

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

Gurpreet Kaur
2017.09.18 12:45
Attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document
high court

CWP No.20686 of 2017

Date of Decision: 12.09.2017

Maninderpal Singh

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

....Respondents

BEFORE :- HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE DAYA CHAUDHARY

Present:- Mr. Gursharan Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

DAYA CHAUDHARY, J. (ORAL)

The present petition has been filed for quashing of impugned transfer order dated 04.09.2017 (Annexure P-1) passed by Director Agriculture Punjab, whereby, the petitioner has been transferred to Block Agriculture Office Maini, District Hoshiarpur from Block Agriculture Office Sarupwali Batala, District Gurdaspur.

Learned counsel submits that the petitioner has been transferred during mid-session and as per transfer policy, it cannot be without having permission from the Chief Minister and only under compelling circumstances, the transfer is to be made. It is also the argument of learned counsel for the petitioner that no reasons have been mentioned in the transfer order.

Heard the arguments of learned counsel for the petitioner and have also perused the impugned order as well as other documents available on the file.

The transfer order has been challenged only on the ground that

as per transfer policy, no transfer can be made during mid-session. Admittedly, the stay of the petitioner is three years at the place where he was posted and no *mala fide*, whatsoever, has been mentioned or addressed by learned counsel for the petitioner. Reasoning are not required to be mentioned in the transfer order. The transfer is part and parcel of service and an employee cannot have a choice over a particular place of posting. Simply by saying that no reason has been mentioned and the transfer has been made in a mid-session, is not a ground to interfere with the transfer order, unless something is brought to the notice of the Court that the petitioner has frequently been transferred or just to give benefit to some other person, he has been transferred.

No such ground has been mentioned either in the petition or during arguments raised by learned counsel for the petitioner.

Accordingly, the present petition, being devoid of any merit, is hereby dismissed.

12.09.2017
gurpreet

(DAYA CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether Reportable

Yes/No