

**Central Administrative Tribunal
Principal Bench**

OA No.1878/2019

New Delhi, this the 3rd day of July, 2019

**Hon'ble Mr. Justice L. Narasimha Reddy, Chairman
Hon'ble Mr. Mohd. Jamshed, Member (A)**

Yagya Datt Viduwa,
S/o Sh. Bipin Bihari Viduwa,
Aged 53 years, DGM,
R/o 16, Ganesh Vihar,
Near Riddhi Siddhi,
Gopalpura Bye Pass,
Jaipur, Rajasthan-302018.
Presently at B-1, Ganpati Galaxy,
Sikandra, Agra, UP.

...Applicant

(By Advocate : Shri Rajendra Prasad)

Versus

1. Union of India,
Through its Chairman,
National Highway Authority of India,
G-5 & 6, Sector-10,
Dwarka, New Delhi-75.
2. The Member Administration,
National Highway Authority of India,
G-5 & 6 Sector-10, Dwarka,
New Delhi-75.
3. The Chief General Manager,
(HR/Admin-1),
National Highway Authority of India,
G-5 & 6 Sector-10,
Dwarka, New Delhi-75.

...Respondents

(By Advocate : Shri Hanu Bhaskar)

ORDER (ORAL)**Justice L. Narasimha Reddy, Chairman :-**

The applicant is working as Deputy General Manager (Technical)/Project Director in the National Highways Authority of India (for short, NHAI). At present, he is in a Unit at Agra. Through an Office Order dated 24.06.2018, he is transferred to Headquarters, in the Quality Cell. The same is challenged in the OA.

2. The applicant contends that he is handling a project working out to Rs.3,000 crores, and at the time when the project is nearing completion, he is transferred with malafide intention. It is also stated that he is sought to relieve even before another Project Director has been posted in his place.

3. We heard Shri Rajendra Prasad, learned counsel for applicant and Shri Hanu Bhaskar, learned counsel for respondents.

4. What is challenged in this OA is an order of transfer simpliciter. To facilitate the handing over of the charge, it is mentioned that it can be handed over to the senior

most officer of the project, till the regular Project Director is posted. The applicant is not able to point out as to what grievance he would suffer, in case he hands over the charge to the senior most officer, as mentioned in the order of transfer itself.

5. Assuming that the project is complete to the extent of 98%, there is nothing in law which requires the same officer to be continued till the project is completed, in all respects.

6. We do not find any merit in the OA and the same is, accordingly, dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

(Mohd. Jamshed)
Member (A)

(Justice L. Narasimha Reddy)
Chairman

‘rk’