

Cross-examination of respondent's witness on oath by Ld. Advocate Shri.R.K.Khandelwal for Complainants :-

12] I know that the complainant Late Kerabai Devkar was in the employment of the respondent. It is correct to say that, at the time of joining employment the respondent had not issued any appointment order. It is correct to say that, on 01-12-2002 the respondent instructed complainant not to report on duties. I know that being aggrieved with the instruction of respondent the complainant had been raised industrial dispute in which the Labour Court has passed award in favour of the complainant. However, said award was challenged before the Hon'ble High Court by filing Writ Petition No.1073/2015 and complainant was not taken in the employment. Said Writ Petition was came to be dismissed on dated 02-09-2015. I cannot tell whether respondent has deposited or not an amount of Rs.21,840/- before the Hon'ble High Court and said amount was withdrawn by complainant. I do not know about any interim order passed by Hon'ble High Court. I do not know that, Review Petition was filed by respondent and same came to be rejected by Hon'ble High Court. I do not know that against the order passed by Hon'ble High Court the respondent had moved to Hon'ble Supreme Court in SLP. It is correct to say that, on 07-01-2017 the respondent has given public advertisement for the employees to join their duties. It is correct to say that, since 2014 to 2017 the respondent has not paid wages to the complainant. It is not correct to say that, the respondent never called to the complainant to resume her duty. It is correct to say that, the legal heirs of complainant are entitled to claim benefit.

Exh. No. C-14

Complaint ULP No. 101 of 2016

Cross-examination is over.
No Re-examination.

R.O.A.C.

Witness is discharged.

Before me

Place: Aurangabad

Date:- 10/08/2026

(S. D. SURYAWANSHI)
Member,
Industrial Court, Aurangabad