

Government of India  
Ministry of Labour & Employment,  
Central Government Industrial Tribunal –Cum- Labour Court-II, New Delhi  
Present: Smt. Pranita Mohanty

**ID.NO.114/2020**

Shri Ravish Kumar Verma,  
Through-Sh. Man Mohan Sood, Regional Secretary,  
State Bank of India Staff Association, Region –IV,  
Saharanpur, Add: House No. 1B/4181, Street No. 48,  
Near Sharda Nagar Chowk, Sharanpur, Uttar Pradesh-247001.

.....Workman

Versus

1.The Regional Manager,  
STATE BANK OF INDIA,  
Region –IV, Sharanpur, Opp. Thana Sadar,  
Saharanpur, Uttar Pradesh-247001.

.....Management

**AWARD**

In the present case, a reference was received from the appropriate Government vide letter No.L-12011/09/2020(IR(B-I) dated 11.03.2020 under clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section (2A) of Section 10 of the Act, for adjudication of a dispute, terms of which are as under:

“Whether the management of State Bank of India is justified in denying the payment of salary in lieu of recovery of excess paid sum to the workman Shri Ravish Kumar Verma, retired from armed forces and reemployed with bank? If so, is the bank management free to recover the excess amount paid to the workman as it deem fit?

2. In the reference order, the appropriate Government commanded the parties raising the dispute to file statement of claim, complete with relevant documents, list of reliance and witnesses with this Tribunal within 15 days of receipt of the reference order and to forward a copy of such statement of claim to the opposite parties involved in the dispute. Despite directions so given, Claimant union opted not to file the claim statement with the Tribunal.

3. On receipt of the above reference, notice was sent to the workman as well as the management. Neither the postal article sent to the claimant, referred above, was received back nor was it observed by the Tribunal that postal services remained unserved in the period, referred above. Therefore, every presumption lies in favour of the fact that the above notice was served upon the claimant. Despite service of the notice, claimant opted to abstain away from the proceedings. No claim statement was filed on his behalf. Thus, it is clear that the workman is not interested in adjudication of the reference on merits.

4. Since the workman has neither put in his appearance nor has he led any evidence so as to prove his cause against the management, this Tribunal is left with no choice, except to pass a 'No Dispute/Claim' award. Let this award be sent to the appropriate Government, as required under Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, for publication.

Presiding Officer  
Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum  
Labour Court No.II, Rouse Avenue Court,  
New Delhi-110002.

Date: 10<sup>th</sup> May, 2022