

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA, BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 25<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF AUGUST, 2015

**PRESENT**

**THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE N.KUMAR**

**AND**

**THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARAVIND KUMAR**

W.P.NO.35393/2015(S-KAT)

**BETWEEN:**

SMT.MAYADEVI GALAGALI  
W/O SRI.K.B.VIJAY KUMAR  
AGED ABOUT 38 YEARS,  
PROJECT DIRECTOR,  
DISTRICT URBAN DEVELOPMENT CELL,  
OFFICE OF DEPUTY COMMISSIONER,  
BELGAUM.  
R/A C1R1, GOVERNMENT QUARTERS,  
NEAR WATER TANK,  
VISHVESHWARIAH NAGARA,  
BELGAUM-590001. ..PETITIONER

(BY SRI.K.V.NARASIMHAN, ADVOCATE)

**AND:**

1.THE STATE OF KARNATAKA  
BY ITS SECRETARY,  
PERSONNEL AND ADMINISTRATIVE REFORMS  
DEPARTMENT,  
VIDHANA SOUDHA,  
BANGALORE-560001.

2.THE STATE OF KARNATAKA  
BY ITS SECRETARY,  
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL WELFARE,  
VIDHANA SOUDHA,  
BANGALORE-560001.

3.THE STATE OF KARNATAKA  
BY ITS SECRETARY,  
URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT,  
VIKASA SOUDHA,  
BANGALORE-560 001.

4.THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER  
BELGAUM DISTRICT,  
BELGAUM-590001.

5.SMT. GEETHA E.KOULAGI  
MAJOR,  
WORKING AS SPECIAL LAND  
ACQUISITION OFFICER,  
URBAN DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY,  
BELGAUM-590001. ..RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT.S.SUSHEELA, AGA FOR R-1 TO R-4,  
SRI.ARAVIND H., ADVOCATE FOR C/R5)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES  
226 & 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING  
TO:

QUASH THE ORDER PASSED IN APPLICATION  
NO.6657/2015 BY THE HON'BLE KARNATAKA  
ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, BANGALORE  
DATED:17.08.2015 AT ANENXEXURE-D AND STAY THE  
OPERATION AND EXECUTION OF THE ORDER VIDE

ANNEXURE-A1 PASSED BY THE R-1 CONCERNING THE APPLICANT AND R-5 AND THE ORDER AT ANNEXURE-A2 PASSED BY THE R-3 DATED:05.08.2015, PENDING DISPOSAL OF THE APPLICATION NO.6657/2105 BEFORE THE HON'BLE ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, BANGALORE

THIS WRIT PETITION COMING ON FOR PRELIMINARY HEARING, THIS DAY, **N.KUMAR J**, MADE THE FOLLOWING:

**ORDER**

Petitioner has challenged in this writ petition the order passed by tribunal declining to stay the order of transfer of fifth respondent to the post where the petitioner was working.

2. It is not in dispute the petitioner was working in the present post on deputation. Four years have lapsed. Now the petitioner is repatriated back to her parent department. Fifth respondent is posted to the said post where the petitioner is a deputationist and

after four years she has been repatriated to the parent department. She has no right to challenge the order of transfer. In that view of the matter, we do not find any merit in this writ petition. Accordingly it is dismissed.

**SD/-  
JUDGE**

**SD/-  
JUDGE**

SBN