



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

**WRIT PETITION NO. 3616 OF 2026**

Sheshrao Dhonduba Dighole and others

.Vs.

The Divisional Manager, Yavatmal and others

---

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

Court's or Judge's orders.

---

None for the petitioner/s

**CORAM : ANIL S. KILOR AND RAJ D. WAKODE, JJ.**  
**DATED : 05<sup>th</sup> MAY, 2026.**

None appears for the petitioners even on second call.

2. Perusal of the prayer clause reveals that the petitioners are seeking direction against the respondent Nos. 1 to 3 to consider the petitioners for regularization as the Forest Labor alongwith arrears of their services/salaries in view of the Government Resolution dated 16.10.2012. The petitioners also seek a direction against the respondent No. 3 to consider and decide the representation dated 25.03.2026 made by the petitioners.

3. Perusal of the petition reveals that this Court, on earlier occasion, in *Writ Petition N. 676 of 2026 (Dilip Deshmukh and others .v/s. The Divisional Manager, Yavatmal and others)* deal with similar prayers and had informed learned counsel for the petitioners that relief as sought aforesaid cannot be claimed before a writ Court and



the proper and appropriate forum will be Industrial Court as the petitioners are claiming the benefit of regularization.

4. In view of the same, learned counsel for the petitioners on 03.02.2026 had withdrawn the earlier writ petition alongwith liberty to file appropriate proceedings. After the aforesaid order, the petitioners had submitted a representation on 25.03.2026 to the respondent No. 3 Managing Director, Forest Development Corporation Limited, Nagpur and now the petitioners are seeking direction against the respondent No. 3 to decide the aforesaid representation.

5. It was intimated to the learned counsel for the petitioners in the earlier round of litigation that the proper remedy for claiming the benefit of regularization under the appropriate provision of law is before the competent Industrial Court.

6. The learned counsel for the petitioners has relied upon the judgment of this Court in *Writ Petition No. 715 of 2017 (The Divisional Manager, Nagpur & others .v/s. The Member, Industrial Court, Bhandara and others)* with other connected matters, which is at Page 37 Annexure E. Perusal of the aforesaid judgment also reveals that it was not in the original jurisdiction that the aforesaid petitions were entertained. But the aforesaid writ petitions were filed by the employer to challenge the orders passed by the Industrial Court upholding the claim of the employees for regularization



of their services in view of the Government Resolution dated 16.10.2012.

7. In view of the above, the present writ petition seeking direction to the respondents for deciding the representation for granting the benefit of regularization is not sustainable in the eyes of law. Hence, the present writ petition stands dismissed.

8. However, the petitioners are at liberty to approach the appropriate Industrial Court for claiming relief of regularization under the appropriate provision of law.

9. The writ petition is accordingly **disposed of**. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

[RAJ D. WAKODE, J]

[ANIL S. KILOR, J.]