

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

923 WRIT PETITION NO.6232 OF 2022

**DATTATRAY ONKAR RANMAL  
VERSUS  
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH ITS DY. SECRETARY  
AND OTHERS**

.....  
Mr. Arvind G. Ambetkar, Advocate for the petitioner  
Mr. S. G. Sangle, AGP for respondent/State  
.....

**CORAM : RAVINDRA V. GHUGE  
AND  
ANIL L. PANSARE, JJ.**

**DATE : JUNE 21<sup>ST</sup>, 2022**

**PER COURT : -**

1. The petitioner has put forth prayer clause 'B' to 'G' as  
under : -

“B] Issuing writ of Mandamus or any other appropriate writ or direction in the like nature, the Hon’ble Court may kindly be pleased to quash and set aside the transfer order dated 25.05.2022 issued by the respondent No.3 against the petitioner as Exh.- “C”.

C] Issuing writ of Mandamus or any other appropriate writ or direction in the like nature, the Hon’ble Court may kindly be pleased to direct the respondent No. 2 to decide the Appeal / representation dated

02.06.2022 filed by the petitioner within two weeks as Exh.- "F".

- D] Issuing writ of Mandamus or any other appropriate writ or direction in the like nature, the Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to direct to hold and declare that petitioner is not entitled for intra/inter-district transfer 2022 on administrative ground as per Government Resolution dated 15.05.2014 and Rules.
- E] Pending hearing and final disposal of petition, the Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to stay the transfer order dated 25.05.2022 issued by the respondent No. 3 as Exh. - "C".
- F] Pending hearing and final disposal of petition, to direct the respondent No. 2 to decide the Appeal / representation dated 02.06.2022 filed by the petitioner.
- G] Pending hearing and final disposal of petition, to direct the respondents to not take any coercive action against the petitioner in pursuance of the transfer order dated 25.05.2022 issued by the respondent No.3."

2. We have considered the submissions of the learned advocate and we have perused the reason for which the petitioner

has been transferred on administrative grounds before he completed ten years at one location. We find from the impugned transfer order that the petitioner has already been relieved to join the place of transfer. In view thereof, we express our disinclination and call upon the petitioner to join at the place of transfer.

3. The learned Counsel for the petitioner submits, on instructions, that this Court may only pass an order of directing respondent no. 2 - Divisional Commissioner, Nashik to consider his representation dated 02.06.2022.

4. In view of the above, this petition is **disposed off**. Let respondent no. 2 decide the representation of the petitioner dated 02.06.2022, as expeditiously as possible and preferably on or before 30.07.2022.

[ ANIL L. PANSARE ]  
JUDGE

[ RAVINDRA V. GHUGE ]  
JUDGE