

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA, CHANDIGARH
CWP No. 13185 of 2011
Date of Decision: May 5, 2015

Maruti Suzuki India Ltd.

..... Petitioner

Versus

**Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court
No.1, Gurgaon and another**

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

Present:- Mr. Harsh Aggarwal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Pankaj Jain, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

1. Whether reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment ?
2. To be referred to the reporters or not?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest?

Amit Rawal, J (Oral)

The challenge in the present writ petition is to the effect of the order dated 23.5.2011 passed by the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Gurgaon vide which an application Annexure P-4 filed on behalf of the workman for summoning the witnesses from the Management has been allowed.

Mr. Harsh Aggarwal, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that the witnesses sought to be summoned through the application particularly at S.No. iv and v is not relevant, much less vague as it does not pertain to the matter in issue.

Mr. Pankaj Jain, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the workman submits that his client is willing to give up the

record sought to be summoned against the witnesses at S.No.iv and v.

In view of the concession made by the learned counsel for the workman, the order dated 23.5.2011 is modified

It is made clear that the petitioner-Management shall produce the record at S.No. i, ii and iii through the concerned clerk.

With the aforementioned observations the writ petition stands disposed of.

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

May 5, 2015
archana