



\$~90

\* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **W.P.(C) 5909/2025**

**HEEMRAJ SINGH**

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Satwik Misra, Ms. Gunjan  
Dogra & Ms. Devashree,  
Advocates.

versus

**AIRPORTS AUTHORITY OF INDIA & ORS.** .....Respondents

Through: Mr. Digvijay Rai, Standing  
Counsel for AAI with Mr. Archit  
Mishra, Advocates with Mr.  
Yatinder Choudhary, Law Officer,  
AAI  
Mr. Jayesh Bhardwaj, JE, Ms.  
Seema Sharma, AGM (HR), Mr.  
Dharmender Kumar, AM (HR), Dr.  
Naresh Sain, AGM, Secretary,  
AAI.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN**

**ORDER**

% **05.05.2025**

**CM APPL. 26922/2025(Exemption)**

Exemption allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

The application stands disposed of.

**W.P.(C) 5909/2025, CM APPLs. 26921/2025, & 26923/2025**

1. Issue notice. Mr. Digvijay Rai, learned Standing Counsel, accepts  
notice on behalf of respondent.



2. The petitioner assails a transfer order dated 01.04.2025 by which he has been transferred from the post of Assistant Manager, Security, at the Corporate Headquarters of Airports Authority of India [“AAI”] to the same post at Jamnagar.

3. Several violations of the AAI Transfer Policy have been urged in the writ petition, including that the petitioner has not completed a tenure of three years in his present station, or five years in the region. It is also contended that the petitioner’s transfer is against the Policy requirement that an officer who has been at the same station longest, should be transferred first.

4. Mr. Rai contends that the departure from the Transfer Policy, including the minimum tenure, was required in the present case for operational/administrative reasons. He submits that Clause 11 of the Policy permits a departure for such reasons, with the approval of the Chairman based on specific recommendations from Member (HR)/Member concerned, and that this power has been delegated to the concerned members of AAI.

5. In the record produced, there does not *prima facie* appear to be any reasons given for any operational and administrative reasons given necessitating a departure from the transfer policy.

6. Mr. Satwik Misra, learned counsel for the petitioner, also points that the petitioner had made a representation, against the transfer, by a letter dated 02.04.2025. Several objections were taken in the representation, including *inter alia* availability of a person at the same level, who had spent a longer period in the Northern Region, and the fact that the petitioner has neither completed three years in Delhi nor five



years in the region.

7. The representation has been rejected on 28.04.2025 with the simple statement that it has been “*examined but not acceded to by the Competent Authority*”.

8. Having regard to the fact that the petitioner had made various submissions relating to the operation of the Transfer Policy, I am of the view that a reasoned decision ought to have been communicated to him. Instead of going into the issues raised by the petitioner at this stage, I am of the view that an opportunity should be given to AAI itself to reconsider the representation of the petitioner, as the representation has been rejected without disclosing any reasons.

9. For the present, therefore, the decision dated 28.04.2025 on the petitioner’s representation is set aside, and the respondents are directed to reconsider the petitioner’s representation dated 02.04.2025. They may pass a reasoned order, with reference to the clauses of the Transfer Policy and the record relating to any departure therefrom.

10. In the event an adverse order is passed against the petitioner on his representation, such an order will not be given effect for a period of one week from communication.

11. All rights and contentions of the parties are reserved.

12. The writ petition, alongwith pending applications, stand disposed of.

**PRATEEK JALAN, J**

**MAY 5, 2025**  
**‘pv/KB’/**