

Shailaja

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIRCUIT BENCH AT KOLHAPUR**

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION NO.18365 OF 2024

Shrikrushna Khema Sawant and others	]	Petitioners
versus		
The State of Maharashtra and others	]	Respondents

....

Mr. Mahesh M. Rawool i/b Mr. Sachin Gawade, for Petitioners.

Mr. A.P. Vanarase, A.G.P, for Respondent – State.

....

**CORAM : M.S. KARNIK &
AJIT B. KADETHANKAR, JJ.**

DATE : 27th NOVEMBER, 2025.

P.C:

1. Heard learned Counsel for the petitioners.

2. The petitioners claim to be similarly situated as those complainants/employees who had benefited from the decision of the Industrial Court, Maharashtra at Kolhapur in *Complaint (ULP) No.25 of 1993 (Maharashtra Rajya Chaturtha Shreni Sarkari Karmachari Sanghatana, Mumbai Vs. Phalodhyan Upsanchalak-Vikas Adhikari Kudal and others)*.

3. In fact, by a communication dated 29th October, 2021 addressed to Bayabai Zimu Kokre (Petitioner No.16) and others, the District

Superintendent, Agricultural Officer, Sindhudurg had informed the petitioners that the issue as regards grant of similar benefits to the petitioners is pending consideration. It was informed that further decision would be taken after curing the deficiencies, if any.

4. We find that from 29th October, 2021, no decision has been taken on the representation made by the petitioners. *Prima facie*, the petitioners appear to be similarly situated and entitled to similar benefits as extended to the complainants/employees in Complaint (ULP) No.25 of 1993.

5. In such view of the matter, we direct respondent No.2 – The Commissioner for Agriculture, Maharashtra State, Pune to take the representation made by the petitioners dated 20th October, 2021 as stated in communication dated 29th October, 2021, which is at page 96 of the Writ Petition, to its logical conclusion and appropriate decision be taken after considering the judgment and order of the Industrial Court in the Complaint (ULP) No.25 of 1993 filed by the similarly situated employees, as expeditiously as possible and, in any case, within a period of twelve weeks from the date of communication of this order.

6. The petition is disposed of in the aforesaid terms. No order as to costs.

[AJIT B. KADETHANKAR, J.]

[M.S. KARNIK, J.]