

.. 12 ..

**Resumed on S.A.**

**Cross-examination by Learned Advocate Shri. P. S. Shetty for the Complainant :**

19. Now, I have shown documents at page No.2, 5, 8, 12, 20, 23, 26, 27 and 38 of list Exh.C-23. Those are the applications made by concerned employees for withdrawal of their 50% provident fund contribution. It is true to say that the said employees were made an application for withdrawal of their 50% employees' contribution of provident fund. (Witness Volunteers that some employees were made an application for withdrawal of employer's contribution also).

**(Further cross-examination is deferred due to recess).**

R.O.A.C.

Place : Mumbai.

Date : 28/07/2025.

Rry/-

( Dr. Priya P. Shinde )

Judge,

7<sup>th</sup> Labour Court, Mumbai.

**Resumed After Recess.**

**Further cross-examination continued by Learned Advocate Shri. P. S. Shetty for the Complainant :**

20. Shri. Sagar Chougule and Shri. Mithilesh Singh made an application for withdrawal of 100% provident fund. Employer and employee contribution for provident fund is equal i.e. 12% each. The amount of provident fund is in the custody of the Society. It is not true to say that the Society has not paid 100% provident fund amount to Shri. Sagar Chougule and Shri. Mithilesh Singh. It is true to say that the Society has not produced any document to show that the Society has paid 100% provident fund amount to Shri. Sagar Chougule and Shri. Mithilesh Singh. (Witness Volunteers that- I can produce the

.. 13 ..

document to show that 100% provident fund amount is paid to Shri. Sagar Chougule and Shri. Mithilesh Singh. Remaining 7 employees were made an application for 50% amount of their provident fund. It is true to say that the 9 employees were assured that if they received the amount of provident fund, they will not proceed further against the Respondents. It is not true to say that the Society has told to said 9 employees that if they will not made affidavit, the Society will not paid the amount of provident fund to them. It is not true to say that as per the instructions of Society the said 9 employees were made an affidavits alongwith their application for withdrawal of the amount of provident fund. It is not true to say that the Society sent all the 9 employees to the Notary Advocate for notarizing their affidavits. It is not true to say that the Society pressurized the said 9 employees to give affidavits for withdrawal of the amount of provident fund. It is not true to say that I am deposing falsely.

**Cross-examination is completed.**

**No re-examination.**

R.O.A.C.

***Sd/-***

( Dr. Priya P. Shinde )

Judge,

7<sup>th</sup> Labour Court, Mumbai.

Place : Mumbai.

Date : 28/07/2025.

*Rry/-*