

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

**WRIT PETITION NO. 4843 OF 2019**

The Hingoli Hamal Sahakari Sanstha Ltd.  
Hingoli, Taluka and District Hingoli,  
through its President,  
Mr. Hira Mohana Pyarewale

... Petitioner

Versus

- 1 The State of Maharashtra  
Through its Chief Secretary,  
Mantralaya, Fort,  
Mumbai – 400 032
  - 2 The Principal Secretary,  
Labour & Administration Department Ministry,  
Mantralaya, Mumbai
  - 3 The Principal Secretary  
Food, Civil Supplies and  
Consumer Protection Department,  
Mantralaya, Mumbai
  - 4 The Collector,  
Collector Office, Hingoli,  
District Hingoli
- ... Respondents

....

Mr. B. L. Sagar Killarikar, Advocate for petitioner.  
Ms. P. V. Diggikar, AGP for the respondents - State.

....

**CORAM : PRASANNA B. VARALE  
AND  
NITIN W. SAMBRE, JJ**

**DATED : 22<sup>nd</sup> APRIL, 2019**

**PER COURT:-**

1. Heard Mr. Killarikar, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and the learned AGP for the respondents-State.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that a limited grievance is raised in the petition. The petitioner is an association/society working for the issues of Mathadi, Hamal and other manual workers. The petitioner society submitted representation to the authorities of State, more particularly respondent No.2 to 4 i.e. the Principal Secretary, Labour & Administration Department, the Principal Secretary, Food, Civil Supplies and Consumer Protection Department and the Collector, Hingoli.

3. Our attention is invited to the copies of the representations. On the backdrop of this submission, Mr. Killarikar, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that, though the provisions of the Maharashtra Mathadi, Hamal and Other Manual Workers (Regulation of Employment and Welfare) Act, 1969 are aimed at the beneficial prospectus of the manual workers, policy framed by the State Government by way of the Government Resolution thereby introducing the private operators in the field of transportation. It is the submission of learned counsel for petitioner that such an introduction by the State Government frustrate the very object of the Act itself as claim for providing work to the labour like petitioner is ignored.

4. Considering the submissions of learned counsel for the petitioner, we deem it appropriate to dispose of the petition at the threshold.

5. Issue notice to the respondents. Learned AGP waives for all the respondents.

6. In the facts and circumstances, respondent Nos. 2 to 4 are directed to decide the representations submitted to them as expeditiously as possible and not later than eight weeks from the date of receipt of order of this Court. Needless to state that these authorities to decide the representation on the backdrop of the provisions of the Maharashtra Mathadi, Hamal and Other Manual Workers (Regulation of Employment and Welfare) Act, 1969.

7. The writ petition is accordingly disposed of.

8. Authenticated copy of this order be supplied to the learned Counsel for the petitioner and also to learned AGP.

**( NITIN W. SAMBRE )**  
**JUDGE**

**(PRASANNA B. VARALE)**  
**JUDGE**

SMS