



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

113

CWP-6805-2026 (O&M)
Date of decision: 09.03.2026

Kuldeep Singh

....Petitioner

Versus

Punjab State Power Corporation Limited and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Dr. Sumati Jund, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Shivang Berry, Advocate
for the respondents.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in this writ petition filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, is for issuance of a writ in the nature of *certiorari*, for quashing the transfer/posting order dated 23.02.2026 (Annexure P-1) passed by the office of respondent No.1 whereby the petitioner has been transferred from District Mansa to District Sri Muktsar Sahib, Punjab, in violation of Transfer Policy dated 29.03.2010 (Annexure P-2) issued by the office of respondent No.1 Further a writ of *mandamus* has been sought, directing the respondents to stay the operation of impugned order dated 23.02.2026 (Annexure P-1) during the pendency of the writ petition.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner, *inter alia*, contends that the petitioner is serving as Lineman with unblemished service record in



the office of respondent No.2. Vide office order dated 23.02.2026 (Annexure P-1), the petitioner was transferred from District Mansa to District Sri Muktsar Sahib, about 100 Kms away. The said transfer of the petitioner is in utter disregard to the policy instructions dated 29.03.2010 (Annexure P-2) which mandates that premature transfer before 03 years in non-sensitive posts is contrary to policy unless falling under exceptions. He further submits that the case of the petitioner does not fall under any exception i.e. complaint, administrative exigency, disciplinary grounds and the percentage ceiling prescribed in the policy and seniority/long stay criteria have not been considered. Feeling aggrieved, the petitioner filed a representation (Annexure P-3), which remain unheeded.

3. *Per contra*, learned counsel for the respondents/Corporation submits that the petitioner is relying upon the policy dated 29.03.2010 (Annexure P-2), which stands superseded with the issuance of new policy dated 16.12.2019, which provides that an employee cannot stay at a particular place of posting beyond a period of 04 years and while passing the impugned order inadvertent mistake has occurred. He submits that the respondents/Corporation would consider the representation (Annexure P-3) filed by the petitioner and pass a speaking order strictly in accordance with the applicable transfer policy, within a period of one week from today.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner, in reply, submits that he has no objection, in case a direction is issued to respondent/Corporation



for time-bound consideration and decision of the representation (Annexure P-3) filed by the petitioner.

5. In the wake of the specific averment made by learned counsel for respondents/Corporation, the present petition is disposed of and the respondent/Corporation is directed to consider and decide the representation (Annexure P-3) filed by the petitioner strictly in accordance with the applicable transfer policy, within a period of one week from today. Further, the decision taken thereof shall be conveyed to the petitioner. Needless to say, if the petitioner is found entitled to the relief sought, the same shall be granted forthwith by respondent/Corporation.

6. Disposed of, accordingly.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

09.03.2026
yakub

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