

hvn

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY**CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION****WRIT PETITION NO. 13028 OF 2016**

Sharad Hiramana Dhadawad and Ors. ... Petitioners

Versus

State of Maharashtra and Ors. ... Respondents

AND**WRIT PETITION NO. 13029 OF 2016**

Sahebrao Walu Gavit and Ors. ... Petitioners

Versus

State of Maharashtra and Ors. ... Respondents

AND**WRIT PETITION NO. 13030 OF 2016**

Pushpa Amruta Deshmukh ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Maharashtra and Ors. ... Respondents

AND**WRIT PETITION NO. 13031 OF 2016**

Suresh Madhukar Chaudhari and Ors. ... Petitioners

Versus

State of Maharashtra and Ors. ... Respondents

AND**WRIT PETITION NO. 13038 OF 2016**

Savaliram Sitaram Pader and Ors. ... Petitioners

Versus
State of Maharashtra and Ors. ... Respondents

AND
WRIT PETITION NO. 13058 OF 2016

Kaushik Yashwant Dhamode and Ors. ... Petitioners

Versus
State of Maharashtra and Ors. ... Respondents

Mr. A.R. Kapadnis i/by Mr. B.S. Shinde for the petitioners.

Ms.Nisha Mehra, AGP for Respondent State.

**CORAM : SHANTANU KEMKAR &
PRAKASH D. NAIK, JJ.**
DATED : NOVEMBER 22, 2016.

P.C.

Not on board. Taken on production board in view of the urgency.

2. Parties through their counsel.

3. Petitioners claim that their proposal in respect of inter district transfer is pending before the respondent no. 2. According to the petitioners, their cases are squarely covered by the order passed by the Division Bench in the case of Lilabai Vasant Talekar Vs. Chief Executive Officer, Zilla Parishad, Pune in WP No. 5779 of 2014 decided on 3.3.2015 as also the order passed by the Division Bench of this Court in the case of Latika Lalasaheb Kakade Vs. The Chief Executive Officer, Zilla Parishad, Pune and Ors. in W.P. No. 4857 of 2016 decided on 5.5.2016. Today when the matter came

up for hearing, the only prayer made by the petitioners is to dispose of these petitions by granting liberty to the petitioners to submit a detailed representations with the supporting documents before respondent no. 2 and the said authority be directed to consider and take appropriate decision on the said representations keeping in view the law laid down by this court in the case of Lilabai Vasant Talekar (supra) and Latika Lalasaheb Kakade (supra).

4. Keeping in view the aforesaid limited prayer, without commenting upon the merits of the matter and petitioner's entitlement, we dispose of these petitions by directing the respondent No. 2 to consider and take appropriate decision on the petitioner's claim keeping in view the laid down in the abovesaid decisions. The decision be taken within six weeks from the date of receipt of copy of this order. Needless to say that we have not expressed any opinion about the merits of the petitioner's claim.

5. Writ Petitions are disposed of.

(PRAKASH D. NAIK, J.)

(SHANTANU KEMKAR, J.)