



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

Writ Petition No. 83 of 2023

[Raibhan s/o Ramchandra Nagrare ..vs.. Zilla Parishad, Nagpur, through its C.E.O.]

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram,
appearances, Court's orders of directions
and Registrar's orders

Court's or Judge's orders

Mr. J. L. Bhoot, Advocate for the petitioner
Mr. Majid Shaikh, Advocate for the respondent

CORAM : ANIL L. PANSARE J.

DATED : 03-03-2025

On 9-1-2023, following order was passed.

"1] Heard Mr. Bhoot, learned counsel for the petitioner.

2] Mr. Bhoot, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in terms of the G.R. dated 6.8.2001, there is no necessity of any approval by the State Govt for conversion of the CRT status and therefore, once the petitioner was brought on CRT status by the communication dated 21.11.2001 (pg.33), the action could not have been reversed, as per the order dated 2.5.2008 (pg.52). It is submitted that the action of bringing the petitioner on CRT status was only after compliance of all the requirements of State Resolution, which were fulfilled by the petitioner, for which reliance is placed upon the communication dated 20.2.2008 (pg.50-A), in pursuance to which I.D. 141/1988 was withdrawn and 25% of the back-wages were also deposited (challan at pg 51). He therefore, submits that the impugned order dated 20.12.2016 could not have been passed by the learned Industrial Court on the ground that the CRT status of the petitioner was on account of mistake.

3] Issue notice for final disposal returnable in four weeks.

4] Petitioner shall placed on record the G.R. dated 6.8.2001 and 24.4.2001."

2. As could be seen, the petitioner was directed to place on record the Government Resolutions (G.R.) dated 6-8-2001 and 24-4-2001. The G.R.s, however, are not yet placed on record.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that G.R. dated 24-4-2001 is available but the other is not.

4. Thus, G.R. dated 6-8-2001 is not available. The order dated 9-1-2023 clearly indicates that Mr. Bhoot, learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that in terms of the G.R. dated 6.8.2001, there is no necessity of any approval by the State Government for conversion of the CRT status and, therefore, once the petitioner was brought on CRT status, the action could not have been reversed.

5. Since the argument was based on G.R. dated 6-8-2001, the Court directed the petitioner to place on record said G.R. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the G.R. is not available. This would destroy the foundation of the petitioner's case that there is no necessity of any approval by the State Government in terms of G.R. dated 6-8-2001. That being so, there appears to me no reason why should impugned order be interfered with in absence of G.R., which is directed to be placed on record. The petition is accordingly dismissed.

(Anil L. Pansare, J.)