



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH AT NAGPUR
WRIT PETITION NO.6287 OF 2024

The Wardha District Central Co-operative Bank, Wardha **Vs.** Rajendra
S/o. Ramraoji Pohankar

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearances, Court's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Court's or Judge's orders
--	---------------------------

Mr. S.K. Bhoyar, Advocate for the Petitioner.
Mr. C.V. Jagdale, Advocate for the Respondent.

CORAM: SIDDHESHWAR S. THOMBRE, J.

DATED : 13th OCTOBER, 2025

1. Heard Mr. S.K. Bhoyar, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr. C.V. Jagdale, learned counsel for the respondent.
2. The petitioner is challenging the order passed by the learned Industrial Court, Nagpur in complaint ULP No.22/2016 dated 27.01.2023, whereby, the learned Industrial Court directed the petitioner-Bank to regularize the services of respondent/complainant and granting him other consequential benefits of permanency along with monetary benefits.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the learned Industrial Court, Nagpur recorded the findings on the ground that there was a joint pursis filed in some other proceedings and the petitioner would not get an opportunity to defend that the joint pursis. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that there is no sanctioned vacant posts available with the Bank, but, this ground was not considered by the learned Industrial Court therefore, he prayed to allow the present writ petition.

4. Per contra, learned counsel for the respondent-employee has contended that the petitioner-Bank appointed this respondent prior to 20 years on 01.01.2004 and through other proceeding his services were regularized. Therefore, on that count, he supported the order passed by the learned Industrial Court and prayed to dismiss the **writ petition**.

5. I have gone through the documents on record placed before me alongwith the writ petition, as well as I have gone through the order passed by the learned Industrial Court. It is clear that the Court has considered the fact that since 2004, the respondent is working in the petitioner-Bank. When it was asked to the learned counsel for the petitioner that whether the respondent employee working with the bank and he fairly stated that the employee is working with the Bank. Therefore, the learned Industrial Court has considered the fact that the employee/respondent has completed 240 days in one calendar year and therefore, these findings are based on the evidence led by the respondent/employee.

6. In view thereof, no perversity is found in the order passed by the learned Industrial Court, accordingly, the present writ petition is **disposed of**. No order as to costs.

(SIDDHESHWAR S. THOMBRE J.)

Privel