

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

CWP No.8000 of 2018
Date of decision: 02.04.2018

Sunil Kumar

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN PALLI

Present: Mr. JP Dhull, Advocate for the petitioner.

ARUN PALLI, J. (Oral)

The petitioner is aggrieved by an order dated 27.12.2017 (Annexure P3), as also the order dated 21.02.2018 (Annexure P5), whereby his transfer from Nuh to Jind Depot was cancelled and his objections to the order of cancellation of his transfer have since been declined.

The petitioner is employed as Conductor with the respondent-department, and pursuant to his appointment on 07.05.2014, he was posted at Nuh. Vide order dated 15.05.2017 (Annexure P2), he was transferred from Nuh to Jind, but vide order dated 27.12.2017 (Annexure P3), his transfer was cancelled. It was in this background, he had even earlier approached this Court vide CWP No.41 of 2018, which was disposed of vide order dated 29.01.2018 (Annexure P4) requiring the respondents to consider his claim/grievance in the wake of the decisions of this Court dated 01.09.2017 (Annexure P6), as also the judgment dated 12.12.2017, rendered in CWP No.24190 of 2017 (Dilbag Singh v. State of Haryana and others). But since

the respondent-authorities, vide order dated 21.02.2018 (Annexure P5), have declined the request of the petitioner, thus, this petition.

Ex facie, the respondent-authorities, on a due consideration of the claim of the petitioner, have clarified that as there is no Conductor at Jind Depot, who had completed two years' service, it was not feasible to adjust the petitioner. Likewise, even Baljeet Singh Conductor No.141, vice whom the petitioner was sought to be adjusted, had also not completed two years at Jind. Thus, the claim of the petitioner could not be countenanced. On being pointedly asked, learned counsel for the petitioner could not show as to how the orders passed by the respondent-authorities (Annexure P5) was either contrary to the decisions of this Court, referred to above, or suffered from any material illegality.

No ground is made out to interfere under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India. The petition being devoid of merit is, accordingly, dismissed.

02.04.2018
Rajan

(Arun Palli)
Judge

Whether speaking / reasoned:
Whether Reportable:

YES
NO