



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

118

CWP-31576-2025

Date of Decision: 12.01.2026

KHUSHBU AND OTHERS

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA

Present:- Mr. Rohit Mittal, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Ms. Tanushree Gupta, Senior Deputy Advocate General,
Haryana.

TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA, J. (Oral)

The petition has been filed, *inter alia*, seeking a writ of *mandamus* directing the respondents to release the benefits admissible to the petitioners in terms of clause 11 of the Teachers Transfer Policy, 2016.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners contended that the petitioners were posted in the Hathin Educational Block of Palwal district (considered as Mewat area) which entitled them to additional ten per cent of the basic pay plus dearness allowance in terms of clause 11 of the aforementioned Policy, dated 09.08.2023. The benefit, however, has not been given without citing any reason. He has also placed reliance upon a decision of this Court rendered in CWP-8002-2025 titled *Mahipal Singh v. State of Haryana and others*, dated 12.05.2025.

3. Learned State counsel referred to the instructions dated 04.11.2025, Annexure A, received from the Department, and contended that



petitioners no.1 and 2 were appointed as Post Graduate Teachers (PGTs) vide orders dated 03.04.2025 and 03.07.2024, Annexures P-1 and P-2, respectively, and were temporarily posted in two different Schools at Palwal. Condition 3(vi) required them to complete their MIS Profiles from the station of posting, so that they could opt for further posting in the next phase of transfer drive. Similarly, the posting of the petitioner no.3 is also temporary, as apparent from his promotion order as Principal, dated 19.11.2024. She further contends that the Transfer Policy whereunder the claim has been raised, has also been replaced by a new Transfer Policy notified on 28.11.2025, and the Department has already initiated the transfer drive in terms therewith, inviting options from teachers including the petitioners.

4. Submissions made by learned counsel for the parties have been considered.

5. It is apparent on record that the petitioners were posted in District Palwal as a temporary measure till the Department initiated a new transfer drive and/or until they completed the formalities required for participation therein. Not only has the drive been initiated now, the Policy under which the petitioners have claimed the benefit has also been replaced by a new Policy dated 28.11.2025. Further, reliance upon the order in *Mahipal Singh* case *ibid.* also does not advance the petitioners' case, as the facts therein are different. In that case, the petitioners had remained posted at Palwal for a long period of about two years, and their posting order did not state that they had been temporarily posted. Besides, the Department had also not initiated any transfer drive in that case.



6. In view thereof, this Court is not inclined to entertain the petition and it stands dismissed.

(TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA)
JUDGE

12.01.2026
Ad

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>