

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

WRIT PETITION NO.4508 OF 1995

- 1) Gangadhar Shsstri Gune,
Ayurved Hospital, Ahmednagar,
Through its Superintendent.
- 2) Gangadhar Shastri Gune
Ayurved College, through its
Principal, r/o Ahmednagar. = **PETITIONERS**

VERSUS

Mrs. Padma w/o Hiralal Dhotre,
Age:Major, occu. Service,
R/o 4027, Chitale Road,
Ahmednagar. = **RESPONDENT**

Mr.VS Bedre, Advocate for Petitioners;
None for respondent, though served.

CORAM : P.R.BORA, J.

DATE : 15th July, 2016.

ORAL JUDGMENT:

1) Heard. The present petition is filed against the judgment and order dated 6th February, 1995 passed by the Industrial Court, Ahmednagar in Complaint (ULP) No.118/1991, whereby the

Industrial Court has directed the present petitioner to give promotion to the complainant therein, i.e. present respondent, as Dresser w.e.f. 1st May, 1991 and to offer her all the benefits and consequential benefits to the post of Dresser w.e.f. 1st March, 1991.

2) This Court, while granting Rule in the matter, has passed the following order on 9.11.1995, -

" Heard Shri Bedre for the petitioner and Shri A.A.Shastri for the respondent.

. Rule.

. Interim stay to the back wages bu the respondent should be continued to be employed as Dresser only and should be paid emoluments applicable to the Dresser. "

3) From the documents on record it can be gathered that in the year 1991, the original complainant was aged about 54 years. Though the interim stay was granted by this court while admitting the petition, it was only in respect of the back wages. Perusal of the interim order shows that the petitioners were directed to

continue the respondent as Dresser only and were directed to pay her the emoluments applicable to the post of Dresser. The Industrial court, vide impugned order had directed the present petitioners to promote the respondent on the post of Dresser and to pay her all the benefits and consequential benefits of the said post of Dresser w.e.f. 1st March, 1991.

4) Today, none was present for the respondent. There is nothing on record to show that any grievance was made by the respondent/employee that the petitioners have not complied with the interim order passed by this Court on 9.11.1995.

5) As stated earlier, the respondent/employee must have been long back retired from the services after attaining the age of superannuation. In the circumstances, it appears that by passage of time, the present petition has become infructuous and nothing

remains to be considered. The petition,
therefore, stands dismissed as infructuous.
Rule discharged.

sd/-
(P.R.BORA)
JUDGE

bdv/