



110

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH****CWP-17324-2025****Date of Decision:23.09.2025**

Shabnam

...Petitioner

vs.

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat**Present :** Ms. Prabhjot Kaur Virk, Advocate
for the petitioner.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India with a prayer to quash the impugned order No.SBS/Ferozepur/B-3/1894 dated 23.01.2025 (Annexure P-1) passed by respondent No.4, whereby the petitioner has been transferred from main Library to Dean's Academic Office and was assigned the work of Departmental Library, (Agriculture stream). A further prayer has been made to quash the order No. SBSSU/FZR/ODA/3349 dated 20.05.2025 (Annexure P-2), whereby the petitioner has been again transferred from Dean's Academic Office to the Admission Branch as Data Operator. A further prayer has been made to direct the respondents to permit the petitioner to continue in Central Library, so that her cader and seniority may have no adverse effect for promotion.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner was appointed as a Library Assistant in Shaheed Bhagat Singh Nagar, State University, Moga Road, Ferozepur in the year 2009 and was regularized in the year 2016. She further contends that the petitioner was performing her duties

without any complaint against her on the post of Library Assistant. During her service at the Central Library, she was harassed by Tejpal, Librarian and the petitioner submitted several complaints to the higher officials of the University, but no action was taken to the same. Ultimately, only with a view to harass the petitioner, the petitioner was transferred to the office of Dean Academic along with Department of Library (Agriculture Department) and after four months, she was again transferred to Admission Branch as a Data Operator. She further contends that in fact, the Librarian of Central Library was not maintaining good behaviour and was continuously harassing the present petitioner. Even at one stage, the matter was compromised with the senior officials as well. Even the petitioner had submitted various representations for her promotion also, but the same were also not considered by the respondents. She further contends that in fact, the petitioner has been transferred from one department to another in the respondent-University, just to humiliate her.

3. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner at length and perused the record.

4. In the present case, from the record, it is evident that the petitioner was regularized on the post of Library Assistant in the respondent-University in the year 2016. However, from a perusal of the impugned order dated 23.01.2025 (Annexure P-1), it is apparent that a dispute was going on between the present petitioner and the Librarian of the Central Library. Consequently, the petitioner was ordered to be transferred to Dean's Academic Office and was assigned the duty of looking after the work of Departmental Library (Agriculture Stream), till further orders. It appears that the said order was passed due to dispute between the petitioner and her superior officer i.e.

Librarian of the Central Library. Again, it appears that keeping in view the workload in the Admission Office, the petitioner was also transferred to Admission Branch to receive online forms for admission to the University for the Academic year 2025-2026. The petitioner was transferred from one department to another by the competent authority, to run the administration in an efficient and smooth manner. Learned counsel for the petitioner has failed to point out any illegality in the impugned orders passed by the respondent-University. Moreover, no *mala fide* has been alleged against the competent authority, which had passed the impugned orders (Annexures P-1 and P-2, respectively). Even otherwise, it is well settled that the transfer of an employee is an incident of service and the competent authorities is at liberty to post an employee as per the workload in different branches. Even otherwise, the petitioner has been transferred from one department to another in the same University campus and she cannot be permitted to say that she was being harassed by the respondent in any manner.

5. Thus, finding no merits, the petition deserves to be dismissed by this Court.

6. Ordered accordingly.

23.09.2025

hemlata

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No