

**BEFORE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL  
TRIBUNAL – CUM – LABOUR COURT-II, NEW DELHI**

**I.D. NO. 206/2021**

**Smt. Jyoti, W/o Sh. Raj Kumar,  
R/o- House No.-540/14, Nai Basti, Kishan Ganj,  
Delhi-110007.**

**VERSUS**

**1. Director General of Taxpayer Services,  
Central Board of Indirect Taxes & Customs,  
Central Revenues (CR) Building, I.P. Estate, New Delhi-110002.**

**2. SCS Enterprises,  
1790, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor, Chuna Mandi, Paharganj,  
New Delhi-110055.**

*Appearance*

*For claimant: None*

*For respondents: None.*

**AWARD**

This is an application U/S 2A of the **Industrial Disputes Act (here in after referred as an “Act”)**. Claimant had stated in her claim statement that she was working with the management-1 through management-2 (contractor) at the post of

MTS since 15.07.2019 at the last drawn salary Rs. 16,500/- per month and she was receiving the salary of Rs. 12,900/- per month after deductions made by the management towards ESIC and provident fund. During the course of her employment, she had performed her duties with utmost dedication and without any complaints from the managements. One Sh. Yogesh, TA started to get informal with the workwomen and misbehaved with her and threatened her that if she does not accept his whimsical and illegal demands then he would get her terminated. She made a complaint against Sh. Yogesh to senior officials and before Delhi Women Commission in the year 2019. Thereafter, on 31.08.2020, her services were terminated and she was told not to come for work. She was continuous and uninterrupted employee of the management till 31.08.2020 and she was terminated from her services in sheer illegal manner. She had gone to the conciliation officer, but, it was resulted into failure. Hence, she filed the present claim.

Management-1 & 2 have appeared and filed their WS respectively. They have denied the averment made in claimant's claim. They also submitted that her claim be dismissed.

After completion of the pleadings, following issues have been framed on 08.08.2022 i.e.-

1. Whether the proceeding is maintainable.
2. Whether the claimant was an employee working under M1 and there exists employer and employee relationship between them.
3. Whether the service of the workman was illegally terminated by the management no. 1 and 2.

4. To what relief the claimant is entitled to.

Now, the matter is listed for workman evidence. Workman is not appearing since long to substantiate her claim, inspite of providing a number of opportunities

In these circumstances, when the claimant has not been appearing since long to substantiate her claim, it appears that she is not interested to pursue her case. Her claim stands dismissed. Award is passed accordingly. A copy of this award is sent to the appropriate government for notification as required under section 17 of the ID act 1947. File is consigned to record room.

Date: 27.02.2025

ATUL KUMAR GARG  
Presiding Officer.  
CGIT-cum-Labour Court-II