

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

ID.NO. 104/2020

Sh. Mukesh Kumar,
Nayi Basti , Block-3, Indira Colony,
Chakhuwala, Dehradun-248014.

.....Workman

Versus

1.The Chief Regional Manager,
National Insurance Co. Ltd.,
56 Rajput Road, Jai Plaza, Dehradun-248001.

2.Rajendra & Savitri Security Services,
Head Office-17 , New Road, Near Union Bank,
Dehradun-248001.

.....Managements.

AWARD

In the present case, a reference was received from the appropriate Government vide reference no. D-844/RD/2020/05/IRDDN, Dehradun dated 27.02.2020 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 act of terminating the service of Sh. Mukesh Kumar, engaged by M/s Rajendra & Savitri Security Services (Regd.) Dehradun in the Estb. of M/s National Insurance Co. Ltd. Dehradun for performing multi tasking service is legal, fair and justified?

Whether the workman is entitled for reinstatement / regularization of his service in the said Estb. as usual? If not, what relief / remedies, the concerned workman is entitled to ?”

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 opted not to file the claim statement.

3. On receipt of the above reference, notice was sent to the workman as well as the managements. 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 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.

15th March, 2023

Presiding Officer
CGIT-cum Labour Court II,
Rouse Avenue,
Delhi-110002.