



1

WP-18971-2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF MADHYA PRADESH
AT INDORE

BEFORE

HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE VIJAY KUMAR SHUKLA

ON THE 8th OF JUNE, 2026WRIT PETITION No. 18971 of 2026*DINESH WASKEL**Versus**THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS*

.....
Appearance:

Shri Yash Pal Rathore - Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms Drishti Rawal - Government Advocate for the respondents State.

.....

ORDER

The petitioner is challenging the order dated 14.05.2026 passed by the respondent No.1, whereby the petitioner has been transferred from Kannod District Dewas to the office of Principal Chief Conservator of Forest, Bhopal.

2. The counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner was transferred from Bhikangaon District Khargone to Kannod District Dewas vide order dated 17.06.2025 (Annexure-P-2) and within a year the petitioner has been transferred from the present place of posting without there being any administrative exigency. He further submitted that the petitioner's daughter has taken admission in Class VI and the petitioner's son taken admission in Class-II. It is further stated that her daughter Bhanupriya Waskel is suffering from Osteomyelitis.

3. Counsel for the respondents filed the reply without issuance of the



notice opposing the petition.

4. The respondents have stated that the transfer policy of the State Government (Annexure-R-2) does not apply to the Department of the Forest. It is further stated in the reply that the transfer order has been issued on administrative exigency and in public interest and the petitioner has already been relieved and the additional charge has been given to the DFO, Baagli.

5. After hearing learned counsel for the parties, this Court is of the view that the employee has a right to make a representation against the transfer order to the employer.

6. Considering the same, the petition is disposed off with liberty to the petitioner to submit a detailed and comprehensive representation before the respondent No.1, within a period of three working days, from today and if such representation is submitted within the said period before the respondent No.1, the respondent No.1 shall consider and decide the same, in accordance with law, within a period of 30 days, from the date of filing of the representation.

7. So far as the interim relief is concerned, considering the fact that no regular incumbent has been posted in place of the petitioner and only interim arrangement by giving additional charge to other officer has been made, it is directed that till the representation is decided by the respondent No.1, the petitioner shall be allowed to work at the present place of posting.

8. With the aforesaid observations, the petition stands disposed of.

No order as to costs.



(VIJAY KUMAR SHUKLA)
V. JUDGE

rashmi