

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

WRIT PETITION NO. 6754 OF 2015

Uttam Laxmanrao Badwane .. Petitioner

Versus

The Chief Engineer (Distribution),
Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution
Co. Ltd. and Others .. Respondents

Shri A. S. Golegaonkar, Advocate for the Petitioner.

Shri A. S. Bajaj, Advocate Respondent Nos. 1 to 3.

Shri S. G. Sangle, A. G. P. for the Respondent No. 4.

**CORAM : S. V. GANGAPURWALA AND
V. K. JADHAV, JJ.**

DATE : 22ND JULY, 2015.

PER COURT :

1. Mr. Golegaonkar, the learned counsel for the petitioner submits that, petitioner has completed 24 years and 6 months in the same zone, as such can not be transferred, as in the next year petitioner is required to be considered for transfer out of the zone and the petitioner is ready to go out of zone. The learned counsel further submits that, last year a request was made by the petitioner not to transfer, on the ground of his

daughter. However, at that time even the petitioner could not have been transferred by the respondents. The learned counsel submits that, the father of the petitioner is suffering from hemorrhage and as such he is required to attend his father who is taking treatment at Nanded. According to the learned counsel for 6 months the respondents can accommodate the petitioner at the same place.

2. Mr. Bajaj, the learned counsel for respondents submits that, the petitioner is working in the same zone since 27 years. It is not that he has completed 24 years and 06 months only. The learned counsel further submits that, there was problem with the person working at Degloor. Many complaints were received and as such the senior person like the petitioner is required to be transferred at the said place so as to take care of all the aspects. Last year the petitioner was not transferred only at his request.

3. We have considered the submissions canvassed by the learned counsel for respective parties. It is not disputed that, last year the petitioner had requested that he should not be transferred on account of his daughters education and the same request is considered last year by the respondents. It is

submitted that, the petitioner has completed 27 years in the same zone and the transfer is a administrative transfer, considering the reasons given in the affidavit.

4. In light of the above, the case of the petitioner can not be considered in the present petition. The petitioner may make a representation with the respondents, which the respondents may consider on its own merits, in accordance with law and policy. The authorities may decide the same expeditiously and preferably within two (2) months from the date of filing of representation. Writ petition accordingly is disposed of. No costs.

[V. K. JADHAV, J.]

[S. V. GANGAPURWALA, J.]

sam/July. 15