



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

CWP-28904-2025

Date of Decision: 29.09.2025

Manjinder Singh

...Petitioner(s)

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

...Respondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE N.S.SHEKHAWAT

Present : Mr. Dheeraj Mahajan, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Swapan Shorey, DAG, Punjab.

N.S.SHEKHAWAT, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition with a prayer to quash the impugned order dated 15.09.2025 (Annexure P-2) passed by the respondent No.1, whereby, the petitioner has been transferred from Government ITI Patti District Tarn Taran to Government ITI Moga within a period of less than 02 years.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is working as Senior Assistant in the respondent-department. On 16.03.2024, the petitioner was ordered to be transferred to Government ITI Patti, District Tarn Tarn and since then he was posted there. However, vide order dated 15.09.2025 (Anexure P-2), the petitioner has been again transferred from Government ITI Patti, District Tarn Taran to Government ITI Moga within a period of less than 02 years. He further contends that the wife of the petitioner is posted as clerk at Municipal Corporation Amritsar and now the petitioner has been transferred at a distance of 66 Kilometers from Patti. He further contends that the petitioner has been transferred by the respondents by completely overlooking the transfer policy (Annexure P-1).

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions by the learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that the petitioner has remained posted near Amritsar/Tarn Taran for most of the time and even now he has been transferred from Patti to Moga only on administrative reasons or grounds. Moreover, the wife of the

petitioner is also posted in nearby District and no prejudice has been caused to the petitioner.

4. After hearing learned counsel for the parties, this Court is of the considered opinion that the transfer order dated 15.9.2025 has been passed purely on administrative grounds and does not deserve to be quashed. Still further, the transfer is an incident of service and there is no allegation of any political *malafide* in the present case. Thus, there is no illegality in the impugned order passed by the respondents.

5. At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner contends that his representation dated 15.09.2025 (Annexure P-3) is pending with the respondent No.1 and keeping in view the family conditions of the petitioner, the respondent No. 1 may be directed to consider it sympathically.

6. Even, learned counsel for the State has no serious objections to the limited prayer made by the learned counsel for the petitioner.

7. Consequently, the respondent No.1 may consider the representation of the petitioner sympathically, in accordance with law.

8. Disposed off in the above terms.

29.09.2025

amit rana

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)

JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No