

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH.

Case No. : C. W. P.No. 5770 of 2015

Date of Decision : September 07, 2015

Dalip Singh Petitioner

vs.

State of Haryana and others Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK SIBAL.

* * *

To be referred to Reporters or not ?

Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest ?

* * *

Present : Mr. Satbir Gill, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Karan Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. G. C. Shahpuri, Advocate
for respondent no. 4.

* * *

DEEPAK SIBAL, J. :

Through the present petition, the petitioner seeks quashing of order dated 16.03.2015 (Annexure P-7), through which he has been transferred from Fatehabad to Chandigarh.

The petitioner challenges the transfer order on the ground that he, in the recent past, has been frequently transferred, only to accommodate respondent no. 4, who is politically linked.

After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it

is revealed that the petitioner was serving the respondent Department as a Clerk at Sirsa. Through order dated 15.07.2013, on his promotion as Assistant, he was transferred from Sirsa to Kaithal. This transfer, at his own request, was cancelled and thus, he continued to stay at Sirsa. Thereafter, vide order dated 27.11.2013, the petitioner was again transferred to Fatehabad, which transfer also, on his own request, was cancelled, keeping him at Sirsa. Vide order dated 19.12.2014, the petitioner has been transferred from Sirsa to Fatehabad, and thereafter, vide order impugned, he has been transferred from Fatehabad to Chandigarh.

It can thus be seen that barring the last two orders of his transfer, the petitioner has always been successful to keep himself posted at Sirsa and thus, cannot complain of frequent transfers.

The allegations of mala fide against respondent no. 4 are vague, unsubstantiated and thus, cannot be relied upon.

Further, transfers of employees are made by the employers while keeping in mind administrative exigencies and unless mala fides, perversity or extreme hardship in such orders is proven, they should not be lightly interfered with. The petitioner has not brought his case in either of the three eventualities referred to above.

In view of the above, I find no merit in this writ petition and the same is ordered to be dismissed with no order as to costs.

(DEEPAK SIBAL)
JUDGE

September 07, 2015