

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

WRIT PETITION NO. 10577 OF 2021

Vidyadevi Kashinath Hande

.. Petitioner

Versus

The State of Maharashtra and another

.. Respondents

Mr. A. S. Khedkar, Advocate for the Petitioner.

Mr. S. K. Tambe, AGP for Respondent No. 1.

Mr. Avinash Aghav, Advocate for Respondent No. 2.

**CORAM : S. V. GANGAPURWALA &
R. N. LADDHA, JJ.**

DATED : 23rd September, 2021.

PER COURT:-

. Heard Mr. Khedkar, learned counsel for the petitioner. The learned counsel submits that the Education Officer does not have powers to decide the representation filed by the petitioner for transfer on the ground of couple convenience.

2. Mr. Aghav, learned counsel for respondent No. 2 submits that the Education Officer has already rejected the application of the petitioner for transfer.

3. It is submitted that, only the Chief Executive Officer has powers to consider the representation.

4. The petitioner may file representation to the Chief Executive Officer. The Chief Executive Officer may consider the said representation and take decision upon it, in accordance with law and policy, expeditiously and preferably within a period of eight (08) weeks from the date the representation is filed.

5. Writ petition is disposed of. No costs.

(R. N. LADDHA)
JUDGE

(S. V. GANGAPURWALA)
JUDGE

P.S.B.