

3. We are surprised by the stand taken by Dr. Sanjay Tryambak Gandhe, Principal of Respondent No. 2 College, that in order to maintain judicial discipline, the complaints of these Petitioners was kept pending since this Petition was before this Court. He makes a request that this Court should permit the Grievance Redressal Committee to complete the process and decide the complaints of the Petitioners. We find this to be a lame excuse put forth for keeping the complaints pending for exactly 1 year.

4. Recently, the Aurangabad Bench of this Court has delivered a Judgment in the matter of *Bhartiya Kamgar Sena & Anr. v/s. State of Maharashtra & Ors.* (Writ Petition No. 14395 of 2019) vide Judgment dated 03.03.2025, concluding that the 7th Pay Commission Recommendations have to be implemented. A few years ago, a similar judgment is delivered against the same MGM Institute vide Judgment dated 10.2.2012 (*Bhartiya Kamgar Sena & Anr. v/s. State of Maharashtra & Ors. WP No. 11091 of 2010 and other connected Petitions*). The same was carried to the Hon'ble Supreme Court in SLP No. 7540 of 2023 (*Secretary Mahatma Gandhi Mission & Anr. v/s. Bhartiya Kamgar Sena & Ors.*) and vide Judgment dated 11.3.2024, the SLP was dismissed.

5. In the case of the present Management, the learned Advocate for the Petitioners submits that earlier when the 6th Pay Commission Recommendations were not implemented and the employees had to approach this Court which granted them the relief, the Management did not comply with the directions of this Court despite dismissal of their SLP No. 7540 of 2023 by order dated 11.3.2024. Hence, Contempt Proceedings had been initiated.

6. Be that as it may, in the case in hands, there was no plausible reason for the Management to delay the hearing in the matter which is supposed to be completed within 15 days in the light of the notification dated 22nd March, 2021.

7. As such, **this Petition is disposed off** with a direction to the said Grievance Redressal Committee to follow the due procedure laid down in law and deliver a reasoned order in the light of the Judgment delivered by this Court in *Bhartiya Kamgar Sena & Anr. v/s. State of Maharashtra & Ors. dated 3.3.2025* (supra), within a period of 30 days from today.

8. The Petitioners submit that one of them is 64 years of age and had already been superannuated 6 years ago and Petitioner No. 2 has recently superannuated and is made to litigate in the manner as is explicit from the record. Hence, they pray for cost and submit that the amount of cost may be given to the Petitioners in equal proportions.

9. In view of the above, we direct the Management to pay cost of Rs. 15,000/- to each of the Petitioners, within a period of 30 days from today.

(ASHWIN D. BHOBE, J.)

(RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)