

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

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 14658/2026
CNR: RJHC010673432026 | URN: CW / 26734U / 2026

Vishnu Methi S/o Shri Mahesh Chand Gupta, Aged About 40
Years, R/o Gudri Mohalla, Kumher, District Bharatpur Rajasthan.
-----Petitioner

Versus

1. Jodhpur Vidyut Vitran Nigam Ltd., New Power House Road, Jodhpur Rajasthan, Through Its Managing Director.
 2. Secretary (Administration), Jodhpur Discom, New Power House Road, Jodhpur Rajasthan
 3. Executive Engineer (O And M), Jodhpur Vidhyut Vitaran Nigam Ltd. Sri Dungargarh, District Bikaner Rajasthan.
- Respondents

For Petitioner(s)	: Mr. M.S. Godara.
For Respondent(s)	: Mr. Mehul Kothari & Mr. Ayush Goyal, for Mr. Vinay Kothari. Mr. Bhavit Sharma. Mr. Tabish Samdani.

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE NUPUR BHATI
Order

23/07/2026

1. This writ petition has been filed by the petitioner with the following prayers:

“(i) That the order dated 10.07.2026 (Annex.-7) may be declared illegal quo the petitioner; and
(ii) Any other appropriate relief which this Hon'ble Court deems just and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case, in favour of the petitioner, may kindly be granted to him.”

2. Brief facts of the case are that the petitioner was initially appointed as an Assistant Engineer under the respondents. While holding the said post, he was posted at various locations and was eventually transferred from Bhadra to Keshrisinghpur vide order dated 12.08.2021 (Sr. No. 46). Subsequently, upon promotion to the post of Executive Engineer vide order dated 31.01.2022, he was posted at Raniwara (Jalore). From Raniwara, he was

transferred to Sri Dungargarh vide order dated 09.06.2022; then to Nokha within five months vide order dated 10.12.2022; to Bikaner within three months vide order dated 13.01.2023 (Sr. No. 4); back to Sri Dungargarh vide order dated 21.02.2024 (Annex.6) (Sr. No. 15); and lastly, back to Bikaner vide the impugned order dated 10.07.2026 (Sr. No. 43). As a dutiful and dedicated employee, the petitioner complied with six consecutive transfer orders within a period of five years without protest. However, the respondents have now arbitrarily transferred him for the seventh time in less than five years. This frequent reshuffling not only obstructs the smooth and peaceful performance of his official duties but also causes severe mental agony and family disruption. Aggrieved by the transfer order dated 10.07.2026 (Annexure-7), the petitioner has been constrained to prefer the present Writ Petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been subjected to frequent and arbitrary transfers, having been transferred as many as five times between the years 2021 and 2026. It is contended that such repeated administrative shifts constitute an abuse of process, causing severe prejudice and undue hardship to the petitioner.

4. Per contra, learned counsel appearing for the respondents submits that the petitioner, before passing the impugned order, was lastly transferred on 21.02.2024 (Annexure-6) from XEN-TA to ZCE (BZ), Bikaner to XEN (O&M), Sridungargarh and subsequently, after serving a stable tenure of over two years and five months at Sridungargarh, the petitioner was transferred vide the impugned order dated 10.07.2026 (Annexure-7) back to

Bikaner. He emphasizes that the transfer does not cause any administrative disruption, as the petitioner remains within the same district/zone. It is further submitted that the substitute official posted in place of the petitioner has already assumed the charge of duty.

5. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material available on record.

6. Upon consideration of the submissions, this Court finds that the petitioner worked at his previous place of posting for a period of almost 2 years and 5 months before being transferred vide order dated 10.07.2026. Therefore, the plea of "frequent transfer" does not hold ground after 2024. Furthermore, the petitioner has neither challenged the competence of the transferring authority nor substantiated any personal bias or mala fides against the respondents. It is a well-settled principle of service jurisprudence that transfer is an exigency and an inherent condition of service. An order of transfer is not liable to be interfered with by writ courts under Article 226 of the Constitution unless it suffers from clear statutory violation, lack of jurisdiction, or established mala fides.

7. In view of the facts and circumstances noticed above, this Court finds no merit or legal infirmity in the impugned transfer order warranting judicial interference.

8. Consequently, the writ petition fails and is hereby dismissed. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of accordingly.

(DR.NUPUR BHATI),J