



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

WRIT PETITION NO. 620 OF 2025

Janardan Laxmanrao Kolhe and others

-Vs.-

State of Maharashtra and others

Office notes, Office Memoranda of
Coram, appearances, Court's orders Court's or Judge's Orders.
or directions and Registrar's orders.

Mr. Shashibhushan Wahane, Adv. for the petitioners.
Mr. N.R.Patil, AGP for the respondents-State.
Mr. Sachin W. Sambre, Adv.for the respondent Nos.4 and 5.
Mr. R.N.Ghughe, Adv.for the respondent-intervenor.

**CORAM : AVINASH G. GHAROTE &
ABHAY J. MANTRI, JJ.**

DATE : 5TH FEBRUARY, 2025

Heard the learned counsel for the parties.

2. The only grievance raised in the petition, is that on account of the order dated 26/09/2024, passed by the Director Marketing-respondent No.2, the seniority of the petitioners, who are appointed earlier in point of time shall be adversely affected.

3. The persons, who are directed to be appointed are the intervenors, who have filed Civil Application (W) No.311 of 2025 for intervention. The appointment of the intervenors has been directed by the Industrial Courts, in various judgments, passed by it upon the disputes filed by them. What is also necessary to note, is that the APMC has passed a resolution on 07/12/2024, in which, while

indicating the terms on which the appointment of the intervenors would be there, Condition No.4 specifically protects the seniority of the persons, who were already working with the APMC (Pg.26 & 31). The Director of Marketing in his earlier order dated 26/09/2024, (Pg.83-A) has granted approval for the appointment of the intervenors on the condition, that the seniority of the employees appointed earlier shall not be disturbed. It is therefore apparent, that any appointments of the intervenors or persons, who are being sought to be appointed in pursuance to the judgments of the Industrial Court, would not adversely affect of the seniority of the petitioners and the persons similarly situated to them, in view of which, the apprehension by the petitioners, is clearly unfounded. We therefore do not see any reason to interfere with the impugned order. The petition is therefore dismissed. No costs.

(ABHAY J. MANTRI,J)

(AVINASH G. GHAROTE, J)