

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION NO. 14602 OF 2024

Vikas Sharadchandra Pathare ...Petitioner
Versus
The State Of Maharashtra
Thr. The Secretary Higher
And Tech. Edu. & Ors. ...Respondents

AND

WRIT PETITION NO. 14603 OF 2024

Sanjay Shantaram Patil ...Petitioner
Versus
The State of Maharashtra
Thr. The Secretary Higher & Tech. Edu.
And Ors. ...Respondents

AND

WRIT PETITION NO. 14644 OF 2024

Sunil Narayan Patil ...Petitioner
Versus
The State of Maharashtra
Thr. The Secretary Higher & Tech. Edu.
And Ors. ...Respondents

AND

WRIT PETITION NO. 14645 OF 2024

Ranjendra Jagannath Patil ...Petitioner
Versus
The State of Maharashtra
Thr. The Secretary Higher & Tech. Edu.
And Ors. ...Respondents

Mr. Avinash Belge, Advocate for the Petitioners.

Ms. Nisha Mehra, AGP for Respondent Nos.1 & 2/State in
WP/14602/2024.

Ms. P.M.J. Deshpande, AGP for Respondent Nos.1 & 2/State in WP/14603/2024.

Mr. V.M. Mali, AGP for Respondent Nos.1 & 2/State in WP/14644/2024.

Ms. Rupali Shinde, AGP for Respondent Nos.1 & 2/State in WP/14645/2024.

Mr. Vilas Jadhav i/by Mr. Hardikar, Advocate for Respondent Nos.4 & 5 in all Petitions.

**CORAM : RAVINDRA V. GHUGE
&
M.M. SATHAYE, JJ.**

DATE : 21st OCTOBER, 2024

PER COURT :-

1. The Petitioners are workmen under Section 2(s) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (the 'said Act'). The Employers are the Industries under Section 2(j) of the said Act, keeping in view the Judgment delivered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Bangalore Water Supply & Sewerage Board V/s. A. Rajappa And Others*, (1978) 2 SCC 213.

2. The learned Advocate for the Petitioners submits that they would approach the Industrial Court, considering that the suspension is a recurring cause of action.

3. In view of the above, **these Writ Petitions are disposed off.**

If the Petitioners approach the Industrial Court, the disposal of these Writ Petitions would not be an impediment and the time spent by the Petitioners in this Court from 30th September, 2024 till the passing of this order, would be a good ground for condonation of delay. Needless to say, the issue of continuous cause of action, is kept open.

(M.M. SATHAYE, J.)

(RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)