

**BEFORE SHRI. SUDAM P. DESHMUKH, MEMBER, INDUSTRIAL
COURT, MAHARASHTRA, MUMBAI**

COMPLAINT (ULP) NO. 132 OF 2010

Percy P. Shroff of Mumbai, Indian
Inhabitant, **residing at:**
808, Khushum, Dr. Ambedkar Road,
Dadar, Mumbai- 400 014.

...Complainant.

V/s.

1) ACC Ltd. a Company incorporated
Under the Companies Act, 1956, and
having it registered office at:
'Cement House' Maharashi Karve Road,
Churchgate, Mumbai.

2) Mr. Sumit Banerjee, Managing Director,
'Cement House' Maharashi Karve Road,
Churchgate, Mumbai.

....Respondents.

Coram : Sudam P. Deshmukh, Member.

Appearances : Shri. P. M. Patel, Advocate for complainant.
: Shri. B. G. Goyal, Advocate for respondents.

ORDER BELOW EXH. U-1
(Passed on: 17/11/2015)

1) Today, matter is raised for disposal off by judgment on merits but Advocates of both parties claimed that matter be disposed off in accordance with terms of settlement purshis Exh. C-11. The contents of purshis admitted by both the parties. Parties have not signed it. Parties undertaken the correctness of the contents of the purshis. Thus, court may recognized this purshis for disposal of matter on merits.

2) In the complaint, complainant prayed for directions to the

respondents to consider 12 days Privillage Leave in his account but in the purshis Advocate of respondents undertaken that, 10 days Privillage leave will be considered in favour of complainant. This proposal of Advocate of respondent being accepted by Advocate of complainant, the court having no cause to defer the disposal of complaint in the terms of settlement purshis Exh. C-11.

3) There was objection of the Advocate of respondents regarding jurisdiction of the court. To that effect issue was framed. According to the Advocate of respondent since the court has framed issue on jurisdiction because of the objection of respondents, but now the case is to be disposed off by settlement these objections are not sustainable. I observed that, court may record findings in view of settlement between parties. In the result, following order:

ORDER

- 1) The Complaint (ULP) No. 132 of 2010 is allowed subject to terms of settlement purshis Exh. C-11.
- 2) No order as to costs.

Date- 17/11/2015

(Sudam P. Deshmukh)
Member
Industrial Court, Maharashtra,
Mumbai.

SSA-19/11/2015

