

**CWP-30463-2018 and  
CWP-6130-2019**

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

**Date of decision: 09.03.2023**

**1. CWP-30463-2018**

Sukhvinder Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

.....Respondents

**AND**

**2. CWP-6130-2019**

Manjeet Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

.....Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL**

Present:- Mr. Sachin Bansal, Advocate for  
Mr. Raje Ram Kaushik, Advocate,  
for the petitioners in both the petitions.

Mr. R.S.Budhwar, Addl. A.G. Haryana.

**HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)**

Both these writ petitions can be conveniently disposed of by a common judgment since they raise the same issue as to the transfers of the petitioners to the place/preference of their choice. However, the facts are being taken from CWP-30463-2018.

Challenge in the present petition is to order dated 12.04.2018

**CWP-30463-2018 and  
CWP-6130-2019**

(Annexure P-3) to the extent that the petitioner was deputed from GPS, Mangar, Faridabad, to GPS Bansa, Karnal, for a period of four months only on temporarily basis.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner who is 70% differently-abled, was deputed to GPS Bansa, Karnal, for a period of four months only on temporarily basis whereas the persons who are not the regular appointees and are juniors to the petitioner, have been given priority for the place of posting, over him, and that act of the respondents seems to have been done without considering the physical disability and seniority of the petitioner.

On the other hand, learned State counsel submits that the petitioner had been selected for the post of Primary Teacher in the second list and that the districts to the candidates selected in the second list had been allotted in 2017 randomly. Learned State counsel further submits that the petitioner who joined the service in 2017, was not eligible for participating in the transfer drive carried out on 23.08.2019 for the reason that he had not completed three years of service.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

The main grouse of the petitioner is that the persons who are not the regular appointees and are juniors to him, have been given priority for the place of posting, over him. Govt. of Haryana, framed the 'Cadre Change Policy for District Cadres'. The petitioner joined the service in 2017. A perusal of the aforesaid Cadre Change Policy reveals that a teacher must have completed three years of regular service for participating in the transfer drive, and that some additional marks are to be

**CWP-30463-2018 and  
CWP-6130-2019**

awarded/allocated to the special categories of teachers, including differently-abled persons like the petitioner. Moreover as per the reply, the petitioner had joined the service, in pursuance of the appointment letter, without submitting any grouse. There is no provision in the Cadre Change Policy to opt for a fresh district immediately after joining the service.

Furthermore, whether, and if so where, an employee should be posted are matters which are governed by the exigencies of service. An employee has no right or, for that matter, a vested right to claim a transfer or posting of his choice.

No other point has been urged.

In view of the above, this Court does not find any merit in both the petitions.

Dismissed.

**09.03.2023**  
parveen kumar

**(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)**  
**JUDGE**

Whether reasoned/speaking?  
Whether reportable?

Yes/No  
Yes/No