

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

**CWP No.17254 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 26.08.2016**

Virender Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

... Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA

Present:- Mr. Sandeep Kumar Goyat, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA, J. (ORAL)

The petitioner who is serving on the post of Auditor under the Directorate of Food and Supplies, Haryana has filed the instant petition being aggrieved of his transfer from Hisar to Fatehabad.

The sole argument raised by learned counsel is that respondent No.4, namely, Sandeep has exercised his political patronage to be adjusted at Hisar whereas on an earlier occasion he had been transferred out on account of a complaint. It is argued that there is no administrative exigency involved insofar as the transfer of the petitioner is concerned and it is only on account of certain political proximity that the private respondent enjoys and the petitioner is sought to be dislocated from Hisar.

Having heard counsel for the petitioner at length, this Court is of the considered view that no interference in the matter is called for.

During the course of arguments, it stands conceded that the petitioner was promoted from the post of Clerk to Auditor on 14.01.2014.

Prior thereto for a period in excess of four years, the petitioner served on the

post of Clerk at Hisar itself. Upon taking over the promotional post he has continued at Hisar. In other words, he has already served at Hisar for a period in excess of six years.

Transfer is an incidence of service. Petitioner possibly cannot object to an order of transfer having served at one particular place of posting for a period more than six years.

As regards the allegations that the impugned transfer has been managed by private respondent No.4 Sandeep is concerned, even such allegations are completely vague. There is no political personality impleaded as a party respondent in this petition and who as per the petitioner had exercised influence and was responsible for issuance of the impugned order. Such aspect as such cannot be gone into by this Court.

For the reasons recorded above, petition is found to be bereft of merit and is dismissed.

26.08.2016

vandana

**(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether Reportable

Yes/No