



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

112

**CWP-11007-2026 (O&M)
Date of decision: 21.04.2026**

Kuldeep Singh

....Petitioner

Versus

Punjab State Power Corporation Limited and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR**Present:** Dr. Sumati Jund, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Rahul Sharma, Sr. Advocate
with Mr. Ayush Lamba, Advocate for the respondents.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR J. (Oral)

1. The present writ petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India seeking issuance of a writ in the nature of *certiorari* for quashing the impugned speaking order dated 25.03.2026 (Annexure P-5), whereby the representation of the petitioner against his transfer has been rejected and the transfer order dated 23.02.2026 has been upheld. A further prayer has been made for issuance of a writ in the nature of *mandamus* directing the respondents to stay the operation of the impugned order dated 25.03.2026 (Annexure P-5) during the pendency of the present petition.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner, *inter alia*, contends that the petitioner, who has been serving as a Line Man with an unblemished service record, has been subjected to an arbitrary and premature transfer vide Office Order No. 34 dated 23.02.2026 (Annexure P-1). She further submits that the said transfer has been made without any prior notice



and is in clear violation of the Transfer Policy, which mandates a minimum tenure of four years at a station unless the case falls within specified exceptions. The petitioner has neither completed the prescribed tenure and has served only for about seven months at D.S. Sub-Division Bhikhi, nor does his case fall under any of the exceptions as provided in the policy, yet the respondents have failed to consider the applicable criteria. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the petitioner submitted a detailed representation against the impugned transfer order, however, the respondents rejected the same vide speaking order No.50 dated 25.03.2026 (Annexure P-5) in a mechanical manner without due application of mind. The impugned action of the respondents is, thus, arbitrary and violative of Articles 14 and 21 of the Constitution of India. She further contends that the transfer of the petitioner to a place approximately 100 kilometers away has caused undue hardship to him and his dependent family members.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner further contends that the petitioner was working as an Assistant Lineman and for the purpose of transfer under the applicable policy, the tenure is required to be reckoned from the date of posting on the present post, i.e. Lineman, and not from any previous cadre and admittedly, the petitioner has served only for a period of about 7 months as Lineman, and therefore, the service rendered by him prior thereto as Assistant Lineman, cannot be



taken into account for determining the prescribed tenure, rendering the impugned transfer premature and contrary to the policy.

4. *Per contra*, learned Senior counsel for the respondents submits that the petitioner has not placed on record the complete and correct particulars. He further submits that as per Clause (vi) of the Transfer Policy dated 16.12.2019, the maximum stay period for Lineman/ALMs is four years with a cooling period of two years. The petitioner has been working at D.S. Sub-Division Bhikhi since 08.06.2018 and has completed a stay of more than seven years and eight months at the same Station, initially as an Assistant Lineman and thereafter as a Lineman. As per the said transfer policy, the stay at one feeder/line/sub-station is to be treated as continuous stay for the purpose of transfer. Learned Senior counsel for the respondents further submits that the transfer of the petitioner has been made strictly in accordance with the applicable policy and on administrative grounds.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record with their able assistance.

6. The primary grievance of the petitioner is that his transfer is premature and in violation of the transfer policy. However, from the perusal of the record, it is evident that the petitioner has been continuously posted at D.S. Sub-Division Bhikhi since 08.06.2018 and he has completed more than seven years of service at the same Station.

7. The contention raised by learned counsel for the petitioner, that the tenure is to be counted only from the date of petitioner's



promotion/posting as Lineman, cannot be accepted in view of Clause (vi) of the Transfer Policy dated 16.12.2019, which specifically provides that stay at one feeder/line/sub-station shall be considered as stay on one seat for the purpose of the policy. Thus, the entire period of stay at the same station, irrespective of change in designation within the same line, is liable to be counted. For a ready reference, Clause (vi) of the transfer policy dated 16.12.2019, reads as under:-

(vi) The maximum stay period for JE-1, JE/Electrical, JE/Sub-Station, SSA, Lineman, ALMs shall be 4 years with a cooling period of 2 years. In case of line/sub-station stay at one feeder/line/sub-station shall be considered as stay on one seat for the purpose of transfer Policy. The maximum stay period of Consumer Clerks, Meter Readers, Cashiers, Asst. Revenue Accountants, Revenue Accountants, Revenue Superintendents & Meter Inspectors shall be 3 years.

8. The petitioner has admittedly exceeded the maximum permissible tenure of four years at a particular Station and therefore, his transfer cannot be termed as premature rather, it is in consonance with the policy guidelines.

9. In view of the above, this Court finds no illegality or perversity in the impugned orders warranting interference in exercise of writ jurisdiction. Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

21.04.2026

yakub

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No