

**BEFORE SMT. A. C. RAUT, MEMBER,**  
**INDUSTRIAL COURT, MAHARASHTRA MUMBAI**



**COMPLAINT (ULP) No. 238 of 2025**  
**(CNR No. MH1C01-000535-2025)**

Ms. Reena Pravinchandra Doshi, ... **Complainant.**

**Versus**

M/s. Good Value Financial Services  
Pvt. Ltd. & Ors. ... **Respondents.**

**:- Order Below Exh. CA-6 :-**  
**( Delivered on 01.11.2025 )**

1. This application is filed by the Respondent No. 2, praying for stay to the operation and implementation of the order dated 23.09.2025 for a period of four weeks.

2. The complainant has filed her say and strongly objected the said application. It is submitted that the complainant has worked for the entire month, however respondents have failed to pay her salary till date without giving any reason. Further, the respondents failed to comply the order of this Court, although complainant is discharging her duties continuously. No reason given by the respondent no. 2 for seeking stay of the order dated

23.09.2025 passed by this Court. Hence, it is prayed that application be rejected.

3. The respondent no. 3 filed his say and submitted that the complainant has worked for entire month and is entitled for her wages. Hence, it is prayed that the present application be rejected.

4. In view of the rival submissions of the parties, the following points arise for determination. My findings thereon are recorded below, for the reasons stated hereinafter -

**POINTS**

**FINDINGS**

- |  |    |                     |
|--|----|---------------------|
| 1. Whether the Respondent No. 2 has made out a case for grant of stay to the order dated 23.09.2025 passed by this Court, below Exh. U-2 ? | :- | In the Negative.    |
| 2. What Order ?  | :- | As per Final Order. |

**:- R E A S O N S :-**

5. **As to Points No. 1 and 2** :- Heard both the sides. The Ld. Advocate for the respondent no. 2 submitted that at the time of filing of the reply to interim relief application, he could not place before the Court detailed facts and therefore, now he is

intending to file the review application. Therefore, he prayed for two weeks time stay to the order dated 23.09.2025 passed on Exh. U-2.

6. I have gone through the record. The order on Exh. U-2 was passed on 23.09.2025. The present application is filed on 07.10.2025, wherein nothing mention about intention to file any review application. The only ground taken was that Respondent No. 2 was taking steps to obtain a certified copy, and a four-week stay was prayed for. The said period has already elapsed. In my opinion, sufficient time was already availed by the respondent no. 2, if he intents to challenge the order or file any review application. It appears that the application is filed mere to delay the proceedings. Therefore I do not find any substance in the present application. Hence, following order -

**O R D E R**

The Application is rejected.

Place :- Mumbai

(Smt. A. C. Raut),  
Member,

Date :- 01.11.2025.

Industrial Court, Mumbai

SPC/-