

kps

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

WRIT PETITION NO. 5218 OF 2002

Maharashtra State Road Transport
Corporation, Ahmednagar Division,
Ahmednagar.
Through Divisional Controller.

...PETITIONER

-VERSUS-

Laxman Digambar Helkar,
resident of Bhagwati Kolhar,
Taluka Rahata, District Ahmednagar.

...RESPONDENT

...
Advocate for Petitioner : Shri Goyanka M.K.
...

CORAM: RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.

DATE :- 01st October, 2015

Oral Judgment:

1 This petition was admitted by this Court on 16.12.2002.
Interim relief was not granted.

2 Shri Goyanka, learned Advocate for the Petitioner/
Corporation, submits as under:-

(a) The sole Respondent/ Employee was appointed as

“Waterman” on contract basis on 16.06.1979.

- (b) His monthly wages were at the rate of Rs.45/-.
- (c) His job was of providing water and washing buses.
- (d) He preferred Complaint (ULP) No.415/1991 on 04.01.1991 before the Industrial Court seeking permanency.
- (e) By the judgment and order dated 22.04.2002, the complaint was partly allowed and the Respondent/ Employee was granted part permanency as part time Waterman w.e.f. August, 1986.
- (f) The Respondent/ Employee preferred yet another Complaint (ULP) No.52/2008 before the Industrial Court seeking full time regularization.
- (g) By the judgment and order dated 17.12.2009, the said complaint was allowed and the Respondent was granted regularization as a Cleaner on full time basis.
- (h) This judgment dated 17.12.2009 has not been challenged by the Petitioner/ Corporation before this Court or any other superior court.
- (i) The Respondent retired on 31.12.2014 after attaining the age of superannuation.
- (j) Legal dues, provident fund accumulations and gratuity have already been paid to the Respondent.

3 Shri Goyanka strenuously assails the impugned judgment.

4 I have considered the fact situation recorded as above.

5 The Petitioner has challenged the judgment of the Industrial Court dated 22.04.2002 granting regularization on part time basis. The judgment dated 17.12.2009 delivered by the Industrial Court granting regularization to the Respondent, has not been challenged before any Court.

6 I, therefore, find it fruitless to go into the legality and validity of the impugned judgment in the light of the subsequent events. Hence, no interference is called for in the impugned judgment. This petition is rendered of an academic interest. The same is, therefore, dismissed. Rule is discharged.

(RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)