

**THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL
CUM LABOUR COURT DELHI - 1,
NEW DELHI.**

ID No. 213/2022

Smt. Rajrani W/o Late Sh. Daya Ram,
Rept. By General Secretary, Municipal Employees Union,
(Regd No. 793), Agarwal Bhawan,
G.T. Road, Tis Hazari-110054.

Workman...

Versus

The Commissioner,
Municipal Corporation of Delhi,
Dr. S.P. Mukherjee Civic Centre,
J.L. Nehru Marg, New Delhi-110002.

Management...

AWARD

In the present case, a reference was received from the appropriate Government vide letter No. L-42011/220/2022 (IR(DU)) dated 28.06.2022 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:

The Schedule

“Whether demand of Smt. Raj Rani W/o Late Sh. Daya Ram through Municipal Employees’ Union, Delhi vide letter dated 31.03.2021 to the Management of North Delhi Municipal Corporation (NDMC) for payment of all arrears of difference of salary on the principle of “Equal Pay for Equal Work” for the period 26.10.2000 to 25.01.2014 to deceased Shri Daya Ram through his legal heir/wife Smt. Raj Rani, is proper, legal, justified and devoid of unreasonable delay? If yes, to what relief is the disputant worker entitled and what direction, if any, is necessary in the matter?”

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 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 favor 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 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.

Justice Vikas Kunvar Srivastava
Retired Judge, Allahabad High Court
Presiding Officer

Date: 07.11.2024