



Sl. No.	Date	Office Stamp, signature, date or proceedings as directed and Registrar's order with signature	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			WPSS No.1605 of 2026 <u>Hon'ble Pankaj Purohit, J.</u> Mr. Akshay Pradhan, learned Counsel for petitioner. 2. Mr. Ganga S. Negi, learned Addl. CSC for the State. 3. The facts of the case are that the petitioner is serving as a Workshop Instructor in the Technical Education Department and was posted at Government Polytechnic, Bhalaswagaj, District Haridwar. By order dated 11.06.2026, he was transferred to Government Polytechnic, Kotdwar, District Pauri Garhwal. Aggrieved by the said transfer order, the petitioner has filed the present writ petition. The grievance of the petitioner is that prior to issuance of the transfer order, he had submitted an application dated 30.05.2026 seeking mutual transfer with another Workshop Instructor and had also submitted a representation dated 03.06.2026 alleging incorrect computation of his service in difficult/inaccessible areas. According to the petitioner, the said representations were not considered before the transfer order was issued. 4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner had applied for mutual transfer with a consenting employee belonging to the same cadre and the said application had been duly recommended through the proper channel. It is contended that the competent authority failed to consider the petitioner's application before finalizing the transfer exercise and



		thereby acted arbitrarily and contrary to the provisions governing annual transfers. It is further submitted that the petitioner had specifically pointed out an error in the calculation of his service rendered in difficult and inaccessible areas and sought correction of the official records by representation dated 03.06.2026. However, without examining the petitioner's grievance or verifying the records, the respondents proceeded to issue the impugned transfer order, thereby vitiating the decision-making process. 5. Learned counsel also submitted that similarly situated employees were accommodated at stations of their choice during the same transfer exercise, whereas the petitioner's request was ignored without assigning any reason. It is, therefore, contended that the impugned transfer order is arbitrary, discriminatory and violative of Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India and deserves to be quashed. 6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material available on record, this Court is not inclined to interfere with the impugned transfer order. It is well settled that transfer is an incidence of service and an employee has no vested right to remain posted at a particular place. The petitioner's principal grievance is that his request for mutual transfer and his representation regarding calculation of service in difficult areas were not considered before issuance of the transfer order. However, mere pendency of a
--	--	---



		representation or a request for posting at a station of choice does not create any enforceable right in favour of an employee nor does it invalidate an otherwise lawful transfer order. 7. Furthermore, no <i>mala fides</i> have been alleged against any authority and no violation of any mandatory statutory provision has been demonstrated warranting interference under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. 8. Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed. (Pankaj Purohit, J.) 17.06.2026 <i>RDang</i>
--	--	---