

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

WRIT PETITION NO. 1730 OF 2025

Anup Vikal C/o Maple Infra InvIT Manager ... **Petitioner**

Versus

The State of Maharashtra and Ors ... **Respondents**

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 1731 OF 2025

Maple Infra InvIT Investment
Manager Private Limited ... **Petitioner**

Versus

The State of Maharashtra Thr.
The Industries and Ors ... **Respondents**

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 1733 OF 2025

Chandrani Sen Maple Infra
InvIT Manager Pvt Ltd ... **Petitioner**

Versus

The State of Maharashtra and Ors ... **Respondents**

Mr. Sharan Jagtiani, Sr. Advocate a/w Ankita Singhania & Mr. R. V. Pawar i/b Pragnya Legal for the Petitioner in WP/1730/2025 & WP/1733/2025.

Mr. Gautam Ankhad Sr. Advocate a/w Ms. Aarti Sathe Mr. Ankoosh Chatti for the Petitioner in WP/1731/2025.

Mr. Aseem Naphade, Ms. Vilasini Balsubramaniam, Ms. Vishakha i/b Jayakar & Partners for Respondent No.2 in all matters.

Ms. Snehal S. Jadhav, AGP for Respondent/State in WP/1730/2025.

Ms. Tanu N. Bhatia, AGP fro Respondent/State in WP/1731/2025.

Ms. P.J. Gavhane, AGP for Respondent/State in WP/1733/2025.

CORAM : SANDEEP V. MARNE, J.

DATE : 5 FEBRUARY 2025.

P.C. :

1) Applications filed by the Petitioners for striking-off their names from array of parties in the Appeal under provisions of Order 1 Rule 10 of the Code of Civil Procedure have been rejected by the Industrial Court by order dated 20 January 2025, which is subject matter of challenge in the present Petitions.

2) Mr. Jagtiani, the learned senior advocate alongwith Ms. Singhanía appearing for Petitioners in Writ Petition No. 1730 of 2025 and Writ Petition No. 1733 of 2025 and Mr. Ankhad the learned senior advocate appearing for Petitioner in Writ Petition No. 1731 of 2025, on instructions, submit that the Petitioners do not desire to press the present Petitions so far as the impugned orders dated 20 January 2025 are concerned. They would however raise a serious objection to the maintainability of the Appeal before the Industrial Court. As of today, it appears that the Petitioners have not filed any application questioning maintainability of the Appeal under provisions of Section 18 of the Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition, and Redressal) Act, 2013, though such objection appears to have been raised in the reply filed before the Industrial Court.

3) Mr. Jagtiani and Mr. Ankhad, on instructions, would submit that appropriate applications raising the issue of maintainability of the Appeal as well as seeking its dismissal shall be filed by the Petitioners within a period of one week. In order to

enable the Petitioners to prosecute such applications, the Industrial Court is requested to defer recording of evidence in the Appeal till decision of such applications. The Applications questioning maintainability of the Appeal and seeking its dismissal shall be decided by the Industrial Court on its own merits as expeditiously as possible. All points raised by the rival parties on merits are expressly kept open.

4) With the above observations and directions, the Petitions are permitted to be **withdrawn and disposed of**.

[SANDEEP V. MARNE, J.]