



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

914 WRIT PETITION NO.13401 OF 2025

1. Machhindranath Vishwambhar Lokhande
2. Smt. Archana Bhausaheb Gosavi
3. Smt. Sonali Appasaheb Randive
4. Smt. Rohini Maruti Nalage
5. Smt. Pratibha Kisan Pol
6. Smt. Nita Jagdish Dhavale
7. Smt. Dipali Balbhim Datal
8. Smt. Manisha Vasant Shinde

.. Petitioners

VERSUS

1. State of Maharashtra
Through its Secretary,
School Education Department,
Mantralaya, Mumbai-32.
2. The Secretary,
Rural Development Department,
Mantralaya, Mumbai-32.
3. The Divisional Commissioner,
Nashik Region, Nashik.
4. The Chief Executive Officer,
Zilla Parishad, Ahilyanagar,
Dist. Ahilyanagar.
5. The Education Officer (Primary),
Zilla Parishad, Ahilyanagar,
District Ahilyanagar

..Respondents

.....

Mr. A. G. Ambetkar, Advocate for the Petitioners.
Mr. N. S. Tekale, AGP for Respondent Nos.1 to 3/State.
Ms. Sheetal V. Salunke, Advocate for Respondent Nos.4 and 5

.....

**CORAM : SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI &
HITEN S. VENEGAVKAR, JJ.**

DATE : 02 DECEMBER 2025

ORDER :

. The present petition has been filed for directions to respondent No.4 to give posting to the petitioners within 30 kms under couple convenience scheme in available vacancy.

2. Heard the learned Advocate for the petitioner. Learned AGP waives notice for respondent Nos.1 and 2 and learned Advocate Ms. Sheetal Salunke waives notice for respondent Nos.4 and 5.

3. The spouses of the petitioners are working as Teachers under the Zilla Parishad. At present, their postings are at different places and the distance between those places are 32, 42, 42, 51, 61, 40, 60 and 120 kilometers respectively. There is no dispute that there is a scheme and rules for transfer, where it is stated that preference would be given for couple convenience when both of them are teachers.

4. Learned Advocate for respondent Nos.4 and 5 submits that as regards the petitioners herein, the representations have been decided.

5. Under such circumstance, we are of the opinion that though the petitioners are challenging the orders of transfer itself, there might be then the possibility of some vacancies available and then in view of the said contingency, if there are vacancies available, then the petitioners may be considered for a suitable transfer. In view of this, we hope that respondent No.4 would take appropriate steps.

6. With these observations, we dispose of the writ petition.

[HITEN S. VENEGAVKAR]
JUDGE

[SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI]
JUDGE

scm