

Amk

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

WRIT PETITION NO. 8007 OF 2018

Kranti Madhukar Patil .. Petitioner
Vs.
Syndicate Bank & Ors. .. Respondents

Mr. Pratap Patil for the Petitioner.
Mr. P. N. Shah a/w. Mr. Jay Vora for the Respondent No.3.

**CORAM : R. M. SAVANT &
K. K. SONAWANE, JJ.**
DATE : 12th SEPTEMBER, 2018.

P. C.

1. The above Petition has been filed challenging the order dated 15.06.2018 Exhibit 'E' issued by Respondent No.1 by which order the Petitioner has been transferred from Talegaon-Dabhade Branch in Pune District, Maharashtra to Kakkinje Branch, District Udupi, Karnataka. The said challenge is on the ground that it is the policy of the Respondent No.1 to keep the husband and wife at the same place. It seems that the husband of the Petitioner is working in the Police Department as Police Sub-Inspector and posted in Mumbai.

2. The learned Counsel appearing for the Respondent No.1-Bank Mr. P. N. Shah points out that the Petitioner had completed her tenure of 3 years at the said Talegaon Dabhade Branch and was therefore due for transfer. The learned Counsel would submit that the Petitioner has achieved an expertise in providing finance to the horticulturists and therefore the

Petitioner has been transferred to Kakkinje Branch in Udupi District, Karnataka for the said purpose. The learned Counsel further submits that the Petitioner has been, in fact, trained in Manglore District in so far as providing finance to the horticulturists is concerned. Apart from contending that it is the policy of Respondent No.1-Bank to keep the husband and wife at the same place as far as possible subject to the vacancy position at the same place as also the needs of the administration. We have not been pointed out any other service regulation or policy decision on the basis of which the Petitioner can contend that she cannot be transferred. In fact, the learned Counsel for the Petitioner fairly conceded that the Petitioner is holding a transferable post.

3. In our view, therefore, no interference is called for with the said transfer order. However, it would be open for the Petitioner to make a representation to the Respondent No.1-Bank for re-transferring her to a Branch in Maharashtra in terms of the policy of the Respondent No.1-Bank. If any such representation is made by the Petitioner, the Respondent No.1-Bank may consider it appropriately in terms of its policy. It is, therefore, not necessary to keep the above Petition pending.

4. With the directions as aforesaid, the Petition is disposed of.

[K. K. SONAWANE, J.]

[R. M. SAVANT, J.]

Arjun
Machhindra
Kadam

Digitally signed
by Arjun
Machhindra
Kadam
Date: 2018.09.14
14:19:34 +0530