

• • • • •

• • • • •

Pg 1 of 2

vakalatnama on behalf of Respondent No.1, will have to withdraw her vakalatnama.

(iii) In the event, however, Respondent No.2 appears as a representative of Respondent No.1 by filing an authority in Form-1, he will have to withdraw his affidavit in lieu of examination-in-chief filed on behalf of Respondent No.1.

(iv) In any event, and particularly if Respondent No.2 does not choose to represent Respondent No.1 by filing an authority in Form-1, the question as to whether or not he can lead evidence on behalf of Respondent No.1 by filing an affidavit in lieu of examination-in-chief, will be considered by the Industrial Court before the affidavit of evidence is accepted on record and read as an examination-in-chief and the Petitioner herein is called upon to cross-examine him.

(v) Needless to add that in view of the directions contained in clause (iii) above, the order dated 5 December 2015 stands quashed and set aside.

(S.C. GUPTE, J.)