



2026:CGHC:3750-DB

NAFR**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR****WA No. 12 of 2026**

Asha Minj (Forest Ranger Officer) D/o Philip Minj Aged About 42 Years
R/o E.W.S. 601, 6th Floor, Himalayan Heights, Phase 2, In Front Of Jain
Public School, Dumartarai, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh

... Appellant**versus**

- 1** - State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, General Administration Department, Government Of Chhattisgarh, Mahanadi Bhawan, Naya Raipur, Chhattisgarh
- 2** - Under Secretary Forest Department Government Of Chhattisgarh, Mahanadi Bhawan, Naya Raipur, Chhattisgarh
- 3** - Coordinator And Secretary Transfer Committee Ministry Of General Administration Department, Government Of Chhattisgarh, Mahanadi Bhawan, Naya Raipur, Chhattisgarh
- 4** - Deputy Secretary Forest And Climate Change Department Atal Nagar, Naya Raipur, Chhattisgarh
- 5** - Principal Chief Conservator Of Forest And Chief Of Forest Force Atal Nagar, Naya Raipur, Chhattisgarh
- 6** - Additional Chief Secretary Home And Jail Department Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Naya Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh 492002 (Chairman Of Committee Of Senior Secretaries)
- 7** - Secretary School Education Department Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Naya Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh 492002 (Committee Member Of Senior Secretaries)



8 - Secretary In-Charge General Administration Department Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Nava Raipur, District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh-492002 (Member Secretary Of Committee Of Senior)

... Respondents

For Appellant : Mr.Neeraj Mehta and Mr.Shashi Bhushan Tiwari, Advocates
For Respondent- : Mr.S.S.Baghel, Government Advocate
State

Hon'ble Shri Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice

Hon'ble Shri Ravindra Kumar Agrawal, Judge

Judgment on Board

Per Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice

22.01.2026

1. Heard Mr.Mr.Neeraj Mehta and Mr.Shashi Bhushan Tiwari, learned counsel for the appellant as well as Mr.S.S.Baghel, learned Government Advocate appearing for the respondent-State.
2. The appellant has filed this writ appeal against the order dated 08.12.2025 passed by the learned Single Judge in WPS No.12233 of 2025 by which the learned Single Judge has dismissed the writ petition filed by the appellant/writ petitioner.
3. Brief facts necessary for disposal of the case are that the appellant had only recently been transferred on 01.01.2025 from Manora Range, Forest Division Jashpur to present place of posting, and within six months, she has again been subjected to another transfer. Such, successive transfers constitute an instance of frequent transfer violating Clause 3.10 of the Transfer Policy, 2025



issued by the State Government. It is further urged that the representation preferred by the appellant has been negatived vide order dated 16.09.2025 by a wholly non-speaking order, thereby warranting quashment of both orders dated 31.07.2025 and 16.09.2025 by filing the writ petition. By the impugned order, the learned Single Judge has dismissed the writ petition filed by the appellant. Hence, this writ appeal.

4. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that learned Single Judge committed a grave error in dismissing the writ petition *in limine* without verifying the factual matrix of the case and without issuing notice to the State Government, thereby denying the appellant an opportunity of effective adjudication. Learned counsel further submits that learned Single Judge erred in upholding the rejection order, which is a non-speaking and unreasoned order, passed in complete violation of the principles of natural justice. It is further submitted that the second transfer of the appellant, effected within a short span and without assigning any specific reason, clearly reflects the mala fide intention of the respondent authorities, as such, frequent transfers cannot be justified on the ground of any administrative exigency. Learned counsel also submits that the impugned transfer order dated 31.07.2025 has been passed without issuing any show-cause notice to the appellant, rendering the same arbitrary and illegal. Lastly, it is submitted that the transfer order dated 31.07.2025 was issued despite the fact that no officer was posted to take charge of the



appellant's position at Sankargarh Range, Forest Division, Balrampur, which is in utter violation of the clauses of the new transfer policy. As such, the writ appeal deserves to be allowed and the impugned order deserves to be set aside / aside.

5. On the other hand, Mr. S.S.Baghel, learned State counsel opposes the submissions made by the learned counsel for the appellant and submits that the learned Single Judge after considering all the aspects of the matter has rightly dismissed the writ petition filed by the appellant, in which no interference is called for.
6. We have learned counsel for the parties and perused the impugned order and other documents appended with writ appeal.
7. From perusal of the impugned order, it transpires that the appellant has been posted at her present place of posting since 01.01.2025 and, by virtue of the impugned order, she has been entrusted with the charge of Officer on Special Duty within the same forest range. In such a factual matrix, the grievance of the appellant alleging "frequent transfers" is palpably misconceived and deserves to be rejected outrightly. The further submission that the rejection of her representation by a non-speaking order vitiates the administrative action is equally untenable, as no Government employee can insist to remain posted at a particular place in perpetuity. Transfers, being an incidence of service, do not ordinarily impinge upon any civil or fundamental right, and mere absence of elaborate reasoning in rejecting the representation does not



render any illegality or perversity warranting interference by this Court.

8. Considering the submissions advanced by the learned counsel for the parties, perusing the documents annexed with writ petition as also in writ appeal and also considering the finding recorded by the learned Single Judge while dismissing the writ petition filed by the writ petitioner/appellant, 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.
9. Accordingly, the writ appeal deserves to be and is hereby dismissed. No cost(s).

Sd/-

(Ravindra Kumar Agrawal)
Judge

Sd/-

(Ramesh Sinha)
Chief Justice