



\$~104

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

% *Date of Decision: 14.09.2026*

CNR No. DLHC010432872026

+ **LPA 717/2026 & CM APPL. 62155-56/2026, CM APPL. 62158/2026**

GEETA CHAURASIA

.....Appellant

Through: Mr. Ram Anugrah Singh and Ms.
Alpana Kiran, Advocates.

Versus

UCO BANK AND OTHERS

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Sarfaraz Khan, Adv.

CORAM:

HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TEJAS KARIA

TEJAS KARIA, J. (Oral)

CM APPL. 62157/2026 (Exemption)

1. Exemption allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. The Application stands disposed of.

LPA 717/2026

3. The present *intra court* Appeal assails the order dated 03.09.2026 (“**Impugned Order**”) passed in W.P.(C) 12854/2026 titled ‘*Geeta Chaurasia v. UCO Bank and Others*’ (“**Writ Petition**”).

4. Pursuant to the appointment letter dated 07.05.2007, the Appellant joined Respondent No. 1 – UCO Bank (“**Bank**”) as an Officer in Scale-I. Thereafter, the Appellant was posted at various branches and offices of the



Bank and was promoted to the positions of Manager (Scale-II), Senior Manager (Scale-III), and, with effect from 01.02.2019, Chief Manager (Scale-IV).

5. In December 2018, while posted at the Kirti Nagar Branch of the Bank, the Appellant was diagnosed with Hypothyroidism, Polycystic Ovarian Syndrome (PCOS), and Dermographic Urticaria. Thereafter, the Appellant continued to receive treatment for her medical conditions and availed sabbatical leave from 07.01.2023 to 06.01.2025.

6. On 24.06.2025, the Appellant was posted as Chief Manager (Executive Scale-IV) at the New Delhi Zonal Office of the Bank. During 2026, the Appellant availed medical and casual leave on various occasions, which was duly approved by the Bank.

7. *Vide* order dated 13.05.2026 (“**Transfer Order**”), the Bank transferred the Appellant from the New Delhi Zonal Office to the Staff Training Centre, Jaipur, Rajasthan, in the capacity of Chief Manager. Thereafter, the Appellant submitted representations to the Bank seeking cancellation of the Transfer Order and requested her retention or posting at the New Delhi Field Inspection Department on medical grounds. On 16.05.2026, the Bank issued a relieving order (“**Relieving Order**”), directing the Appellant to join the Staff Training Centre, Jaipur, Rajasthan, on or before 18.05.2026.

8. As the Appellant allegedly remained absent from duty with effect from 18.05.2026, the Bank issued a Show Cause Notice dated 08.07.2026 (“**SCN**”) to the Appellant for failing to report to the Staff Training Centre, Jaipur, Rajasthan, pursuant to the Transfer Order.



9. The Appellant challenged the Transfer Order, the Relieving Order, and the SCN before this Court in W.P.(C) 9461/2026. The learned Single Judge, *vide* order dated 16.07.2026, dismissed W.P.(C) 9461/2026. Aggrieved thereby, the Appellant preferred LPA 606/2026.

10. On 20.07.2026, pursuant to the SCN, the Bank issued a chargesheet, together with a statement of allegations and articles of charge, to the Appellant. *Vide* order dated 05.08.2026 passed in LPA 606/2026 (“**LPA Order**”), this Court declined to interfere with the order dated 16.07.2026 passed in W.P.(C) 9461/2026 but permitted the Appellant to submit a representation seeking cancellation of the Transfer Order on medical grounds, setting out the particulars of her medical condition and enclosing supporting medical prescriptions. The LPA Order further directed the competent authority of the Bank (“**Competent Authority**”) to consider the said representation, having regard to the nature of the Appellant’s ailments and medical condition, and to adopt a sympathetic view of the matter on medical grounds.

11. Pursuant to the LPA Order, the Appellant submitted a representation dated 07.08.2026 (“**Representation**”). However, the Competent Authority declined the Representation *vide* communication dated 21.08.2026 (“**Rejection Order**”). Thereafter, the Appellant submitted a reply-*cum*-representation dated 23.08.2026, seeking a fresh, independent, and reasoned reconsideration of her request for cancellation of the Transfer Order in compliance with the LPA Order. *Vide* communication dated 24.08.2026, the Bank informed the Appellant that the Rejection Order was final and that no



further correspondence or representation concerning the Transfer Order would be entertained.

12. Aggrieved by the Rejection Order and the communication dated 24.08.2026, the Appellant preferred the Writ Petition. The learned Single Judge dismissed the Writ Petition *vide* the Impugned Order. Aggrieved thereby, the Appellant has preferred the present Appeal.

13. Learned Counsel for the Appellant submitted that the learned Single Judge failed to appreciate that the Rejection Order did not consider the Appellant's serious and chronic medical conditions in the manner contemplated by the LPA Order. It was further submitted that the Representation was rejected mechanically, notwithstanding the specific direction in the LPA Order that the request for cancellation of the Transfer Order be considered sympathetically.

14. Learned Counsel for the Appellant further submitted that the medical opinion dated 20.08.2026, obtained by the Bank from its empanelled Medical Officer, did not assess the cumulative effect of the Appellant's medical conditions and did not adequately address her neuropsychiatric condition and functional capacity. It was submitted that the Appellant had been undergoing treatment for anxiety, panic attacks, and other psychiatric difficulties, and had been advised to have family or caregiver support and a less stressful environment.

15. It was further submitted on behalf of the Appellant that the Bank ought to have constituted an independent Medical Board, comprising, *inter alia*, an appropriate specialist in neuropsychiatry or mental health, to undertake a



comprehensive assessment of the Appellant's medical condition. Learned Counsel for the Appellant relied upon Clause 13.1 of the Transfer Policy dated 16.10.2025 issued by the Bank ("**Transfer Policy**") to contend that the Competent Authority ought to have allowed the Representation on compassionate grounds.

16. Learned Counsel for the Respondents submitted that, pursuant to the liberty granted by the LPA Order, the Representation was duly considered by the Competent Authority. In doing so, the Competent Authority took into account the Appellant's tenure in the New Delhi Zone; her posting at the Staff Training Centre, Jaipur, in a non-customer-facing administrative assignment, having regard to her medical condition; Jaipur's proximity to Delhi; the availability of medical facilities and support systems in Jaipur; the opinion dated 20.08.2026 obtained from the Bank's empanelled Medical Officer; and the administrative requirements of the Bank.

17. It was further submitted on behalf of the Respondents that, of the Appellant's approximately 19 years of service with the Bank, she had served for more than 15 years in New Delhi and for only three and a half years outside New Delhi, at Chandigarh. With regard to the Appellant's reliance on the Transfer Policy for retention in New Delhi on compassionate grounds, it was submitted that the medical conditions relied upon by the Appellant did not fall within the scope of the Transfer Policy.

18. We have considered the submissions advanced by learned Counsel for the Parties and have perused the material placed on record.



19. The Appellant's challenge to the Transfer Order was dismissed by the learned Single Judge of this Court *vide* order dated 16.07.2026 passed in W.P.(C) 9461/2026, against which the Appellant preferred LPA 606/2026. *Vide* the LPA Order, this Court found no ground to interfere with the order dated 16.07.2026 passed in W.P.(C) 9461/2026 and further observed that no illegality could be attributed to the Transfer Order.

20. The LPA Order, however, permitted the Appellant to submit the Representation and required the Competent Authority to consider it, having regard to the nature of the Appellant's ailments and medical condition, and to adopt a sympathetic view of her request for cancellation of the Transfer Order.

21. In the Rejection Order, the Competent Authority referred to the Appellant's tenure in the New Delhi Zone and the medical conditions relied upon by her. It further recorded that, having regard to the Appellant's medical condition, she had been posted at the Staff Training Centre, Jaipur, in a non-customer-facing administrative assignment. The Rejection Order also records that the proximity of Jaipur to Delhi, the availability of medical facilities and support systems in Jaipur, the opinion dated 20.08.2026 of the Bank's empanelled Medical Officer, and the administrative requirements of the Bank were taken into account while declining the Appellant's request for cancellation of the Transfer Order. The relevant observations in the Rejection Order are reproduced below:

"6. Considering your medical issues, Bank has already taken a compassionate view and transferred you as administrative office staff at Staff Training Centre Jaipur. This posting does not require



customer dealing and is considered suitable in view of the medical conditions represented by you.

7. You have been transferred to Jaipur city which is nearby to New Delhi and has availability of medical facilities and support systems which may be required by you in view of the medical conditions cited in your representation.

8. As regard to your medical conditions, Bank has appropriately obtained an independent opinion from its empanelled Medical Officer, who, vide his opinion letter dated 20-08-2026, has stated that the ailments cited by you require strict diet and medications, if and when necessary and that the treatment for same is possible in any major city of India. We have also noted that Jaipur is a major metropolitan city of India with availability of world class medical facilities.

The Bank has duly considered the medical grounds cited by you and has also taken a sympathetic view by posting you to a non-customer-facing administrative assignment at Staff Training Centre, Jaipur. The fact that Jaipur is geographically proximate to New Delhi and has adequate medical facilities has also been considered. At the same time, the Bank is required to balance the individual circumstances of an employee with its administrative and organizational requirement. Transfer and posting of employee are matters falling within the administrative domain of the Bank, subject to the applicable policies/guidelines and administrative exigencies.”

22. It is, therefore, evident that the Rejection Order was not founded solely on the premise that treatment for the Appellant’s ailments was available in Jaipur. In deciding the Representation, the Competent Authority also considered the nature of the posting assigned to the Appellant, Jaipur’s proximity to Delhi, and the availability of support systems in Jaipur.

23. The Competent Authority thus considered the difficulty expressed by the Appellant in residing at Jaipur while declining her request for



cancellation of the Transfer Order. The direction in the LPA Order to adopt a sympathetic view of the Representation required due consideration of the Appellant's medical condition and the hardship expressed by her in residing at Jaipur, which cannot be construed as a mandate to allow the Representation.

24. The Appellant's reliance on the Transfer Policy is equally untenable. This Court, *vide* the LPA Order, had already concluded that no illegality could be attributed to the Transfer Order. The learned Single Judge rightly observed that the scope of the proceedings in the Writ Petition was limited and that the legality of the Transfer Order was no longer open to examination, the challenge thereto having attained finality in the earlier round of proceedings.

25. Accordingly, the legality of the Transfer Order cannot be reopened in the present proceedings under the guise of examining the Rejection Order. Once the Rejection Order records the considerations that weighed with the Competent Authority in declining the Appellant's request for cancellation of the Transfer Order, those considerations cannot be characterised as arbitrary or perverse. The Court cannot substitute its own assessment of the Appellant's medical condition or the hardship expressed by her in residing at Jaipur for that of the Competent Authority merely because another view may be possible. The learned Single Judge rightly declined to undertake such an exercise in the Impugned Order.

26. We, therefore, conclude that the Competent Authority considered the Representation within the scope of the LPA Order and that the Appellant has



failed to establish any ground warranting interference with either the Impugned Order or the Rejection Order in the present Appeal.

27. It is clarified that the observations made in this Order shall not prejudice the rights and contentions of the Parties in any disciplinary proceedings arising from the Appellant's alleged absence from duty. Any such proceedings shall be adjudicated on their own merits and in accordance with law.

28. Accordingly, the Appeal is dismissed. All pending applications also stand disposed of. No costs.

TEJAS KARIA, J

DEVENDRA KUMAR UPADHYAYA, CJ

SEPTEMBER 14, 2026

HK