

**HIGH COURT OF UTTARAKHAND AT NAINITAL****THE HON'BLE CHIEF JUSTICE MR. MANOJ KUMAR GUPTA****AND****THE HON'BLE JUSTICE MR. SIDDHARTHA SAH****Writ Petition (S/B) No.562 of 2026**

Sumit Saxena

--Petitioner

Versus

Union Bank of India & Others

--Respondents

August 25, 2026-----
Presence:-

Mr. Milan Laskar, learned counsel for the petitioner appeared through V.C.

Mr. Vikas Kumar Guglani, learned counsel for the respondent-Bank appeared
through V.C.
-----**JUDGMENT : (per Mr. Manoj Kumar Gupta, C.J.)**

1. The present writ petition has been filed challenging the transfer order dated 28.04.2026 passed by the respondent-Bank, whereby the petitioner, who was serving as Senior Manager (BRM) at Haldwani, District Nainital, Uttarakhand, has been transferred to Zonal Office, Bhopal, Madhya Pradesh.

2. The petitioner filed a departmental appeal against the transfer order and the ground taken in the appeal was that his spouse was suffering from chronic Orthopedic psoriasis with thyroid disease and her treatment was stated to be going on in Matrix Hospital, Haldwani. The other ground was that his son was



studying in 11th standard in Haldwani. The appeal of the petitioner was duly considered by the Departmental Committee and it rejected the same. The petitioner has already joined at Bhopal. The present writ petition has been filed in the month of August 2026 after the petitioner had joined at Bhopal.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has raised a new ground for challenging the transfer order. He submits that according to the transfer policy of the Bank, an officer cannot be transferred to another zone within five years. He further submits that the petitioner was posted in the present zone only 1 year back and, therefore, the transfer order is illegal.

4. When learned counsel for the petitioner was queried by the Court as regards the details of postings of the petitioner during last five years, he is unable to point out to any such details in the writ petition. On the other hand, learned counsel for the respondent-Bank states that the petitioner had remained posted at Haldwani from 01.08.2020 in different capacities and the contention that he had been transferred to a different zone without completing the prescribed minimum period of posting at Haldwani zone is apparently incorrect.



5. As the aforesaid ground was not taken by the petitioner in his representation, nor the factual foundation in respect thereof has been laid down in the writ petition, the same cannot be accepted.

6. Thus, we find no ground to interfere with the transfer order. The writ petition lacks merit and is accordingly dismissed.

(MANOJ KUMAR GUPTA, C. J.)

(SIDDHARTHA SAH, J.)

Dated : 25.08.2026
Akash