



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH : NAGPUR
MISC. CIVIL (REVIEW) APPLICATION NO.675 OF 2023
IN
WRIT PETITION NO.7192 OF 2019

Vinod Trambakrao Dhage and others ... Applicants
Vs.
Mahindra and Mahindra Limited ... Non-Applicant

Mr. S. D. Thakur for Applicants.
Mr. M. G. Bhangde, Senior Advocate for Non-applicant.

CORAM : MANISH PITALE, J.
DATE : NOVEMBER 18, 2025
(Through VC)

P.C. :

. Heard Mr. Thakur, learned counsel appearing for the applicants and Mr. Bhangde, learned senior counsel appearing for the non-applicant in this review application.

2. By this review application, the applicants seek review of judgement and order dated 27.11.2020 passed by this Court, whereby a bunch of writ petitions were allowed, the impugned judgements and orders of the Industrial Court were set aside and the complaints filed by the respondents workmen were dismissed.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the applicants submits that certain judgements were not brought to the notice of this Court when the writ petitions were heard and disposed of. According to the learned counsel for the applicants, these include a Full Bench judgement of this Court and a judgement of the Supreme Court. A perusal of the grounds raised in the review application shows that none of these judgements find any mention therein. Nonetheless, the principal ground for review

raised on behalf of the applicants is that the aspect of Model Standing Orders was not brought to the notice of this Court and that for the fault of the employer in applying them in letter and spirit, the grievance of the applicants could not have been brushed aside.

4. On the other hand, the learned senior counsel appearing for the non-applicant company submits that the judgement of this Court is a detailed judgement, containing reasons and all these issues have been referred to and dealt with. It is emphasized that the applicants workmen had ceased to be in employment of the company for periods between 9 to 23 years before they approached the Industrial Court with their complaints seeking the relief of permanency and regularization. This aspect was dealt with in detail in the said judgement and therefore, the application does not deserve any consideration.

5. It is settled position of law that a review application can be entertained only if it is demonstrated that there has been an error apparent on the face of the record of the judgement, of which review is sought.

6. Having heard the learned counsel for the rival parties, this Court is of the opinion that all the issues that arose for consideration from the impugned orders of the Industrial Court were referred to and dealt with, in detail, in the judgement of this Court. There was a reference made to the Model Standing Orders also in the context of the claim of continuance and recurring cause of action raised on behalf of the applicants - workmen. Having considered the issues arising in the matter in a comprehensive manner and after referring to various judgements, this Court found that the complaints seeking the relief of permanency and regularization could not have been entertained by the Industrial Court, particularly in the admitted position on facts that the applicants - workmen had ceased to be in employment of the company for periods

between 9 to 23 years, and thereafter, they had approached the Industrial Court raising their grievance. In fact, in the judgement itself, in paragraph 8, a chart was reproduced giving the details of the applicants - workmen with regard to their last dates in employment and the dates on which they filed the complaints.

7. Considering the aforesaid aspects of the matter, this Court is of the opinion that the manner in which the review application is being argued is more in the nature of an appeal, which cannot be permitted. The applicants have failed to demonstrate any error apparent on the face of record and hence, this Court declines to entertain this review application. Accordingly, the review application is dismissed.

(MANISH PITALE, J.)

Minal Parab