



\$~89

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

+ W.P.(C) 17607/2025, CM APPL. 72726/2025, CM APPL. 72727/2025 & CM APPL. 72728/2025

HEEMRAJ SINGH

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Satvik Mishra, Ms. Devashree nd
Ms. Gunjan Dogra, Advs.

versus

AIRPORTS AUTHORITY OF INDIA & ORS.Respondents

Through: Mr. Digvijay Rai, Standing Counsel
with Mr. Archity Mishra, Mr.
Abhishek Singh, Advocates.
Ms. Tanya Rohalla, Manager, Mr.
Taufik Ahmad, AGM, Dr. Naresh
Saii, DGM, Mr. Dharmendra Kumar,
AM, Mr. Jayesh Bhargava, Law
Officer for R-1.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

ORDER

%

20.11.2025

1. This petition is filed aggrieved of the transfer of the petitioner from Delhi to Leh.
2. The brief facts are that the petitioner is working as Assistant Manager (Security) with Airports Authority of India (for short 'AAI'). The petitioner vide order dated 31.10.2025 was transferred from Delhi to Leh. The petitioner filed a representation raising a grievance against the transfer. The representation was rejected vide order dated 14.11.2025. The petitioner was relieved on the same date. Instead of joining at new place, the petitioner has filed this petition.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner relies upon Clause 8 of transfer



policy of 2018 of AAI to contend that the length of continuous stay on a non-tenure station is to be considered before transferring to a hard station.

4. It is further argued that the wife of the petitioner is an expecting mother, is carrying eighteen weeks pregnancy and the other child is of one and half years old. On humanitarian ground, the transfer order should be set aside.

5. Learned counsel for AAI appearing on advance notice submits that the petitioner was transferred to Madurai in 2024 and then to Jabalpur in 2025 but one transfer order was not implemented on the humanitarian ground raised by the petitioner that his child is nine months old and similar relief was granted by this court against second transfer order.

6. On a pin-pointed query, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner lives in a joint family and the parents of the petitioner are staying with him.

7. Learned counsel for the AAI at this stage submits that the petitioner shall be entitled to retain the official residence and to avail the medical facilities for family at Delhi.

8. The contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner relying upon clause 8.2 of the transfer policy is of no avail. It is not the case set up that the transfer policy has a statutory binding. The reliance on clause 8 of the transfer policy is to argue that there are persons who have a longer continuous stay than the petitioner but no such employee has been impleaded as party and moreover, this contention is denied by the learned counsel for the AAI.

9. The argument that the humanitarian aspect of the petitioner was not considered while deciding the representation is noted to be rejected. Suffice



to say that earlier twice the petitioner was successful in a grievance raised against the transfer order. The stay of petitioner at Delhi is more than three years. There is no malafide or irregularity pointed out in the transfer orders.

10. The scope of interference in the transfer orders is well defined and limited. No case is made out for interference in writ jurisdiction. The petition is accordingly disposed of.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J

NOVEMBER 20, 2025/Pa