

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

**108**

**CWP No.16365 of 2017**

**Date of decision: 27.07.2017**

Vijay Kumar

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana & others

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE G.S.SANDHAWALIA**

Present: Mr.Vikas Lochab, Advocate, for the petitioner.

**G.S. SANDHAWALIA, J. (Oral)**

Petitioner seeks quashing of the order dated 29.11.2016 (Annexure P-5), vide which respondent No.3 has transferred him from District Yamunanagar to Karnal.

It is the case of the petitioner that he is suffering from a chronic disease and is covered by a policy dated 06.08.2015 (Annexure P-1) issued by respondent No.2. Similarly, his mother is also suffering from chronic disease and his wife is serving at Delhi and his family is residing at Sonapat. It is further his case that he has earlier filed CWP-18967-2016, which was disposed of on 19.10.2016, to take a comprehensive decision upon his representation and grievances. It is further his case that request made in his representation in that writ petition was also for transfer to Sonapat. It is, in such circumstances, he is seeking adjustment at Sonapat instead of Karnal.

Counsel for the petitioner further points out that thereafter also, the petitioner filed representation dated 16.12.2016 (Annexure P-6) for the necessary relief, which is still pending consideration.

Notice of motion.

Ms.Shruti Jain Goyal, AAG, Haryana accepts notice on behalf of the respondents. Copy of the paperbook has been supplied to her.

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

**108 CWP No.16365 of 2017**

**-2-**

Without commenting upon the merits of the case and keeping in view the fact that since the petitioner is seeking adjustment on account of his family staying at Sonapat and the fact that respondent No.2 is yet to take a decision on the representation of the petitioner, the present writ petition is disposed of, with a direction to respondent No.2 to look into the averments made in the representation dated 16.12.2016 (Annexure P-6). In case the factual aspect is found correct regarding the chronic disease the petitioner and his mother are suffering from and that the family is residing at Sonapat, the said respondent shall take remedial steps, since the petitioner has already been adjusted in some manner and brought closure to the place where his family is already residing, but that does not serve the purpose of the earlier representation. In case the request is to be declined, a reasoned order be passed and communicated to the petitioner, within a period of 4 weeks from the receipt of a certified copy of the order.

27.07.2017  
*Sailesh*

**(G.S. SANDHAWALIA)**  
**JUDGE**

*Whether speaking/reasoned:*                      *Yes/No*

*Whether Reportable:*                              *Yes/No*