

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No. 15969 of 2020
Date of decision 08.10.2020

Surender

...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana and ors.

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RITU BAHRI

Present: Mr. R.S. Saroha, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ritu Bahri, J. (Oral)

This petition under Section 226 of the Constitution of India is for setting aside of order dated 17.08.2020 (P-1) whereby the petitioner has been transferred from Sonapat to Charkhi Dadri.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is seeking quashing of transfer order being a couple case, as his wife is working in Sonapat.

On the other hand, learned State counsel has referred to order dated 08.09.2020 Annexure P-3 whereby representation of the petitioner has been rejected earlier. In this order, it has been stated that the petitioner has been transferred as he has been declared surplus. Further wife of the petitioner is working in Sonapat through outsourcing policy and thus, the case of the petitioner is not covered being a couple case. The petitioner has been working in Sonapat for the last 12 years. Learned State counsel submits that the transfer policy is for regular employees and the wife of the petitioner is working through outsourcing policy at Development and Panchayats Department, Sonapat (Haryana).

In view of the above factual position, no ground is made out to interfere in order dated 17.08.2020 (P-1) and the petition is dismissed accordingly.

08.10.2020
G Arora

(RITU BAHRI)
JUDGE

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