



114

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CWP-32182-2025

Date of Decision:04.11.2025

Hardeep Singh

...Petitioner

vs.

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat

Present : Mr. Ranjivan Singh, 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 dated 22.10.2025 (Annexure P-9) passed by respondent No.1, whereby the petitioner has been transferred from Sub-Centre, Village Harchandpura (Dhuri), District Sangrur to Sub-Centre, Dhadrian under PHC Longowal in District Sangrur within a period of five weeks, in violation of the Transfer Policy dated 23.04.2018 (Annexure P-11).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that vide order dated 15.09.2025 (Annexure P-8), the petitioner was ordered to be transferred from Sub-Centre Gandhuan to Sub-Centre Harchandpura and the petitioner had joined at Sub-Centre Harchandpura on 18.09.2025. However, within a period of five weeks, vide impugned order dated 22.10.2025 (Annexure P-9), the petitioner has again been transferred from Sub-Centre Harchandpura, District Sangrur to Sub-Centre, Dhadrian under PHC Longowal, District Sangrur, which

is at a distance of about 52 kms from his native place. He further contends that the petitioner has been transferred within a short span of 5 weeks only to accommodate respondent No.4 and the transfer order is in violation of the transfer policy dated 23.04.2018 (Annexure P-11). He further contends that the impugned order has been passed by respondent No.1, who was not competent to pass the order. Thus, the impugned order is legally unsustainable.

3. Notice of motion.

4. On the asking of the Court, Mr. Charanpreet Singh, AAG, Punjab, who is present in the Court, accepts notice on behalf of the official respondents and submits that the petitioner has been transferred from Village Harchandpura, District Sangrur to Village Dhadrian, District Sangrur within the same district and there is only distance of 45 kms between both the places. He further contends that the transfer has been ordered purely on administrative grounds and no mala fide has been alleged against any officer in the writ petition.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record carefully.

6. From the record, it is apparent that the petitioner is resident of Meerheri, P.O. Bhullarheri, Tehsil Dhuri, District Sangrur. He had initially joined his service on 09.11.2018 and since then, he has remained posted in District Sangrur itself. Apart from that, on 15.09.2025, the petitioner was ordered to be transferred from Sub-Centre Gandhuan to Sub-Centre Harchandpura. However, again on 22.10.2025, he was transferred from Sub-Centre Harchandpura, District Sangrur to Sub-Centre, Dhadrian under PHC Longowal, District Sangrur. In fact, the law is well-settled that the transfer is an incidence of service and the transfer policy only lays down certain guidelines,

which may be followed by the State, while ordering the transfers of various employees. It is equally well settled that the transfer policy has no statutory force and a writ petition seeking enforcement of the said policy before this Court may not be maintainable. Even otherwise, no employee can claim a right to remain posted at a particular place for an indefinite period. The transfer orders in the present case have been passed in routine, on administrative grounds and the petitioner has been transferred only to a distance of about 45 kms from his earlier place of posting. The petitioner has also not been able to make out any exceptional case, which may warrant interference by this Court.

7. Dismissed.

04.11.2025
hemlata

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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