

(2019) 10 CHH CK 0092
Chhattisgarh High Court
Case No: WA No. 473 Of 2019

Manoj Kumar Sidar Sukhsingh
Sidar And Ors

APPELLANT

Vs

State Of Chhattisgarh And Ors

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision: Oct. 16, 2019

Hon'ble Judges: P.R. Ramachandra Menon, CJ; Parth Prateem Sahu, J

Bench: Division Bench

Advocate: Punit Ruparel, Sudeep Verma

Final Decision: Dismissed

Judgement

P.R. Ramachandra Menon, CJ

1. The Appellants are the writ petitioners. The prayers in the writ petition are in the following terms :

10.1. This Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to quash the transfer of the respondent no. 6 to the Gram Panchyat Salhejhariya, Janpad Panchayat,

Basna to Gram Panchayat Kayatpali, Basna, District Mahasamund (C.G.) by the impugned order dated 12.07.2019 (Annexure P-1) 10.2. This

Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to direct the respondent authorities to appoint any other person as Secretary (who is competent) to the village

Panchayat, Kayatpali, Basna, District Mahasamund (C.G.) 10.3. This Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to direct the respondent authorities to

decide the pending representations / objections of the petitioners (Annexure P/2)

10.4. This Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to grant any other

relief(s) / writ(s) / order(s) in favour of the petitioners, which the Hon'ble Court deemed fit & just in the facts and circumstances of the case, including

awarding of the costs to the petitioners.

2. On going by the pleadings and proceedings, it is seen that the Appellants/writ petitioners are villagers of the village Kayatpali, who are stated as

aggrieved of the deeds and misdeeds of the 6 th Respondent herein, who came to be transferred from the village Kayatpali to some other place as per

Annexure P/1 order dated 12.07.2019. The learned Single Judge observed that there was no locus for the Petitioners/villagers to have approached the

Court challenging the transfer of the 6th Respondent, so far as they were not affected adversely, in any manner. It was accordingly, that the

interference was declined and the writ petition was dismissed, which made the Appellants to approach this Court. Despite the elaborate hearing, the

Appellants were not in a position to point out any provision of law or binding precedents so as to provide them 'locus' to challenge the order passed by

the learned Single Judge. Further, no public interest litigation will lie, in a service matter, by virtue of settled position of law and binding precedents.

3. The appeal fails. It is dismissed accordingly.