

  
**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN AT  
JODHPUR**

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 6779/2026

Pawan Kumar S/o Shri Prem Kumar, Aged About 44 Years,  
Resident Of Village Post Ward Number 1 House Number 13  
Diveder Road Raisinghnagar Tehsil Raisinghnagar District  
Sriganganagar Rajasthan.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Cooperative Department, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The Registrar, Cooperative Societies, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Nehru Sahkar Bhawan, Jaipur.
3. The Ganganagar Central Cooperative Bank Limited, Through Its Managing Director, Sri Ganganagar.
4. Mr. Sandeep Kumar, Manager, 19 Np Gram Sewa Sahkari Samiti Limited, 19 Np Branch Raisinghnagar, Sri Ganganagar.

----Respondents

---

|                   |   |                     |
|-------------------|---|---------------------|
| For Petitioner(s) | : | Mr. Ashok Choudhary |
| For Respondent(s) | : | None present        |

---

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE FARJAND ALI**

**Order**

**25/03/2026**

1. By way of the present writ petition, the petitioner has invoked the extraordinary jurisdiction of this Court seeking quashment and setting aside of the impugned order dated 19.03.2026 passed by The Ganganagar Central Cooperative Bank Ltd. Sri Ganganagar whereby he has been replaced from the post of Loan Supervisor, and further prays for a direction to the respondents to reinstate him on the said post with all consequential benefits.

2. The factual matrix, succinctly delineated, reveals that the petitioner was initially appointed as Assistant Manager pursuant to a resolution dated 01.10.2002 passed by the Management Board of Satjanda Gram Seva Sahkari Samiti Limited. Thereafter, by resolution dated 20.04.2009, he was entrusted with the charge of Manager, and subsequently, upon recommendation of the Screening Committee, his services were regularized on the post of Manager vide order dated 25.05.2010.

2.1. In the course of service, the petitioner was transferred to Bhadvawala Gram Seva Sahkari Samiti Limited on 08.10.2015. Subsequently, pursuant to administrative requisition, he came to be appointed as Loan Supervisor on an ad hoc basis by office order dated 19.02.2024, and was later authorized to discharge duties at Raisinghnagar Branch vide order dated 02.07.2024, whereupon he duly joined and discharged his functions.

2.2. It is the case of the petitioner that his services remained unblemished and satisfactory. However, vide impugned order dated 19.03.2026, he was abruptly replaced by one Mr. Sandeep Kumar, who has also been appointed on an ad hoc basis, thereby giving rise to the present lis.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner vehemently contends that the impugned action is ex facie arbitrary, capricious, and constitutionally impermissible. It is urged that the settled canon of service jurisprudence unequivocally proscribes replacement of one ad hoc employee by another ad hoc appointee, except through a regular selection process, and the impugned action stands in stark derogation of this well-entrenched principle, thereby infringing Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution. It is further canvassed that

the petitioner, being substantially senior, possessed a legitimate expectation of preferential consideration, and his displacement by a junior employee constitutes hostile discrimination and manifest arbitrariness.

3.1. Additionally, it is asserted that the appointee, Mr. Sandeep Kumar, suffers from inherent disqualifications, including alleged irregularity in initial appointment and adverse service record, coupled with pending disciplinary considerations, thereby rendering his appointment wholly unjustified and antithetical to public interest. The petitioner also assails the impugned order on the anvil of violation of principles of natural justice, contending that no prior notice or opportunity of hearing was afforded before effecting his replacement.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner; none appears on behalf of the respondents and perused the material available on record and have bestowed my thoughtful consideration to the niceties and nuances of the controversy involved.

4.1. Upon a comprehensive and penetrative scrutiny of the record, this Court is of the considered view that the substratum of the petitioner's claim rests upon an assertion of continuance on a particular post, albeit on an ad hoc basis. Such a claim, in the realm of service law, does not ripen into an indefeasible or vested right.

4.2. It is trite that matters pertaining to posting, transfer, and assignment of duties squarely fall within the exclusive domain of administrative discretion. The employer retains plenary authority to determine, in accordance with institutional exigencies and

functional requirements, as to which employee is to be entrusted with a particular charge or assignment.

4.3. A public servant, howsoever placed, cannot predicate a legally enforceable right to insist upon retention of a specific post or charge. The conferment of such charge is inherently transient and contingent, often being the result of administrative balancing, and may equally be withdrawn or reassigned in furtherance of organizational efficiency.

4.4. In the present case, the petitioner was admittedly holding the post of Loan Supervisor on an ad hoc basis. The very nature of such appointment is temporary, tentative, and devoid of permanence. The subsequent decision of the competent authority to reassign the said charge to another employee cannot, *ipso facto*, be stigmatized as illegal or unconstitutional, particularly in absence of any demonstrable statutory infraction.

4.5. The argument predicated upon seniority, though alluring at first blush, does not confer an absolute right in matters of ad hoc postings. Likewise, allegations regarding the antecedents or service record of the substituted employee fall beyond the permissible scope of judicial review in such administrative matters, unless they shock the conscience of the Court or are demonstrably perverse, which is not evident herein.

4.6. Equally, the plea of violation of natural justice does not merit acceptance, as no civil consequences, in terms of substantive rank, pay scale, or substantive appointment, have been visited upon the petitioner. The reassignment of an ad hoc charge does not necessitate prior notice or hearing. Thus, the impugned order appears to be an outcome of administrative exigency,

passed in the legitimate exercise of executive discretion, and does not warrant interference under the extraordinary writ jurisdiction of this Court.

5. In view of the foregoing discussion, this Court finds no merit in the present writ petition. The same is accordingly dismissed. Consequently, the stay application also stands disposed of.

**(FARJAND ALI),J**

174-Mamta/-