

JPP

***IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE SIDE JURISDICTION***

WRIT PETITION NO. 10459 OF 2015

Pravi Auto Swing Pvt. Ltd.

... Petitioner.

V/s.

Ashok Kisan More and Ors.

... Respondents.

Mr. K.S. Bapat i/b. Avinash Fatangare for the Petitioner.

Mr. Vaibhav Gaikwad for Respondents 1 to 13.

Ms. Prabha Badadare a/w. Omkar Nagvekar i/b. PR. Arjunwadkar
for Respondent 14.

CORAM : N.M. JAMDAR, J.

DATE : 1 FEBRUARY, 2016.

P.C. :-

By consent of parties taken up for final disposal. The Petitioner has sought transfer of the complaint filed by the Respondents in the Labour Court, Satara to any other Court. This application has been rejected by the President of the Industrial Tribunal by the impugned order dated 30 July 2015.

2. The learned Counsel for the Petitioner submitted that the transfer was sought on two grounds, one regarding certain disputes with Respondent No.14 the Advocate who was

representing the Petitioner and secondly, on the ground that some of the Respondents had threatened the representative of the Petitioner.

3. As regard the dispute with the Advocate is concerned, in view of the earlier orders passed in this Petition, it is informed by the Counsel for the Petitioner that the papers of the matter have been returned by the concerned Advocate and the Petitioner can proceed with the hearing of the complaint.

4. As regard the issue regarding the allegation of threatening by the Respondent, it is the grievance of the Petitioner that this aspect has not been considered by the President, Industrial Tribunal. The learned Counsel for the Respondent has disputed the allegation of threatening.

5. After arguing for some time, the learned Counsel for the parties agree that the complaint is pending since the year 2005 and needs to be disposed of early and the complaint can go on at the Court in Satara and both the parties will co-operate with the Labour Court for disposal of the complaint.

6. It goes without saying that during the judicial proceedings, no litigants should threaten the other party. Since the learned Counsel for the parties have assured that they will co-operate with the Labour Court for disposal of the case, it is

expected that they will do so in orderly manner. In view of these assurances, it is not necessary to go into the rival contentions regarding the disputed acts of threatening. Both parties can put these incidents, if have occurred, beyond them and proceed with the matter on the basis of the assurances recorded above.

7. No further orders are required. The Writ Petition is accordingly disposed of.

(N.M. JAMDAR, J.)