

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH.

123/129/130

Date of decision:11.9.2017

(1) CWP No.20496 of 2017

Mohan Lal

... Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana and others

... Respondents

(2) CWP No.20524 of 2017

Sonu Singhra

... Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana and others

... Respondents

(3) CWP No.20539 of 2017

Satish Kumar

... Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH.

Present: Mr.Shalender Mohan, Advocate,
for the petitioners

...

AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J. (Oral)

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners in all three petitions are covered by the judgment of this Court passed in a bunch of writ petitions, the lead case being CWP No.17899 of 2017, decided on 1.9.2017, they being similarly situated as those referred to as the first set of the petitioners in the aforesaid order.

In CWP No.20496 of 2017, the petitioner is stated to have been relieved from the Haryana Roadways, Jind, to join as a Conductor at the Haryana Roadways City Bus Stand, Faridabad, vide the impugned order (Annexure P-2) dated 3.7.2017, even though he was posted to Jind from

Chandigarh, vide the order (Annexure P-1) on 2.9.2016 (though in the order P-1 it is typed, from Chandigarh to Faridabad and not from Chandigarh to Jind, in the translated version), i.e. within one year of his transfer.

Similarly, in CWP No.20524 of 2017, the petitioner is stated to have been relieved vide the impugned order (Annexure P-2) dated 13.6.2017 from the Haryana Roadways, Rohtak, to join at the Haryana Roadways, ISBT, New Delhi, even though he was posted to Rohtak on 30.6.2016 vide order (Annexure P-1) dated 1.7.2016, i.e. within one year of his transfer.

In CWP No.20539 of 2017, the petitioner has been transferred from the Haryana Roadways, Hisar, to the Haryana Roadways City Bus Stand, Faridabad, vide the impugned order (Annexure P-2) dated 16.3.2017, even though he was posted to Hisar from Jind on 14.6.2016, vide order (Annexure P-1), i.e. within one year of his transfer.

Consequently, the petitioners in all these petitions having been transferred out against the transfer policy (Annexure P-3 in all three cases), they would be covered by the ratio of the aforesaid judgment of this Court passed on 1.9.2017 in CWP No.17899 of 2017 and other connected petitions.

Hence, the impugned orders are hereby quashed. These writ petitions are allowed, but with no order as to costs.

11.9.2017
pk

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No