CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL - Cum - LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR (M.P.)

Date of Order	Order Or Proceeding with Signature of Presiding Officer	Remark
of Proceeding		

### Case No. CGIT/LC/R/55/2015 Shri Rajesh Bharatlal Nayak V/S MOIL.

-	Silli Kajesii Dilatatiai Nayak V/S MOIL.	
07.03.2025	Order on preliminary issue. The preliminary issue, framed vide order dated 23.02.2024 is as follows :- Whether the departmental enquiry conducted against the workman is just proper or legal ? Case of the Workman on this issue is that, he was appointed on 06.11.1996 on compassionate ground, he was transferred from Mansor Mines were he was working to Bharveli Mines vide order of Management dated 02.12.1999 and was relieved on 08.12.1999 with a direction to report on at the place of his transfer. He could not report on place of his transfer because he met an accident while shifting his family and received serious injuries. He informed the Management about the accident and requested them to extend time for reporting at the place of transfer. He was issued a charge-sheet on 14.09.2005 alleging him misconduct by way of unauthorized leave and willfully absenting himself from work without any information to management or getting any leave sanctioned. According to him, he submitted reply of the charge sheet. Management, issued a second charge sheet with	
	himself from work without any information to management or getting any leave sanctioned. According to him, he submitted reply of the charge	
	same allegations on 18.06.2013 and conducted enquiry within one year without following principles of natural justice and rules. No opportunity of cross-examination of witness was given to the Workman.	
	<b>Case of the Management</b> on this issue is mainly that, they have panel of doctors, qualified enough to treat the	

#### CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL – Cum – LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR (M.P.)

Date of Order	8 8 8	Remark
of Proceeding	sick employees of management, the Workman never	
	reported sick nor did he informed management about	
	his sickness and he did not submit any application for leave with medical certificates. He kept himself	
	absenting for 5 years. He was issued a charge sheet on	
	14.09.2005, he submitted reply to the charge sheet on	
	26.09.2005. Thereafter, he again absented himself from	
	duty without information for another 7 years. And	
	reported at workplace thereafter. He was issued a	
	second charge sheet with regard to his unauthorized	
	absence from 09.12.1999 to 11.12.2012 on date	
	18.06.2013.	
	Charges against him were as follows: -	
	second charge sheet with regard to his unauthorized absence from 09.12.1999 to 11.12.2012 on date 18.06.2013. Charges against him were as follows: - <b>Clause 29(A)(10)</b> :	
	Leaving work without permission.	
	Leaving work without permission. Clause 29(B)(5) :	
	Habitual late attendance and habitual absence without	-
	leave or without sufficient cause.	
	Inditial faile attendance and nabitual absence without leave or without sufficient cause. Clause 29(B)(9) : * ABALPUR Habitual indiscipline.	
	Habitual indiscipline.	
	Clause 29(B)(15) :	
	Continuous absence without permission or without satisfactory reason for more than 10 days.	-
	He submitted his reply on 09.07.2013, considering his	5
	reply not sufficient, Management decided to conduct a	
	departmental enquiry in which the Workman participated.	L
	Evidence of the management was taken on that date	
	which was mainly documents. The Workman cross-	
	J	

### CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL – Cum – LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR (M.P.)

Date of Order of Proceeding	8 8	Remark
orroccomg	examined himself in the enquiry. The Enquiry Officer	
	submitted his report on 18.09.2013 holding the charges	
	proved. The Workman submitted reply of the show-	
	cause notice issued to him and enquiry report on	
	26.11.2013 which was found unsatisfactory and order of	
	dismissal of his services was passed by Disciplinary	
	Authority on 09.04.2013. Thus according to	
	management there is no illegality or material	
	irregularity of any kind in the enquiry.	
	Management has filed and proved enquiry documents.	
	They have filed affidavit of its witness as his	
	examination-in-chief. He has been cross-examined by	
	Workman side.	
	The Workman filed his affidavit as his examination-in-	
	chief he has been cross-examined by management.	
	I have heard arguments of Learned Counsel Mr. Uttam	
	Maheswari for Workman and Learned Senior Counsel	
	Mr. Anoop Nair for Management on preliminary issue	
	and have gone through the record.	
	From the evidence on record, documents showed that	:
	show-cause notices were issued from time to time	
	before instituting enquiry and with a copy of Enquiry	
	Report before issuing order of punishment.	
	From perusal of enquiry papers, it comes out that, no	,
	were the request of the Workman to cross-examine any	
	witness was refused. He participated in the enquiry and	
	produced his defence. Hence, holding that there is no	
	illegality or material irregularity with respect to	
	substance or procedure in conducting the enquiry, the	
	departmental enquiry is held just legal and proper.	
	Preliminary issue is answered accordingly.	

#### CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL – Cum – LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR (M.P.)

Date of Order		
of Proceeding	Order Or Proceeding with Signature of Presiding Officer	Remark
of Proceeding F   1 1	Following additional issues are framed : 1. Whether the charges have been rightly held proved from evidence in enquiry. 2. Whether punishment is proportionate to the charges? 3. Whether the Workman is entitled to any relief? Parties are directed to file their evidences in form of affidavits/documents on additional issues till or before date fixed. List on 08.05 2025 for hearing on additional issues. Upload this order Hearing or additional issues. Description of the second sec	