

\$~16

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

+ **W.P.(C) 2821/2019 & CM APPL. 13136/2019**

DINESH SINGH

..... Petitioner

Through: Ms.Saahila Lamba with
Mr.T.S.Dagar, Advocates.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

..... Respondents

Through: Mr.J.K.Singh, Standing Counsel with
Ms.Madhulika Agrawal & Mr.Varun
Bhadola, Advocates.

CORAM:

JUSTICE S.MURALIDHAR

JUSTICE I.S.MEHTA

ORDER

%

20.03.2019

1. The Petitioner who is a Sub-Inspector in the Railway Protection Force ('RPF') is aggrieved by a force order dated 28th September 2018 whereby he has been transferred to the Kashmir valley.

2. He made a representation to his superior officers against the said order pointing out that his wife was employed in a school in Faridabad, Haryana and in terms of the extant policy, as far as possible, a married, working couple should be accommodated at the same station or in the vicinity of the nearest station.

3. It appears that pursuant thereto, a further order dated 4th December 2018 was passed by the Staff Officer/RPF/NR permitting the Petitioner to join the

Kashmir valley on 1st April 2019.

4. Grievance of the Petitioner is that in the past, the Respondents have granted concessions on similar lines as sought by the Petitioner herein to working couples. The instance of four others who had earlier been transferred, but were retained 'being couple case' by a modified order dated 9th June 2017, has been cited. The Petitioner therefore states that he has been discriminated against particularly since he has not even completed three years of his present posting in Delhi.

5. Learned counsel for the Respondents points out that the impugned Force Order was not only in respect of the present Petitioner but 26 other persons who are all serving in different places including Delhi and who have been transferred to the Kashmir valley.

6. The Court also finds that the transfer is indeed not just of the Petitioner, but of several others. Therefore, the contention that the Petitioner that he is being singled out for discriminatory treatment is not correct.

7. In the matters of transfer the scope of interference by the Court is extremely limited. Consequently, the Court is not inclined to accept the prayer of the Petitioner. The petition and application are dismissed.

S. MURALIDHAR, J.

I.S. MEHTA, J.

MARCH 20, 2019/tr