

**ULP., 71/2012**  
(CNR No.MHLC340001682012)

**Devidas Ghume**

**-vs-**

**Maya Ghume & Others**

**Order below Ex. U-90**

(Passed on this 18-02-2025)

1] This is an application filed by the complainant for issuing direction to respondent no.1 and 4 to produce the document as mentioned in the application on record. It is the contention of the complainant that in the present matter the said document is in the custody of respondent no.1 and 4. According to complainant, the said document is essential for the complainant to prove his case. Therefore, prayed to give direction to the respondent no.1 and 4 to produce the document as mentioned in the present application on record.

2] The learned counsel for the respondent no.1 has given their say on the application and strongly opposed this application. It is the contention of the respondent no.1 that the said document is not received to respondent no.1 and it is a personal document. The said document is issued to complainant and he is best custodian of the said document. Therefore, prayed to reject the application. No say filed by respondent no. 4 hence, application is decided without say of respondent no.4.

3] Perused the application. Heard the learned counsel for complainant and respondent no.1. It appears that the document mentioned in

the application is already issued to complainant by respondent no.4. and it is not the case of complainant that the said document is not received to him. Hence, as the said document is already issued to complainant therefore, no such direction can be given to respondent no.1 and 4 to produce it on record. Therefore, application deserves to be rejected. Hence, I proceed to pass the following order.

**ORDER**

- 1] Application - Exh. U-90 is hereby rejected.
- 2] parties to note the order.

Date 18-02-2025  
CHANDRAPUR.

Sd/-  
**(Smt. R.V. Mete)**  
Judge,  
Labour Court, Chandrapur