

CWP-35868 of 2025

2026:PHHC:014123



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

CWP-35868 of 2025

Date of decision: 30.01.2026

Amit Behal

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAMIT KUMAR

Present: - Mr. D.S. Patwalia, Sr. Advocate,
with Mr. Gaurav Rana, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Swapan Shorey, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. R.S. Khosla, Sr. Advocate, and
Mr. Aman Sharma, Advocate,
Mr. Chirag Suri, Advocate,
Mr. Yogender Verma, Advocate, and
Ms. Pawandeep Kaur, Advocate,
for respondent No.4.

NAMIT KUMAR, J.

1. Instant writ petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ of certiorari for quashing the order dated 27.11.2025 (Annexure P-4), vide which the petitioner has been transferred from Nangali to Muradpura, District Amritsar.

2. Learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner, who is working as Patwari, was initially posted in District Patiala. He further submitted that the petitioner remained posted at different stations in District Amritsar from June, 2020 to July, 2025 and vide order dated 28.07.2025 (Annexure P-1), he was transferred from Vaniaeke to Nangli, District Amritsar, where he

2026.PHHC:014123



joined. Thereafter, merely after four months from 28.07.2025, petitioner was again transferred from Nangali to Muradpur, Amritsar, vide impugned order dated 27.11.2025 (Annexure P-4). Learned Senior Counsel contended that the transfer of the petitioner from Nangali to Muradpur is in violation of the transfer policy dated 23.04.2018 (Annexure P-3), which was extended upto 15.09.2025 vide notification dated 30.08.2025 (Annexure P-2). He further contended that the petitioner has been transferred within four months without there being any circumstance as provided under the Transfer Policy. He further submits that the impugned transfer is a mid-term transfer, therefore, the same is liable to be set aside. In support of his contentions, learned Senior Counsel has placed reliance upon the judgment of this Court in ***CWP-28208 of 2025 – Ashish Kumar and others v. State of Haryana and others, decided on 12.11.2025 – Law Finder Doc Id # 2823085.***

3. *Per contra*, learned State counsel defended the impugned transfer order of the petitioner by contending that transfer is an incidence of service and no employee has a vested or enforceable right to remain posted at a particular place. He further submitted that a complaint dated 19.11.2025 was made by the Gram Panchayat, Nangali, against the petitioner. It is contended that the transfer has been made in administrative exigency and does not suffer from any illegality, mala fides, or violation of statutory rules.

4. Learned Senior Counsel for respondent No.4 while relying upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Sri Pubi Lombi v.***

2026.PHHC:014123



The State of Arunachal Pradesh and others, 2024 INSC 200

supported the impugned order by submitting that it is a general administrative order of transfer involving multiple Patwaries and Kanungos. Petitioner's grievance, if any, lies only against the State authorities and not against respondent No.4. He further submitted that the instant petition is liable to be dismissed.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant record with their able assistance.

6. Law on the issue is well settled that transfer is an incidence of service and no employee has a right to be remained posted at a particular place of posting and the transfer policy is mere guidelines and is not legally enforceable under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. A Division Bench of this Court in ***Union of India Vs. Ashok Kumar and another : 2008 (1) SCT 704***, while considering the similar issue has held as under :-

“7. xx xx xx xx xx Apart from the said fact, the question which is required to be examined is whether such posting and transfer policy confers any enforceable right in favour of respondent No.1 so as to challenge his transfer purportedly made on administrative ground before the Tribunal. Guidelines have been framed by the authorities to regulate their internal working and with a view to deal with different situations evenly. Such guidelines are not statutory in nature. Any departure from the said guidelines by itself does not give right to an employee to successfully challenge his transfer. The transfer can be challenged on limited grounds i.e., when the same is not within the cadre or the authority is not competent to order transfer or it is

2026.PHHC:014123



*in violation of the statutory rules or actuated by mala fide. The transfer is normal incidence of service and an employee has no right to resist his transfer on the basis of alleged violation of the guidelines. The issue is not res integra. In **Bank of India v Jagjit Singh Mehta, 1992(1) SCT 161 : AIR 1992 SC 519**, Hon'ble Supreme Court was seized of the guidelines for posting husband and wife at one station even if their employers be different. The Court found that the only thing required in terms of the guidelines is that the departmental authorities should consider this aspect along with the exigencies of administration. Thus, no right is conferred on an employee to remain at the same place even if administrative exigency and transfer policy do not permit it.*

8. In Union of India v. S.L. Abbas, 1995(4) SCT 455 : AIR 1993 SC 2444, Hon'ble Supreme Court held to the following effect :-

"Who should be transferred where, is a matter for the appropriate authority to decide. Unless the order of transfer of vitiated by mala fides or is made in violation of any statutory provisions, the Court cannot interfere with it. While ordering the transfer, there is no doubt the authority must keep in mind the guidelines issued by the Government on the subject. Similarly, if a person makes any representation with respect to his transfer the appropriate authority must consider the same having regard to the exigencies of administration. The guidelines say that as far as possible, husband and wife must be posted at the same place. The said guidelines, however, do not confer upon the Government employee a legally enforceable right".

9. In State of U.P. v. Gobardhan Lal, 2004(2) SCT 368 : AIR 2004 SC 2165, Hon'ble Supreme Court held that no

2026.PHHC:014123



government servant can contend that once appointed or posted in a particular place or position, he should continue in such place or position as long as he desires. Transfer of an employee is not only an incident inherent in the terms of appointment but also implicit as an essential condition of service in the absence of any specific indication to the contra, in the law governing or conditions of service. The administrative guidelines for regulating transfers or containing transfer policies at best may afford an opportunity to the officer or servant concerned to approach their higher authorities for redress but cannot have the consequence of depriving or denying the competent authority to transfer a particular officer/servant to any place in public interest and as is found necessitated by exigencies of service. The order of transfer made even in transgression of administrative guidelines cannot also be interfered with, as they do not confer any legally enforceable right unless shown to be vitiated by mala fides or is made in violation of any statutory provisions.

10. In *National Hydroelectric Power Corporation Limited v. Shri Bhagwan*, 2002(1) SCT 236 : AIR 2001 SC 3309, Hon'ble Supreme Court held that unless an order of transfer is shown to be an outcome of mala fide exercise of power or stated to be in violation of statutory provisions prohibiting any such transfer, the Courts or the Tribunals cannot interfere with such orders as a matter of routine, as though they were the appellate authorities substituting their own decision for that of the management, as against such orders passed in the interest of administrative exigencies of the service concerned.

11. In *S.L. Abbas's case* (supra), Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that the jurisdiction of the Central Administrative Tribunal is akin to the jurisdiction of the High Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India in service matters.

2026.PHHC:014123



The constraints and norms which the High Court observes while exercising the said jurisdiction apply equally to the Tribunal created under Article 323-A of the Constitution. The Central Administrative Tribunal is not an Appellate Authority sitting in judgment over the orders of transfer. It cannot substitute its own judgment for that of the authority competent to transfer.

*12. A Full Bench of this Court in **Jagir Singh Kanungo v. The State of Punjab through the Secretary Vigilance, Punjab, Chandigarh, 1993(2) SCT 128 : 1993(1) Punjab Law Reporter 376**, has the occasion to interpret the guidelines issued by the State of Punjab for conclusion of the inquiry proceedings in a time bound manner. It was held that if the enquiry proceedings are not completed within the aforesaid period, no right accrues to the employee to approach the Court of law for enforcement of those guidelines. It was held to the following effect :-*

“.....If the State Government have issued certain guidelines for the guidance of the various departments or the disciplinary authorities to impress upon them the necessity of finalising the departmental proceedings expeditiously or even within a fixed period, it does not mean that after the expiry of that period, a right in law accrues to the employee to approach the Court of law for the enforcement of those guide-lines...”

Keeping in view the aforesaid parameters and the scope of the jurisdiction of the Tribunal in an application under section 19 of the Act, we are of the opinion that the order passed by the Tribunal setting aside the order of transfer is illegal exercise of the jurisdiction by the Tribunal. The guidelines are not statutory and do not confer any legally enforceable right on the basis of which an employee can challenge his transfer. No doubt, normally the guidelines

2026.PHHC:014123



are to be adhered to by the administrative authorities but their non-adherence will entitle an employee to bring such facts to the notice of the superior authorities but does not confer any right to seek quashing of the transfer either in an application under section 19 of the Act or under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. Under section 19 of the Act or under Article 226 of the Constitution, transfer order can be interfered with if it is shown to be vitiated by mala fide or in violation of the statutory provisions or having been passed by an authority not competent to pass such an order. Since none of the three conditions are satisfied in the case set up by respondent No.1, the order passed by the Tribunal cannot be sustained in law.”

7. To the same effect is the Division Bench judgment of this Court in ***Mool Chand Tewatia Vs. Union of India and others : 2016 (2) SCT 427***, wherein it has been held that the transfer in an incidence of service and the Courts are not to interfere unless the Courts finds that the transfer is due to mala fide or against the service rules.

8. The Hon’ble Supreme Court in ***Sri Pubi Lombi (supra)*** has examined the scope of judicial review in the transfer matters and has held that the same is not permissible in exercising the jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. In the said judgment, it has been held as under: -

“10. In view of the foregoing enunciation of law by judicial decisions of this Court, it is clear that in absence of (i) pleadings regarding malafide, (ii) non-joining the person against whom allegation are made, (iii) violation of any statutory provision (iv) the allegation of the transfer being detrimental to the employee who is holding a transferrable post, judicial interference is not warranted.

2026:PHHC:014123



In the sequel of the said settled norms, the scope of judicial review is not permissible by the Courts in exercising of the jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.”

9. In the present case, the petitioner has been transferred on the basis of a complaint dated 19.11.2025 by the Gram Panchayat, Nangali, alleging therein that the petitioner did not attend the office as a result of which the villagers were being harassed as their revenue works remained pending. Moreover, there is no allegation of malafide against any officer of the department and the petitioner has been transferred within the same Tehsil area, therefore, no prejudice has been caused to him. Further, the contention that the impugned order is in violation of the transfer policy is also not acceptable because of the fact that transfer policies are just guidelines and not legally enforceable. Therefore, no benefit of the judgment relied upon by learned counsel for the petitioner can be given to the petitioner.

10. In view of the above factual position and settled principles of law, I find no merit in the present petition and the same is accordingly dismissed.

(NAMIT KUMAR)
JUDGE

30.01.2026
R.S.

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether Reportable : Yes/No