

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

ID No.247/2024

Shri Ravi Kumar S/o Sh. Virender Singh, Through General Secretary, Delhi Construction Workers Union, 118/2, Govind Puri, in front of Kotak Mahindra Bank, Kalkaji, New Delhi-110019.

...Claimant

Versus

1. The Executive Engineer, CPWD, U-Divison, CGO Complex, Lodhi Road, New Delhi-110003.
2. The Proprietor, M/s Pradeep Kumar, D-169, Vivek Vihar-1, Delhi-110095.

...Management

AWARD

1. In the present case, a reference was received from the appropriate Government vide letter No-ND-25/I-29/2024-IR dated 23.08.2024 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

'1. Whether the Shri Ravi Kumar S/o Shri Virender Singh is covered under the definition of workman under Section 2(s) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947?

2.If so, whether the services of Shri Ravi Kumar S/o Sh. Virender Singh, Ex-Electrical Engineer have been terminated illegally and/or unjustifiably by the management of M/s Pradeep Kumar contractor of CPWD, U Division, New Delhi w.e.f. 19.07.2022? If so, then what relief of Shri Ravi Kumar is entitled and what directions are necessary in this respect?'

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.

Date: 19.12.2025

ATUL KUMAR GARG
Presiding Officer
CGIT – cum – Labour Court – I