
(2019) 12 J&K CK 0038

In the Jammu And Kashmir High Court

Case No : Writ Petition (C) No. 3560 Of 2019, CM No. 7505 Of 2019

Ghulam Rasool Bhat

APPELLANT

Vs

Union Territory Of Jammu And Kashmir & Ors

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 17-12-2019

Acts Referred:

Constitution Of India, 1950 — Article 77, 162, 226
Jammu And Kashmir Civil Servants (Removal Of Doubts And Declaration Of Rights) Act,
1956 — Section 3(1)

Citation : (2019) 12 J&K CK 0038

Hon'ble Judges : Ali Mohammad Magrey, J

Bench : Single Bench

Final Decision : Dismissed

Judgement

Ali Mohammad Magrey, J

1. In this petition, filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, the petitioner has craved the indulgence of this Court in quashing the order bearing No. 258 of FCS & CAK of 2019 dated 10th of December, 2019, whereby the petitioner, while posted as Assistant Storekeeper in Mechanical Transport Section, has been ordered to report to Stationary section immediately for further duties.
2. The petitioner has questioned the order impugned, amongst other grounds, on the ground that the said arrangement is an outcome of premature transfer and in violation of the transfer policy of the Government of Jammu & Kashmir.
3. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner, perused the documents on record and considered the matter.
4. It has, time and again, been held by various Courts, including the Hon'ble Supreme Court of the country that transfer is an exigency of service and it is the prerogative of the employer to see as to at what place the services of an employee can be best utilized in the larger public interest. An employee, holding a transferable post, has no right to insist that he should be allowed to serve at a

particular place for a particular period.

5. A full Bench of this Court, while deciding a reference made in a bunch of writ petitions, the lead case being 'SWP No. 1476/14' titled 'Syed Hilal Ahmad vs. State & Ors.', decided on 31st of August, 2015, has settled the issue with respect to enforcement of the Executive instructions/Government orders. It is well settled legal position that Government instructions are not having statutory force. It is also settled in law that Executive instructions/ Government orders are subject to statutory rules. Executive instructions cannot supplement the rules. The issue is no more res integra and has been settled by the Supreme Court in a catena of judgments. The Full Bench of this Court, while reiterating the observations of the Supreme Court, has also held that the Executive instructions/ Government orders are subject to statutory rules. The relevant paras (11, 12 and 18) of the judgment are reproduced below, word for word and letter for letter:

"11. It is well settled legal position that Government orders are only administrative instructions, having no statutory force. The 1956 Rules having been issued in exercise of powers conferred under Sub-Section (1) of Section 3 of the Jammu and Kashmir Civil Servants (Removal of Doubts and Declaration of Rights) Ordinance, 1956, the same is the statutory rule governing the field. Thus, the contention of the learned counsel appearing for the petitioners that, minimum two years' service is mentioned in the transfer policy through Government Order No. 861-GAD of 2010 dated 28.07.2010, is bound to be adhered to, has no force. As already stated, Rule 27 being statutory rule, empowering the government to post a government servant at any time in any place or in any post borne on the cadre, the said transfer policy, particularly the term mentioned therein, can be adhered to as far as possible and the same is only an executive instruction based on which no right could be claimed and no right having been vested, the government servant has no right to seek enforcement. Even for the sake of argument, the policy cannot have any binding force because the policy, if construed as binding, goes contrary to Rule 27.

12. It is well settled in law that executive instructions/ Government orders are subject to statutory rules and the legislature, who framed the Rule, cannot delegate its power to the authorized officer or executive and the executive can issue Government orders only within the bounds of the Rules. The legislature has not amended Rule 27 fixing any minimum or maximum tenure to a Government servant to serve in a particular station. In the decision reported in AIR 1961 SC 4, (Vasanlal Magan Bhai Sanjanwala v. State of Bombay), Hon'ble the Supreme Court has held that the legislature cannot delegate its essential functions which have been entrusted to it by the Constitution. In the decision reported in AIR 1962 SC 97 (Mohammed Hussain Gulam Mohammed v. State of Bombay) it was held that the authorized officer cannot issue order which is contrary to the statute. If the intention of the executive is to fix minimum or maximum tenure to a government servant to serve in a particular station, it can only recommend the legislature to amend the Rule. In the decision reported in AIR 1986 SC 1323

(Trivedi and sons, D.K v. State of Gujarat), the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that "the rule making authority cannot change the policy of the Act/Regulation". In this case, as on today, Rule 27 is not amended. Moreover no policy decision can be taken in terms of Article 77 or Article 162 of the Constitution of India which would run contrary to the constitutional or statutory schemes as held by Hon'ble the Supreme Court in (2007) 5 SCC 317 (Post Master General, Kolkata v. Tutu Das Dutta) and (2007) 2 SCC 491 (Punjab Water Supply & Sewerage Board v. Ranjodh Singh and Ors).

18. In the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court reported in AIR 2014 SC 263 (supra) it is held that the State Governments are affecting transfers and postings at the whims and fancies of the executive head for political and other considerations and not in public interest. Hence minimum tenure of service is good for the administration and efficiency. Insofar as the State of J&K is concerned, as stated supra, a minimum tenure of two years and maximum tenure of three years is already fixed in Government order dated 28.07.2010 and the said order is a guideline and not having any statutory force. In the said order itself it is stated that premature transfers, wherever unavoidable in the interest of administration, may be ordered on certain contingencies. Hence strict implementation of minimum 2 years and maximum 3 years tenure is not intended in the Government order. In such circumstances, the said Government order will not confer any right of enforcement through Court of law in the light of Rule 27 stated supra".

6. In view of above, this petition is found to be meritless and, as such, shall stand dismissed alongwith connected CM(s). There shall, however, be no order as to costs.