



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

WRIT PETITION NO.275 OF 2026

- | | |
|---|----------------|
| 1. Sumitra Prabhakar Bokade
2. Firojkha Sahebkhya Pathan
3. Surekha Sopanrao Dasarwad | .. Petitioners |
|---|----------------|

Versus

- | | |
|---|----------------|
| 1. The State of Maharashtra
Through Secretary,
Rural Development Department
Mantralaya, Mumbai.
2. The Divisional Commissioner,
Chhatrapati Sambhajinagar.
3. The Chief Executive Officer,
Zilla Parishad, Latur.
4. The Education Officer (Primary),
Zilla Parishad, Latur. | .. Respondents |
|---|----------------|

...

Mr. Balaji S. Shinde, Advocate for the petitioners.
Mr. R. S. Wani, AGP for respondent Nos.1 and 2/State.
Mr. V. C. Patil, Advocate h/f Mr. U. B. Bondar, Advocate for respondent Nos.3 and 4.

...

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

DATE : 22 JANUARY 2026

ORDER (Per Smt. Vibha Kankanwadi, J.) :-

. The petitioners, who are teachers, seek direction to consider and decide their representations dated 29.09.2025 and 06.10.2025 against respondent No.3 in the light of Circular dated 28.06.2018 and Government Resolution dated 21.06.2023 for change in the postings of

the petitioners.

2. Learned Advocate for the petitioners submits that the petitioners have been given posting in a school which is inconvenient, by order dated 22.08.2025. The petitioners initially permitted to fill up 30 options on which the petitioners could have been transferred. The petitioners could not get these 30 schools, but the petitioners converted in displaced round of transfer. The inconvenience is from the point of view of family, for which they have now made representation and it is pending which should be decided.

3. Heard learned Advocate Mr. Balaji S. Shinde for the petitioners, learned AGP Mr. R. S. Wani for respondent Nos.1 and 2/State and learned Advocate Mr. U. B. Bondar for respondent Nos.3 and 4.

4. It will not be out of place to mention here that the petitioners have produced their transfer orders and also the Government Resolutions as well as the copies of their representations. It appears that the representations those have been made by the petitioners are copy paste. As regards petitioner Nos.1 and 3, though they have stated that their husbands are also serving as teachers in different districts, they are not demanding their transfer on the basis of couple convenience ground. Now, they want to rely upon certain decisions of this Court in which, the

concerned Zilla Parishad was asked to consider the representation of those teachers. It is to be noted that these petitioners have been transferred within the district. Petitioner No.1 has been transferred from Ausa to Nilanga in district Latur. Petitioner No.2 has been transferred from Ausa to Anandwadi, Taluka Nilanga and petitioner No.3 has been transferred from Renapur to Nilanga within the same district. It is not in dispute that they were due for transfer. No doubt, as per the Government Resolution, they would be considered as displaced teachers, as they could not get the place of their choice, but merely on the basis of the old age parents, school/college going children or dependency of other family members, it cannot be stated that their representations should be accepted. Even the students in the school where they have been transferred have right to get educated and the school is bound to provide them good teachers. We do not want to burden respondent No.3 by judicial order that he should take decision on the representation by making it time bound and, therefore, we **dismiss** the writ petition with observation that if at all the circumstances so arise and there is a vacancy available of the choice of the respective petitioners, then respondent No.3 may consider the same.

[HITEN S. VENEGAVKAR]
JUDGE

[SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI]
JUDGE

scm