IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

CWP No.16395 of 2025

Date of Decision: 16.10.2025

Radhika .....Petitioner

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh and another ... Respondents

Coram:
Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sandeep Sharma, Judge.
Whether approved for reporting? [1]

For the Petitioner: Mr. Sohail Khan, proxy counsel vice Mr. Tek Ram, Advocate.

For the Respondents: Mr. Rajan Kahol and Mr. Vishal Panwar, Additional Advocate Generals, with Mr. Ravi Chauhan and Mr. Anish Banshtu, Deputy Advocate Generals.

Sandeep Sharma, Judge(oral):

Petitioner herein, who at present is working as TGT(Arts) in Government High School, Jaar u/c Government Senior Secondary School, Bhatgarh, District Sirmour, Himachal Pradesh, which is a hard area, has approached this Court in the instant proceedings, seeking direction to the respondents to consider and decide her pending representation dated 30.09.2025 (Annexure P-1), whereby she has prayed for her transfer from afore station to one of the stations of her choice, as detailed in the representation as well as petition, on account of the fact that petitioner has already completed normal tenure of posting in hard area.

[1] *Whether the reporters of the local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?*

2. Having regard to the nature of prayer and order proposed to be passed, this Court sees no necessity to call for reply on behalf of the respondents, who are otherwise represented by Mr. Rajan Kahol, learned Additional Advocate General. Learned Additional Advocate General fairly states that representation, if not already decided, shall be decided expeditiously.

3. Since it is apparent from the pleadings adduced on record by the petitioner that petitioner has already completed normal tenure of posting in hard area, coupled with the fact that transfer policy formulated by the Government of Himachal Pradesh enables an employee working in hard area to seek transfer to soft area or one of the stations of her choice after his/her having completed normal tenure of posting i.e. two winter and three summers, this Court sees no impediment in issuing direction to the respondents to consider and decide the representation dated 30.09.2025 (Annexure P-1), of the petitioner expeditiously, preferably within a period of three weeks. Ordered accordingly. Needless to say, authority concerned, while doing the needful in terms of instant order, shall afford an opportunity of being heard to the petitioner and pass appropriate order. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

(Sandeep Sharma),
Judge

October 16,2025
(shankar)