

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

WRIT PETITION NO.8501 OF 2022

RANGNATH RAMRAO MORE
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

Mr.V.S.Bhale, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr.S.G.Karlekar, AGP for State.

(CORAM : RAVINDRA V. GHUGE AND
ARUN R. PEDNEKER, JJ.)

DATE : AUGUST 22, 2022

PER COURT :

1. The petitioner has put forth prayer clause 'B' as under :-

"B. The respondent No.2 may kindly be directed to decide a representation dated 26.07.2021 particularly Exh.A, with consider all relevant aspect and documents filed alongwith a representation of the petitioner."

2. We have perused the representation dated 26.07.2021 submitted by the petitioner to the Managing Director of the Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Company Limited, Mumbai. There are several disputes that have been raised by the petitioner. It is submitted that there were about 4 to 5 departmental enquiries conducted against him. He is also aggrieved that an amount of Rs.1,00,000/- was recovered

from him. He also raises a dispute that though he could have been treated as being on leave, he has been treated as being unauthorizedly absent.

3. This Court can not entertain disputed issues. If the petitioner has a specific grievance against the employer with regard to a specific cause of action, being a Workman u/s 2(s) of the I.D. Act and the employer being an Industry u/s 2(j) of the I.D. Act, the petitioner can raise an industrial dispute u/s 2(k) or approach the Industrial Court by preferring a (ULP) complaint u/s 28(1) r/w Item 9 of Schedule IV of the MRTU and PULP Act, 1971. Through such proceedings, he can adduce evidence, prove any act of the employer that amounts to an unfair labour practice and can seek relief from the Industrial Court or a Tribunal, as the case may be.

4. In view of the above, this petition is disposed off with liberty to the petitioner to avail of a remedy as is permissible in Law. The time spent by the petitioner in this Court from 15.02.2022 till the passing of this order, would be considered as a good ground for condonation of delay.

(ARUN R. PEDNEKER, J.)

(RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)