

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

**CWP No.185 of 2020 (O&M)
Date of Decision:06.03.2020**

Sunita Kumari

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA

Present:- Mr. Saurabh Dalal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Shivendra Swaroop, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Sandeep Sharma, Advocate
for the applicant in CM Nos.450, 452 and 971 of 2020.

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA J.(Oral)

Petitioner who is serving on the post of Craft Instructor under the Department of Industrial Training, State of Haryana has filed the instant writ petition aggrieved of her transfer from Rohtak to Hansi.

The only ground assailing the transfer is that husband of the petitioner is serving in BSF and is posted in Jammu and Kashmir. Petitioner's children are studying in Rohtak and she is also looking after her aged in-laws. Counsel contends that transfer to Hansi which is at a distance of 70 kms. approximately from Rohtak would result in practical difficulties.

Having heard counsel for the petitioner at length, this Court is of the considered view that no interference in the matter is warranted.

Transfer is an incidence of service. Orders of transfer are open for intervention in case such transfer is in violation of any statutory rule,

the same had been directed by an authority who is not competent or is vitiated by *mala fides*.

On a specific query having been put, Mr. Saurabh Dalal, learned counsel would concede that the petitioner has already served for a period of more than 5 years at Rohtak as against a normal tenure of posting of three years.

No infirmity as such is found in the impugned transfer order.

Petition dismissed.

Pending application(s), if any, shall also stands disposed of.

(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE

March 06, 2020

shweta

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No