

120

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

Date of Decision : 23.05.2017

1.

CWP No.11038 of 2017 (O&M)

Harish Kumar

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

..... Respondents

2.

CWP No.11042 of 2017 (O&M)

Gagan Deep

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

..... Respondents

3.

CWP No.11047 of 2017 (O&M)

Satyavir Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

..... Respondents

4.

CWP No.11048 of 2017 (O&M)

Sanjay Kumar

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

..... Respondents

5.

CWP No.11053 of 2017 (O&M)

Sanjay Kumar

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

..... Respondents

6. CWP No.11172 of 2017 (O&M)

Naveen Kumar Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others Respondents

7. CWP No.11182 of 2017 (O&M)

Dayanand Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AJAY TEWARI

Present : Mr. Sandeep Parkash Chahar, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Ms. Shruti Jain Goyal, AAG, Haryana.

AJAY TEWARI, J. (Oral)

This is a bunch of seven petitions which are decided by the common order. These petitions have been filed for issuance of directions to the respondents to transfer the petitioner(s) as per the preference given/taken by respondents vide Form-B.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of the Court, Ms. Shruti Jain Goyal, AAG, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of the respondents. Copy of the paper book has been supplied.

The petitioner(s) are JBT teachers who were appointed in the year 2004/2005. It is their contention that their cases were illegally not considered under the 2015 Inter-District Transfer Policy. The learned Assistant Advocate General states that as of today the State of Haryana is facing problems in placing about 9000 JBT teachers who have been freshly selected and that matter is pending before a Division Bench of this Court. Apart from that there are some teachers of the 2011 selection who are claiming placement on a different ground while these petitioners are claiming transfer to the Districts of their choice on yet another ground.

Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) has expressed the apprehension that the placement of the fresh selectees may present a fait accompli which would result in a situation where the cases of the petitioner(s) would never be considered.

Learned Assistant Advocate General states that this apprehension can be very easily allayed because in the case of 2011 selectees she had suffered a statement that any placement made by the Government would be provisional and the claims of all those persons would ultimately be considered and appropriate orders passed. Similarly in the present cases also the same protection would be there and the cases of the petitioner(s) would be considered in due course and if it is found that their cases were illegally not considered under the 2015 policy efforts would be made to now redress their grievance.

In view of the statement suffered by learned Assistant Advocate General all the petitions stand disposed of.

Since the main case has been decided, the pending Civil Misc.
Application, if any, also stands disposed of.

23.05.2017
Pooja sharma-I

(AJAY TEWARI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned - Yes/No
Whether reportable - Yes/No