IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

CWP No.16365 of 2025
Date of Decision: 16.10.2025

Lalita Sharma .....Petitioner

Versus

State of H.P. 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. Surinder Saklani, 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 Lecturer(Physics) at Government Senior Secondary School, Moondhi, District Kangra, Himachal Pradesh, has approached this Court in the instant proceedings seeking directions to respondents to consider and decide her pending representation (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 on the ground of couple case as well as adverse family circumstances.

2. Having regard to the nature of prayer made in the instant petition and order proposed to be passed, this Court sees no necessity to call for the reply on behalf of the respondents, who are

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

otherwise represented by Mr. Vishal Panwar, learned Additional Advocate General. Mr. Panwar states that mere completion of normal tenure at one station cannot be a ground to seek transfer, rather in that regard, it is the prerogative of the employer. He states that since petitioner has not completed normal tenure of posting at present of posting, she is not entitled to be transferred.

3. Careful perusal of the averments contained in the petition, which is duly supported by an affidavit though suggest that petitioner has not completed normal tenure of posting at present place of posting, but once transfer policy formulated by the Government of Himachal Pradesh enables an employee to seek transfer/adjustment on the ground of couple case, this Court sees no impediment in issuing directions to respondents to consider and decide the pending representation of the petitioner in time bound manner.

4. Consequently, in view of the above, this Court, without going into the merits of the case, deems it fit to dispose of the present petition, with the direction to respondents to consider and decide the pending representation(Annexure P-1) of the petitioner expeditiously, preferably, within a period of four 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, taking note of the fact that husband of the petitioner is also Government employee and at present is working at Government Senior Secondary School, Khani, District Mandi, Himachal Pradesh and there is none to take care of mother of the petitioner.

Pending application(s), if any, also stands disposed of.

(Sandeep Sharma),
Judge

October16, 2025
(shankar)