

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

955 WRIT PETITION NO.8578 OF 2022
WITH WP/8580/2022 WITH WP/8596/2022 WITH WP/8597/2022
WITH WP/8583/2022 WITH WP/8598/2022 WITH WP/8581/2022
WITH WP/8582/2022 WITH WP/8588/2022 WITH WP/8589/2022
WITH WP/8595/2022 WITH WP/8590/2022 WITH WP/8587/2022
WITH WP/8586/2022 WITH WP/8592/2022 WITH WP/8591/2022
WITH WP/8584/2022 WITH WP/8585/2022 WITH WP/8594/2022
WITH WP/8593/2022 WITH WP/8579/2022

THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER AND ANOTHER
VERSUS
SOPAN ABHIMAN PATIL

...

Advocate for Petitioners : Mr. Maheshkumar S. Sonawane
Advocate for Respondent : Mr. Rajendra N. Chavan

...

AND

WRIT PETITION NO.10979 OF 2022
WRIT PETITION NO.10980 OF 2022
WRIT PETITION NO.10981 OF 2022

...

THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER AND ANOTHER
VERSUS
BAPU SAHEBRAO MARATHE

...

Mr. V.V. Gujar, advocate for the petitioners .
Mr. Yogesh B. Bolkar, Advocate for the Respondents.

...

CORAM : SANDEEP V. MARNE, J.

DATE : 19-10-2022

PER COURT :

. By these petitions, the petitioners (Zilla Parishad) have assailed the various orders passed by the Industrial Court, Jalgaon allowing the complaints filed by the respondents under the provisions of the Maharashtra Recognition of Trade Unions and Prevention of

Unfair Labour Practices Act. The petitioners (Zilla Parishad) have been directed to bring the respondents Converted Regular Temporary Establishment (CRTE) from the date of completion of 5 years of service. It is also directed to extend the benefits available under the Kalelkar Award along with interest.

2. The issue involved in the present matters is squarely covered by the Judgment of this Court in **Zilla Parishad, Aurangabad and another vs. State of Maharashtra and another**, 2017 (3) ALL MR 122. So far as the petitioner - Zilla Parishad is concerned, it has already faced similar litigation being Writ Petition No.2699 of 2003, Chief Executive Officer, Zilla Parishad Jalgaon vs. Dayaram Shankar Jadhav and another in which this Court directed grant of extension of similar benefits to all the similarly situated persons. Despite this, the Zilla Parishad made the respondents approach the Industrial Court for extension of similar benefits.

3. In view of this position, the petitions are devoid of any merits and the same are dismissed without any orders as to costs.

4. In the event of death of any respondent, the consequential benefits be paid to his / her legal heirs.

(SANDEEP V. MARNE, J.)