

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

51 WRIT PETITION NO.7981 OF 2022

DATTATRAY KESHAVRAO MARATHE  
VERSUS  
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH ITS  
SECRETARY AND OTHERS

...

AND

52 WRIT PETITION NO.7982 OF 2022

DILIP RAJJAN DANDHORE  
VERSUS  
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH ITS  
SECRETARY AND OTHERS

...

AND

53 WRIT PETITION NO.7983 OF 2022

DEVIDAS BABURAO DUSANE  
VERSUS  
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH ITS  
SECRETARY AND OTHERS

...

AND

54 WRIT PETITION NO.7984 OF 2022

LAXMAN LATKAN PATIL  
VERSUS  
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH ITS  
SECRETARY AND OTHERS

...

AND

55 WRIT PETITION NO.7985 OF 2022

BHARAT ANANDA RAISING  
VERSUS  
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH ITS  
SECRETARY AND OTHERS

...

AND  
56 WRIT PETITION NO.7986 OF 2022

NARAYAN SHANKAR CHANDELKAR  
VERSUS  
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH ITS  
SECRETARY AND OTHERS

...

AND  
57 WRIT PETITION NO.7987 OF 2022

SANTOSH PANDIT TAYADE  
VERSUS  
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH ITS  
SECRETARY AND OTHERS

...

AND  
58 WRIT PETITION NO.7988 OF 2022

SURESH DALA PATIL  
VERSUS  
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH ITS  
SECRETARY AND OTHERS

...

AND  
59 WRIT PETITION NO.7989 OF 2022

DILIP DAGADU KANKHARE  
VERSUS  
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH ITS  
SECRETARY AND OTHERS

...

AND  
60 WRIT PETITION NO.7990 OF 2022

PRASHANT VIVEK KANKHARE  
VERSUS  
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH ITS  
SECRETARY AND OTHERS

...

AND  
61 WRIT PETITION NO.7991 OF 2022

AKIL MOHD. SHAFI BAGWAN  
VERSUS  
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH ITS  
SECRETARY AND OTHERS

...

AND  
62 WRIT PETITION NO.7992 OF 2022

DILIP LOTU RANE  
VERSUS  
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH ITS  
SECRETARY AND OTHERS

...

AND  
63 WRIT PETITION NO.7993 OF 2022

PRAKASH PATINGRAO KUMAWAT  
VERSUS  
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH ITS  
SECRETARY AND OTHERS

...

AND  
64 WRIT PETITION NO.7994 OF 2022

RAVINDRA GOVINDA PATIL  
VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH ITS  
SECRETARY AND OTHERS

...

AND  
65 WRIT PETITION NO.7995 OF 2022

ANIL RAMDAS KOLI  
VERSUS  
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH ITS  
SECRETARY AND OTHERS

...

AND  
66 WRIT PETITION NO.7996 OF 2022

SHARAD GAMBHIR SONAWANE  
VERSUS  
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH ITS  
SECRETARY AND OTHERS

...

AND  
67 WRIT PETITION NO.7997 OF 2022

RAJARAM AMARSING PATIL  
VERSUS  
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH ITS  
SECRETARY AND OTHERS

...

AND  
68 WRIT PETITION NO.7998 OF 2022

MADHUKAR SADASHIV POL  
VERSUS  
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH ITS  
SECRETARY AND OTHERS

...

AND

69 WRIT PETITION NO.7999 OF 2022

SHIVCHARAN GAURISHANKAR PANDE  
VERSUS  
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH ITS  
SECRETARY AND OTHERS

...

AND

70 WRIT PETITION NO.8000 OF 2022

SUBHASH DAMU SONAWANE  
VERSUS  
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH ITS  
SECRETARY AND OTHERS

...

AND

71 WRIT PETITION NO.8001 OF 2022

SAYYAD SAJID ALI SAYYAD ABRD ALI  
VERSUS  
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH ITS  
SECRETARY AND OTHERS

...

Advocate for the Petitioners : Shri Ajay G.Talhar  
AGP for Respondent 1/ State : Shri P.K. Lakhotiya

...

**CORAM : RAVINDRA V. GHUGE  
&  
ARUN R. PEDNEKER, JJ.**

**DATE :- 01<sup>st</sup> August, 2022**

**Per Court :-**

1. The petitioners seek to challenge the communication dated 01.04.2022, which is addressed by the Additional

Commissioner, Jalgaon City Municipal Corporation, Jalgaon, to each of these petitioners. By the said communication, the Municipal Corporation has relied upon the judgment delivered by the Single Judge Bench dated 16.12.2016 in Writ Petition No.12153/2016 filed by ***Narendra Gopal Kale vs. Jalgaon City Municipal Corporation*** and a group of petitions. Vide the said communication, the petitioners are placed in a particular pay scale on the basis of the judgment dated 16.12.2016. The contention of the petitioners is that the Municipal Corporation has misread the judgment of this Court.

2. We find from the record that these petitioners had earlier approached the Labour Court. Insofar as their service benefits were concerned, they had approached the Industrial Court by preferring complaints under the MRTU & PULP Act, 1971. Thereafter, they had approached the learned Single Judge Bench of this Court and the judgment dated 16.12.2016 was delivered.

3. Since all these petitioners are “workmen” under Section 2(s) and the Municipal Corporation is an “industry” under Section 2(j) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the petitioners have a statutory and efficacious remedy of

approaching the Industrial Court under Item 9 of Schedule IV of the MRTU & PULP Act, 1971.

4. In view of the above, these Writ Petitions are disposed off with liberty to the petitioners to avail of the said remedy.

*kps* (ARUN R. PEDNEKER, J.) (RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)