

1/4



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH, NAGPUR.

WRIT PETITION NO.644 OF 2026

VIKAS GULABRAO KOKODE

VS

THE CHAIRMAN, MAHARASHTRA GRAMIN BANK, CHHATRAPATI
SAMBHAJINAGAR AND ORS.

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

Court's or Judge's orders

Mr. Swaroop Bhattacharya, Advocate for the petitioner/s
Mr. U.S. Dastane, Advocate for the respondent No.1-Bank

CORAM : ANIL S. KILOR AND RAJ D. WAKODE, JJ.

DATE : 24.04.2026

1. Heard.
2. In the present matter, transfer of the petitioner, vide order dated 17.10.2025 from the Hingna Branch, District Nagpur to Kannad Branch, District Chhatrapati Sambhajinagar is under challenge.
3. The challenge to the said transfer is twofold: firstly, that the transfer has been effected mid-term without assigning any reasons for such administrative exigency; and secondly, that the petitioner has a daughter, namely Charvi, who is a child with disability, suffering from *autism* (*Autism Spectrum Disorder*), and the petitioner is her caregiver.
4. In reply, the learned counsel for the respondent-bank submits that although the transfer order does not disclose

any reasons, it is a matter of record that the petitioner had made several complaints against a senior officer posted at the Hingna Branch regarding his conduct and other issues, and that counter-complaints have also been lodged.

5. He, therefore, submits that due to the conflict between the petitioner and the senior officer, the smooth functioning of the Bank was adversely affected, and in the interest of maintaining administrative efficiency, a decision was taken to transfer one of them, namely the petitioner. He thus submits that it cannot be said that there was no administrative reason for transferring the petitioner.

6. He submits that although the petitioner's child, Charvi, is suffering from an ailment, the petitioner has never raised this issue earlier whenever he was transferred after joining service. He further submits that there are specific rules for the transfer of an employee who is a caregiver of such special child or dependent.

7. It is submitted that a Government employee who is a caregiver to a child with disability is to be considered separately in accordance with the Central Government guidelines. The learned counsel for the respondent-bank has categorically stated that if the petitioner makes an application on this ground, the same will be considered as per the applicable guidelines. However, he submits that it would be appropriate for the petitioner to reconsider his

transfer and join duties at the transferred place.

8. The learned counsel for the petitioner, on instructions, states that the petitioner intends to make an application as a caregiver to a child with disability in accordance with the Government guidelines.

9. Considering the statement made by the petitioner on affidavit before this Court, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner does not wish to pursue the matter further. He further states that the petitioner is ready to go and join duties at the transferred place.

10. In the circumstances, the present petition is **disposed** of with liberty to the petitioner to apply for reconsideration of his transfer on the ground of the ailment of his daughter, Charvi, who is a special child suffering from *autism*.

11. If such an application is made within two weeks from today, the respondent-bank shall consider it in accordance with the Government guidelines, sympathetically, and take a decision within four weeks from the date of receipt of such application.

12. If the respondent-bank finds such application incomplete, it shall point out the deficiencies to the petitioner within four days of receiving it, with reference to the Government of India guidelines, and ask him to correct

them.

13. If such deficiencies are communicated, the petitioner shall remove them within two weeks from the date of such communication.

(RAJ D. WAKODE, J.)

(ANIL S. KILOR, J.)