

ACTION HISTORY OF RTI REQUEST No.FSOID/R/T/25/00012

Applicant Name Kumar Bhaskar Kalbande

Text of Application Respected CPIO FE Division MOEFCC Please find the attachment. An email is submitted to Honble Secretary MOEFCC for compliance on 14/11/2024. Under provision of RtAi Act 2005, please provide following information 1. Certified copies of further correspondence or action initited on the email 2. Certified copies of all the relevant documents including Notesheet I am ready to pay legal charges

Reply of Application Please find attached documents for the sought information.

SN.	Action Taken	Date of Action	Action Taken By	Remarks
1	RTI REQUEST RECEIVED	16/05/2025	Nodal Officer	MOENF/R/E/25/00656
2	REQUEST FORWARDED TO CPIO	16/05/2025	Nodal Officer	Forwarded to CPIO(s) : (1) Sugandha Srivastava
3	REQUEST DISPOSED OF	12/06/2025	Sugandha Srivastava- (CPIO)	

[Print](#)



Kumar Kalbande <kumarkalbande@gmail.com>

Trespassing order and compliance for CAT OA NO 949/2024 regarding

1 message

Kumar Kalbande <kumarkalbande@gmail.com>

Thu, Nov 14, 2024 at 1:03 PM

To: secy-moef@nic.in, nameeta.prasad@gov.in, dgfindia@nic.in, rdez@fsi.nic.in

Cc: sunandhabhashkarkalbande@gmail.com, Haider Ali <alihaider694@gmail.com>

To,
Secretary to Government of India,
MOEFCC
IP Bhavan
New Delhi.

Respected Mam

Please find the attachment. Due to trespassing order dated 17/8/2021, FSI deny my entry to government department. Further, FSI deny speed post and registered post. Proofs are attached herewith.

Please find police letter stated that for my belongings such as identity card original certificates cash book Lord Krishna Frame and others are kept illegally by FSI Nagpur. FSI denied it time and again including many representations to DG FSI Dehradun. Police Directed me to go to court.

FSI Nagpur has also declined leaves of Shri Kushvaha STA when applied online stating that emails are not official communication. Further, FSI Nagpur made false affidavit in CIC regarding not receiving my emails.

Further in reliving order provided in CAT case i was directed to submit NOC by RD FSI Nagpur but on contrary he made me trespasser in my own office. My LPC is also illegal as I am trespasser on the day of issuing LPC. Whereas all 4 other official has relived by appropriate rules.

Most importantly, as per RTI information the transfer order issued by JD FSI Dehradun has not approved by then DG FSI Dehradun Shri Pankaj Aggarwal Sir as FSI failed to show his approval on Notesheet. Only DG FSI Dehradun is authorised to transfer me, not JD FSI Dehradun at that time. Surprisingly, all other transfer order except mine was issued from different file.

The reliving order is signed by regional director and does not have approval of Regional Officer as FSI was merged into IRO and regional officer was my employer during period of reliving.

In this regards i am requesting you to kindly allow me submit my letters as per direction of CAT to IRO MOEFCC Nagpur or may make any suitable arrangements which facilitate to submit my letters for compliance by you.

I shall be obliged if you do the needful earliest as i only have 8 days.

Thanking you.

Yours Faithfully
Kumar Bhaskar Kalbande
JTA FSI CZ Nagpur

Copy for necessary action to

- 1) CVO MOEFCC IP Bhavan New Delhi
- 2) DGF and SS, MOEFCC IP Bhavan New Delhi
- 3) DG FSI Dehradun
- 4) RD FSI EZ Kolkata

5 attachments

संख्या-13-7/2025-प्रशा0-898
भारत सरकार
भारतीय वन सर्वेक्षण
डाकघर-आई0पी0ई0, कौलागढ़ मार्ग
देहरादून-248195

दिनांक 10 जून, 2025

सेवा में,

लोक सूचना अधिकारी
भारतीय वन सर्वेक्षण
कौलागढ़ मार्ग, देहरादून।

विषय:- RTI under the Right to information Act, 2005.

संदर्भ:- पत्र संख्या:-13-4/2025-आर0टी0आई0-662 दिनांक 22.05.2025.

महोदय,

उपरोक्त विषय के संदर्भ में यह सूचित किया जाता है कि Shri Kumar Kalbande, Maharashtra के आर0टी0आई0 आवेदन पत्र संख्या:-Registration No. FSOID/R/T/25/00012 दिनांक 16.05.2025 के द्वारा मांगी गई संबंधित सूचना उपलब्ध रूप में प्रशासन अनुभाग से प्रेषित की जा रही है।

भवदीय,


(मुंडे अरविंद दत्त)

उप निदेशक (का0 एवं प्रशा0)

संलग्नक:-उपरोक्तानुसार


10/6/25

RTI Cell.

संख्या 7-4/2010-प्रशा0 1224
भारत सरकार
भारतीय वन सर्वेक्षण
पीओओ आईओपीओ
कौलागढ़ मार्ग देहरादून-248195

दिनांक 30 जुलाई, 2021

कार्यालय आदेश

संस्थान में कार्यरत निम्नांकित कर्मचारियों का स्थानांतरण लोकहित में निम्नानुसार तत्काल प्रभाव से किया जाता है:-

क्र०स०	कर्मचारी का नाम व पदनाम	वर्तमान कार्यालय जहां कार्यरत है।	कार्यालय का नाम जहां स्थानांतरित किया जाता है।
1.	श्री सिद्धार्थ कुमार, क०स०स०	भा०ब०स०, क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय, नागपुर	भा०ब०स०, क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय, शिमला
2.	श्री प्रदीप कुशवाहा, क०स०स०	भा०ब०स०, क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय, कोलकाता	भा०ब०स०, क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय, नागपुर
3.	श्री आर०डी० पाटील, क०स०स०	भा०ब०स०, क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय, बंगलौर	भा०ब०स०, क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय, नागपुर
4.	श्री कुमार बी० कलबंदे, क०स०स०	भा०ब०स०, क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय, नागपुर	भा०ब०स०, क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय, कोलकाता
5.	श्री के०पी० सिंह, क०स०स०	भा०ब०स०, क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय, नागपुर	भा०ब०स०, क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय, बंगलौर

यह आदेश महानिदेशक महोदय के अनुमोदन से जारी किया जाते हैं।

संयुक्त निदेशक(का० एवं प्र०)

वितरण:-

- वैयक्तिक सहायक महानिदेशक को सूचनार्थ।
- क्षेत्रीय निदेशक, भारतीय वन सर्वेक्षण, क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय, केन्द्रीय/उत्तरीय/पूर्वी/दक्षिणी क्षेत्र, नागपुर/शिमला/कोलकाता/बंगलौर को सूचनार्थ एवं आवश्यक कार्यवाही हेतु।
- संबंधित कर्मचारी।
- श्रीमती सुमित्रा मैसी, अधीक्षक, भारतीय वन सर्वेक्षण, देहरादून।
- फाईल संख्या 3-13/2018-प्रशा०
- कार्यालय आदेश फाइल।

Issued
30/07/21



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH, NAGPUR.

WRIT PETITION NO. 3967 OF 2021

Kumar s/o Bhaskar Kalbande

Vs.

Union of India, New Delhi and others

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram,
appearances, Court's orders of directions
and Registrar's Orders.

Court's or Judge's orders.

Shri Saurabh S. Bhende, Advocate for petitioner.
Mrs. Suhasini N. Deshpande, Advocate for respondent No.1.

CORAM : SUNIL B. SHUKRE AND
ANIL L. PANSARE, JJ.

DATE : 27th OCTOBER, 2021.

Heard Shri Bhende, learned counsel for the
petitioner.

2. The petitioner has questioned his transfer order dated 30.07.2021 transferring him from Forest Survey of India, Central Zone Nagpur to Forest Survey of India, Eastern Zone Kolkata. The grievance of the petitioner is that his transfer order is actuated by malice as in the Communication dated 16.03.2021, the respondent No.4, levelling some allegations against the petitioner, requested the Director General of Forest Survey of India, to immediately transfer the petitioner to any other station and that just a day before issuance of the transfer order, the respondent No.2 had received a request application from Shri R.D. Patil, Junior Technical Assistant, for his transfer from Bangalore Zone



to Central Zone at Nagpur, which was granted just a day after on 30.07.2021.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner, however, admits that the petitioner has been posted to Nagpur, through-out since inception i.e. from the year 2009 and it is only now, for the first time, that the petitioner has been transferred from Nagpur to Kolkatta.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner also admits that the post of the petitioner is transferable though, he submits, that there is no regulation fixing a minimum period of service at a particular station. But, he agrees that period of 13 years for a Government Officer to spend at one station continuously is very long period of time.

5. The object of transfer of Government Officers is to prevent creation of vested interests to promote transparency in the administration, and to ensure good governance. If a Government Officer remains posted for such a long period of 13 years in one go, the object and purpose of the transfer of a Government Servant gets frustrated. It, therefore, follows that a Government Servant like the petitioner, who has continuously remained fastened to Nagpur for 13 long years must not and cannot contend that he has a right to be at Nagpur and that he should not be transferred to a place like



Kolkata. In fact employer of the petitioner has been quite benign so far, as could be seen from the fact of posting of petitioner at Nagpur even after his promotion.

6. Keeping in mind, the object of the transfer of Government Officer and long continuous stay at Nagpur, we are of the view that now, the petitioner has lost his right to challenge his transfer from Nagpur to Kolkata.

7. About some allegations made in the letter dated 06.05.2021, we find that the transfer order dated 30.07.2021 makes no mention of these allegations, does not consider them at all and does not rely on them in any way. The transfer order dated 30.07.2021, rather, shows that it states the reason of "public interest". If this is the reason stated in the transfer order, which we find to be in consonance with the unduly long tenure of petitioner at Nagpur, and the object of the transfer of Government Servants, there would be no ground for us to question the wisdom of the authority in transferring the petitioner. This transfer order, at the cost of repetition, we say that it has not been influenced in any manner by what is stated in the communication dated 06.05.2021 addressed by respondent No.4 to respondent No.2. The transfer order, in our considered view, serves the object of transfer of the Government Officers and has been issued in public interest as stated



earlier, and, therefore, there is no ground whatsoever available here to find any fault in the transfer order.

8. As regards the contention that one Mr. R.D. Patil had made a request for his transfer from Bangalore to Nagpur on 29.07.2021 and it was granted the next day, which showed malafides on the part of the respondent No.2; we must say that even this is not reflected in the order dated 30.07.2021 which is assailed here. Again, we would say that the order has been issued in public interest and it serves the object of the transfer of a Government Officer, as explained by us earlier.

9. The learned counsel for the petitioner, at this stage, has invited our attention to the notice dated 17.08.2021 in order to support his contention that the transfer in question here is by way of a punishment. We don't think that this argument deserves any acceptance by us. By the notice dated 17.08.2021, entry of the petitioner in the office has been prohibited and the reason for the same is also stated. The reason is that, it was found by the superior officers of the petitioner that in spite of his transfer from Nagpur to Kolkatta, the petitioner was visiting the office and creating some scenes, which have been described to be unruly. The learned counsel for the petitioner does not deny the fact that the petitioner, even after his transfer, was trying to

128



9.wp3967.2021.odt

5/5

visit his office. Rather, he submits that the petitioner wanted to visit the office after his transfer order, in order to continue with his official work. If this is so, we are of the view that the petitioner is indulging in a behaviour unbecoming of a Government Officer and this submission made on instructions on behalf of the petitioner is no less than misconduct on the part of the petitioner. On this ground as well, this petition deserves to be rejected.

10. In view of above, the petition stands summarily rejected. No costs.

JUDGE

JUDGE

Prity