## Director Of School Education Madras And ... vs O. Karuppa Thevan on 31 January, 1994

Equivalent citations: 1994 SCC, SUPL. (2) 666, AIRONLINE 1994 SC 66, 1994 SCC (L&S) 1180, (1996) 1 SERV LR 225, (1996) 2 SCT 402, (1996) 1 UPLBEC 347, (1994) 28 ATC 99, (1997) 3 LABLJ 4, (1996) 28 ALL LR 560, 1994 SCC (SUPP) 2 666, 1995 ALL CJ 2 1082, AIRONLINE 1994 SC 53

1

Author: P.B. Sawant

Bench: P.B. Sawant, N.P Singh

```
PETITIONER:
DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL EDUCATION MADRAS AND OTHERS
        ۷s.
RESPONDENT:
0. KARUPPA THEVAN
DATE OF JUDGMENT31/01/1994
BENCH:
SAWANT, P.B.
BENCH:
SAWANT, P.B.
SINGH N.P. (J)
CITATION:
1994 SCC Supl. (2) 666
ACT:
HEADNOTE:
JUDGMENT:
```

## **ORDER**

1. Leave granted. Heard both counsel.

2. The tribunal has erred in law in holding that the respondent employee ought to have been heard before transfer. No law requires an employee to be heard before his transfer when the authorities make the transfer for the exigencies of administration. However, the learned counsel for the respondent, contended that in view of the fact that respondent's children are studying in school, the transfer should not have been effected during mid-academic term. Although there is no such rule, we are of the view that in effecting transfer, the fact that the children of an employee are studying should be given due weight, if the exigencies of the service are not urgent. The learned counsel appearing for the appellant was unable to point out that there was such urgency in the present case that the employee could not have been accommodated till the end of the current academic year. We, therefore, while setting aside the impugned order of the Tribunal, direct that the appellant should not effect the transfer till the end of the current academic year. The appeal is allowed accordingly with no order as to costs.