

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
BENCH AT JAIPUR

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 3226/2026

Bhim Singh Meena S/o Shri Hansraj Meena, Aged About 37 Years, R/o Village And Post Bhedola, Tehsil Choth Ka Barwara, District Sawaimadhapur Rajasthan

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The Principal Secretary, Department Of Education, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur
2. Director, Secondary Education, Rajasthan Bikaner
3. Director Rajasthan Project Cum Commissioner, School Education Premises, Dr. S. Radhakrishnan Shiksha Sankul, Jln Marg, Jaipur Rajasthan
4. Chief Block Education Officer, Samagra Shiksha Choth Ka Barwar, Sawaimadhapur Rajasthan

-----Respondents

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Raj Kumar Sharma
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Manik Kaswan for Mr. Manoj Sharma, AAG

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANAND SHARMA

Order

25/02/2026

1. This writ petition has been filed by the petitioner assailing order dated 10.02.2026 passed by the Rajasthan Civil Services Appellate Tribunal, Jaipur, whereby appeal filed by the petitioner against transfer order dated 10.01.2026 has been dismissed.

2. The petitioner while assailing transfer order contended that vide order dated 26.08.2022, the petitioner was sent on deputation for one year under Rule 144-A of the Rajasthan Civil

Service Rules, 1951 as reference person on the post of Chief Block Education Officer, Samagra Shiksha Choth Ka Barwar, Sawaimadhopur (Rajasthan). Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that although the deputation was initially for one year, however, it was extendable upto four years and since even after completion of period of one year, no order for repatriation of the petitioner to his parent department was passed therefore, it would be correct to presume that the period of one year has been tacitly extended by the competent authority.

3. Learned counsel submits that while the petitioner was in deputation, without firstly passing order of repatriation and without there being any relieving order by the authority, where the petitioner has been sent on deputation, the transfer order could not have been issued.

4. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and perused the record.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner has utterly failed to point out any specific order, whereby deputation of the petitioner, after expiry of initial period of one year, was ever extended by the competent authority. Even otherwise, it is settled proposition of law that no employee has got vested right to continue on deputation and the authority in the parent department, at any point of time can pass order for calling back its employee. Merely, for the reason that no order for repatriation or for calling back the petitioner has been passed, it does not restrain the parent department from issuing the transfer order, which has admittedly been issued after expiry of around three years from the date of initial deputation order.

6. As regards, grievance of the petitioner that without relieving by the Chief Block Education Officer, Samagra Shiksha, he cannot join pursuant to transfer order, it is suffice to observe that when the transfer order has been issued by Director, Secondary Education, Rajasthan, Bikaner, which is higher authority to Chief Block Education Officer, hence, the Chief Block Education Officer, Samagra Shiksha is bound to relieve the petitioner in accordance with Rules.

7. There is no scope of interference either in the order of transfer or in the order passed by the learned Tribunal, hence, the writ petition filed by the petitioner is hereby dismissed.

8. Pending application(s), if any, also stand(s) disposed of.

(ANAND SHARMA),J