

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.15315 of 2018

=====

Dharam Deo Jha Son of Late Mahi Nath Jha resident of Village - Dhangri,
P.S. - Bardaha, District - Araria.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Bank of Baroda through the General Manager, Zonal Office, Guini Motors, West Boring Canal Road, Patna - 1.
2. The Asstt. General Manager (R H), Bank of Baroda, Regional Office - Purnea.
3. The Regional Manager, Regional Office, Khiru Chowk, Bhatta Bazar, Purnea.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Amit Kumar Anand
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Dr. Anshuman

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SHIVAJI PANDEY
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 19-09-2018

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and counsel for the State.

In this case, the petitioner is challenging the order dated 7.7.2018 by which the petitioner has been transferred from Regional Office, Purnea to Patna having raised a grievance that he has been transferred seven times in a year and, thus, it is nothing but, a harassment to the Bank employee.

A counter affidavit has been filed by the Bank denying the statement made in the writ application and submitted that it is not so that the petitioner has been treated maliciously and the order has been passed illegally. In fact, the petitioner was posted at Altakamalpur Branch, Kishanganj and transferred to Begusarai vide order dated 12.12.2016 but, that transfer order was not acted



upon, again the transfer order was passed from Altakamalpur Branch, Kishanganj to Bhagalpur on 31.12.2016 but, on the request, the petitioner was sent to Forbeshganj Branch, in that manner, the petitioner was accommodated as per his choice. Again the petitioner was transferred from Farbesganj Branch to Bhagalpur Branch on 12.5.2017, again on his request, he was sent to Regional Office, Purnea and now from Purnea to Patna on 7.7.2018.

In fact, it is a single transfer which can be said to have been effected by the Bank is the order dated 7.7.2018 and the purpose has been mentioned that he has been brought to Regional Office for filing the cases in connection with SARB, DRT, Patna and, on that account, he has been brought there.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has produced the guideline which prescribes three years stay at one place but, as per petitioner, in his matter, he has not been allowed to stay for three years. These are the guideline, in normal circumstances, has to be invoked for transfer from one branch to another branch, one zone to another zone but, for administrative reasons, any employee can be transferred even before three years.

This Court does not find any apparent error in the order of transfer. Accordingly, this writ application is dismissed with a



liberty to the petitioner to raise his grievance before the appropriate authority.

(Shivaji Pandey, J)

rishi/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	03.10.2018
Transmission Date	

