lecturer (Science), which includes the Chemistry subject as subject of Science. There was no vacant post available for Lecturer (Chemistry/ Science) and therefore, the name of appellant is placed in the State Level counselling and she has been allotted the Bhopalpatnam school. Even otherwise. Teacher Rationalization Instructions are mere guidelines. It may not supplant the general powers of the employer, provided under the statutory service rules, i.e. to post a person at a place in the public interest and in administrative exigency. It is a trite law that transfer/posting is an incidence of service, the Court should not interfere with the transfer/posting



order, unless there is malice. infringement of statutory rules and regulations. The employees may be posted anywhere at the instance of the employer in the public interest and administrative exigency. It is not a case of proved mala fide, lack of competence of the officer passing the transfer order or infraction of any statutory Rules and Regulations.

9. Considering the submissions advanced by the learned counsel for the parties and the finding recorded by the learned Single Judge while dismissing the writ petition filed by the writ petitioner, we are of the considered opinion that the learned Single Judge has not committed any illegality, irregularity or jurisdictional error in the impugned order warranting interference by this Court.

10. Accordingly, the writ appeal being devoid of merit is liable to be and is hereby dismissed. No cost(s).”

4. Learned State counsel further submits that since the facts and issue involved in the present case is identical to that of WA No. 674 of 2025, this petition may also be dismissed in the same terms.
5. Having considered the rival submissions made by learned counsel for the parties and having gone through the materials available on record, it is evident that the facts and issue involved in this petition is identical to **WA No. 674 of 2025**, this Court deems it appropriate not to take a view other than what has been taken in the aforesaid writ appeal.



2026:CGHC:24626

6. Accordingly, the present petition is **dismissed** in terms of the order dated **18.09.2025** passed in **WA No. 674 of 2025**.

SD/-
(Bibhu Datta Guru)
Judge

Amardeep