

2026:PHHC:084888



277 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

DECIDED ON: 27.05.2026

CWP-9771-2026

AYUSH MEDICAL OFFICERS ASSOCIATION HARYANA (REGD.) AND
ANR.

.....PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.

...RESPONDENT(S)

CWP-1539-2026

ARUN RATHEE

.....PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.

...RESPONDENT(S)

CWP-3477-2026

ANIL KUMAR

.....PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.

...RESPONDENT(S)

CWP-5021-2026

UDAYVIR JHAJHRIA

.....PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.

...RESPONDENT(S)

CWP-5408-2026

KRISHAN AND ORS.PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS. ...RESPONDENT(S)

CWP-5583-2026

SURINDER AND ANR.PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS. ...RESPONDENT(S)

‘ CWP-5653-2026

NAVNEET GUPTA AND ORS.PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS. ...RESPONDENT(S)

CWP-6080-2026

SUMITRA DEVI AND ANR.PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS. ...RESPONDENT(S)

CWP-12262-2026

DR. LALIT SAINI AND ORS.PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS. ...RESPONDENT(S)

CWP-2825-2026
BALRAJ AND ORS.
.....PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS
STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.
...RESPONDENT(S)

CWP-6514 -2026
SATISH KUMAR AND ANR.
.....PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS
STATE OF HARYANA AND ANR.
...RESPONDENT(S)

CWP-2141-2026
SUNIL NANDAL AND ORS.
.....PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS
STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.
...RESPONDENT(S)

CWP-4381-2026
SUMIT LOHAN
.....PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS
STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.
...RESPONDENT(S)

CWP-5615-2026
WARDER SANDEEP AND ANR.
.....PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS
STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.
...RESPONDENT(S)

CWP-6150-2026

DR. SAPNA RANI AND ORS.

.....PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANR.

...RESPONDENT(S)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. Sanchit Punia, Advocate
for the petitioner
Mr. S.P.Chahar, Advocate with
Ms. Savita Chahar,
Mr. Neeraj Goel, Advocate
Mr. Madan Pal, Advocate and
Mr. Shamsheer Singh, Advocate
Mr. T.S. Dhull, Advocate
Mr. Babbar Khan, Advocate
Mr. K.S. Banyana, Advocate
Mr. Mayank Mathur, Advocate
Mr. Neeraj Sansaniwal, Advocate
Mr. Sarthak Gupta, Advocate
Mr. Suryaveer Surjewala, Advocate
Mr. Madan Pal, Advocate
Mr. Vikram Sheoran, Advocate
Mr. Harish Goel, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Tanushree Gupta, Addl. A.G., Haryana with
Mr. Teevar Sharma, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Sukriti Gupta, Advocate for respondent No.4 in CWP-6150-2026.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

Vide this common order, this Court shall dispose of above mentioned petitions since common questions of law is involved therein.

The instant petition has been filed seeking issuance of an appropriate writ, order or direction, especially in the nature of certiorari quashing the

impugned letter dated 8.2.2026 (Annexure P-5) along with list (Annexure P-6), list showing vacancies at various stations (Annexure P-7) and list of Ayurvedic Medical Officers to participate in impugned Model Online Transfer Drive (Annexure P-8) as the same are on the basis of illegal, arbitrary and discriminatory action of respondents.

Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that the impugned letter dated 08.02.2026 (Annexure P-5) and connected lists (Annexures P-6 to P-8) relating to the Model Online Transfer Drive are wholly illegal, arbitrary and discriminatory, inasmuch as the respondents have selectively included only some Ayurvedic Medical Officers appointed in 2025 pursuant to Advertisement No. 16/2024 while excluding others similarly situated, by wrongly declaring certain posts as surplus or notional vacancies; further, the exclusion of posts held by contractual AMO Volunteers from the zone of consideration is in clear violation of Clause 3(xiv)(2) of the Model Online Transfer Policy dated 23.05.2025, thereby denying equal opportunity to the petitioner and similarly placed officers to opt for stations of their choice, in contravention of Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India, rendering the entire transfer exercise liable to be quashed.

He further contends that the posts presently occupied by Ayurvedic Medical Officer (AMO) volunteers on a contractual basis ought to be included in the transfer drive so as to ensure that all regularly selected Ayurvedic Medical Officers are afforded equal opportunity to exercise their preferences for all available stations. It is further contended that all newly appointed/regularly appointed Ayurvedic Medical Officers pursuant to Advertisement No. 16/2024 (Annexure P-2) should be treated uniformly and equally, either by including all of them in the transfer drive or by excluding all of them therefrom.

Today, Ms. Tanushree Gupta, Addl. A.G. Haryana, has appeared before the Court and states that the State is willing to reformulate its policy by placing limited reliance on age and experience in cadre to the extent of 25% each, and for the remaining half, special circumstances to be enumerated in the policy. She also informs the Court that learned Advocate General has also given this undertaking before Division Bench of this Court on 21.05.2026 passed in CWP-7092-2026 and connected cases titled as '*Vijay Chaudhary and ors. vs. State of Haryana and anr.*'

In view of the above undertaking given by learned State Counsel, this Court do not deem it appropriate to keep this bunch of writ petitions pending any further.

The writ petitions are accordingly disposed of with liberty reserved to the State of Haryana to formulate an appropriate transfer policy and to proceed further in accordance with law.

Pending application(s), if any, stand(s) disposed of.

A photocopy of this order be placed on the file(s) of connected case(s).

27.05.2026
anuradha

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

:Yes/No
:Yes/No