



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
WRIT PETITION NO.17728 OF 2025

Pune Mahanagar Parivahan
Mahamandal Ltd. ...Petitioner

V/s.

Govind Rajaram Limbale ...Respondent

Ms. Madhavi M. Tavanandi *for the Petitioner.*

Ms. Poonam Pal *i/b. Mr. Sachin Hande for the Respondent.*

CORAM: SANDEEP V. MARNE, J.

DATED: 10 JUNE 2026.

P.C.:

1) By this Petition, the Petitioner challenges interim order dated 23 April 2025 passed by the Member, Industrial Court, Pune, by which the Petitioner is directed to grant leave with pay to the Respondent as per his medical report dated 3 May 2024 for the period from 22 April 2024 to 21 October 2024. The Industrial Court has further directed assignment of light duty to the Respondent if recommended by the Medical Board.

2) I have heard Ms. Tavanandi, the learned counsel appearing for the Petitioner and Ms. Pal, the learned counsel appearing for the Respondent and have considered the submissions canvassed by them.

3) What is challenged in the Petition is a mere interim order passed on Application at Exhibit-U 2. The complaint is still pending before the Industrial Court. It appears that the interim directions issued by the Industrial Court are in consonance with the first proviso to Section 47 of the Persons with Disabilities (Equal Opportunities, Protection of Rights and Full Participation) Act, 1995 and Section 20 of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, 2016. In similar circumstances, [See: *Pune Mahanagar Parivahan Mahamandal Ltd. V/s. Sharad Gotpagar*]¹ this Court has not entertained Petitions by passing order dated 19 November 2024, which reads thus:

1) These Petitions are filed by Pune Mahanagar Parivahan Mahamandal Ltd., challenging various interim orders passed by Member Industrial Court, Pune by which the Petitioner is restrained from making any deduction from salaries of the Respondents with a further direction to pay 100% salary to them. The directions issued by the Industrial Court appear to be in tune with the first proviso to Section 47 of the Persons with Disabilities (Equal Opportunities, Protection of Rights and Full Participation) Act, 1995 and Section 20 of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016. Therefore, I am not inclined to interfere in the impugned orders. The learned Industrial Court is requested to expedite the hearing of the complaint.

2) Writ Petitions are accordingly disposed of.

4) In my view, therefore, no infirmity can be traced in the impugned order. Writ Petition is accordingly **disposed of**. Industrial Court is however, requested to expedite the hearing of the main complaint.

[SANDEEP V. MARNE, J.]

¹ Writ Petition No.1401 of 2024, decided on 19 November 2024