



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

106+248

RA-CW-413-2025 in
CM-20370-CWP-2023 in/and
CWP-13069-2023 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 11.05.2026

SOOBA SINGH

.....Petitioner

Versus

UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK MANCHANDA

Present: Petitioner-Sooba Singh in person.

Ms. Shalini Atri, Advocate,
Senior Panel Counsel
for the applicant-respondents.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI, J. (Oral)

RA-CW-413-2025

The present review application has been filed for reviewing the order dated 19.03.2025 passed in CM-20370-CWP-2023.

Keeping in view the fact that the main petition has been disposed of, therefore, no order is required to be passed in the present review application. Accordingly, the present review application is dismissed.

Main Case

1. In the present petition, the challenge was raised by the petitioner qua his transfer, vide order dated 28.07.2022, from the office of GE (Air Force) Chandigarh to AGE (I) (Air Force), High Ground. The original application filed by the petitioner was dismissed by the Central Administrative Tribunal (for short, the Tribunal) vide order dated 19.04.2023



(Annexure P-4), against which, the present petition was filed.

2. A co-ordinate Bench of this Court passed a detailed order on 19.03.2025 directing that the petitioner should be posted at GE(AF), Chandigarh, which order has been complied with, and the petitioner is presently posted there.

3. The petitioner, who appears in person, submits that he has approximately 02 years of service left until his retirement from service and therefore, once he has already been allowed to join at Chandigarh, he should be retained at Chandigarh only.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondents-UOI on instructions from Mr. A.K. Antony, Motor Transport Officer, submits that the petitioner was transferred from GE (Air Force) Chandigarh to AGE (I) (Air Force), High Ground in the year 2022, after which he did not join to perform his duty for a period of approximately 02 years but, concedes the fact that in pursuance to the order dated 19.03.2025 passed by the co-ordinate Bench of this Court, the petitioner was directed to be allowed to work at Chandigarh, which order has been complied with. Learned counsel for the respondents further submits that transferring an employee is within the jurisdiction of the employer especially when the post of transfer was not more than 10 km away from the earlier post, and within Chandigarh, hence any interference on the request of the petitioner for transfer should not be entertained.

5. We have heard the petitioner as well as learned counsel for the respondents and have gone through the record with their able assistance.

6. Though, unless and until the transfer is mala fide, or without any jurisdiction, no interference should be called for as the employees are required to work wherever, the employer has the jurisdiction to post them in view of the administrative exigencies.



7. The co-ordinate Bench of this Court, vide order dated 19.03.2025, has allowed the petitioner to rejoin his service at Chandigarh and for the last approximately 01 year, he is working at Chandigarh. He has two more years left to retire, till July, 2028. Keeping in view the fact that the petitioner is at the fag end of his career, unless and until the conduct of the petitioner forces the respondents to transfer him, the petitioner be allowed to continue at Chandigarh till his retirement. This order is only being passed keeping in view the exceptional facts and circumstances of the present case, coupled with the fact that an interim order passed by the co-ordinate Bench of this Court, has already been complied with by the respondents so as to allow the petitioner to perform his duties at Chandigarh.

8. The present petition is disposed of in the above terms.

9. Civil miscellaneous application pending, if any, is also disposed of.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)
JUDGE

11.05.2026
Sandeep

Whether Speaking/Reasoned :	Yes
Whether Reportable :	No