

226b

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

CWP No. 383 of 2020 (O&M)

Date of decision: 18.04.2022

Ved Vyas

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice Arun Monga

Present : Mr. Joy Preet Singh Meelu, Advocate for
Mr. Japal Singh Maanipur, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr. Pankaj Midha, Additional Advocate General, Haryana.

Arun Monga, J. (oral)

Petitioner herein, *inter alia*, seeks issuance of a writ in the nature of certiorari to quash transfer order dated 13.12.2019 (Annexure P-2) qua the petitioner vide which he has been transferred from Yamuna Nagar to Palwal.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he is working as Forest Guard in the Forest Block Bilaspur, Sadhaura Forest Range, District Yamuna Nagar and has been transferred to Mandkola Block, Palwal Forest Division, District Palwal on administrative grounds. He submits that he had been posted at Forest Block Bilaspur, Sadhaura Forest Range vide order dated 03.01.2019. He submits that impugned order is in violation of the transfer policy. As per the policy dated 06.10.2004 (Annexure P-3), the petitioner was entitled to stay at least for two years. Hence, the instant petition.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel strenuously opposes the writ petition.

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

5. While issuing notice of motion vide order dated 09.01.2020, stay was granted on the impugned transfer order. More than two years have elapsed and petitioner has been continuing at District Yamuna Nagar by virtue of interim stay granted by this Court. In any case, 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. No grounds to interfere are made out. Dismissed.

18.04.2022
vs

(Arun Monga)
Judge

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No