



BEFORE THE JUDGE, LABOUR COURT No. 1 AURANGABAD
(D. S. Khedekar, Judge, Labour Court No. 1)

Comp. ULP No. 10/2026
(CNR: MHLC20000044-2026)

Sau. Rekha Sahebrao Jethe (Samindre),

Age : 49 years, Occ : S. T. Conductor,

Batch No. 48089, R/o : Mauli Nagar,

Mhasoba Galli, Sillod, At Post : Sillod,

Taluka : Sillod, District :

Chhatrapati Sambhajanagar

...Complainant

Versus

1] **Maharashtra State Road Transport
Corporation, Through its Divisional Controller,**
S. T. Divisional Office, Chhatrapati Sambhajanagar

2] **Divisional Traffic Superintendent,**
(D.T.S. Default) (Competent Authority)
Maharashtra State Road Transport Corporation,
S. T. Divisional Office,
Chhatrapati Sambhajanagar

... Respondents

Advocate: Shri P. P. Shahane, Advocate for complainant

Smt. Sunita Kadam, Advocate for Respondents

ORDER ON INTERIM RELIEF APPLICATION (EXH.U-2)

(Delivered on : 10/02/2026)

This application is filed for interim relief under Section 30(2) of the MRTU & PULP Act, 1971 against the respondents.

2] **The brief facts of complainant's case is as under that :**

The complainant has challenged the show cause notice of dismissal issued by respondent on 03/02/2026 on the perverse findings on respondent No. 2 and complainant alleged that respondent has committed unfair labour practice and issued show cause notice of dismissal. The complainant had joined services of respondent No. 1 on 01/03/2004 on regular time scale and become permanent. The complainant was presently working as conductor in Sillod Depot of respondent and rendered graceful and satisfactory work.

3] It is contended that the complainant was performing duty as conductor on Sillod to Pune route on 03/10/2025 and she had issued proper tickets to all passengers traveling in the bus, however the machine had developed some technical fault, therefore tickets were not properly printed and therefore complainant had informed the said fact to the Shirur depot for rectify the fault. However, there was no response from the depot and inspection report in the machine was showing proper sale of tickets. It is contended that the bus had reached at Koregaon and checkers had entered in bus and snatched the ticket machine from the complainant. The checkers have used rough and filthy language against the complainant and despite explaining fault of ticket

machine the checkers have not heard to the complainant and themselves have taken print out of inspection report from the machine.

4] It is contended that the complainant had issued proper tickets to all the passengers traveling in the bus, however false report was made by the checkers while running of the bus and on the basis of statement recorded behind back of the complainant and not on the spot. The complainant is implicated into false complaint under indulging victimization being lady conductor. The complainant contended that driver of the bus had pressurized to make statement by the checkers, however he had refused and by alleging misconduct on false report made by the checkers, the charge sheet was issued to the complainant on 22/10/2025 by respondent No. 2.

5] It is contended that the charge-sheet was received from respondent No. 2 on dated 08/10/2025 under Clause 7(a), 7(c), 7(j), 7(h), 10, 11 and 28 of Schedule A of the Disciplinary and Appeal Procedure, wherein it was alleged that the complainant was performing duty as conductor on 03/10/2025 at Sillod to Pune route by bus and when it was checked between Koregaon Bhima to Pune the complainant was found collected of Rs. 212/- from passengers traveling from Tarakpur to Pune and one lady passenger from Tarakpur to Pune of Rs. 107/- of concessional fare under Mahila Sanman Yojna, however failed to issue tickets despite collecting the amount at the time of boarding of bus and did not cooperated to the checkers while checking bus and therefore

committed misconduct of collecting bus fare and not issue tickets. The complainant contended that there was no charge of misappropriation under Clause No. 12(b) of Schedule of A of the D. & A procedure and no dishonesty is leveled against the complainant.

6] It is contended that the complainant had replied to charge-sheet on 22/10/2025 and denied the charges leveled against her. The complainant explained that the ticket machine had developed fault and it was not printing proper tickets. The complainant had verified sale from the report of machine and it has shown proper sale of ticket against the amount deposited. The checkers had used arrogant and filthy language against her and snatched the ticket machine from her and pressurized the driver for making statement against their wish and whims. The statement of complainant is that the checkers have recorded the statement of passengers traveling in the bus without her presence.

7] It is contended by complainant that she had issued proper tickets by collecting fare of the amount and not committed any misconduct. The complainant is victimized being lady by using filthy language and therefore challenged the inquiry of the misconduct alleged against her by claiming that inquiry is conducted by violating the rules of natural justice and the findings drawn by the Inquiry Officer are perverse and issued by violation of principle of natural justice. There is no proof of alleged misconduct, hence, the findings are perverse and the notice of dismissal issued by respondent is illegal and respondent has issued notice under the

unfair labour practice and therefore, complainant has claimed interim relief in terms of prayer Clause 7 (a to d) of the application.

8] The respondent has filed reply at **Exhibit C-3** and denied the contentions of the complainant. The respondent contended that application for interim relief is false, baseless, misleading and not tenable. The complainant has suppressed material fact and does not come with clean hands, therefore, application is liable to be rejected. There is no prima face case, balance of convenience and no possibility of loss to the complainant if interim relief is not granted in her favour. The respondent contended that complainant was revenue collector as well as holding post of conductor and show cause notice of dismissal was issued for fraud and dishonest misappropriation of S. T. revenue and second time show cause notice was issued for the fraud and misappropriation for similar conduct, therefore, complainant has no case for issuing interim relief being premature and application is not tenable and liable to be rejected.

9] The respondent contended that from 03/10/2025 complainant was performing duty at Sillod to Pune by bus No. MH-14 MH 0549 as conductor and the bus came to be checked between Koregaon Bhima to Pune in which Checking Squad found following serious misconduct committed by the complainant. There were total 43 passengers traveling at the time of checking and I) One passenger was traveling from Tarakpur to Pune and complainant collected 212/- towards fare at boarding point but he did not issued tickets till checking point and thereby misappropriated Rs 212/-.

ii) Again One female passenger was traveling from Tarakpur to Pune and complainant collected Rs 107/- towards the Mahila Saman Yojna Fare and did not issued valid ticket but issued Inspection report to the said passenger.

iii) The complainant did not co-operate in checking work and created obstacle and provoked the passenger against the checking squad due to which the image of corporation was maligned.

iv) The complainant had hide her serious misconduct and refused to give spot statement and behaved in rude manner with the checking squad.

v) As the complainant refused to give spot statement therefore the checking squad has recorded the spot statement of security guard in which the complainant refused to give spot statement as well as refused to sign on the relevant statement which were recorded by the checking squad.

vi) The S. T. Cash was checked as per ticket sale and un punched tickets of Rs 212+107 (Rs 319) of two without ticket it was found less by 445/-.

10] It is contended by the respondent that there was serious and grave misconduct by the complainant and therefore charge sheet was served on dated 08/10/2025 for the clauses as mentioned in the Charge Sheet and she was supplied all the relevant documents. The complainant replied to the said charge sheet on

23/10/2025 and taken all false, bogus after thought defense. Thereafter the complainant was called for departmental enquiry 30/12/2025 however the complainant submitted adjournment application therefore the departmental enquiry came to be adjourned and it was fixed on 06/01/2026 and 09/01/2026. The complainant was present through her union representative Shri V. L. Mangrulkar in which the evidence of the reporter was recorded accordingly complainant has taken detailed. cross examination of the reporter through her Union representative.

11] It is contended that the complainant was granted each and every opportunity to plead and defend herself in the departmental enquiry through Union representative. The competent authority has drawn findings and while drawing the findings the competent authority came to the conclusion that the complainant is liable for the punishment of dismissal as charges leveled against the complainant are proved beyond doubt on the basis of oral and documentary evidence came before him, therefore the competent authority has issued dismissal show-cause notice dated 03/02/2026 to the complainant The complainant was asked to reply the same, but the complainant did not reply to the said dismissal show cause notice and has approached before this Hon'ble Court and filed the complaint along with interim relief application.

12] It is contended that the complainant was earlier first time served with dismissal show cause notice dtd 24.08.2009 for the serious misconduct of misappropriation of ST Revenue and against the said dismissal show cause notice she has filed Complaint

ULP No. 113/2009 along with interim relief application. This Hon'ble Court was please to grant status quo in the matter but after hearing both the sides has rejected interim relief application therefore she filed Revision ULP No. 26/2010 before the Hon'ble Industrial Court. Hon'ble Industrial Court was please to allow the said revision and remanded the matter to this Hon'ble Court with directions to decide the matter within stipulated period. The Order passed in Revision ULP No. 26/2010 was challenged by respondent before the Hon'ble High Court Bombay Bench at Aurangabad by filing Writ Petition No. 9452/2010.

13] It is contended that the Writ Petition filed by the respondent was allowed and the order passed by the Hon'ble Industrial Court was set aside and directed the complainant to submit reply to show cause notice of dismissal. The complainant submitted reply to the said show cause notice and thereafter the complainant came to be dismissed w.e.f. 23.12.2010. The said dismissal was challenged by filing Complaint ULP No. 60/2010 before this Hon'ble Court. It is contended that the Central Office Mumbai has issued Circular No. 25/2016 Kutumb Suraksha Yojna in which it was decided to appoint Conductors those who are dismissed and their matter is pending before the Hon'ble Court. In the said Circular Specific terms and condition were mentioned if the dismissed conductor accept or agree with the said terms and conditions conductor may apply and request for compromise as per Circular No. 25/2016.

14] It is contended that accordingly the complainant has submitted application on 10.08.2016 with request to consider her compromise proposal since she agreed and accepted the terms and conditions of the said circular. In the said circular it was specifically mentioned that the conductor after compromise and herein after will not commit any serious misconduct of misappropriation fraud or dishonesty and if the conductor commits such misconduct then he/she would be liable for dismissal for which she will be fully responsible.

15] It is contended that the complaint ULP No. 60/2010 was pending before this Hon'ble Court and said compromise proposal was filed before this Hon'ble Court and the matter was disposed off on 17.10.2016. The complainant was out of service and she was having sufficient knowledge of legal litigation however she has not taken any lesson from the same and again committed the above said serious misconduct which shows that she has totally neglected the opportunity granted by the respondent corporation as well as breached the terms conditions of circular and hence she is not entitle for any relief. The complainant has become habitual and interim relief is liable to be rejected.

16] On the basis of the contentions of both the parties, following points arise for determination of application. I have recorded my findings against each of them for the reasons given below :-

Sr No	Points	Findings
1	Whether the complainant proves that there is a prima facie case in her favour ?	Affirmative
2	Whether the complainant proves that balance of convenience lies in her favour ?	Affirmative
3	Whether respondents will suffer irreparable loss if interim relief is granted in favour of the complainant ?	Negative
4	What order ?	As per final order.

REASONS

17] The complainant has relied upon documents at **Exh. U-4** i.e. Original copy of the show cause of dismissal, original copy of suspension order, original charge sheet, original reply to charge sheet, copy of Inquiry papers, original representation of complainant.

18] The respondent has relied upon documents at Exh. C-4 i.e. copy of letter received from Pune division, copy of report of checking squad, copy of spot statement of passenger and ticket of writer who wrote spot statement, copy of spot statement of passenger, copy of spot statement of security guard, copy of spot statement of driver, copy of inspection report issued by complainant, copy of tickets and ticket report, copy of cash checking report, copy of inspection report before checking and after checking, copy of letter of depot manager and complainant complaint, copy of charge sheet, copy of suspension order of complainant, copy of letter of DM

sillod, copy of Lr. DM Sillod, copy of inquiry letter, copy of inquiry proceeding, copy of defence statement of the complainant, copy of findings of competent authority, copy of dismissal show cause notice, copy of application of complainant to compromise, copy of application submitted by complainant, copy of affidavit submitted by the complainant, copy of appointment order, copy of default card.

19] I have heard learned Advocate for complainant and respondents.

20] I have gone through the contentions of both the parties and documents filed on record. I have given thoughtful consideration to the contentions of the both parties and proceeded to discuss the points arises for consideration mentioned herein above.

AS TO POINT NOS. 1 TO 3 :-

21] The complainant has challenged the order of show cause notice of dismissal issued on 03/02/2026 received on 03/02/2026 at 4.25 pm along with perverse finding of respondent No. 2 and claimed that the respondent has committed unfair labour practice by issuing show cause notice of dismissal. Whereas the respondent has come with case that the complainant was found committing misconduct by not issuing tickets to the passenger traveling in the bus from Tarakpur to Pune despite collecting amount of Rs. 212/- and one ticket was not issued to the female passenger who was traveling from Tarakpur to Pune despite collecting amount of Rs. 107/- towards Mahila Sanman Yojna fare.

22] It is alleged that on inspection it was found that the complainant did not issued valid ticket and the passenger had found without ticket and therefore, the inquiry was held by issuing charge-sheet to the complainant on specific charge-sheet dated 08/10/2025 and inquiry was held by following principles of natural justice. The respondent has alleged that complainant was performing duty as conductor and being revenue collector the record of complainant is bad and prior in time show cause notice of dismissal was issued and misappropriation was served and again the complainant was found commission of misconduct of misappropriation, therefore, considering serious misconduct of fraud and misappropriation second show cause notice of dismissal was issued.

23] Having considered the statement of complainant and respondent it is material to state that the person who is seeking relief of temporary injunction has to establish three essential conditions such as prima facie case, balance of convenience and question of hardship in his favour and therefore, on this aspect consideration of case of complainant is necessary. Undisputedly the complainant was conductor at the time of inspection of the bus by the checkers on 03/10/2025 and her schedule of performing duty was from Sillod to Pune by bus MH-14 MH 0549 and in between Koregaon Bhima to Pune the squad had checked the bus and while checking the bus, the passenger had found without ticket by the squad and therefore the allegations of misconduct is leveled against the complainant.

24] On the contrary complainant has claimed that she had issued tickets to all passengers and false report is prepared against her in the running bus. The checkers have recorded statement of passenger behind the back of complainant and not on the spot. Therefore, the statement of complainant as regards recording of statement of passenger and the false implication under the victimization requires consideration. The complainant had replied to the charge-sheet and the copy of reply is filed on record at Exhibit U-4 page No. 23 on 22/10/2025. Wherein the complainant has alleged that the machine was developed fault and not printing proper tickets and therefore, she had verified the sale of tickets from the report of machine which shows proper sale of tickets against the amount deposited.

25] It appears that the fact of developing fault in machine was explained by her to the checker, however despite that the checkers had used arrogant and filthy language against her and the snatched ticket machine, therefore the consideration of statement of complainant as regards issuing tickets to the all passenger and the particular issuance of ticket whereof misconduct is alleged against the complainant is necessary. The complainant has alleged that she had issued tickets all passenger and tickets were properly issued out of them one senior citizen had sit from Tarakpur to Pune and sought ticket of Rs. 212/- and accordingly she had issued ticket bearing No. 89660, however the print of the ticket was not properly showing number of ticket due to the fault, however the amount was shown to the ticket.

26] It is alleged by the complainant that the another two lady passengers sit from Tarakpur to Pune had sought ticket and accordingly she had issued ticket bearing No. 89661 of Rs. 107/- and the amount was showing the correct figure and despite that the said lady passenger had sought proper ticket showing correct description of the amount and number. Therefore, the complainant had issued paper containing number of ticket bearing No. 89661 and is has shown result of 41 passengers and on those inspection the checkers had found that the tickets are not issued to the passengers. The complainant had informed the fact as regards machine is not correctly showing prints and made report, however the checkers have found the ticket bearing No. 89661 issued by handwritten number and despite informed to check the machine as per the issuance of ticket of report, the particular inspector had used filthy language and threatened for dismissal of the complainant.

27] In view of statement of complainant and issuance of ticket entry as per the inspection report to the passenger bearing ticket No. 89660 and 89661, prima facie shows from the inspection report that prior to the allegations and the copy of inspection report at page No. 68 bearing reference of issuing tickets for 41 passengers and last ticket was issued at 12.32.10. The number of 41 tickets which are claimed to be issue by the complainant and it contains tickets of the passenger bearing No. 89660 and 89661 and issuance of these tickets is reflected in the ticket machine. In order to find out correct situation and consideration of statement of complainant, I had taken original file of report for verification of real tickets and the inspection report original produced before the Court having

same reference of 41 full tickets issued prior to the alleged red and as per inspection report the passengers had issued ticket 89660 and 89661 by the complainant.

28] The original tickets by virtue of original file if perused, it appears that the said tickets does not bear the number as well as the amount and from close visualization one cannot understand the number of the ticket and the payment made against the said ticket, therefore, prima facie the aspect of fault of machine required to be taken into account to find out whether it machine carried by complainant was really faulty or whether the passengers had been issued tickets or not whether the tickets when found to be correctly issued as per entry of inspection report then how the passengers had denied the issuance of tickets.

29] The respondent had on the basis of statement of passengers recorded at the time of inspection and on the basis of statement of one passengers Raosaheb has stated that he had not been issued tickets by the complainant and another passenger namely Ashwini Lotke also claiming that the complainant did not issued her ticket despite receiving amount of ticket and the passenger had been shown inspection report issued by the complainant. It means the inspection report was shown to the passengers by the complainant due to the fault of machine and the inspection report drawn by the checker prima facie shows the issuance of ticket bearing No. 89660 and 89661, however the checkers have issued tickets to the passengers bearing No. 89695 and 89696 from the E.T.I. Machine and it was not bearing reference

of ticket number and the signature of the complainant was taken thereon.

30] This tickets bearing No. 89695 and 89696 were taken by the checker as proof of misconduct against the complainant, however, the machine report at the time of inspection prima facie bears the reference of issuance of ticket to the passengers therefore, the question as regards the actually issuance of ticket and allegations of passengers as regards they did not received tickets despite payment of fare has to be proved through the statement of these passengers. The another aspect as regards the mode of conducting inquiry is required to be taken in to account and it appears that the respondents have conducted inquiry against the complainant and the reporter had made statement as per his report bearing No. 483/2025 and he has not specifically made statement of fact constituting misconduct in the inquiry and therefore the allegation of misconduct and its prima facie proof, conduct of inquiry prima facie does not shows that the principles of natural justice are followed in its true spirit.

31] It appears that the respondent had alleged that the amount of Rs. 319/- is misappropriated and loss of said amount is caused to the respondents, however in the cross-examination before inquiry officer it is admitted by the witness of respondent/ reporter that the cash was less of Rs. 445/-. If there would have been misappropriation of Rs. 319/- then as to how the cash was found less and the question as regards the misappropriation of funds requires consideration and therefore on this aspect, the conclusion of

misappropriation of funds of respondent cannot be drawn. Unless the collection of amount from the passengers is established and unless the actual possessing tickets is establish contrary to the inspection report which shows issuance of tickets by the complainant, the conclusion of misappropriation of amount of respondent can not be drawn to hold that the amount was misappropriated.

32] The statement of passengers is recorded by the checkers on the running bus and it is alleged that complainant did not sign on the statement, however the consideration of statement whether recorder before complainant or independently needs to be assessed and in such circumstances the question as regards the misappropriation of funds prima facie needs to be adjudicated when the complainant has prima facie shown the issuance of tickets as per the inspection report drawn by the checkers prior in time of inspection of bus, passengers and tickets. When the tickets are issued to the passengers as per inspection report after the drawing first inspection report and if the amount is found to be less and there was no excess cash found with the complainant then, blanket accepting statement of passengers alleged to be recorded behind the back of the complainant and therefore the allegations of not issuing tickets needs to be examined and established.

33] From the inspection report of machine showing correct number of tickets and entries thereof and therefore, I am of the prima facie view that the examination of passengers was necessitated for arriving correct findings. The examination of passengers and to bring correct situation on record was necessitated

when the inspection report shows issuance of correct tickets at 12.30 pm and after inspection there seems to be 43 passengers for the reasons that two tickets are issued to the passengers who had alleged that they do not have tickets and therefore, the proof of tickets is produced which bearing No. 89695 and 89696.

34] In view of allegations of the respondents, if prima facie there would have been any misappropriation of fund the inspection report or checkers would have found excess amount with the complainant, however, the respondent did not take pain to examine passengers to find correct position contrary to inspection report. It is always argued that the examination of passengers is not necessary, however when there is contrary situation through the documents, then examination of passengers is material to through light on the uncertain aspect. The Ld. Advocate for complainant submitted that the inquiry was conducted contrary to the principles of natural justice and only the reporter is examined. There is no direct evidence about misappropriation of fund and therefore, the inquiry report is without bearing findings and proof on the misconduct and consideration of past record without the charge sheet is perverse.

35] On the other hand Ld. Advocate for respondent submitted that the complainant was earlier found committing misappropriation and therefore on the basis of terms and conditions of circular dated 06/08/2016 bearing No. 25/2016 the complainant was appointed and by virtue of undertaking the complainant has admitted if she found misappropriated of funds then she may be dismissed from the service. The complainant was appointed under

the scheme and despite that again found in commission of misappropriation of funds, therefore, inquiry was conducted and principles of natural justice are followed. The terms and conditions of the circular binds the complainant, however there should have been finding on proof of misappropriation and following procedure as per law is necessitated.

36] In view of submission of Ld. Advocate for both parties and by perusal of report of inquiry officer prima facie it appears that the procedure of inquiry is conducted by the Inquiry Officer and the report of reporter bearing No. 483/2025 was taken as proof without making specific statement of committing misconduct by complainant and without constituting misconduct against the complainant. Through the evidence of the reporter is recorded however the leading questions are asked by the reporter which prima facie does not establish the correct and fair conducting inquiry and suffers from the lack of exercising principles of natural justice.

37] The question and answer form used by the Inquiry Officer while recording evidence and therefore prima facie shows that the leading questions are asked by suggesting answer to the witness and this would not be termed as following of procedure of inquiry to find out the misconduct in fair manner. There is no direct statement of reporter against the complainant for proving of misconduct and therefore, the consideration of report on the basis of statement of sole witness is necessary. The report of Inquiry Officer prima facie does not bear the particular reasons by which the Inquiry Officer had come to the conclusion about misconduct and proof of

misconduct. Prima facie shows that there is no findings of the Inquiry Officer on the present charge and there is reference of earlier/ past misconduct which was neither charged nor show cause notice for the past record was issued.

38] Prima facie it appears that there was no allegation of misconduct through issuing charge sheet for the past record therefore the Inquiry Officer has recorded the charges of misconduct against the complainant and no particulars thereof are referred and no findings of Inquiry Officer reveals from report to come to the conclusion as regards the misconduct of complainant. There is no conclusion of inquiry officer as regards misconduct are proved against the complainant and therefore, prima facie I am of the view that the decision of the Inquiry Officer by considering past record of the complainant is against the principles of natural justice.

39] The past record was not part of charge-sheet. There is no clear cut findings of misconduct against the complainant and sans drawing conclusion of finding of misconduct against the complainant, proposing punishment by the Inquiry Officer prima facie appears to be against the principles of natural justice. Moreover prima faice it shows that on the basis of report, there is recommendation of dismissal by the inquiry officer and therefore, the respondent has issue notice for dismissal of the complainant. The inquiry conducted by the respondent prima facie found to be against the principles of natural justice and no prima facie findings is recorded about misconduct committed by the complainant for present charge and consideration of past record without having charge sheet causing prejudice to the right of complainant.

40] On the basis of recommendation of inquiry officer without recording clear findings, the action of issuance of show cause notice by the respondent without assessment of allegations seems to be action under unfair labour practice and direct conclusion of issuing dismissal notice prima facie appears to be against the principles of natural justice. For the aforesaid reasons I am of the view that the complainant has made out prima facie case for staying the show cause notice of dismissal during the pendency of the complaint and it is necessary, until the consideration of allegations and decision of fairness of inquiry and perversity of findings of inquiry conducted against the complainant, and hence the complainant has made of prima face case for staying the show cause notice of dismissal during the consideration of bonafide questions raised in respondent conducted inquiry and finding thereof.

41] The balance of convenience is lies in favour of the complainant since the Inquiry Officer did not record any findings about the present misconduct alleged against the complainant. The consideration of past record without having charge sheet and proposing punishment of dismissal without recording clear finding of misconduct for the present charges prima facie establishes conclusion of show cause notice for dismissal into actual dismissal from service and it would result prejudice to the right of complainant. The complainant would suffered hardship than the respondent since the consideration of inquiry report and the findings of the Inquiry Officer is matter of trial by procedure. In comparatively no prejudice would be caused to the respondent if

interim relief is granted when the consideration of inquiry report and findings of Inquiry Officer is matter of examination and assessment and the examination of allegations and findings of the Inquiry Officer is necessary during the course of trial. The complainant has made out prima facie case for interim relief during the pendency of the complaint and till the decision of complaint. For the aforesaid reasons I answer point No. 1 and 2 affirmatively and point No. 3 negatively and proceed to pass following order;

<u>ORDER</u>	
1.	The application is allowed.
2.	The operation, execution and implementation of show cause notice of dismissal dated 03/02/2026 received by complainant on 03/02/2026 at 4.25 PM is stayed during the pendency and till the decision of complaint and respondents shall not dismiss the complainant and continue the complainant in service as conductor till decision of the complaint.
3.	Application is disposed of accordingly.

(Dictated and pronounced in open Court.)

Place: Aurangabad
Date: 10/02/2026

(D. S. Khedekar)
Judge,
Labour Court-1, Aurangabad