

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

**CWP No.14421 of 2016
Date of decision: 23.07.2016**

Parveen Kumar

..Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

..Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE DAYA CHAUDHARY

- 1. Whether reporters of local newspapers may be allowed to see judgment? Yes/No**
- 2. To be referred to reporters or not? Yes/No**
- 3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest? Yes/No**

Present: Mr. Vivek Salathia, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Daya Chaudhary, J. (Oral)

This writ petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of certiorari for quashing of transfer order dated 28.06.2016 (Annexure P-2), whereby, the petitioner has been transferred from Village Kalsian Kalan to Village Khem Karan, District Tarn Taran just to accommodate respondent No.3.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was transferred 10 months earlier and again he has been transferred as respondent No.3 made a request for his transfer, which was accepted but no request was made by the petitioner. The petitioner has made representation dated 04.07.2016 (Annexure P-3) but no action has been taken thereupon and the same is still pending. Learned counsel also submits that the transfer of the petitioner is contrary to the guidelines relating to transfer policy.

Heard arguments of learned counsel for the petitioner and have

also perused impugned transfer order as well as other documents available on the file.

Admittedly, a representation (Annexure P-3) has been moved by the petitioner but no action has been taken thereupon so far.

Keeping in view the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner, the present writ petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2 to consider representation dated 04.07.2016 (Annexure P-3) and take necessary action in accordance with law within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

Disposed of accordingly.

However, in case, respondent No.1 comes to the conclusion that the transfer is contrary to the policy framed by the State Government, the petitioner be not relieved from the present place of posting.

23.07.2016
neetu

(DAYA CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE