



\$~37

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ W.P.(C) 5157/2026 and CM APPL. 25254/2026

SANDEEP KUMAR

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Himanshu Gautam, Ms.
Niharika Punm, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Shoumendu Mukherji
Senior Panel Counsel with Mr.
Vinay Kaushik, GP with Ms.
Megha Sharma, Mr. Aniruddha
Ghosh, Ms. Surabhi Tuli, Advs.
for UOI with Deputy
Commandant Tanishka
Naithani.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

%

17.04.2026

1. Through the present Petition, the Petitioner seeks issuance of a writ in the nature of certiorari for quashing the orders dated 28.01.2026, 20.02.2026, 23.02.2026 and 07.04.2026 [hereinafter referred to as 'Impugned Orders'] passed by the Respondents.
2. The Petitioner was posted at Delhi in March, 2023. Thereafter, vide Impugned Transfer Order dated 28.01.2026, he was transferred to Port Blair. On the request of the Petitioner, his relieving was deferred for a period of two months. Subsequently, another request for deferment was also accepted by the Competent Authority. Now the Petitioner has sought to be relieved. Hence, he has come to the Court.
3. Learned counsel representing the Petitioner submits that the



Petitioner ought to have been granted six months' time prior to relieving and that the transfer policy contemplates such period, the expression used therein being "ordinarily".

4. This Court finds no merit in the said submission. The policy does not mandate a minimum notice period of six months and merely uses the expression "ordinarily", which cannot be construed as conferring an enforceable right.

5. Moreover, the Petitioner had completed nearly three years at the present station and was aware that he was liable to be transferred in terms of the applicable policy. Significantly, at the Petitioner's own request, his relieving already stood deferred for approximately three months.

6. In view of the aforesaid, no arbitrariness, illegality, or procedural infirmity is made out, warranting interference with the Impugned Orders in exercise of the extraordinary jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

7. The present Petition is accordingly dismissed. The pending application also stands closed.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J.

APRIL 17, 2026
jai/shah