

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

CWP-18492-2021

Date of decision: 16.09.2021

Rajbir Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA

Present: Mr. Sushil Jain, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Tapan Kumar Yadav, DAG, Haryana.
(Presence marked through video conference).

ARUN MONGA J. (ORAL)

Petitioner herein, *inter alia*, seeks issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to consider his request submitted before the Grievance Redressal Committee constituted for implementation of “*Online Transfer Policy for Junior Engineers*” dated 02.06.2020 (Annexure P-1) issued by respondent No.1.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that respondent No.2 i.e. Director General without considering the options submitted by the petitioner for his transfer has illegally transferred the petitioner vide impugned order dated 08.09.2021 (Annexure P-3). He contends that petitioner is fully conscious that being a Government servant, he can be transferred but the same ought to have been done in accordance with the transfer policy.

3. On advance service, learned State counsel joins proceedings and submits that petitioner has been transferred only from one block to another block within the same district i.e. Sonapat.

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, to transfer an official or not to, is sole discretion of the employer based on the administrative exigencies. Not doing or doing so is not a punishment, but an integral part of service conditions.

6. In the present case, concededly, the petitioner has been transferred from one block to another block, both located in the same district i.e. Sonapat, where the petitioner is currently posted. In the premise, neither it is a case of hardship nor otherwise the family of the petitioner will be uprooted, in any manner.

7. No grounds to interfere are made out. However, petitioner is at liberty to pursue his cause with the competent authority since he also contends Grievance Redressal Forum/Committee has favourably recommended his case, but yet the recommendation has been ignored.

8. Disposed of accordingly.

16.09.2021

vandana

(ARUN MONGA)

JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:

Yes/No

Whether reportable:

Yes/No