

IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

CWP No.17375 of 2025
Date of Decision: 07.11.2025

Manmohan Singh Chandel	Versus	Petitioner
HPSEBL and Others		Respondents

Coram:
Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sandeep Sharma, Judge.
Whether approved for reporting? ¹

For the Petitioner: Mr. Vikrant Chandel, Advocate.

For the Respondents: Mr. V.S. Kanwar, Advocate, vice Mr. Ravinder Thakur, Advocate.

Sandeep Sharma, Judge (oral):

Petitioner herein, who at present is working as Assistant Engineer (Electrical) at ESD, HPSEBL, Larji, District Kullu, H.P., is aggrieved of order dated 01.10.2025 passed by Under Secretary, HPSEBL, Shimla, whereby he has been transferred from present place of posting to the office of Resident Engineer, Bhaba Power House Division, HPSEBL, Bhabanagar, District Kinnaur.

2. Though it has been fairly admitted at the behest of petitioner that petitioner has completed normal tenure of posting at the present place of posting, but impugned transfer order has been laid challenge on the ground that on account of adverse family circumstances, petitioner cannot be sent to hard area. Since petitioner's father is suffering from 100% blindness and there is none to take care of

¹Whether the reporters of the local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?

him, petitioner has approached this Court in the instant proceedings for cancellation of his transfer.

3. Having regard to the nature of prayer made in the instant petition and order proposed to be passed, this Court sees no necessity to call for the reply on behalf of the respondents, who are otherwise represented by Mr. V.S. Kanwar, Advocate, vice Mr. Ravinder Thakur, Advocate. Mr. Kanwar states that petitioner has already completed normal tenure of posting at the present place of posting and prior to his being transferred, he never served hard area and as such, no illegality can be said to have been committed by the respondents while passing impugned transfer order.

4. Having carefully perused impugned transfer order dated 01.10.2025, this Court sees no reason to interfere with the impugned transfer order and as such, same is upheld, however, having taken note of the fact that father of the petitioner is 100% blind and there is none to take care of him, this Court, without going into the merits of the case, deems it fit to dispose of the present petition, reserving liberty to the petitioner to file representation within a period of one week to the competent authority praying therein for cancellation of his transfer order or adjustment at convenient station, which in-turn shall be decided by the competent authority expeditiously, preferably, within a period of ten days. Ordered accordingly. Needless to say, authority concerned while doing the needful in terms of instant order, shall afford an opportunity of being

heard to the petitioner and pass appropriate orders thereupon taking note of Transfer Policy, formulated by the Government of Himachal Pradesh, which certainly enables an employee to seek transfer at the convenient station on the ground of adverse family circumstances and the competent authority may also take note of the fact that one post of Assistant Engineer is also lying vacant at office of Resident Engineer P/Division Thalout, District Kullu.

Pending application(s), if any, also stands disposed of.

**(Sandeep Sharma),
Judge**

November 07, 2025
(Rajeev Raturi)