

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
WRIT PETITION NO. 4932 OF 2017

Suhas Gopal Mulay

....Petitioner

Versus

The General Manager, Bharat Sanchar
Nigam Limitd and ors.

...Respondents

Mr. Nikhil M. Pujari, for the Petitioner.

Mrs. Neeta V. Masurkar, for Respondent nos.1 and 2.

CORAM: B. R. GAVAI &
N. J. JAMADAR, JJ
DATED: 5th March, 2019

PC:-

1. The petition challenges the order passed by the learned Central Administrative Tribunal, Mumbai, thereby rejecting the original application filed by the present Petitioner, which was in turn filed to challenge the transfer order of the Petitioner from Nashik to Dindori

2. The scope of interference, while exercising the jurisdiction of Article 226 of Constitution of India, for examining the correctness of the orders passed by the Tribunal, is very limited. The learned Tribunal has considered the grievance of the Petitioner that the Petitioner was working as 'Technician' at Nashik. Taking into consideration the grievance, the Tribunal has recorded the statement of the

Respondent that the Petitioner will be given work of 'Technician' at Dindori.

3. In any case, the transfer is an incidence of service. The Petitioner was continuously working at Nashik for the period of 30 years. The distance between Nashik and Dindori is hardly 30 to 35 kms.

4. In that view of the matter, no case is made out. The petition is, therefore, rejected.

[N. J. JAMADAR, J.]

[B. R. GAVAI, J.]