

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

**ID No.280/2023**

Sh. Bachu Singh Tenguriya S/o Sh. Rajkumar Singh Tomar, 210, Aliganj, Kotla Mubarakpur, Delhi-110003 through Progressive National Labour Union, Opp. 11 DSIDC Shades, Scheme 2, Phase 2, Okhla Industrial Area, Delhi-110020.

...Claimant

Versus

1. University College of Medical Science, 2, Tahirpur Rd, GTB Enclave, Dilshad Garden, New DELhi-110095.
2. M/s Nexgen Manpower Services Pvt. Ltd., C-28, Ground Floor, Lane No.4, Mahendru Enclave, New Delhi-110033.

...Management

**AWARD**

1. In the present case, a reference was received from the appropriate Government vide letter No-ND-25/II-53/2023-IR dated 07.11.2023 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. Bachu Singh Tenguriya (Security Guard) through Progressive National Labour Union against the University College of Medical Science, New Delhi (Principal Employer) and M/s Nexgen Manpower Services Pvt. Ltd, New Delhi (Contractor) for reinstatement with full back wages is legal, just and fair? If yes, then what relief are the workman is entitled to and from when?’***

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: 12.12.2025

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