

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

WRIT PETITION NO.12975 OF 2019

SANTOSH LIMBAJI DHANDE
VERSUS
THE MAHARASHTRA GRAMIN BANK THOROUGH CHAIRMAN AND
OTHERS

...

Advocate for the Petitioner : Shri Ganesh B Patunkar
Advocate for the Respondents : Shri Shahane Parag P. and Shri Shahane
Pradeep L.

...

CORAM: RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.

DATE :- 17th October, 2019

Per Court:

1 Mrs.Gunjal, learned advocate, submits that as the petitioner has engaged another advocate, her appearance may be discharged. Shri Patunkar, learned advocate, confirms that he is appearing for the petitioner. Hence, the appearance of Mrs.Gunjal is discharged.

2 I have considered the submissions of the learned advocates for the respective sides and have perused the impugned judgment of the Industrial Court dated 27.02.2019 by which, Complaint (ULP) No.139/2011 filed by the petitioner has been dismissed on the ground that the respondent/ bank would not be covered by the MRTU & PULP Act, 1971 in view of the appropriate Government being the Central

Government under Section 2(a) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. The respondent/ bank is constituted under the Regional Rural Banks Act, 1976.

3 The learned advocate for the respondent submits that the petitioner has already raised an industrial dispute and the proceeding under the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 before the Assistant Commissioner, Labour (Central Act), Pune has already commenced.

4 In view of the above, this Writ Petition is disposed off.

5 Needless to state, as the petitioner's grievance has not been entertained under the MRTU & PULP Act, 1971, the Assistant Commissioner, Labour (Central Act), Pune would be at liberty to consider the proceeding independently.

kps

(RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)