

Sr. No.103

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

CWP No.34357 of 2019 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 26.11.2019

Devender Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State Bank of India and another

... Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA

Present:- Mr. Sumit Sangwan, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Akshay Jain, Advocate,
for the caveater/respondents-SBI.

ARUN MONGA, J.(ORAL)

Impugned herein is transfer order dated 16.11.2019 (Annexure P-1) and relieving order dated 19.11.2019 (Annexure P-2) whereby, the petitioner has been transferred from Rewari to Jalandhar and was relieved against the Transfer Policy.

2. Contents of the writ petition have been perused.

3. The earlier round of litigation instituted by the petitioner, an impression was given that no successor has yet joined at Rewari from where he has been transferred to Jalandhar.

4. In the premise, competent authority was directed to pass fresh orders keeping in view the contentions of learned counsel for the petitioner as recorded in the order dated 31.10.2019 passed in CWP No.31442 of 2019 passed by this Court.

5. Pursuant whereto order dated 16.11.2019 has been

passed, which is impugned by the petitioner in this round of litigation. A perusal of the order reflects that the contention of the petitioner that no successor has joined is misplaced inasmuch as the said post has been abolished/merged in to another post and all the work of the said post has already been assigned to another successor officer. While the factual assertion that no successor has joined is correct but the same is duly justified as stated in the impugned order that due to the merger of the said post, no successor is required.

6. Transfer being matter of administrative exigencies, this Court generally interferes, if at all, very cautiously. Transfer is not a punishment but an essential aspect of service, particularly, on a transferable post.

7. In my opinion, in the present case, the impugned transfer order dated 16.11.2019 (Annexure P-1) does not call for any interference from this Court in exercise of its extraordinary writ jurisdiction vested under Article 226 of Constitution of India.

8. Petition is, accordingly, dismissed being devoid of any merit.

26.11.2019

vandana

**(ARUN MONGA)
JUDGE****Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable****Yes/No
Yes/No**