



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH, NAGPUR

WRIT PETITION NO. 1805 OF 2020

(Shailendra S/o. Devdas Rodge vs. M/s. Indoworth India Ltd. and another)

*Office Notes, Office Memorandum of Coram,
appearances, Court's orders or the directions,
and Registrar's orders.*

Court's or Judge's order

Mr. V.D.Raut, Advocate for petitioner.
Mr. D.M.Kakani, Advocate for respondent No.1.
Mrs.Mukta Kavimandan, AGP for respondent No.2.

CORAM : SIDDHESHWAR S. THOMBRE, J.
NOVEMBER 26, 2025

- 1) Heard learned counsel for the respective parties.
- 2) Being aggrieved by the transfer order dated 27/09/2017, whereby the petitioner was transferred from Nagpur to Raipur, filed Complaint(ULP)No.253/2017 before the learned Industrial Court, Nagpur. After considering the evidence led by the petitioner and the respondent, the learned Industrial Court dismissed the complaint for want of jurisdiction on preliminary ground that the petitioner has failed to prove that he is a 'workman' under Section 2(s) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.
- 3) Learned counsel for the respondent No.1 at the outset submits that the Company, Plant and Sales Office are already closed and no commercial activities are going on.
- 4) I have gone through the entire record and order passed by the learned Industrial Court. On perusal of the same, it reveals that after considering the evidence led by the parties, learned Industrial Court has rightly observed that the petitioner

had lastly worked on the post of Assistant Officer, however, he suppressed this material fact in his pleadings for being promoted as Assistant Officer (Marketing) w.e.f. 01/04/2015, therefore, the petitioner is not a 'workman' under Section 2(s) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and when now plant and sales office are closed and as this matter pertains to the transfer, no interference is called for.

5) Learned Industrial Court has rightly observed that it has no jurisdiction to try and entertain the complaint filed by the complainant. Hence, I do not find any reason to interfere with the order passed by the learned Industrial Court.

6) In view thereof, the petition is dismissed. No order as to costs.

(SIDDHESHWAR S. THOMBRE, J.)