

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

CWP No.10928 of 2016

Date of decision: 28.05.2016

Sachin Malik

...Petitioner

versus

The State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RITU BAHRI

Present: Mr. Saurabh Dalal, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

RITU BAHRI, J.

The petitioner is seeking direction to the respondents to transfer him at Rohtak as per the transfer policy.

Grievance of the petitioner is that his juniors have been adjusted, whereas he has been ignored, although he had earlier made an application for mutual transfer. With regard to his grievance, the petitioner made a representation dated 11.01.2016 (Annexure P-3) to respondent No.2, but to no avail.

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that the petitioner was seeking mutual transfer with one Ram Phal Rathee, who has now retired, therefore, he restricts his prayer for transfer, if a vacant post is available in Rohtak.

At this stage, this petition is disposed of by giving a direction to the respondents to consider the representation dated 11.01.2016 (Annexure P-3), if any vacant post is lying vacant in Rohtak, and pass appropriate order in accordance with law

28.05.2016
ajp

(RITU BAHRI)
JUDGE