



150+273+278 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

Date of decision:21.05.2026

1. CWP-7092-2026(O&M)

VIJAY CHAUDHARY AND OTHERS ...Petitioners

V/S

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER ...Respondents

2. CWP-10808-2026(O&M)

SAVITA MARWAHA @ SAVITA MARWAH ...Petitioner

V/S

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS ...Respondents

3. CWP-1362-2026(O&M)

AMITESH BOKEN ...Petitioner

V/S

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS ...Respondents

4. CWP-2584-2026(O&M)

RACHNA ...Petitioner

V/S

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS ...Respondents

5. CWP-2973-2026(O&M)

SURENDER SINGH AND OTHERS ...Petitioners

V/S

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS ...Respondents

6. CWP-36537-2025(O&M)

VINOD KUMAR AND ANOTHER ...Petitioners

V/S

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS ...Respondents

**CWP-7092-2026(O&M) &
other connected cases**

-2-

202605251252



7. CWP-38528-2025(O&M)

RAJESH KUMAR ...Petitioner
V/S

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS ...Respondents

8. CWP-3956-2026(O&M)

MANJU ...Petitioner
V/S

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS ...Respondents

9. CWP-4134-2026(O&M)

SATBIR SINGH ...Petitioner
V/S

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS ...Respondents

10. CWP-4374-2026(O&M)

ANITA RANA ...Petitioner
V/S

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS ...Respondents

11. LPA-878-2026(O&M)

SURINDER KUMAR SHARMA ...Appellant
V/S

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER ...Respondents

12. CWP-14159-2026(O&M)

PARSHANT KUMAR ...Petitioner
V/S

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS ...Respondents

13. CWP-9588-2026 (O&M)

PARDEEP KUMAR AND OTHERS ...Petitioners
V/S

**CWP-7092-2026(O&M) &
other connected cases**

-3-

2026051417180803426



STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

...Respondents

14.

CWP-16238-2026(O&M)

VEENITA KUMARI AND OTHERS

...Petitioners

V/S

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ROHIT KAPOOR**

Present: Mr. Raywant Kaushish, Advocate
for the petitioner in CWP-7092-2026.

Mr. L.K. Gollen, Advocate and
Ms. Bharti Gollen, Advocate
for the petitioner(s) in CWP-36537-2025.

Mr. Sanchit Punia, Advocate
for the petitioner in CWP-2584-2026.

Mr. J.S. Toor, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Jasbir Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner in CWP-38528-2025.

Mr. Sunil K. Nehra, Senior Advocate, assisted by
Mr. Karan Ranjha, Advocate
for the applicants-proposed respondents No. 5 to 51
in CM-4863-CWP-2026(CWP-1362-2026).

Mr. Mazlish Khan, Advocate
for the petitioner in CWP-1362-2026.

Ms. Shruti Jain Goyal, Advocate
Ms. Anagya R. Chauhan, Advocate
for the appellant/petitioners in LPA-878-2026 &
CWP-9588-2026.

Ms. Nidhi Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner in CWP-3956-2026.

Mr. Rishab Arora, Advocate
for the petitioner(s) in CWP-2973-2026.

Mr. Ravinder Singh Dhull, Advocate
for the petitioners in CWP-16238-2026.

Mr. Jai Shree Kaushik, Advocate,



for the petitioner(s) in CWP-10808-2026.

Mr. Sachin Punia, Advocate
for the petitioner(s) in CWP-2584-2026.

Mr. Deepak Sonak, Advocate &
Ms. Riya Kangra, Advocate
for the petitioner(s) in CWP-4134-2026.

Mr. M.K. Taya, Advocate
Mr. Sachin Balda, Advocate
for the petitioner(s) in CWP-4374-2026.

Mr. Suryaveer Singh Surjewala, Advocate
for the petitioners in CWP-14159-2026.

Mr. Pravindra Singh Chauhan, Advocate General Haryana
Ms. Tanushree Gupta, Sr. DAG, Haryana
Ms. Naina Ranot, Advocate
for the respondents-State.

Mr. Sandeep Kumar, Advocate for
respondents No.3 to 5.

ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA, J. (Oral)

1. In this bunch of writ petitions/appeal, the petitioners/appellant essentially have assailed the transfer policy framed by the State of Haryana on the ground that the formulation of the policy is on irrational considerations and excessive emphasis has been laid to the age of the employees concerned. This bunch of petitions/appeal was entertained and orders were passed from time to time calling upon the State to examine the issues raised and to formulate an appropriate policy consistent with the norms which may have relevance for the purpose.

2. Today, learned Advocate General, State of Haryana, assisted by Ms. Tanushree Gupta, Sr. DAG, 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.

3. Considering the fact that the State itself is willing to have a re-look at its policy and come up with the fresh transfer policy, we do not deem it necessary to keep this bunch of writ petitions/appeal pending any further.
4. The writ petitions alongwith Letters Patent Appeal 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.
5. Pending application(s), if any, stand(s) disposed of.

(ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA)
JUDGE

(ROHIT KAPOOR)
JUDGE

21.05.2026

neeraj

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes	No
Whether Reportable :	Yes	No