



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

NAGPUR BENCH, NAGPUR

WRIT PETITION No.6797 OF 2026

PATANJALI FOODS LIMITED,
(Earlier known as Ruchi Soya Industries Limited)
Through its Authorized Representative,
Venkatesh Manthapurwar
Office Address: 249-319, Umred Road,
Butibori, Nagpur.

: PETITIONER

...VERSUS...

1. SHIVSHANKAR SINGH,
Aged about 49 years,
R/o. 21, behind Saraswati School,
Hari Om Nagar, Ward No.6,
Railway Station Road, Butibori,
Nagpur.
2. GLORISHINE MULTITRADE PVT. LTD.
Through its Official Liquidator,
119-A, 1st Flor, Vinaya Bhavan,
Complex, 159, CST Kalina,
Santacruz (East), Mumbai.

: RESPONDENTS

=====

Mr. Ranjan N. Deshpande, Advocate for Petitioner.
Mr. Rushikesh S. Bhoyar, Advocate for Respondent No.1.

=====

CORAM : **NANDESH S. DESHPANDE, J.**

DATE : **07th SEPTEMBER, 2026.**

ORAL JUDGMENT :

1. Rule. Rule made returnable forthwith. Heard finally

with the consent of learned counsel appearing for the parties.

2. The present petition challenges the order passed in Complaint (ULP) No.54 of 2014, below Exhibit U-24, passed on 17.06.2025. The said Exhibit U-24 was an application filed by the original complainant i.e. respondent No.1 herein seeking addition of party. It was the contention of the original complainant that he had filed a complaint against the General Manager of M/s. Ruchi Soya and during the pendency of the proceedings a new management of Patanjali Group has taken the business of the respondent No.1. It was, therefore, contended that the said establishment i.e. the present petitioner herein needs to be added as a party respondent.

3. After hearing the parties, the learned Labour Court vide order dated 17.06.2025 passed an order thereby allowing the application. It further directed to make the necessary amendment by adding the proposed respondent as respondent No.3.

4. Being aggrieved by this, the petitioner carried the matter before the Industrial Court by filing Revision bearing Revision (ULP) No.54 of 2025. The said revision was rejected by the Industrial Court on 24.03.2026. Both these orders are impugned before me in the present petition.

5. I have heard Mr. Ranjan N. Deshpande, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr. Rushikesh S. Bhoyar, learned counsel for the respondent No.1.

6. It is contended by the learned counsel for the petitioner that resolution plan was approved by the NCLT on 24th July, 2019. A public notice as contemplated under Section 15 of the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016 and the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Board of India (Insolvency Resolution Process for Corporate Persons) Regulations, 2016 therein were also published. It is, therefore, his contention that the present petitioner could not have been added as a party in view of the specific bar under the provisions of the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code. He, therefore, submits that both the Courts below have not taken into consideration this aspect resulting in the orders impugned in the petition being passed.

7. Per contra, learned counsel for the respondent No.1 submits that even the said Regulation mentioned supra states that a notice of approval of the resolution plan has to be published at such other places where it is reasonably believed that corporate debtors or persons having claims would be residing.

8. Upon perusal of the order of the Labour Court more particularly in paragraph 12 thereof, it has been categorically

observed that the petitioner has not provided any clarity as to whether the employees of the erstwhile company located in Maharashtra were duly informed regarding the initiation of Corporate Insolvency Resolution Process. The Industrial Court, which has concurred with the said order of the Labour Court has categorically held that looking to the limited jurisdiction vested in it under Section 44 of the Maharashtra Recognition of Trade Unions and Prevention of Unfair Labour Practices Act, 1971 no reason to interfere has been spelled out.

9. Two factors are against the petitioner; firstly, the fact that the complaint before the Labour Court was pending when the resolution plan was approved by the NCLT; and secondly, prima facie, the concerned employee i.e. respondent No.1, was not informed about the resolution plan. Moreover, the Labour Court and the Industrial Court have not foreclosed the right of the petitioner. The petitioner can very well take such defences in the proceedings pending before the Labour Court.

10. Reliance is placed on the judgment of this Court of Aurangabad Bench, in Writ Petition No.11862 of 2025 and other companion writ petitions. The reliance is entirely misplaced since in the said judgment reported supra, the defence was taken

regarding the embargo of the concerned employee to seek payment or other reliefs when a resolution plan is approved. That stage is yet to come. The petitioner cannot take aid of the said judgment since the facts are totally different.

11. In that view of the matter, the petition is misconceived and liable to be rejected. Hence, I pass the following order :

ORDER

- (i) The petition is rejected.
- (ii) Rule is discharged. No order as to costs.

(NANDESH DESHPANDE, J.)