

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

L.P.A.No.1348 of 2015.

Date of Order: 14.09.2015

**Dalip Singh son of Sri Chand, resident of village Kheri, Tehsil
Nathusari Thopta, District Sirsa.**

..Appellant

Versus

State of Haryana and others

..Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIVE BHALLA
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NAVITA SINGH**

**Present: Mr. Satbir Gill, Advocate,
for the appellant.**

RAJIVE BHALLA, J (Oral)

The appellant, challenges order dated 07.09.2015,
dismissing his writ petition.

Counsel for the appellant submits that the appellant has
been repeatedly transferred to accommodate respondent no.4, who
is politically influential. A perusal of the record reveals that the
appellant was transferred from Sirsa to Kaithal, then to Fatehabad
and thereafter vide the impugned order, to Chandigarh. The repeated
transfer of the appellant is malafide and may, therefore, be set aside.

We have heard counsel for the appellant, perused the
impugned order as well as the entire paper book.

A perusal of the record reveals that the appellant was

serving as a Clerk in the respondent-department at Sirsa and was transferred, on 15.07.2013, on promotion to Kaithal. The appellant was able to get the transfer order cancelled. On 27.11.2013, the appellant was transferred to Fatehabad, but this order was also cancelled. Vide order dated 19.12.2014, the appellant was again transferred from Sirsa to Fatehabad and then by way of the impugned order, to Chandigarh. The learned Single Judge has while dismissing the writ petition, rightly held that barring the last two orders, the appellant succeeded in ensuring that he remains posted at Sirsa and, therefore, cannot complain that he has been transferred frequently. The allegations of malafide have been held to be vague and unsubstantiated. A perusal of the pleadings in the writ petition reveal that the allegations of malafide are not only general in nature but there is no reference to the persons who are politically linked to respondent no.4, the alleged cause of the appellant's transfer. The writ petition appears to be an attempt to ensure that the appellant remains posted at Sirsa. We, therefore, find no reason to interfere with the impugned order.

Dismissed.

(RAJIVE BHALLA)
JUDGE

September 14, 2015
nt

(NAVITA SINGH)
JUDGE