

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY  
BENCH AT AURANGABAD  
WRIT PETITION NO.10473 OF 2022

CHANDRASHEKHAR VITHALRAO SHENDE  
VERSUS  
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUG ITS SECRETARY AND  
OTHERS

...

Mr. G. J. Karne, Advocate for the Petitioner.  
Mr. S. K. Tambe, AGP for Respondents-State.  
Mr. S. B. Pulkundwar, Advocate for Respondent Nos.2  
to 4.

...

CORAM : RAVINDRA V. GHUGE  
AND  
SANJAY A. DESHMUKH, JJ.

DATED : 18<sup>th</sup> OCTOBER, 2022.

PER COURT:-

1. The petitioner is aggrieved that respondent no.5 who was earlier respondent no.4, did not forward the name of the petitioner to respondent no.2-Zilla Parishad and consequentially, he had to work in difficult area from 2014, when he was eligible for transfer to a normal area after three years. He, however, submits that the present respondent no.4 has forwarded the name of the petitioner to respondent no.2.

2. In view of the above, this petition is disposed off. If the petitioner has any grievance

about the conduct of respondent no.5, he would be at liberty to approach the Chief Executive Officer, Zilla Parishad, Washim where respondent no.5 is posted. We make it clear that we have not expressed any opinion as to what course the Chief Executive Officer, Zilla Parishad, Washim should follow.

3. The learned advocate representing the Zilla Parishad submits that if the petitioner's name is received by the Chief Executive Officer, Zilla Parishad, the same would be considered in accordance with the procedure applicable.

**(SANJAY A. DESHMUKH)**  
**JUDGE**

**(RAVINDRA V. GHUGE)**  
**JUDGE**