

-10-

Cross-examination of the complainant on S.A. by Advocate Shri.S. B. Mene for respondent:

23] I have gone through the appointment letter produced in the present complaint along with Exh.U-4 and my appointment order is independently marked as Exh.U-14 and U-23 and U-27 to U-28. It is correct to say that, I know the contents of said appointment orders and same are true and correct. I do not know that, the respondent is working as per M.R.T.P. Act. 1966. It is correct to say that, in the respondent company no any product is produced. It is not correct to say that, in my affidavit I deposed falsely that I have completed 240 days continuously in every year. I cannot tell that, respondent is not Industry, therefore this Court has no jurisdiction to entertain my complaint. Witness voluntarily states that, respondent is Industrial establishment. It is correct to say that the respondent has issued appointment order for every six months. It is not correct to say that, my appointment is temporary therefore I am not entitled to get permanent post, permanency and other consequential benefits with the respondents.

Cross Examination over.

No Re-examination.

R.O.A.C.

Witness is discharged.

Before me

Place: Aurangabad

sd/-

Date:-03-12-2025

(S. D. SURYAWANSHI)

kad/-

Member,

Industrial Court, Aurangabad