

122+123+124+125+126

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

Date of Decision: 16.09.2022

1) CWP-21344-2022 (O&M)

Rekha Rani		Petitioner
	Versus	
State of Haryana and others		Respondents

2) CWP-21345-2022 (O&M)

Babita Devi		Petitioner
	Versus	
State of Haryana and others		Respondents

3) CWP-21349-2022 (O&M)

Preeti Sharma		Petitioner
	Versus	
State of Haryana and others		Respondents

4) CWP-21351-2022 (O&M)

Alka Rani		Petitioner
	Versus	
State of Haryana and others		Respondents

5) CWP-21355-2022 (O&M)

Vandana		Petitioner
	Versus	
State of Haryana and others		Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA

Present: Mr. R.D. Gupta, Advocate
with Mr. Gaurav Gaur, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Pankaj Middha, Addl.A.G., Haryana.

ARUN MONGA, J.

1. Since the issue involved in all the petitions is similar; they are being decided by a common order. For the sake of convenience, the facts are being taken from the petition bearing CWP No.21344 of 2022.
2. Petitioner is before this Court *inter alia* seeking issuance of a writ, order and/or direction in the nature of Certiorari to quash the impugned order dated 13.09.2022 (Annexure P-1), whereby, she has been transferred from Rohtak to Odhan (District, Sirsa).
3. Petitioner, serving as a Supervisor, was posted on 14.09.2016 at the Women and Child Development Programme, Rohtak Rural Block and has been there ever since. Vide impugned order, she has been transferred to Odhan in District Sirsa. Aggrieved, she is before this Court.
4. Learned counsel for the petitioners would strenuously argue, giving illustration of petitioner's counter parts at serial no.142, 143 & 144, that the respondent-department is indulging in cherry picking by transferring some within the same district, whereas, the petitioner has been transferred to another district.
5. On advance service, the learned State counsel appears. He argues that merely because some of the other employees have been adjusted within the same district, does not give rise to any vested right to others to be kept in the same district.
6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and gone through the case file.
7. Transfer being matter of administrative exigency, this Court generally refrains to interfere and treads cautiously, unless it is a case of

extreme hardship. This bunch of petitions do not make a case of the kind deserving 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.

8. Furthermore, in fact, I feel that the respondents have since sought prior willingness and choice of posting for transfer through online portal, the same only goes out to show that State functionaries are rather increasingly adopting an employee friendly and transparent mode in order to avoid any heartburn amongst the officials who are to be transferred due to administrative exigencies. Of course, options given by an employee are not binding but merely an indicator for employer to keep the same in mind while passing orders. Being so, I do not think it appropriate to interfere and create any hurdle in the process adopted by the State, particularly when mass transfers (*as many as 340 transfers as reflected in Annexure P-1*) have been carried out and, therefore, it cannot even be canvassed that only the petitioner(s) have been singled out by way of any *mala fide* and/or any collateral hostile discrimination of any kind.

9. Dismissed.

10. Pending civil miscellaneous applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

(ARUN MONGA)
JUDGE

September 16, 2022
ashish

Whether speaking/reasoned:
Whether reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/No