

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

CWP No.12362 of 2016

Date of Decision:-07.06.2016

Subhash Chander

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARI PAL VERMA

1. *Whether reporters of local newspapers may be allowed to see judgment?*
2. *To be referred to reporters or not?*
3. *Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?*

Present:- Mr. Jitender Malik, Advocate
for the petitioner.

HARI PAL VERMA J.(Oral)

Petitioner Subhash Chander is working as Driver No.186 in Haryana Roadways, Rohtak Depot, has filed the present writ petition impugning his transfer order dated 1.6.2016 (Annexure P-1) passed by respondent No.2, whereby he has been transferred from Rohtak to Gurgaon.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that in February 2016 twin babies have born to the wife of the petitioner. Even, wife of the petitioner is 75% bodily paralyzed. He is also required to take care of his old mother, who is about 81 years of age. Transferring the petitioner at this

juncture would disturb his family. However, he submits that in case the impugned order of transfer dated 1.6.2016 (Annexure P-1) is kept in abeyance for a period of six months, the petitioner would come out from hard time and would be able to join the new place of posting.

Notice of motion.

On asking of the Court, Mr. Manish Bansal, Deputy A.G., Haryana accepts notice on behalf of respondents. Learned counsel for the petitioner is directed to hand over requisite number of copies of paper book to learned State counsel during the course of the day.

Without commenting on merits of the case, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent Nos.2 and 3 to consider the case of the petitioner and take note of the representation dated 2.6.2016 (Annexure P-7) as submitted by the petitioner. The respondents shall take conscious decision on the said representation of course with rational approach. While deciding the claim of the petitioner, respondent No.3 shall keep in mind the family problems of the petitioner to which he has prayed for non-implementation of the impugned order of transfer for about six months.

With the aforesaid observation, the present petition is disposed of.

June 07, 2016
Vijay Asija

(HARI PAL VERMA)
JUDGE