



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

126

CWP-7090-2025

Date of Decision: 17.03.2025

Sunil Kumar

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present: Mr. Ravinder Bangar, Advocate,
and Ms. Anjali Bangar, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Rajni Gupta, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226 and 227 of the Constitution of India is seeking setting aside of order dated 06.03.2025 (Annexure P-1) whereby he has been transferred from Commando Wing to GRP on the ground that he has completed 30 years of age.

2. The petitioner is assailing his transfer on the ground that he is suffering from spine disease, thus, it is difficult for him to perform general duty. The respondent has transferred him ignoring his medical condition. He cannot perform duties assigned to District Police officials. Before effecting his transfer, the authorities were bound to invite offer from him with respect to two districts.

3. Ms. Rajni Gupta, Addl. A.G., Haryana, who on advance notice is present in Court, submits that petitioner has not been transferred to District Police whereas he has been transferred to GRP. The job profile of GRP officials is not hectic, thus, petitioner cannot claim that he should not be transferred out of Commando Force. The maximum stay of a Commando in



Commando Force is till the age of 40 years and normally it is 30 years. The petitioner at present is 42 years, thus, he has already been accommodated a lot.

4. I have heard the arguments and perused the record.

5. The petitioner has been transferred from Commando Wing to GRP. His claim that he is suffering from spine disease, thus, should not be transferred out from Commando Wing is not sustainable. It is well known fact that job of officials of GRP is not as hectic as District Police. He has been transferred to GRP and would be assigned District by GRP. He is claiming that respondent is inviting offer of two districts from each official, however, he has not been asked to offer two districts. This Court is sanguine of the fact that GRP before assigning any district would consider claim of petitioner if the practice is followed *qua* other employees.

6. Disposed of.

17.03.2025

shivani

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)

JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking

Yes

Whether reportable

No