

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

WRIT PETITION NO. 8830 OF 2024

Naxnova Technologies Pvt. Ltd. & Anr. }*Petitioners*

: Versus :

Sudhir Chopdekar and anr. }*Respondents*

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 8843 OF 2024

Naxnova Technologies Pvt. Ltd. & Anr. }*Petitioners*

: Versus :

Nandlal Verma and anr. }*Respondents*

WITH

WRIT PETITION (ST.) NO. 11963 OF 2024

Naxnova Technologies Pvt. Ltd. & Anr. }*Petitioners*

: Versus :

Yogita Vanmali and anr . }*Respondents*

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 8830 OF 2024

Naxnova Technologies Pvt. Ltd. }*Petitioner*

: Versus :

Sudhir Chopdekar and anr. }*Respondents*

**WITH
WRIT PETITION (ST.) NO. 11197 OF 2024**

Naxnova Technologies Pvt. Ltd.& anr. }*Petitioners*

: Versus :

Mr. Santosh Tatkare and anr. }*Respondents*

**WITH
WRIT PETITION (ST.) NO. 11958 OF 2024**

Naxnova Technologies Pvt. Ltd. & Anr. }*Petitioners*

: Versus :

Shakuntala Boir and anr. }*Respondents*

Ms. Madhavi Tavanandi *with Ms. Swati Deshpande, for the Petitioners.*

Mr. Yogendra Pendse *with Ms. Priyanka Patkar, for the Respondents.*

CORAM : SANDEEP V. MARNE, J.

Dated : 22 August 2024.

P.C. :

1) Ms. Tavanandi, the learned counsel appearing for the Petitioners has submitted that for putting an end to the entire litigation, Petitioners are willing to offer to each of the Respondents/Workmen the following amounts :

SR.NO.	NAME OF THE EMPLOYEE	1 YEAR BASIC + D.A.
1.	Santosh Tatkare	Rs.5,00,000/-

2.	Sudhir Chopdekar	Rs.4,50,000/-
3.	Yogita Vanmali	Rs.3,00,000/-
4.	Shakuntala Bhoir	Rs.3,00,000/-
5.	Nandlal Verma	Rs.4,50,000/-

2) Ms. Tavanandi has submitted that the above amounts are over and above the amounts already paid to the Respondents-Workmen.

3) Mr. Pendse, the learned counsel appearing for the Respondents/Workmen, after taking instructions from his clients would submit that Workmen are not agreeable to the offer made by the Petitioners.

4) Since parties are not able to amicably settle the dispute amongst them, Ms. Tavanandi and Mr. Pendse have canvassed their submissions on merits of the petition.

5) Arguments heard. Judgment Reserved.

[SANDEEP V. MARNE, J.]