

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, JAIPUR BENCH, JAIPUR

Date of order: 21st August, 2001

OA No.362/2001

Bhupendra Singh s/o Shri Sarwan Singh r/o P-59/2 I.T.U. Line Jaipur at present working as JE (QS&C), MESCWE, Jaipur

..Applicant

Versus

1. Union of India through the Secretary for Defence, Ministry of Defence, New Delhi.
2. Engineer-in-Chief, Army H.Q. Kashmiri House, D.H.Q.P.O., New Delhi.
3. Command Chief Engineer H.Q. Southern Command, Pune.
4. H.Q. Chief Engineer Jaipur Zone, Jaipur.
5. Board of Officer for local posting/transfer through SO-I (PLG) HQ Chief Engineer, Jaipur Zone.

.. Respondents

Mr. P.S.Sirchi, counsel for the applicant

.....

CORAM:

Hon'ble Mr.A.K.Mishra, Judicial Member

Hon'ble Mr.A.P.Nagrath, Administrative Member

ORDER

Per Hon'ble Mr. A.K.Mishra, Judicial Member

Applicant has challenged the transfer order Ann.Al dated 9th August, 2001 by which he was transferred from the office of CWE to the office of CEJZ, Jaipur on the ground that this transfer order is in violation of the departmental guidelines issued by the Government of India, Ministry of Defence and there is no administrative exigency in transferring the applicant. It is also stated by the applicant that the post on which the applicant is being transferred was held by the applicant earlier and as per the guidelines, a person cannot be re-transferred on the post he had held earlier. One more ground taken

25/8/

by the applicant is that on representation of certain other employees, they were adjusted and transfers were cancelled and thus, the department has discriminated ~~against~~ the applicant. In view of the above submissions, the applicant has also prayed for staying the operation of the impugned transfer order.

2. It was also submitted by the learned counsel for the applicant that the applicant was earlier transferred from the present post to another by order dated 28th April, 2000 and this order was subsequently withdrawn and again the transfer order was passed by the respondents.

3. We have considered this aspect. From the order dated 28th April, 2000 (Ann.A2) and the impugned order dated 9.8.2001, we find that the place of transfer is same in both the cases. The so called order passed in between the two transferring the applicant from one post to another and then recalling ^{of the applicant} the transfer order is not available on record. The learned counsel for the applicant, in this connection, submitted that this order was not given to the applicant. However, he has been able to locate this order and, therefore, repeated transfer of the applicant from one place to another amounts to malafide transfer.

4. We have considered this aspect. The applicant has not been transferred from one station to another station so as to dislocate his family and the studies of his children. Table transfers or transfers from one zone to another at the same station, though may be passed repeatedly, will not amount to disturbance of family or the studies of their children. Therefore, repeated transfers like the one on the same station cannot be categorised as malafide transfer and, therefore, submission in this respect is rejected.

2/11

5. Considered the submissions of the learned counsel for the applicant and we have gone through the OA. The law relating to transfer is more than settled and the transfer order can only be interfered with when the same is passed due to malafide and for extraneous consideration. The transfer order can also be interfered with, if the same is in violation of the statutory guidelines or rules framed by the Government. In the instant case, the departmental guidelines or rather guidelines issued by the Ministry of Defence are broad guidelines and they have no statutory force. It is for the departmental authorities to consider as to which place a particular individual is to serve. It is not for the Government employee to point out that he be posted on a particular post and not be transferred to other place. The peculiar thing that we see in the instant transfer order is that the applicant has not been disturbed from his posting place i.e. he is not being transferred out of Jaipur. Transferring the applicant from one seat to another in the same city, may be in the different zone, cannot be said to be violative of guidelines. In this case, there was no change of place, therefore, this argument does not hold any force. In the case of malafide transfer, in the instant case, has been made ^{No} ~~not~~ ^{when} calling for our interference in the matter. ~~and~~ the posting is not of the applicant's likings, it can always be termed as malafide transfer, but malafide alleged should be such that it should lead us to the conclusion on the face of it that the transfer order is malafide. In the instant case, there seems to be no such thing. Orders made in administrative exigencies are not to be interfered with. Courts are not supposed to run the administration. It is the departmental authorities who have to see the suitability, requirement and desirability of adjusting a particular person from one post to another or transferring a Government servant from one post to another.

[Signature]

6. In view of this, we do not see any force in the present application and the same is dismissed in limine.

Aug 21/81/2001
(A.P.NAGRATH).

Adm. Member

AM 21/81/2001
(A.K.MISHRA)

Judl. Member