



2026:CGHC:10150



2025:CGHC:16566

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

W.P.(S) No. 5669 of 2021

S.K. Lal, S/o Late Shri P. K. Lal, aged about 56 years, R/o - Raja Talab, Ward No. 36, Raipur, District - Raipur, Chhattisgarh. Posted As - Senior Technical Officer, Office Of Regional Forest Officer, Raipur Forest Division, Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Versus

- 1** - State Of Chhattisgarh Through - The Secretary, Department Of Forest, Mantralay, Naya Raipur, District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh;
- 2** - Principal Chief Conservator Of Forests, Department Of Forest Mantralay, Naya Raipur, District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh;
- 3** - Chief Conservator Of Forests Department Of Forest, Mantralay, Naya Raipur, District - Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

Respondents

For Petitioner	: Shri Yogendra Pandey, Advocate.
For Respondent / State	: Shri Rohitashva Singh, Dy. G.A.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Sachin Singh Raipur

Order on Board

26/02/2026

1. Heard.
2. Challenge in this writ petition is to the order dated 28/08/2021 (Annexure P/1) by which the petitioner who was working as Senior Technical Officer, Raipur, Forest Division was asked by the respondent No.3 to perform his duties at Mahasamund, Forest Forest Division temporarily until further orders.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that by impugned order, the petitioner has been ask the petitioner to perform duty other than which he is performing at the present place of posting.



-2-

4. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that the impugned order was passed in accordance with law.
5. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.
6. Be that as it may, the perusal of the record would indicate that the impugned order was passed on 28.08.2021. This Court on 22.10.2021 stayed the operation and effect of the impugned order. As submitted by Shri Pandey, Advocate that on the strength of the interim order, the petitioner is still performing his duties on the present place of posting. Taking into consideration the above stated facts, and that the impugned order was passed in the year 2021 and by lapse of five years, it must have lost its exigency.
7. Thus, this writ petition is disposed of with an observation that the respondent shall not act upon the impugned order Annexure P-1. However, the respondent would be at liberty to issue fresh order in case any exigency arises.

**Sd/-
(Sachin Singh Rajput)
Judge**