



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

914 WRIT PETITION NO. 895 OF 2022

ARUN BABURAO DESAI
VERSUS
UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS

...
Mr. Parag V. Barde – Advocate for Petitioner
Mr. Ajay G. Talhar – Advocate for Respondent Nos.1 to 6
Mr. V.S. Badakh – AGP for Respondent, State

...

CORAM : SIDDHESHWAR S. THOMBRE, J.
DATE : 03.12.2025

PER COURT :

1. Heard learned Counsel for the respective parties.
2. The petitioner's only grievance is regarding the order dated 24.01.2020 passed by the Deputy Chief Labour Commissioner, (Central) Mumbai, in order No. – B.90/01(7)/2019.IR, whereby the authority referred the industrial dispute to the Labour Court.
3. Learned Counsel – Mr. Parag Barde appearing for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was terminated from service and therefore, the authority has referred the dispute only in respect of termination and not in respect of permanency. He submits that both the issues ought to have been referred. The authority, while referring the dispute, has

specifically observed *"Whether the claim of the applicant workman for reinstatement with continuity of service and full back wages is legal, justified and proper? And if yes, the relief entitled thereto?"*.

4. As the reference was forwarded regarding termination and consequential benefits, I do not find any reason to interfere with the order dated 24.01.2020 passed by the Deputy Chief Labour Commissioner, (Central) Mumbai, in order No. – B.90/01(7)/2019.IR, under Article 227 of the Constitution of India.

5. In view thereof, the Writ Petition stands dismissed. No order as to costs.

6. In case the Labour Court holds that the termination of the petitioner is illegal and grants other benefits, the petitioner is at liberty to file appropriate proceedings for claiming permanency.

[SIDDHESHWAR S. THOMBRE]
JUDGE