

2025:PHHC:151068



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

122

CWP-28545-2025
DECIDED ON:09.10.2025

AMIT AHLAWAT

...PETITIONER

VERSUS

INDIAN OVERSEAS BANK & OTHERS

...RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. Ashok Kumar Sehrawat, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Gaurav Goel, Advocate and
Mr. Tejinder Singh, Advocate
for the respondent-Bank.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J

1. The jurisdiction of this Court under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India has been invoked seeking issuance of a writ in the nature of *Certiorari* setting aside the impugned order dated 10.09.2025 (Annexure P-9) passed by respondent No.3 with further prayer for setting aside the order dated 11.09.2024 (Annexure P-5) vide which the petitioner stands transferred from Batala to Mysuru (Karnataka).

2. At the outset, learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has joined the respondent-Bank 09.06.2014. However, he has been subjected to a series of arbitrary, frequent, and punitive transfers in gross violation of the Bank's own transfer policy, the Government of India's guidelines on compassionate and transparent transfer practices, and the

constitutional guarantee of equality enshrined under Article 14 of the Constitution of India.

3. It is asserted that between April 2023 and September 2024, the petitioner has been transferred and/or deputed no less than seven times from Chandigarh to Jind, RCC Department, Barwala, Ambala, Batala, Gurdaspur, Mandi (HP), and finally to Mysuru, Karnataka. Such excessive and repeated transfers within short intervals are wholly unreasonable, arbitrary, and without any administrative justification. The same clearly indicate a pattern of harassment and victimization. It is contended that as per the Bank's transfer policy, an employee is ordinarily required to serve a reasonable tenure at a particular station before being considered for transfer. The petitioner has been shifted multiple times within months, without completion of his normal tenure, and without any exigency of service being demonstrated by the respondent. Thus, the impugned transfer order dated 11.09.2024 is violative of the Bank's own policy and deserves to be set aside on this ground alone. However, while rejecting the representation of the petitioner, the respondent-Bank completely ignored the medical record/documents placed on record showing health issues of the wife of the petitioner.

4. In view of the foregoing facts and circumstances, it is evident that the petitioner has been repeatedly accommodated by the Bank on his own requests for transfer on two earlier occasions, and his subsequent transfer to RO-Mysuru vide order HRMD/SUP/MGMT_TRF/7/2024-25 dated 11.09.2024 was issued purely on administrative grounds in accordance with the Bank's Transfer Policy and the Indian Overseas Bank (Officers') Service Regulations, 1979. The record clearly establishes that the conduct of the petitioner during his tenure at RO-Chandigarh was unbecoming of an officer

unauthorized absence, and misbehavior with senior officials. The representations preferred by the petitioner on medical and compassionate grounds were duly examined and found not to satisfy the requirements stipulated under Clause 9 of the Transfer Policy, particularly as his father was declared a non-dependent in the records of the Bank. The transfer order, being a matter of administrative exigency and organizational interest, does not merit interference under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

5. Accordingly, the writ petition is devoid of merit, misconceived, and liable to be dismissed in *limine*.
6. No order as to costs.

09.10.2025
sham

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No