

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

**CWP No.6323 of 2019
Date of decision:22.10.2019**

Dr. Sucheta Yadav

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

Present:- Mr. Mukul Goyal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Hitesh Pandit, Addl.A.G.Haryana.

AMIT RAWAL J. (Oral)

Contention of learned counsel for the petitioner is that incumbent who has replaced the petitioner cannot fall in the category of couple case as his wife is posted at Charkhi Dadri which does not fall within District Bhiwani. Petitioner is an aged doctor and about to retire in two years and had been working in Bhiwani District and her husband is posted in Bhiwani.

Contention with regard to working of petitioner's husband in Bhiwani has been rebutted by learned State Counsel that though he has taken voluntary retirement from Government service but now is working under National Rural Health Mission on contractual basis.

The objection was also raised with regard to non-impleadment of proper party in the writ petition or in the likelihood of necessary party.

This Court noticing the arguments of learned counsel for the petitioner, called upon learned State Counsel to apprise whether petitioner can be posted in any hospital which is closely situated to Bhiwani.

At this stage, aforementioned proposal is not accepted by Mr. Mukul Goyal, Advocate.

The transfer matters are purely administrative in nature. The petitioner is already working in Rohtak District for the last nine months and husband of petitioner has already retired, thus, case of petitioner does not fall in the couple case policy. This Court cannot interfere in the administrative matters while exercising the powers under judicial review.

Dismissed.

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

October 22, 2019
savita

Whether Speaking/Reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No