

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND  
HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No.22637 of 2018 (O&M)

Date of Decision.14.02.2023

Ravish Kumar

...Petitioner

Vs

The Haryana State Co-operative Agriculture & Rural Development Bank  
Ltd.

...Respondent

CORAM:HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JAISHREE THAKUR

Present: None for the petitioner.

Mr. Kapil Bansal, DAG, Haryana.

-. -

**JAISHREE THAKUR J. (ORAL)**

The present writ petition has been filed under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of a writ in the nature of Certiorari to quash impugned transfer order dated 30.08.2018 (Annexure P-6).

Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner while challenging the aforesaid impugned order had contended that the petitioner was being transferred frequently against the transfer policy dated 06.10.2004. He was initially transferred from Mahendergarh to Assand on 03.03.2016 and within a period of 7 months, he was transferred from Assand to Pundri vide order dated 13.10.2016, which order was cancelled later on. Again without any cogent reasons, petitioner stood transferred from Jind to Nuh on 30.08.2018.

The Coordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 06.09.2018, while issuing notice of motion, had stayed operation of the impugned order dated 30.08.2018. Thereafter, the matter remained pending and was not listed on account of COVID-19 pandemic. The matter was

taken up for hearing on 12.09.2022, on which date, the same was adjourned to 14.02.2023.

No one has put in appearance on behalf of the petitioner.

While going through the pleadings of the writ petition, it transpires that the petitioner had been subjected to frequent transfers, however, operation of the last transfer order dated 30.08.2018 stood stayed. Meaning thereby, petitioner continued to work at Jind from 15.09.2017 i.e. for more than 5 years. The argument raised by the petitioner at the time of admission of the matter was that petitioner was being subjected to frequent transfers against the transfer policy dated 06.10.2004. Taking into account the fact that as per transfer policy, generally an employee is not to be transferred out of current place of posting before his completion of two years at the post but the petitioner has now served at one place of posting i.e. Jind for more than five years, this Court is of the opinion that stay of transfer of the petitioner for indefinite period would defeat the purpose of aforesaid transfer policy.

Consequently, the instant petition stands dismissed.

**(JAISHREE THAKUR)**  
**JUDGE**

**February 14, 2023**  
Pankaj\*

|                           |        |
|---------------------------|--------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned | Yes/No |
| Whether reportable        | Yes/No |