



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH : NAGPUR

WRIT PETITION NO.6326/2024

(Sudhir S/o Pandurang Sontakke Vs. The State of Maharashtra and others)

Office Memoranda of Coram,
appearances, Court's orders of directions
and Registrar's orders

Court's or Judge's orders

Mr. D.S. Sawarkar, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. A.S. Fulzele, Additional Government Pleader for respondent Nos.1 to 4.

CORAM: NITIN W. SAMBRE & MRS.VRUSHALI V. JOSHI, JJ.

DATED: 21.10.2024.

Heard Mr. D.S. Sawarkar, learned Advocate appearing for the petitioner.

2. The challenge in the petition is to the order dated 20.9.2024 passed in Original Application No.853/2023.

3. The petitioner claims to be in the employment of the respondent i.e. State Reserve Police Force, Group IX, Amravati. According to the petitioner, his transfer was notified he being Assistant Police Sub-Inspector of Wireless. By virtue of such transfer order he is posted in Washim district. The contentions of Mr. Sawarkar are that in absence of there being choice of Washim furnished by the petitioner, he is entitled to be posted in Amravati (Rural) area or such other place for which his choice was furnished.

4. As against above, learned Additional Government Pleader Mr. Fulzele would oppose the prayer as according to him it is not open for the petitioner to claim that he is entitled to be transferred at a particular place.

5. We have appreciated the submissions.

6. The Tribunal has gone into the details and recorded that the petitioner has rendered 17 years of service in Amravati district. This

fact is disputed by the learned Advocate for the petitioner and it is claimed that petitioner has rendered 7 years of service.

7. The fact remains that the relevant provisions of the Act governs the transfer and contemplates tenure of three years at one place. Apart from above, it is not open for the petitioner to seek posting at a particular place of his choice as there is no statutory mandate to that effect.

8. The services of the petitioner are transferable is not a fact in dispute.

9. That being so, no case for causing interference in extraordinary writ jurisdiction is made out.

10. The petition fails and is dismissed accordingly.

(MRS.VRUSHALI V.JOSHI, J.)

(NITIN W. SAMBRE, J.)