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

ID No.158/2023

Sh. Kumar Rajneesh, D-114, Gali No. 13, west Vinod Nagar near 30 futa road, Delhi-110092.

...Claimant

Versus

- 1. The Manager, Kotak Mahindra Bank, Hauz Qazi, Unit No. 3372-3382, Chawri Bazaar, Delhi-110006.
- 2. HR Manager, Kotak Mahindra Bank, Unit No. 829, sewa Corporate Park, 14th Floor, MG Road, Revenue State of Sarhaul Tehsil, Gurugram-122002.

...Management

AWARD

1. In the present case, a reference was received from the appropriate Government vide letter No-96(21)/ID(2A)2023-DYCLC dated 30.06.2023 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 the demand of Sh. Kumar Rajneesh, workman for reinstatement by the management of Kotak Mahindra Bank is justified, fair and legal and if yes, then what relief the workman is entitled for?"

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.

2

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. But,

no claim statement was filed on his behalf. On one occasion, attendance on behalf

of the claimant was mark and more time was sought for filing of statement.

Thereafter, neither the claimant appeared nor filed statement of claim. Thus, it is

clear that the workman is not interested in adjudication of the reference on merits.

4. In these circumstances, 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.

Date: 26.11.2025

ATUL KUMAR GARG **Presiding Officer**

CGIT – cum – Labour Court – I