

\$~25

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ CM(M) 1050/2015 & CM No.24765/2015 (*stay*)

PRADEEP KUMAR

..... Petitioner

Through

Mr.Prem Chand Ganganiya, Advocate
with petitioner in person

versus

THE CANTONMENT BOARD MEERUT

..... Respondent

Through

Mr.Shiv Prakash Pandey &
Mr.Raghav Pandey, Advocates

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAYANT NATH

ORDER

%

29.07.2016

1. By the present petition, the petitioner seeks to impugn the order dated 27.08.2015 by which the application filed by the petitioner/workman for specifying the documents which were sought to be summoned from the management was dismissed.
2. The learned counsel for the petitioner has taken me through the application filed under Section 11(3) of the Industrial Disputes Act for production of the original documents as mentioned in the application.
3. It was put to the learned counsel for the petitioner that the manner in which the application is framed, it amounts to seeking a roving enquiry as huge and voluminous documents are sought which don't appear to be relevant. The learned counsel for the petitioner fairly conceded that he only wants the documents as specified in paragraph 3 of his application filed

under Section 11(3) of the Industrial Disputes Act which are as follows:

“3(a). That the original copy of the complaint dated 10.08.1998 sent to the SHO of P.S. Sadar Bazar Meerut Cantt. Sent by Shri Harish Prashad, Superintending Officer, Meerut Cantt, Meerut, U.P. for the injuries sustained by the workman alongwith other persons at Sadar Bazar Meerut, U.P.

(b) Attendant Register of Muster Role of the Safai Karamchari for the month of January, 2005, February, 2005, March, 2005, April 2005, June 2005, September 2005, October 2005, November 2005, December 2005, January 2006, February 2006, March 2006, April 2006, May 2006, April 2007, May 2007, June 2007, July 2007 and January to March 2008.

.....

(f) That muster register for the month of August 1998.”

4. The learned counsel for the respondent points out that earlier also the order was passed by the Industrial Disputes Tribunal permitting the learned counsel for the petitioner to inspect the documents available with the respondent and pursuant to the inspection, he was given copies of the documents required by him. He also submits that in case any document is left out, the authorised representative of the petitioner may carry out necessary inspection again.

5. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that except the copy of the complaint dated 10.08.1998 which is said to have at serial No.3(a) of the application, the petitioner does not have the copies of the documents as stated at serial No.3(b) & 3(f) of the application.

6. The authorised representative of the petitioner is permitted to carry out inspection in the office of the respondent to inspect the documents as stated in para 3(b) & 3(f) of the application as noted above. The respondent

shall permit such inspection and shall give attested copy of any extract of the documents which may be sought for by the petitioner. The inspection shall be carried out by the authorised representative of the petitioner by giving an advance notice of 15 days in writing in which he will mention the date and time as to when he wants to carry out inspection. For any extracts of the documents he will request in writing to the respondent. The respondent shall on receipt of such a written request, within 15 days, provide attested copies of the extracts of the documents sought for by the petitioner.

7. In view of the above direction, the present petition is disposed of.

JAYANT NATH, J.

JULY 29, 20016/v