

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

WRIT PETITION NO.2819 OF 2020

DHAGE CHAYA AMBADAS
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

Mr.Suvidh S.Kulkarni, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr.P.S.Patil, AGP for respondent Nos. 1 and 2.
Smt.S.M.Zaware, Advocate for respondent Nos. 3 and 4.

(CORAM : RAVINDRA V. GHUGE &
S.G. MEHARE, JJ)

DATE : SEPTEMBER 22, 2021

PER COURT :

1. The petitioner, a lady employee of respondent Nos. 3 and 4 Zilla Parishad, has put forth prayer clause B & C as under :-

“B. That this Hon’ble Court may be pleased to issue writ/order or direction of like nature and direct the Respondent No.2 and 3 to consider the case of the petitioner and give her the posting within 15 days as contemplated under the GR dated 28/05/2019.

C. That, this Hon’ble Court may be pleased to issue writ/order or direction and direct the Respondent No.2 and 3 to decide the representations dated 14/01/2020 and 31/12/2019 filed by petitioner as expeditiously as possible in light of the Govt. Resolution dated 28/05/2019.”

2. The petitioner had approached this Court by filing this petition on 10/02/2020 with the contention that the petitioner is a feeding mother and has been transferred. In the entire memo of the petition, there is not a whisper as to when did the petitioner go on maternity leave and when did she deliver a child. When called upon, the learned Advocate for the petitioner submits that this was a second child that was born in 2018.

3. We find from the petition that the only ground on which the petition has been filed is that the petitioner is a feeding mother and should not be transferred. This ground would not be available to the petitioner after a passage of more than 3 years. We, therefore, are not entertaining this petition.

4. The learned Advocate for the petitioner submits that she would make an application to her employer for seeking accommodation as per the policy of the Government on the principle of 'couple arrangement' as her husband is also working with the same Zilla Parishad.

5. The learned Advocate for respondent Nos. 3 and 4 Zilla Parishad

submits that if such an application is made, the respondents would consider the same strictly in accordance with its rules and policies.

6. In view of the above, this petition is disposed off.

(S.G. MEHARE, J.)

(RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)