

**BEFORE SHRI. S.D. SURYAWANSHI, MEMBER**  
**IN THE INDUSTRIAL COURT, MAHARASHTRA AT MUMBAI**  
**COMPLAINT (ULP) NO. 96 OF 2020**  
**CNR NO.MHIC01-000273-2020**

KRANTIKARI KAMGAR UNION ... **COMPLAINANT**

... **V/s** ...

MAHANAGAR MEDIA NETWORKS  
PVT. LTD. ... **RESPONDENT**

**:- AD-INTERIM ORDER BELOW EXH.U-2 :-**  
(Passed on 06.08.2020)

1) Today heard Ld. Advocate Shri. Arvind Tapole for Complainant and Ld. Advocate Shri. Manoj Gujar for Respondents through video conference. Ld. Advocate for the Complainant submitted that, as per his information Respondent's unit is functioning as on date also and carrying out activities of newspaper publication. But today the complainant is unable to produce supportive documents and hence requested to grant some time.

2) Ld. Advocate for Respondent submitted that, in pursuance of closure notice, Respondent has paid part amount towards legal dues to the concerned employees through their bank account. Since effecting closure, services of the concerned employees are retrenched or terminated. Further, it is

submitted that as on date there is no newspaper printing but Respondent continuing digital activities and for that purpose, Respondent is engaging 10 to 12 employees. Ld. Advocate Shri. Gujar also submitted that since services of the concerned employees are terminated due to closure, therefore ad-interim order passed on dated 17.07.2020 causing grate hardship to the Respondent. Therefore, ad-interim order granted on 17.07.2020 be vacated.

3) After hearing both the Ld. Advocates, it is observed that admittedly, closure notice was published, but after filing present complaint Respondent has paid part amount to the concerned employee. If perused closure notice, therein clearly mentioned that unit is going to be closed irrevocably. Then question arise how the Respondent is functioning its digital activities and how the Respondent engaging 10 to 12 employees. The entire subject matter is required to be heard on its own merits. Hence, to protect interest of the employees and avoid further litigation, this Court is of view that ad-interim order passed on 17.07.2020 is required to be modified. Therefore, this Court proceed to modify and pass the order as under :-

- : ORDER : -

1. Respondent No. 1 to 3 are hereby directed to maintain status quo about service conditions of 57 employees whose names are given in Annexure 'A' and shall not effect any changes in their service conditions till next date.
2. Operative Order (ii) passed on 17.07.2020 i.e. "*The Respondent No.1 to 3 are hereby directed to temporarily allow the concerned 57 employees to resume their duties following Maharashtra Government Notification issued from time to time during the period of lock-down*" kept in abeyance till next date.
3. With the consent of both the parties matter is fixed on 21.08.2020

Place :- Mumbai

Sd/-

Date :- 06.08.2020

(SANJAY D. SURYAWANSHI)  
Member,  
Industrial Court, Mumbai