

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL,  
JAIPUR BENCH, JAIPUR

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 291/00093/2016

(Order Reserved on 09.03.2016)

DATE OF ORDER: 29/03/2016

CORAM

HON'BLE MS. MEENAKSHI HOOJA, ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER

Ajay Kaushal S/o late Shri Ram Swaroop Kaushal, aged about 51 years, R/o 223, Keshav Nagar, Opp. Vaishali Nagar, Ajmer and holding the post of UDC, Kendriya Vidyalaya No. 2, Foy Sagar Road, Ajmer and under transfer to Kendriya Vidyalaya, BSF, Anupgarh, Rajasthan.

...Applicant

Mr. C.B. Sharma, counsel for applicant.

**VERSUS**

1. Kendriya Vidyalaya Sangathan through its Joint Commissioner, 18, Institutional Area, Shaheed Jeet Singh Marg, New Delhi – 110016.
2. Deputy Commissioner, Kendriya Vidyalaya Sangathan, Regional Office, 92, Gandhi Nagar Marg, Bajaj Nagar, Jaipur – 302015.
3. Principal, Kendriya Vidyalaya No. 2, Foy Sagar Road, Ajmer – 305005.
4. Shri Ramesh Chandra Sharma, Principal, Kendriya Vidyalaya No. 2, Foy Sagar, Ajmer – 305005 under transfer K.V. Khariar (Odisha) (Raipur Region).

...Respondents

Mr. Hawa Singh, counsel for respondent nos. 1 to 3.

None present for respondent no. 4.

**ORDER**

This Original Application has been filed by the applicant under Section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985, against the Memo dated 01.02.2016 (Annexure A/1) by which the representation of the applicant against transfer from Kendriya Vidyalaya No. 2 Ajmer to Kendriya Vidyalaya, BSF, Anupgarh has been rejected by the respondents, seeking the following reliefs:

“(i) That respondent may be directed to produce entire record relating to the case and after perusing the same suitable directions be issued to the respondents to allow the applicant

to perform his duties in Kendriya Vidyalaya No. 2, Ajmer where post is still lying vacant as being performed prior to passing of orders by quashing memos dated 01/02/2016 & 29/01/2016 (Annexure A/1 & A/22) and orders dated 15/01/2016 (Annexure A/3 & A/4) with all consequential benefits.

- (ii) That the respondents be further directed not to harass the applicant in day to day working
- (iii) Any other order/directions or relief may be granted in favour of the applicant which may be deemed just and proper under the facts and circumstances of this case.
- (iv) That the costs of this application may be awarded."

2. When the matter came up for hearing on 09.03.2016, Ld. Counsel for the applicant, while referring to the points raised in the OA , inter alia, submitted that the applicant, working on the post of UDC, was transferred from Kendriya Vidyalaya No. 2 Ajmer to Kendriya Vidyalaya, BSF, Anupgarh on administrative grounds vide order dated 15.01.2016 (Annexure A/3) and further he was relieved on the same day by relieving order dated 15.01.2016 (Annexure A/4). Counsel for applicant then referred to Annexure A/2, which is the order dated 29.01.2016 passed by this Bench of the Tribunal in earlier OA No. 291/00070/2016 filed by the applicant, in which direction was given to the respondent no. 2 to consider and decide the representation dated 20.01.2016 submitted by the applicant in accordance with law, within a period of one month from the date of receipt of a copy of the order and till then the effect and operation of the transfer order dated 15.01.2016 and the relieving order dated 15.01.2016 shall remain stayed. Counsel for applicant contended that this order of the Tribunal was passed on 29.01.2016 and the respondent no. 2 decided the representation of the applicant on 01.02.2016 (Annexure A/1) i.e. just within a day after the order of the Tribunal in undue haste.

3. Referring further to the reasons given in the Memo Annexure A/1 dated 01.02.2016, counsel for the applicant submitted that the word 'administrative exigency' has been used for not acceding to the request of the applicant and rejecting his representation, though in the transfer order dated 15.01.2016 (Annexure A/3), he was transferred on 'administrative grounds'. The word 'exigency' connotes an immediate requirement of service and thus there is a contradiction in the language used in transfer order dated 15.01.2016 (Annexure A/3) and the Memo dated 01.02.2016 (Annexure A/1) by which his representation has been rejected. Counsel for applicant further submitted that in para 4 (iii) of the Memo dated 01.02.2016 (Annexure A/1) it has been mentioned that there is no vacancy available in Kendriya Vidyalaya No. 1 as Shri Arun Kumar Sharma has been posted there and he has joined his duties on 25.01.2016 at KV No. 1. In this context, counsel for applicant mentioned that Shri Arun Kumar Sharma was working as LDC at KV No. 1 Ajmer and was transferred to Sawai Madhopur as UDC on promotion but just in about four months, his place of posting was modified and he was posted back to KV No. 1 Ajmer as UDC. He further submitted that had the respondents considered the case of the applicant properly, looking to the reasons given by him in his representation dated 20.01.2016, especially regarding his wife being in State Govt. service and posted at Ajmer and the medical problems of his son etc. the respondents could have shifted Shri Arun Kumar Sharma to KV No. 1 Ajmer and adjusted the applicant in KV No. 2 Ajmer, but the respondents have simply not cared to do so.

4. Counsel for applicant also submitted that in fact this is a case of malice in fact and mala fide attitude of the respondents especially Sh. R.C. Sharma, then Principal, KV No. 2, Ajmer who has been impleaded as respondent no. 4 in private capacity. Though the applicant had outstanding record and even the Respondent No. 4 himself as Principal of the school recommended him for KVS incentive award on 29.05.2013 (Annexure A/8) but the Respondent No. 4 got annoyed with the applicant because while discharging his duties he brought certain lapses and irregularities to the notice of Respondent No. 4 by submitting certain note sheets. One such note is at Annexure A/9 dated 02.05.2015 by which the applicant objected to the use of CCTV cameras against the instructions and also for payments being made for the same, on which the Respondent No. 4 simply directed for the payment to be made. Later the Respondent No. 4 got further annoyed with the applicant when he was directed vide letter dated 08.06.2015 (Annexure A/10) to follow the instructions regarding the use of CCTV's Cameras and to remove the CCTV camera installed / fixed inside the office as there is a violation of official privacy of the office staff. In this situation the applicant also requested for his transfer from KV No. 2 to KV No. 1 vide letter dated 04.07.2015 (Annexure A/11). The applicant also submitted a note sheet dated 08.09.2015 (Annexure A/13) regarding irregular payment being made to a Caterer for an Athletics Meet but the Respondent No. 4 just directed for the payment to be made and wrote on the marginal note that he has spoken to the Chairman, Vidyalaya Management Committee(VMC) in this regard.

5: With reference to the complaint dated 27.06.2015 made against the applicant, by Shri M.S. Shekhawat DIG Police, CRPF, who was the Chairman of the Vidyalaya Management Committee of KV No. 2, and submitted to the Commissioner, KVS (HQ) New Delhi (filed as Annexure R/1 with the reply), counsel for the applicant submitted that it was also managed by the Respondent No. 4 because of his prejudice against the applicant. Counsel for the respondent further contended that as brought out by the Respondents in their reply in para 4 (page 93 of the OA) the complaint made by the Chairman, VMC, (as also by Principal K.V. No. 2, Ajmer against the applicant and the complaint made by the applicant against Principal K.V. No. 2) were inquired by the Inquiry Officer appointed by Deputy Commissioner, KVS, Regional Office, Jaipur but the Inquiry Committee did not find anything adverse against the applicant. Counsel for applicant further emphasized that the Respondents have deliberately not filed the inquiry report and they may be asked to produce the same. Counsel for applicant submitted that the Principal (Respondent No. 4) who was transferred from Ajmer to Khariar (Raipur Region) on 14.01.2016 on the basis of the fact finding enquiry, made it a prestige point to see that the applicant was also got transferred out of the school. The Respondents have also claimed in reply (at page 98) that the applicant was transferred on the basis of letter dated 05.01.2016 issued by competent authority, but the said letter has not been filed by the respondent, therefore, it is not established that the transfer of the applicant to a faraway place like Anupgarh was specifically directed vide the aforesaid letter.

6. Counsel for applicant thereby, in sum, contended that, in the first place the representation of the applicant has been decided vide Annexure A/1 dated 01.02.2016 without duly considering the fact that his wife is in State Govt. service at Ajmer and that he could have been adjusted at KV No. 1 by sending Shri Arun Kumar Sharma to KV No. 2 and that the representation has been decided just within a day in a harsh manner and further that his transfer to a faraway place 450 Kms from Ajmer has been made in malice arising out of certain due objections raised by him before the Principal, and even though there were no adverse findings against him in the inquiry report. The respondent no. 4, impleaded in private capacity has not even filed a reply to the OA. Counsel for respondents also placed reliance upon order dated 23.07.2015 of the Guhawati Bench of CAT in OA No. 234/2013 and judgement of Hon'ble Apex Court in Somesh Tiwari Vs Union of India and Others in Civil Appeal No. 7308 of 2008 decided on December 16, 2008 (2009) 1 Supreme Court Cases (L&S) 411 and prayed that Memos Annexure A/1 dated 01.02.2016, Annexure A/22 dated 29.01.2016, and transfer order dated 15.01.2016 Annexure A/3 and relieving order dated 15.01.2016 Annexure A/4 to be set aside and the OA be allowed.

7. Per contra, counsel for official respondent nos. 1 to 3, with reference to the points brought out in the reply, submitted that in the first place as upheld by the Hon'ble Apex Court in a catena of judgments, Courts and Tribunals should not ordinarily interfere in matters of transfer and posting which are an incident and condition of Govt. service, unless there is a violation of statutory provisions, the order has not been issued

by the competent authority or there is proven mala fide, and submitted that none of these grounds are there in the present OA.

8. In this regard counsel for official respondents drew special attention to the fact that as mentioned in Para 2 of Annexure A/1 Memo dated 01.02.2016, the representation dated 18.01.2016 of the applicant was already decided on 22.01.2016 (copies of representation dated 18.01.2016 and Memo dated 22.01.2016 were submitted by the counsel for respondents at that time, during the course of hearing) and pointed out that in the earlier OA No. 291/00070/2016 these facts were concealed by the applicant. Moreover even his representation dated 20.01.2016 (filed as Annexure A/17 in the OA No. 70/2016) submitted as pending had actually been decided vide Memo dated 29.01.2016 and now the same has been filed as Annexure A/22 in the present OA.

Counsel for official respondents argued that had the applicant properly revealed all the information and not concealed the facts, then the Hon'ble Tribunal probably would not have given directions (on 29.01.2016 while disposing of OA No. 291/00070/2016) to decide the pending representation, which in fact was not pending. The earlier representation dated 18.01.2016 had already been decided on 22.01.2016 and the representation dated 20.01.2016 (detailed out in Annexure A/1), is almost similar/identical to that of representation dated 18.01.2016.

However, counsel for respondent further submitted that the respondents with due regard to the directions of the Hon'ble Tribunal, again considered the representation dated 20.01.2016 and decided the same vide Memorandum dated 01.02.2016 (Annexure A/1). Rebutting the arguments of counsel for the applicant that the representation of the

applicant has been decided by the respondents in haste just within one day after the order was passed by the Tribunal on 29.01.2016 (in earlier OA No. 291/00070/2016), counsel for respondents submitted, that as brought out, representations dated 18.01.2016 and 20.01.2016 were on the similar and identical lines/grounds, and as representation dated 18.01.2016 had already been decided therefore, there was really no new ground for consideration and the matter was decided promptly taking all the factors into account. Deciding a representation in a timely and prompt manner, can by no stretch of imagination be considered a undue haste.

9. Counsel for official respondents drew special attention to Annexure R/1 dated 27<sup>th</sup> June, 2015 filed with the reply in which the Chairman of the Vidyalaya Management Committee (VMC) K.V. 2 i.e. the DIG Police, CRPF, Ajmer has written a letter to the Commissioner, KVS, HQ, New Delhi detailing out the problems and difficulties being created by the applicant in the running of KV No. 2, Ajmer and his constant hindrance and interference and threats to the Principal. The fact that the applicant was creating difficulties and engaging in improper conduct rather than carrying out the instructions of the Principal and not performing the duties properly can also be seen from Annexure R/2 Memorandum dated 02.05.2015, Annexure R/3 earlier letter dated 21.02.2014, Annexure R/4 Memorandum dated 22.02.2014 and other Memos dated 08.09.2015 and 11.09.2015. In this regard, counsel for respondents contended that rather than carrying out his duties, the applicant has shown a tendency towards interfering in the other activities and tried to malign the Principal who is actually responsible for running

the School and if there are any lapses on his performance, action can be taken as required, by so many authorities higher to him, and an UDC cannot take over the responsibility of running the School and be allowed to create day to day hindrances.

10. Counsel for respondents then referred to Para 4 of the reply and submitted that as brought out, on the complaint made by the Chairman VMC (Annexure R/1) and by the Principal KV No. 2 and the complaint made by the applicant against the Principal KV No. 2 were got inquired by the inquiry officer appointed by Deputy Commissioner, KVS, Regional Office, Jaipur. The inquiry officer in its report concluded that (reference page 93):

“The institution is more important than the individual. Unnecessary stubborn/adamant attitude on the part of the Principal and his arguments with UDC as well as the counter arguments of the UDC with the Principal can bring the sanctity of the Vidyalaya into disrepute and spoil the academic fabric of the Vidyalaya. The UDC Mr. Ajay Kaushal also needs to be cautioned to maintain his decorum inside the Principal’s room. It is hence concluded that suitable/appropriate action be taken on both the Shri R.C. Sharma, Principal and Shri Ajay Kaushal, UDC.”

11. It was further submitted by the counsel for respondents that keeping in view the Inquiry report, the Memos issued by the Principal R/2, R/3 and R/4, issues raised by the applicant as at R/5 and DO letter dated 27.06.2015 of the Chairman VMC (Annexure R/1) the entire matter was referred to the competent authority, KVS (Hqrs), New Delhi for appropriate action against both the individuals i.e. Respondent No. 4 and the applicant, in the larger interest of the Vidyalaya and the Organization. The competent authority thereafter, keeping in view the gravity of the matter decided to shift both Shri R.C. Sharma, Principal and the applicant from KV No. 2 Ajmer and, therefore, due to

administrative exigencies, the applicant was transferred on administrative grounds from KV No. 2 Ajmer to KV BSF, Anupgarh vide order dated 15.01.2016 by the Deputy Commissioner, KVS, Regional Office, Jaipur under para 7 (e) of KVS Transfer Guidelines and the Principal Shri R.C. Sharma was also shifted/transferred to KV, Khariar (Raipur Region) vide KVS (Hqrs) New Delhi order dated 14.01.2016. On these grounds, counsel for respondents prayed that the transfer order and relieving order dated 15.01.2016 (Annexure A/3 and A/4) are fully justified and are in accordance with the transfer guidelines and issued by the competent authority and no mala fide whatsoever is made out either in the transfer order/relieving order or in the rejection of the representation vide Memo dated 01.02.2016 (Annexure A/1) and earlier Memorandum dated 29.01.2016 (Annexure A/22) and prayed for the dismissal of the OA. In support of his contentions, counsel for official respondents also relied upon the following decisions / judgments:

- (1) in Commissioner, Kendriya Vidyalaya Sangathan, New Delhi & two others vs. V. Satya Narayan Murty (W.P. (C) No. 5280/2013), Date of Order 22.04.2013 – Orissa High Court, Cuttack,
- (2) Vipin Kumar Maurya vs. Kendriya Vidyalaya Sangathan & Ors. (OA No. 468/2013) Date of Order 21<sup>st</sup> November, 2013 – Central Administrative Tribunal, Lucknow Bench, Lucknow,
- (3) Marshal Franki vs. Union of India and Ors., Date of Order 29<sup>th</sup> September, 1999 – Central Administrative Tribunal, Lucknow Bench, Lucknow,
- (4) Mohd. Masood Ahmad vs. State of U.P. & Ors., Appeal (Civil) No. 4360/2007, Date of Judgment- 18.09.2007 – Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, and
- (5) Dr. Keerti Nathuram vs. UOI & Ors. (OA No. 291/00252/2014), Date of Order – 05.02.2015, Central Administrative Tribunal, Jaipur Bench, Jaipur.

13. Counsel for official respondents also placed the relevant transfer guidelines of KVS for perusal and consideration, which have also been filed by the applicant as Annexure A/5.

14. Considered the aforesaid contentions, and perused the record including that of earlier OA No. 291/00070/2016 and the judgments/orders relied upon by the respective ld. counsels for applicant and official respondents. It is noted that while deciding earlier OA No. 291/00070/2016 at admission stage itself, vide order dated 29.01.2016 (Annexure A/2) this Bench of the Tribunal, after considering the submissions made by the counsel for applicant gave the following directions: -

“3. In view of the above position and that the representation of the applicant is still pending considering with the respondents No. 2, it is considered appropriate to dispose of the OA at the admission stage itself, without going into the merits of the case, with certain direction.

4. Accordingly, the respondent no. 2 is directed to consider and decide the representation of the applicant dated 20.01.2016 (Annexure A/17) submitted by the applicant in accordance with law within a period of one month from the date of receipt of a copy of this order and till then the effect and operation of the transfer order dated 15.01.2016 (Annexure A/1) and the relieving order dated 15.01.2016 (Annexure A/2) shall remain stayed. The applicant is also directed to supply a copy of this order along with a complete copy of paper book / OA to the respondent no. 2 within a week. In view of the limited relief being granted, the requirement of issue of notices to the respondents is dispensed with.”

15. However, it is seen from Annexure A/1 Memo dated 01.02.2016 that the applicant had earlier also filed representation dated 18.01.2016 which was decided vide Memo dated 22.01.2016 (and copies of said representation and Memo were submitted by the counsel for respondents during the course of hearing) but the fact of submission of this representation and decision on the same was not revealed in OA No. 291/00070/2016. Further even representation dated 20.01.2016, which

was considered to be pending in view of the submissions of the counsel for the applicant, had already been decided vide Memo dated 29.01.2016 and the same has now been appended in the present OA as Annexure A/22. However, as evident from perusal of Annexure A/1 the respondent no. 2 in the present OA, again considered the representation dated 20.01.2016 and decided the same vide Memo dated 01.02.2016 (Annexure A/1) in compliance of the directions dated 29.01.2016 given by this Tribunal in the earlier OA No. 291/00070/2016.

16. In this regard counsel for applicant had contended that the respondent decided the representation of the applicant just within one day after the order dated 29.01.2016 was passed by the Tribunal in OA No. 70/2016, without even properly considering the issues raised by the applicant and this appears to be unduly hasty and harsh and prejudiced. However, as brought out by the counsel for the respondents it is noted that the representation dated 20.01.2016 had more or less similar points as those mentioned in the representation dated 18.01.2016, therefore, a prompt and timely decision cannot be, on the face of it, said to be unduly hasty or borne out of malice.

17. It is further noted that the transfer order dated 15.01.2016 (Annexure A/3) has been made under Para 7(e) of the Transfer Guidelines of KVS which is regarding Method for Administrative Transfer and Para 7(e) provides that "*an employee can be transferred from a location if the employee's stay has become prejudicial to the interest of the organization.*"

18. Counsel for applicant had contended that the then Principal, KV No. 2 Ajmer, impleaded by name as Private Respondent no. 4, who had

earlier even recommended the applicant for KVS incentive award vide letter dated 29.05.2013 (Annexure A/8) got annoyed with the applicant because the applicant submitted several note-sheets pointing out the irregularities being committed in the School (refer A/9 dated 02.05.2015 regarding CCTV cameras), and the Principal in this case was directed vide letter of the respondents dated 08.06.2015 (Annexure A/10) to remove the CCTV cameras fixed inside the office and to use it strictly in accordance with the directions of the Department and this further annoyed Respondent No. 4. Another such note sheet submitted by the applicant raising objection regarding payment to a Caterer is at Annexure A/13 dated 08.09.2015. However, it is also evident from the reply and the contentions made by the counsel for the respondents that the Principal also gave several Memos and Advisory Notes to the applicant (Annexure R/2 02.05.2015, R/3 dated 21.02.2014, R/4 dated 22.02.2014 and 08.09.2015 and 11.09.2015) advising the applicant to do his duty properly, not create hindrance, and not to interfere in those of others and to follow the directions of the Principal. The counsel for applicant had submitted that the applicant had made request for transfer from KV No. 2 to KV No. 1, in view of harassment by the Principal and threats of transfer and issue of notices/memos, but it is noted that the request of transfer of the applicant as at Annexure A/11 dated 04.07.2015 is a simple request on personal grounds rather than based on any acts of Respondent No. 4, and a transfer application was also submitted by one Shri Vishal Soni of KV No. 1 (Annexure A/12 also dated 04.07.2015) on mutual exchange basis for Intra Station transfer. The application of the applicant for transfer was also forwarded by the Principal (i.e. Respondent No. 4) vide letter dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September, 2015

(Annexure A/15). It is also noted that the Memos issued by the Principal (Respondent No. 4) pertain not only to the period after note sheet regarding CCTV Cameras dated 02.05.2015 (Annexure A/9) or directions of higher authorities dated 08.06.2015 (Annexure A/10) were given to the Respondent No. 4 in this regard, but also relate to much earlier period as Annexure R/3 is dated 21.02.2014 and Annexure R/4 is of 22.02.2014. Thus it cannot be said that the action of Respondent No. 4 are all borne out of annoyance and prejudice due to submission of certain note sheets raising objections regarding various irregularities.

19. It is further noted that Shri M.S. Shekhawat, DIG Police, CRPF, Ajmer, in his capacity as Chairman, Vidyalaya Management Committee(VMC) of KV No. 2, Ajmer, made a complaint to the Commissioner KVS vide letter dated 27<sup>th</sup> June, 2015 (Annexure R/1) and referred to certain misconduct on the part of the applicant and recommended to transfer the applicant from KV No. 2, Ajmer in order to maintain a peaceful environment in the School. However, there is nothing on record to establish, as contended by the counsel for the applicant, that the communication Annexure R/1 of the Chairman, Vidyalaya Management Committee (VMC) of KV No. 2 was manipulated by the Principal (Respondent No. 4) or that a person of a high repute, entrusted with the duties of Chairman VMC could so easily be influenced so as to write against the applicant, merely at someone else's behest.

20. It is seen that various complaints including that of the applicant and then Principal (Respondent No. 4) as well as letter dated 27.06.2015 of Chairman VMC (Annexure R/1) were inquired into by a Inquiry

Officer appointed by Respondent No. 2. It has been contended by the counsel for applicant in this regard that, in the first place inquiry report has not been placed on record by the respondents and secondly, even as brought out in the reply (at page 93), there was no adverse findings against the applicant and it was only directed that the applicant be cautioned and therefore, no case of transferring the applicant and that too, to such a faraway place was made out. However, it is seen from the record that after the receipt of inquiry report, the entire matter, including complaints of the Respondent 4 and the applicant, were referred to the competent authority, who after considering the position and the gravity of the matter decided to shift both i.e. the then Principal (Respondent No. 4) and the applicant from the KV No. 2, Ajmer and vide letter dated 05.01.2016 directed Respondent No. 2 to shift the applicant to KV, BSF Anupgarh. The transfer order dated 15.01.2016 (Annexure A/3), has been clearly made with the approval of the competent authority and there cannot be said to any mala fide on his part. Further it is well within the rights of the respondent Department to carry out transfers for running the Organization in a effective and proper manner. Even though the applicant has claimed in the rejoinder, that there were actually no directions to transfer the applicant to Anupgarh, a faraway place and letter dated 05.01.2016 has not been produced with the reply to support this point, but transfer to a particular place cannot really be questioned, as the applicant has All India transfer liability as per Article 71 of the Education Code of the KVS and in this case, it is noted that the transfer has been specifically made as per Para 7(e) of the transfer guidelines with the approval of the competent authority.

21. Further the Memo dated 01.02.2016 (Annex. A/1) appears to be a reasoned and speaking order and the points as raised in the representation dated 20.01.2016 have been duly considered. It cannot be said that Memo Annexure A/1 dated 01.02.2016 does not take into account the personal problems of the applicant, which are any way subject to the overall interest of the Organization. The distinction sought to be made by the counsel for applicant regarding administrative ground and administrative exigency also appears to be overstretched and does not really lend support to his contentions.

22. In view of the above analysis and the principles laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court in a catena of judgments that Courts and Tribunals should not ordinarily interfere in matters of transfer and posting which are an incident and condition of Govt. service, unless there is a violation of statutory provisions, the order has not been issued by the competent authority or there is proven mala fide, but as no such case is made out in the present O.A and considering the entire facts and circumstances of the case there appear no grounds to accept the contentions of the applicant and to set aside the Annexure A/1 (Memo dated 01.02.2016), Annexure A/22 (Memo dated 29.01.2016), transfer order dated 15.01.2016 (Annexure A/3) and relieving order dated 15.01.2016 (Annexure A/4) or to grant any other relief as prayed for by the applicant.

23. Accordingly, the Original Application is dismissed with no order as to costs. The Interim Relief granted on 09.02.2016 also stands vacated in view of the above order.

  
(MS. MEENAKSHI HOOJA)  
ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER

Kumawat/Badetia