

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

WRIT PETITION NO.9943 OF 2016

(The Commissioner, Aurangabad Municipal Corporation Vs. Jyotiba Bharat)

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO.9944 OF 2016

(The Commissioner, Aurangabad Municipal Corporation Vs. Anitabai Dabhade)

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO.9945 OF 2016

(The Commissioner, Aurangabad Municipal Corporation Vs. Suresh Sable)

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO.9946 OF 2016

(The Commissioner, Aurangabad Municipal Corporation Vs. Kalindabai
Rajendra)

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO.9947 OF 2016

(The Commissioner, Aurangabad Municipal Corporation Vs. Ushabai Subhash)

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO.9948 OF 2016

(The Commissioner, Aurangabad Municipal Corporation Vs. Nandabai Prakash)

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO.9950 OF 2016

(The Commissioner, Aurangabad Municipal Corporation Vs. Balu Sahebrao)

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO.9951 OF 2016

(The Commissioner, Aurangabad Municipal Corporation Vs. Sunita
Gautam)

Mr.S.S.Tope, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr.R.K.Khandelwal, Advocate for the respondents.

(CORAM : RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)

DATE : 28/09/2016

PER COURT :

1. Learned Advocate for the petitioner Mr.Tope and learned Advocate Mr.Khandelwal for the respondents in all these 8 matters jointly submit that an identical issue arising out of identical causes of action has been decided by this Court by judgment dated

10/08/2016 in WP No.8476/2016 and connected matters from WP No.8486/2016 to 8499/2016, 8506/2016 and 8507/2016.

2. It is jointly submitted that these petitions can be allowed and the liberty granted to the respondents/workmen in paragraph No.14 of the earlier judgment dated 10/08/2016, could be granted to these respondents.

3. In the light of the above, these petitions are allowed. The impugned orders are quashed and set aside and the Misc.Applications filed by the respondents are rejected.

4. Nevertheless, the respondents are at liberty to assail the rejection of their reference cases by preferring writ petitions in this Court and the time spent by the respondents before the Labour Court in the pending proceedings and in this Court in these petitions, could be considered as a ground for entertaining the writ petitions.

(RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)