



2024:DHC:8044-DB



\$~196

\* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

***Date of decision: 15.10.2024***

+ W.P.(C) 14403/2024 & CM APPL. 60395/2024

AZAD SINGH

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr.Vijay Kumar Ravi &  
Mr.Sanjay Singh, Advts.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS

....Respondents

Through: Mr.Sahaj Garg, SPC with  
Ms.Tanisha Verma, GP &  
Mr.Ram Niwas, Adv.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVIN CHAWLA**

**HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SHALINDER KAUR**

**NAVIN CHAWLA, J. (Oral)**

1. This petition has been filed by the petitioner under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, challenging the transfer Order dated 31.08.2024, whereby the petitioner has been Transferred to 1448 BCC 761 BRTF, Arunachal Pradesh.

2. It is the case of the petitioner that aggrieved of the abovesaid Transfer Order, the petitioner submitted representations against the same to the respondents, however, they were rejected by the competent authority *vide* Orders dated 19.09.2024 and 27.09.2024, stating that there is no evidence of any threat perception concerning the petitioner.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that while the petitioner was posted in Arunachal Pradesh between 2016 and 2018, he had met with an accident at Dett Boling near the village of Buddha.



2024:DHC:8044-DB



The local populace had *gheraod* the petitioner, and finally, a compromise had been arrived at by paying Rs. 1,20,000/- to them. However, this did not conclude the dispute, and an additional demand of Rs. 5,00,000/- was made from the petitioner, threatening to kill him in case the petitioner did not succumb to this demand. The petitioner contends that these negotiations were presided over by higher officials of the respondents, that is, Brig. S.K. Pradhan, Captain Shiva, and Brig. Jaleel. Later, the superior officers, appreciating the threat to the life of the petitioner, attached him at HQ DGBR before being posted out to Kargil, Ladakh. The petitioner now apprehends that on being posted back, the petitioner may again be threatened or physically harmed.

4. As noted above, the petitioner's representations were rejected by the competent authority *vide* Orders dated 19.09.2024 and 27.09.2024 due to a lack of any supporting documents or evidence. We even otherwise find that the alleged threat perception of the petitioner is rather vague and cannot be accepted. The episode, even if it is to be believed, was of the year 2018, that is, six years back. A transfer made in the exigency of service, cannot be stalled on such a vague plea.

5. Accordingly, we find absolutely no merit in the present petition.

6. The petition along with the pending application is, accordingly, dismissed.

**NAVIN CHAWLA, J**

**SHALINDER KAUR, J**

**OCTOBER 15, 2024/rv/DG**

*Click here to check corrigendum, if any*