

\$~15

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ W.P.(C) 3442/2017

RAVI KANT

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Asad Alvi, Mr. Aishwarya
Pathak, Ms. Tamanya Gaur, Advs.

versus

VICE CHANCELLOR, INDIRA GANDHI NATIONAL OPEN
UNIVERSITY & ANR

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Kirtiman Singh and Mr. Saurabh
Chauhan, Advs. for R1 and R2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V. KAMESWAR RAO

ORDER

%

24.04.2017

The present petition has been filed by the petitioner challenging his transfer from IGNOU Regional Centre, Lucknow to IGNOU Regional Centre, Aligarh.

The primary grounds pleaded in the writ petition are that the brother of the petitioner has expired and the petitioner has to look after the family of his brother; the petitioner is constructing a house at Lucknow and as the petitioner is getting retired on 30th June, 2019, he is entitled to the benefit of clause 6 of the transfer policy, Annexure-A5 of the paper book. It is conceded that the petitioner is holding an All India transferrable post. If that be so, the law is well settled that if a person / employee is aggrieved by a transfer order, he should join the place of posting and make a representation for review of the order of transfer.

Mr. Asad Alvi, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner states, as there are compelling grounds for the respondents to review the transfer order, he would be satisfied if this petition is treated as a representation to the respondents, who shall consider the same and pass a reasoned and speaking order.

Noting the aforesaid submission, the respondents shall consider the writ petition of the petitioner as a representation and dispose of the same within four weeks with communication to the petitioner. Pending consideration of the writ petition as representation, the petitioner shall join the place of posting immediately.

The petition is disposed of in terms of the above.

CM No. 15083/2017

Dismissed as infructuous.

V. KAMESWAR RAO, J

APRIL 24, 2017/jg