

**106+129****IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH************CWP-20224-2025 and
CM-10525-CWP-2025(O&M)
Date of Decision: 25.07.2025****SUKHJEET KAUR****...PETITIONER****Vs.****CANARA BANK AND ORS.****...RESPONDENTS****CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ**

Present:- Mr. Sanjeev Manrai, Sr. Adv. with
Mr. Rohit Bhardwaj, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Ms. Rahish Pahwa, Advocate for the respondent(s)-Canara
Bank.

**********VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (ORAL)****CM-10525-CWP-2025**

Allowed, subject to all just exception(s).

CWP-20224-2025

1. Seeking setting aside of the impugned order of transfer dated 31.05.2025 passed by respondent(s) No.2 and 3, the instant writ petition has been filed.
2. Learned Senior Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that as per the internal guidelines dated 31.03.2025 on transfer for the officers in Scale I, II and III of the Canara Bank, a Transfer Grievance Redressal Forum has been constituted. The same reads as under:-

“(XIX) *Transfer Grievance Redressal*



Chief General Manager/General Manager, H.R. Wing, H.O. shall redress grievances received from officers citing violation of Transfer Policy in respect of Inter Circle Transfers. Such grievances shall be dealt in a considerate manner and suitably responded after detailed deliberations and by duly recording the reasons thereof.

In a similar way, respective Circle Head shall redress grievances related to Intra Circle Transfers.”

3. Learned Senior Counsel further contends that the respondents do not dispute that the petitioner had submitted a detailed representation highlighting her personal circumstances and the exigencies in which she requested for a favourable consideration of the request and for modifying/setting aside of the order of transfer from Chandigarh to Bangalore. He contends that in the written statement filed by the respondent(s) they have responded to the same by saying that the representation(s)/appeal filed by the petitioner did not find favour. He contends that the policy prescribed for the grievance addressed by the employee shall be dealt with in a considerate manner and suitably responded to after detailed deliberations by duly recording the reasons thereof, however, no reasons for such denial/rejection of the representation are forthcoming.

4. Learned counsel for the respondent(s) does not dispute that from the communications so generated and the averments in the reply, the reasons for rejection of the representation are not clearly borne out.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the respective parties and have

**CWP-20224-2025 (O&M)****-3-**

gone through the documents appended with the instant writ petition.

6. In the circumstances, it cannot be said that the consideration on the representation of the petitioner was in accordance with the internal guidelines dated 31.03.2025 which prescribe the manner in which the grievances of the employees are to be redressed.

7. Consequently, the instant petition is disposed of with directions to the respondent(s) to treat the instant writ petition as a representation and further directing the respondent(s) to take a decision on the same in the manner as prescribed therein.

8. The impugned order of transfer dated 31.05.2025 passed by respondent(s) No.2 and 3 shall be kept in abeyance till the date such a decision is taken by the respondent(s).

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

25.07.2025
Rahul Joshi

Whether Speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No