

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY  
NAGPUR BENCH : NAGPUR**

**Writ Petition No.6965 of 2018**

Namdeo Rambhau Padmukh (Since Deceased) Thr. Lrs., Smt. Kalavat Namdeo  
Padmukh And Others

Vs

Nagar Parishad, Mehkar Through Its Chief Officer And Others

---

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of  
Coram, appearances, Court's Orders  
or directions and Registrar's order

Court's or Judge's Order

---

Shri Sayajee Jagtap, Advocate for the Petitioner/s  
Shri A.R. Deshpande, Advocate for the respondent No.1

**CORAM : ANIL S. KILOR, J.**

**DATED : 26.07.2023**

1. Heard.
2. The petitioners are the legal heirs of one Namdeo Rambhau Padmukh, who was working in the respondent- Municipal Council and his claim was allowed by the learned Industrial Court for regularization with incidental benefits and difference of wages. Since the order of the Industrial Court was not complied with, Misc. ULP (Recovery) Application No.16 of 2006 was filed for issuance of Recovery Certificate before the learned Industrial Court on 12.10.2006.
3. In the meantime, the respondent-Council granted permanency to Namdeo Padmukh w.e.f. 21.05.1988 and as such Namdeo Padmukh is entitled for difference of wages with other benefits and thereafter, in pursuance to the same, the respondent-Council paid Rs.4,85,169/- to Namdeo Padmukh in three

installments without prejudice to the other rights of Namdeo Padmukh.

4. It is worth mentioning here that Namdeo Padmukh was to superannuate on 28.05.2002 but expired on 18.09.1999 and as a settlement arrived between the respondent-Council that Namdeo Padmukh to receive the amount in three installments. It appears that in the year 2006, Namdeo Padmukh approached to the learned Industrial Court under Section 50 of the Maharashtra Recognition of Trade Union and Prevention of Unfair Labour Practices Act, 1971 (for short “the Act of 1971”) for recovery of arrears and difference of wages to the tune of Rs.13,86,000/-.

5. An affidavit filed on 11.10.2013 in the said proceeding by the legal heirs of Namdeo Padmukh shows outstanding amount as Rs.82,67,565/-. There was no mention about the amount received in view of the settlement dated 30.08.2013 from Municipal Council. Whereas, in the evidence the amount of Rs.4,85,169/- was stated as the amount recoverable from the respondent- Council.

6. Thus, from the above referred facts, it is evident that the petitioners are not sure about the amount recoverable from the respondent-Municipal Council.

7. The application under Section 50 of the Act of 1971 is an execution proceeding and in absence of any calculation submitted by the petitioners and further in view of suppression of facts as regards the amount received by the petitioners, in paragraph 10 of the impugned order the learned Industrial Court

has categorically held that the petitioners have not approached to the Court with clean hands and since the petitioners have not approached with a specific amount after making the calculation, the application was rejected vide impugned judgment and order dated 24.01.2017.

8. In that view of the matter, since nothing has been pointed out to show any perversity or illegality committed by the learned Industrial Court while dismissing the application under Section 50 of the Act of 1971, I do not find any merits in the present petition. Accordingly, it is **dismissed**.

[ANIL S. KILOR, J.]