

kps

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

CIVIL APPLICATION NO.16042 OF 2015
IN WP/536/2004
WITH
CIVIL APPLICATION NO.16043 OF 2015
IN WP/536/2004
WITH
CIVIL APPLICATION NO.16044 OF 2015
IN WP/536/2004

UTTAM SHIVLING GANACHARI.
LALASAHEB MARUTI NANNAWARE.
BALASAHEB BABURAO IKHE.

VERSUS

THE MARATHWADA GRAMIN BANK, NANDED AND ANOTHER

...

Advocate for Applicants : Shri Undre Vikram S.

Advocate for Respondent No.1 : Shri Parag Shahane.

Advocate for Respondent No.2 : Shri P.P.Mandlik, Senior Advocate a/w
Shri U.B.Bilolikar.

...

CORAM: RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.

DATE :- 18th December, 2015

Per Court:

1 At the request of Shri Undre, leave to delete prayer Clauses
(B), (C) and (D) of the Civil Applications is granted. Deletion to be carried
out forthwith.

2 The Applicants in this applications are the members of the

Employees Union which is Respondent No.2 in Writ Petition No.536/2004. It is submitted that these three Applicants are beneficiaries of the judgment dated 11.06.2003 passed in Application No.LCB-11/1999. Their claim was espoused by the Union. They have a serious apprehension that the Respondent Union is not pursuing their cause properly. Hence, they pray for being arrayed as Respondent Nos.2, 3 and 4 so as to assist this Court.

3 Shri Mandalik, learned Senior Advocate appearing on behalf of the Respondent Union, submits that the Union is strongly pursuing this matter. There is no dispute in between the members of the Union and the Applicants need not be apprehensive about bona-fides of the Union.

4 Shri Shahane, learned Advocate for Non-Applicant No.1/original Petitioner, submits that it makes no difference whether, the Applicants are the Respondents or not, since the Union is contesting the Writ Petition.

5 Considering the submissions of the learned Advocates and the reasons set out in the Civil Application, I do not find that any harm or inconvenience would be caused to any of the litigating sides if these three Applicants in their representative capacity are permitted to be arrayed as

Respondent Nos.2, 3 and 4 in the Writ Petition. They can assist Respondent No.1/ Union as well as this Court.

6 In the light of the above, these three Civil Applications are allowed. The original Petitioner shall implead the Applicants as Respondent Nos.2, 3 and 4, respectively, in the Writ Petition on or before 22.01.2016. Notice on the petition need not be issued to the parties since Shri Undre, learned Advocate appears on behalf of these Applicants in the petition as well.

7 It be noted that these three Applicants are permitted to be arrayed only in their representative capacity and would not mean that all 129 members of the Respondent Union should be impleaded as Respondents in the Writ Petition.

(RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

WRIT PETITION NO.536 OF 2004

MARATHWADA GRAMIN BANK, NANDED.
VERSUS
MARATHWADA REGIONAL RURAL BANK EMPLOYEES UNION.

...

Advocate for Petitioner : Shri Parag Shahane.
Advocate for Respondent No.1 : Shri P.P.Mandlik, Senior Advocate a/w
Shri U.B.Bilolikar.

Advocate for Intervenors : Shri Undre Vikram S.

...

**CORAM: RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.
DATE :- 18th December, 2015**

Per Court:

1 Shri Shahane, learned Advocate for the Petitioner, prays for correcting the name of the Petitioner Bank in the light of the subsequent events.

2 Leave granted to correct the name of the Petitioner Bank. Correction be carried out on or before 22.01.2016.

3 After correction and addition of the parties is done on or before 22.01.2016, this petition shall be listed for final hearing on 04.02.2016.

(RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)