

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION NO. 12294 OF 2025

Urmila Milind Auti

...Petitioner

Versus

The State of Maharashtra & Ors.

...Respondents

Mr. Vivek B. Rane, Advocate for the Petitioner.

Mr. Kedar B. Dighe, Addl. G.P. a/w Ms. Nisha Mehra, AGP for the Respondent/State.

Mr. Ashwin R. Kapadnis, Advocate for Respondent Nos.3 & 4.

CORAM : RAVINDRA V. GHUGE
&
ASHWIN D. BHOBE, JJ.

DATE : 20th SEPTEMBER, 2025

P.C. :-

1. We have heard Mr. Rane, the learned Advocate for the Petitioner, Mr. Dighe, the learned Additional G.P. for the Respondent/State and Mr. Kapadnis, the learned Advocate for the Respondent Nos.3 and 4, Zilla Parishad, Pune.

2. The learned Advocate for the Zilla Parishad, submits that the process of granting transfer of the Petitioner on the principle of couple convenience, is still underway. If the Petitioner makes an

application to the CEO of the Zilla Parishad, as per the prescribed procedure, such application can be considered at the level of the Zilla Parishad. The Petitioner has directly rushed to this Court.

3. He further submits that if any one of the spouses makes an application to the Zilla Parishad, since only one of the spouse is permitted to make an application and not both spouses, the Zilla Parishad can consider the application and make an effort to post the couples, as far as possible and practicable, within a radius of 30 kilometers.

4. In view of the above, we permit the Petitioner to make his application to the CEO of the concerned Zilla Parishad, under the couple convenience policy, within 7 days from today. We clarify that one member of the couple i.e. either the husband or the wife, with mutual agreement, would be filing such an application and both would not file such application. After the Zilla Parishad receives such applications, the CEO Zilla Parishad would follow the procedure and the Government Resolution applicable and accordingly ensure that the couple convenience policy is given effect to, as expeditiously as possible.

5. Needless to state, until such a decision, the Petitioner would not be relieved since the learned Advocate for the Zilla Parishad submits that she is yet to be relieved.

6. In the event the Petitioner is not liable to be transferred, she may say so in her application addressed to the CEO Zilla Parishad and the said authority would apply its mind to such a statement.

7. With the above directions, this **Writ Petition is disposed off.**

(ASHWIN D. BHOBE, J.)

(RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)