



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 19TH DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 2025

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.T. NARENDRA PRASAD

WRIT PETITION NO. 23663 OF 2025 (S-RES)

BETWEEN:

SRI SRINIVASA J M
S/O SRI MUNIYAPPA
AGE ABOUT 40 YEARS
WORKING AS HEAD MESSENGER
P F NO 6226922
STATE BANK OF INDIA
P C EXTENSION BRANCH 40668
KOLAR 563101
R/O JANAGALAHALLI VILLAGE
MUDIVATTI POST, VAKKALERI HOBLI
KOLAR TALUK AND DISTRICT
KOLAR 563101

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. R B SADASIVAPPA., ADVOCATE)

AND:

Digitally signed by
HEMALATHA A
Location: HIGH
COURT OF
KARNATAKA

1. THE REGIONAL MANAGER
STATE BANK OF INDIA
REGIONAL BUSINESS OFFICE 6(AO-I)
NEW EXTENSION
DOOM LIGHT CIRCLE
KOLAR 563101.
2. THE BRANCH MANAGER
STATE BANK OF INDIA
P C EXTENSION BRANCH
KOLAR 563101

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. T P MUTHANNA., ADVOCATE FOR R1 & R2)



THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLE 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO ISSUE WRIT IN THE NATURE OF CERTIORARI TO QUASH THE IMPUGNED ORDER VIDE ANNEXURE - A BY R2 BEARING NO.BR/40668/2025-26/TRF1 DATED 04/06/2025 AND ALSO THE ORDER DATED 29/07/2025 (RECEIVED ON 01/08/2025) VIDE ANNEXURE - D BY R1 PENDING DISPOSAL OF THE ABOVE WRIT PETITION, IN THE INTEREST OF JUSTICE AND EQUITY AND ETC.

THIS PETITION, COMING ON FOR ORDERS, THIS DAY, ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.T. NARENDRA PRASAD

ORAL ORDER

This writ petition is filed under Articles 226 and 227 of the Constitution of India challenging the transfer order dated 04.06.2025, vide Annexure-A, issued by the second respondent, transferring the petitioner from Kolar Branch to K.R. Road, Hosakote Branch.

2. The case of the petitioner is that he was working as Head Messenger of the State Bank of India, P.C. Extension Branch, Kolar, for the last 1½ years. By the impugned order, he has been transferred to Hosakote without assigning any reason. The said transfer order has been issued before he could complete five years of service



at the said branch. Being aggrieved, the petitioner has approached this Court.

3. Sri R.B. Sadasivappa, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, raised the following contentions:

(i) As per the transfer policy produced at Annexure-B, subordinate staff shall not be transferred outside the Centre before completing five years of service. In contravention of the said policy, the petitioner has been prematurely transferred.

(ii) No reason is assigned in the transfer order. In fact, there is a shortage of staff at the Kolar Branch, and there is no surplus. Despite this, the petitioner has been transferred, which is contrary to the guidelines.

(iii) The petitioner submitted a representation (Annexure-C) to the first respondent, requesting continuation at Kolar, on the ground that his three children are studying at Chinmaya School, Kolar, and that he has



an aged father, aged about 75 years, residing with him. He contends that daily travel of over 40 kilometers would cause severe hardship.

(iv) The State Government, by Circular dated 26.11.2024 (Annexure-F), directed that transfers shall be carried out transparently and with reasons duly recorded. Despite a meeting held between the Employees' Union and the Bank, the impugned transfer order was passed. Hence, he seeks to allow the writ petition.

4. Per contra, the learned counsel for the respondents submits as follows:

(i) The petitioner has been working at Kolar Centre for the last 12 years. As per transfer policy, once subordinate staff complete five years in a Centre, they may be transferred outside. Since the petitioner has already served more than 12 years in Kolar Centre, his transfer is in line with policy.



(ii) Due to administrative exigency, the K.R. Road, Hosakote Branch requires two permanent messengers for smooth functioning of the Currency Chest, in terms of RBI guidelines. Since one messenger retired by superannuation, the petitioner was required to be transferred to Hosakote.

(iii) The distance between Kolar and Hosakote is only about 40 kilometers, which will not cause undue hardship. Hence, the writ petition is liable to be dismissed.

5. Heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the material on record.

6. The petitioner was initially appointed at RBO, Kolar on 26.05.2011, where he continued till 27.10.2023, i.e., for more than 12 years. Thereafter, he was transferred to P.C. Extension Branch, Kolar, which is barely 500 meters away from RBO, Kolar. By letter dated 27.10.2023, under the Uniform Transfer Policy, he was posted as Head Messenger at P.C. Extension Branch. He reported on



30.10.2023 and worked there till 04.06.2025. Thereafter, he was transferred to K.R. Road, Hosakote Branch.

7. Although the impugned transfer order does not mention reasons, the respondents, in their objections, specifically stated that due to superannuation of one messenger, only one permanent messenger was left at the Currency Chest, Hosakote. As per RBI guidelines and Bank's internal procedure, two permanent messengers are mandatory for smooth functioning of Currency Chests. Hence, the petitioner's transfer was necessitated.

8. The petitioner has been working in Kolar since 2011. The transfer policy prohibits transfer outside the Centre before five years, but permits such transfer in case of administrative exigencies or surplus staff. In the present case, administrative exigency is clearly demonstrated.



9. Further, the distance between Kolar and Hosakote is only about 40 kilometers, which cannot be said to cause serious prejudice to the petitioner.

10. Thus, no error or illegality is made out in the impugned transfer order dated 04.06.2025 passed by the second respondent. Accordingly, the writ petition fails and is dismissed.

However, if the petitioner reports to the K.R. Road, Hosakote Branch, the respondents shall consider his representation (Annexure-C) sympathetically.

In view of disposal of the petition, all pending applications stand disposed of.

Sd/-
(H.T. NARENDRA PRASAD)
JUDGE

CM/HA
LIST NO.: 1 SL NO.: 19