



2026:CGHC:3486-DB



2026:CGHC:3486-DB
NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WA No. 46 of 2026

Philip Minj S/o Late Matiyas Minj Aged About 52 Years Resident of Village- Nandotoli, Police- Station - Narayanpur, Tahsil - Bagicha, District- Jashpur (C.G.)

... Appellant

versus

1 - State of Chhattisgarh Through- The Secretary, Social Welfare Department Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya Atal Nagar, Nawa Raipur, District- Raipur (C.G.)

2 - The Collector District- Bastar (C.G.)

3 - Tomeshwar Sinha Trained Teacher (Vision Impaired) Officer of Superintendent, Govt, Vision Impaired Vidyalaya, Jagdalpur, District- Bastar (C.G.)

... Respondents

(Cause-title taken from Case Information System)

For Appellant	:	None
For State/Respondents No.1 & 2	:	Mr. Prasun Kumar Bhaduri, Deputy Advocate General

Hon'ble Shri Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice
Hon'ble Shri Ravindra Kumar Agrawal, Judge
Judgment on Board

Per Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice

21.01.2026

1. None appears nor is any representation made on behalf of the appellant to press this appeal on repeated calls. Mr. Prasun Kumar Bhaduri, learned Deputy Advocate General, appearing on behalf of the State/respondents No.1 & 2, is present.



2. The present intra Court appeal has been filed by the appellant against the order dated 01.12.2025 passed by the learned Single Judge in WPS No.13470 of 2025, whereby the learned Single Judge has dismissed the writ petition filed by the writ petitioner.
3. From perusal of the impugned order of the learned Single Judge and the record annexed therewith, it transpires that the appellant/writ petitioner, who is working as Superintendent, was transferred from Jashpur to Jagdalpur on administrative grounds. The learned Single Judge, after considering the rival submissions, has recorded a finding that the appellant/writ petitioner had remained posted at Jashpur since 14.01.2019 and had completed about six years at the said place of posting. It was further held that transfer being an incidence of service, no Government servant can insist upon remaining posted at a particular place for an indefinite period, and in the absence of any perversity, arbitrariness, or violation of statutory provisions, no interference was warranted.
4. On due consideration of the impugned order and the material available on record, we do not find any error apparent on the face of the record nor any infirmity in the reasoning adopted by the learned Single Judge so as to warrant interference by this Court in exercise of appellate jurisdiction.
5. Even otherwise, in view of the settled position of law relating to transfer of Government servants, the impugned order does not



call for any interference. Accordingly, the writ appeal is devoid of merit and is hereby **dismissed**.

Sd/-

(Ravindra Kumar Agrawal)
Judge

Sd/-

(Ramesh Sinha)
Chief Justice

Anu