



**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL  
PRINCIPAL BENCH**

**O.A. No. 1294/2020**

New Delhi, this the 17th day of September, 2020

(through video conferencing)

**Hon'ble Mr. Pradeep Kumar, Member (A)**

**Hon'ble Mr. R.N. Singh, Member (J)**

Rakesh Kumar,  
Aged 58 years,  
Assistant Director (Horticulture)  
Group 'B'  
S/o Shri Rajinder Kumar,  
R/o 1-B, Block-55, Sector-II  
Gole Market, New Delhi-110001

....Applicant

(By Advocate: Mr Ashish Nischal)

Versus

1. Union of India,  
Through its Secretary,  
Ministry of Housing & Urban Affairs,  
Nirman Bhawan, New Delhi-110108
2. The Director General,  
Central Public Works Department,  
Nirman Bhawan,  
New Delhi-1100108

(By Advocate: Mr Sanjeev Yadav)

**ORDER (ORAL)**

**Mr R. N. Singh, Member (J):-**

Mr Ashish Nischal, learned counsel appeared for the applicant and  
Mr Sanjeev Yadav, learned counsels appeared for the respondents.

2. The applicant herein is working as Assistant Director (Horticulture) under the respondents. He has preferred the instant OA seeking quashing of the transfer order dated 14.8.2020 wherein he was

transferred from Delhi to Chandigarh. The applicant made a representation which was rejected vide order dated 10.09.2020. Aggrieved at this rejection, OA has been preferred.



3. In this rejection order, it is indicated that a vigilance investigation is going on and the applicant is required to be posted on a non-sensitive post. Since no such non-sensitive post is available in Delhi, the applicant is transferred to Chandigarh where such a post is available.

4. The applicant pleaded that his wife is working in Dr R.M.L. Hospital and in terms of DOPT directions, both husband and wife are required to be posted at one place.

5. Applicant also takes reliance of policy directions issued by the CPWD wherein guidelines have been given that those who are retiring within two years, may not be transferred. In the instant case, applicant is going to superannuate on 28.02.2022 from this fact also applicant has to be retained at Delhi.

6. Since his request has been rejected, he has preferred the instant OA seeking relief to stay the transfer order dated 14.8.2020.

7. Matter has been heard. In view of the peculiar circumstances that a vigilance investigation is going on and the applicant was posted at Delhi for about 18 Years & six months while outside Delhi he has been posted for 4 years & 10 months, the Tribunal does not find any merit to interfere with the transfer order in the instant OA.

8. OA stands dismissed. No costs.

**(R.N. Singh)**  
**Member (J)**

**(Pradeep Kumar)**  
**Member (A)**

/sd/rb/neetu