

131

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP No.14207 of 2020 (O&M)

Date of decision: 16.09.2020

Meenakashi Sharma

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN

Present: Ms. Aishwarya Bajaj, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Deepak Grewal, DAG, Haryana.

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN J. (Oral)

Prayer in this writ petition is for quashing the order dated 31.08.2020 vide which the petitioner, who is working as a G.I. Group Instructor in I.T.I., Karnal has been transferred to I.T.I., Panipat.

The only averment raised in the petition is that the transfer of the petitioner is not made as per the policy notified by the State of Haryana on 24.07.2020.

A perusal of the policy show that under Clause 9(iii), a remedy is provided to an aggrieved employee to make a representation to the competent authority. Clause 9(iii) of the Policy, reads as under:-

“9. Post transfer exercise:

(i) XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

(ii) XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

(iii) Aggrieved employees can represent to the competent authority within 15 days of issuance of orders, after joining at new place of posting. Their representation will be considered in accordance with the Policy and appropriate decision will be conveyed to him/her within

CASE HEARD THROUGH VIDEO CONFERENCING

15 days.

Counsel for the State has referred to certain orders passed by this Court in CWP Nos.13907 and 13602 of 2020, wherein this Court in similar circumstances has directed the petitioner to avail the remedy available under the policy itself.

Accordingly, this petition is disposed of with a direction to the petitioner to make a representation to the competent authority and the same will be decided expeditiously within a period 01 month from the date of filing of the representation, after affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner.

(ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN)
JUDGE

16.09.2020
yakub

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether reportable:	Yes/No