

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

CWP-12225-2021

Date of Decision: 09.07.2021

Ankush Goyal

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA

Present: Mr. Sanjay Kumar Saini, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Anurag Goyal and
Mr. Mandeep Singh, Advocates,
for the caveator.

Mr. Rajneesh Chadwal, AAG, Haryana.

ARUN MONGA, J. (ORAL)

Petition herein, *inter alia*, is for issuance of a writ in the nature of certiorari to quash the impugned order dated 05.07.2021 (Annexure P-1) whereby petitioner has been transferred from Sub Division, Hisar to Sub Division No.2, Hisar.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits impugned order has been passed to accommodate respondent No.3, who has been transferred in place of the petitioner. He further submits that petitioner has been transferred 2nd time in a short span of 4 months and 27 days only, which is in violation of Transfer Policy/Guidelines dated 07.04.1989, issued by Chief Secretary, Government of Haryana contained at Annexure P-2.

3. Learned counsel for respondent No.3 appears on caveat. Caveat stands discharged. He submits that this petition is completely frivolous. Not only the petitioner has been transferred merely from one division to other,

but his new office is also in the same premises. Petitioner would also continue to reside in the same city and impugned transfer order is not going to create any hindrance, in any manner.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and gone through the case file.

5. Transfer being matter of administrative exigency, this Court generally refrains to interfere and treads cautiously, unless it is a case of extreme hardship. The case in hand does not seem to be such so as to deserve any indulgence. Moreover, transfer is not a punishment but an essential aspect of service, particularly, on a transferable post.

6. The impugned order dated 05.07.2021 (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.

7. At this stage, when this Court showed disinclination to interfere in the matter, confronted with the situation, learned counsel for the petitioner seeks permission of this Court to withdraw the instant petition.

8. Dismissed as withdrawn.

(ARUN MONGA)
JUDGE

July 9, 2021
Vandana

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