Reference No. 13/2022

Dinabandhu Adhikari Vs.

Kunustoria Colliery, ECL

PRESENT:

For the Union / Workman : Mr. Chandi Banerjee, union representative.

For the Management : Mr. P. K. Das, learned advocate.

Order dated: 10.10.2025

The case is fixed up today for further evidence of management witness. Mr. P. K. Das, learned advocate appeared for ECL. Mr. Chandi Banerjee, union representative appeared for the petitioner. Smt. Harshana Lal (MW-I) is examined in full. Documents are marked as Exhibits M-1 to M-5. Witness is cross-examined and discharged. Evidence of management witness is closed. To 24/03/2026 for hearing of argument.

Reference No. 10/2017

Thika Shramik Adhikar Union

Vs.

Uttarakhand Purv Sainik Kalyan Nigam Limited (UPNL) and ECL Headquarters, Sanctoria

PRESENT:

For the Union / Workman: Union representative.

For the Management: Mr. P. K. Das, learned advocate.

Order dated: 10.10.2025

Mr. P. K. Das, learned advocate appeared for ECL. The case is fixed up today for further cross-examination of WW-2. Mr. Ramjan Khan (WW-2) has appeared. He is cross-examined by the ld. Advocate for ECL. Witness is discharged. Union representative for the workman filed an application praying for time for further evidence of workman witness. Prayer is considered and allowed as last chance. To 28/11/2025 for further evidence of workman witness as last chance.

Reference No. 05/2025

Pankaj Kumar Nonia, S/o Late Lakshmi Nonia Mahato

Vs.

Khas Kajora Colliery, Kajora Area, ECL

PRESENT:

For the Union / Workman : Mr. Rakesh Kumar, union representative.

For the Management : Mr. P. K. Das, learned advocate.

Order dated: 10.10.2025

Mr. P. K. Das, learned advocate appeared for the Agent, Khas Kajora Colliery, ECL and filed a Vokalatnama. The case is fixed up today for appearance and filing written statement by parties. Mr. Rakesh Kumar, union representative filed an application praying for time to file written statement. A separate application is filed by Mr. Das praying for time to file written statement. Prayers are allowed. To 01/12/2025 for filing written statement by parties.

Reference No. 38/2022

Madan Bouri

Vs.

Chora Block Incline, Kenda Area of M/s. ECL

PRESENT:

For the Union / Workman : Mr. Rakesh Kumar, union representative.

For the Management : Mr. P. K. Das, learned advocate.

Order dated: 10.10.2025

Madan Bouri, the dismissed workman is represented by Mr. Rakesh Kumar, union representative. Mr. P. K. Das, learned advocate appeared for ECL. The case is fixed up today for hearing of argument. Heard argument advanced at length and in full.

Workman was dismissed for his unauthorized absence for nine months from 17/04/2008 to 05/02/2009 without providing information to the company. He participated in the enquiry where he disclosed that due to death of his son, he was mentally disturbed and was under treatment. During the period of his absence, he issued several letters to the management under certificate of post and produced receipts before the Enquiry Officer without any copy of letter. Workman was found guilty of charge. A Note Sheet was initiated by the Agent and he proposed stoppage of increment. No proof of issuance of second show cause Notice has been placed. The competent Authority finally dismissed the workman w.e.f. 24/07/2010. Union prayed for reinstatement of the workman in service. Management to the contrary prayed for dismissal of the Industrial Dispute as the workman was absent without any communication to the employer. Considered. Award is reserved.

Reference No. 04/2013

Dinesh Kurmi and 60 Others

Vs.

Khottadih Project of M/s. ECL

PRESENT:

For the Union / Workman : Mr. S. K. Pandey, Union representative.

For the Management : Mr. P. K. Das, learned advocate.

Order dated: 10.10.2025

Dinesh Kurmi and sixty other workmen are represented by Mr. S. K. Pandey, union representative. Mr. P. K. Das, learned advocate appeared for ECL. The case is fixed up today for hearing of argument. Heard argument advanced on behalf of the union in part. Dispute involved in this case is that upon deployment of sixty one Piece Rated workmen to Time Rated category, pay of employees got reduced contrary to the rules of the company. It is submitted that on 13/11/2011, without providing Notice to the workmen under section 9-A of the Industrial Disputes Act and without having consultation with the union, management converted those workmen from Piece Rated to Time Rate category by issuing office order which was given retrospective effect w.e.f. 20/10/2010 causing suffering to the workman in their reduction of pay. Upon direction of the Tribunal, management filed statement showing difference of wages in respect of workmen which were marked as Exhibit M-2 on 01/07/2024. Mr. S. K. Pandey, union representative sought for an opportunity to verify contents of the statement. Prayer is considered and allowed. The case is adjourned and fixed on 28/11/2025 for further hearing of argument.