

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

**ID No.299/2023**

Shri Pravin Kumar & 2 ors. Through President, All India CPWD Karamchari Union, Babu Lal Complex, Shop No.4, Opp. Bus Stand, Gurugram.

...Claimant

Versus

1. The Director General, CPWD, Nirman Bhawan, New Delhi.
2. The Executive Engineer, CPWD, Electrical Division-81, CGO Complex, Lodhi, Delhi-110003.
3. M/s Parmar Electrical, A-112, (New A-162) Padhan Enclave (Behind Bramchari Market), Burari, New Delhi-110084.

...Management

**AWARD**

1. In the present case, a reference was received from the appropriate Government vide letter No-ND-25/I-78/2023-IR dated 01.12.2023 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 contract workmen Pravin Kumar & 2 ors (details mentioned in Annexure-1) through All India CPWD Karamchari Union, for regularization of their services in the establishment of CPWD, is legal and/or justified? And if so, then what relief the workmen concerned are 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: 12.12.2025

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