



WEB COPY

WP No. 40611 of 2025



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 28-10-2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE G.K. ILANTHIRAIYAN

WP No. 40611 of 2025

and

WMP.Nos. 4537 & 45538 of 2025

1. Dr.P.Kanagaraju

Petitioner

Vs

1. State Of Tamilnadu

Rep By The Secretary To Government,
Animal Husbandry Dairying, Fisheries
And Fishermen Welfare Department
Secretariat, Fort St. George,
Chennai 600 009

2.The Director

Directorate Of Animal Husbandry And
Veterinary Services, Integrated Animal
Husbandry And Fisheries Department
Office Complex, Veterinary Hospital
Compound Nandanam Chennai 600 35

Respondents



PRAYER : Writ Petition is filed under Article 226 of Constitution of India, praying for writ of certiorari, calling for the records on the file of the second respondent in Na.Ka. No 30639 / VS-4 / 2025 dated 17.10.2025 and quash the same in respect of the petitioner is concerned and pass such further or other orders.

For Petitioner: Mr. D.Senthilkumar

For Respondents: Mr. R.U. Dinesh Rajkumar, AGP

ORDER

The writ petition has been filed challenging the order of transfer dated 17.10.2025, whereby the petitioner was transferred from the Veterinary Dispensary, Vengadathanur, Trichy District, to the Veterinary Dispensary, Neermulai, Nagapattinam District, as Veterinary Assistant Surgeon.

2. The case of the petitioner is that the petitioner was initially appointed to the post of Veterinary Assistant Surgeon in the year 2012 under Rule 10(a)(i) of the Tamil Nadu State and Subordinate Service Rules. Subsequently, he was selected through direct recruitment conducted by the Tamil Nadu Public Service Commission (TNPSC) in 2019 and appointed as Veterinary Assistant Surgeon at



Vengadathanur, Musiri Division, Trichy District. While so, the petitioner was transferred to Neermulai, Nagapattinam District, through the impugned order dated 17.10.2025. Challenging the same, the present writ petition is filed.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the transfer order is arbitrary and issued without any valid reason. It was contended that the petitioner's wife is also serving as a Veterinary Assistant Surgeon in the same district, and the petitioner's only son, studying in the 5th standard, has been undergoing treatment for psoriasis since 2023, requiring daily medical care. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submitted that the transferred place is situated nearly 200 kilometers away from the present working station. As per the Government guidelines, transfers are to be effected through counselling. Since the petitioner did not complete three years of service in his current place, he was not permitted to participate in the General Counselling conducted by the second respondent. Nevertheless, the petitioner was transferred on administrative grounds.



4. The learned counsel further submitted that even if the transfer is stated to be on administrative grounds, the order must contain reasons, which are absent in the impugned order. It was also pointed out that the petitioner had earlier filed W.P. No. 32551 of 2024 before this Court, seeking regularisation of his services from the date of his initial appointment under Rule 10(a)(i) of the Tamil Nadu State and Subordinate Service Rules, and the same is still pending consideration. The petitioner apprehends that the present transfer might have been issued on account of the said writ petition.

5. On the other hand, the learned Additional Government Pleader appearing for the respondents submitted that the impugned transfer order was issued purely on administrative grounds. He further submitted that a total of 49 Veterinary Assistant Surgeons were transferred under the said order, and except for the petitioner, all others have accepted the transfer and joined in their respective new postings. Therefore, the petitioner is also bound to comply with the transfer order and report for duty at the transferred place.



6. This Court has carefully considered the rival submissions made by both sides and perused the materials placed on record.

7. It is not in dispute that the petitioner was initially appointed as Veterinary Assistant Surgeon in 2012 under Rule 10(a)(i) of the Tamil Nadu State and Subordinate Service Rules and was subsequently selected through direct recruitment in 2019 by the TNPSC. He has been serving at Vengadathanur, Musiri Division, Trichy District, since his appointment in 2019 and completed three years of service on 12.04.2022.

8. The contention of the petitioner that the transfer order was issued on account of his earlier writ petition filed in 2024 seeking regularisation of service is not supported by any material evidence. The mere pendency of a writ petition before this Court cannot be presumed to have influenced the administrative decision of transfer unless malafides or vindictive motives are clearly established. No documentary record has been produced to show that the respondents were actuated by any personal bias or that the transfer was a measure of retaliation for the petitioner approaching this Court earlier.



Moreover, as rightly contended by the learned Additional Government Pleader, if at all the said writ petition had been the reason for the transfer, such transfer would have taken place immediately after the filing of the petition during 2024 itself. The timing of the present transfer, after a lapse of several months, clearly indicates that the order was a part of general administrative reshuffling and not a targeted punitive measure.

9. The Court, in exercise of its jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, will not ordinarily interfere with transfer orders unless there is clear proof of malafide intention, violation of statutory provisions, or arbitrariness that affects the rights of the employee. In the present case, none of these vitiating circumstances are made out. The petitioner has only raised personal grounds and apprehensions that, though understandable, cannot form the basis for judicial interference in a routine administrative transfer. Hence, this Court is of the considered view that the impugned transfer order dated 17.10.2025 issued by the 2nd respondent does not suffer from illegality or infirmity warranting interference.



WEB COPY

10. Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petitions are closed. There shall be no order as to costs.

28-10-2025

Index: Yes/No

Internet: Yes

ak

To

1. The Secretary To Government,
Animal Husbandry Dairying, Fisheries
And Fishermen Welfare Department
Secretariat, Fort St. George,
Chennai 600 009

2. The Director
Directorate Of Animal Husbandry And
Veterinary Services,
Integrated Animal Husbandry And
Fisheries Department Office Complex,
Veterinary Hospital Compound
Nandanam, Chennai 600 35



WEB COPY

WP No. 40611 of 2025



G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN, J.

ak

WP No. 40611 of 2025

28-10-2025