

**THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,**  
**JABALPUR**

**NO. CGIT/LC/R/74/2017**

**Present: P.K.Srivastava**  
**H.J.S..(Retd)**

**The General Secretary,**  
**Dainik Vetan Bhogi Bank Karamchari Sangathan,**  
**F-1, Tripti Vihar, Opp. Engg. College,**  
**Ujjain (M.P.)**

**Workman**

**Versues**

**The Regional Manager,**  
**State Bank of India,**  
**RBO, Region-IV,**  
**Guna -**

**Management**

**(AWARD)**

**(Passed on this 06<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2026)**

As per letter dated 24/05/2017 by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour, New Delhi, the reference is made to this Tribunal under Section-10 of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (in short the 'Act') as per Notification No. L-12011/30/2016 (IR(B-I)) dt. 24/05/2017. The dispute under reference relates to:

*"Whether the demand of Union claiming difference of wages in favour of Sh. Radheyshyam Rathore daily wage employee from 16.05.83 to 05.01.11 is justified or not? If so, what relief the daily wager is entitled for?"*

**Case of the Workman Union** is that, the Workman Radheyshyam Rathore was appointed as a peon on temporary basis by the then State Bank of Indore in its Sarangpur Branch on scale wage Rs. 245 with DA from the period 16.05.1983 to 23.05.1983 and 07.11.1983 to 12.11.1983. Thereafter he was appointed as daily wager on 18.08.1986 on a daily wage under oral orders of the Branch Manager and worked till 05.01.2011 when he was terminated without any notice or compensation for which he has filed another case. His claim in the case in hand is that he is entitled to the wages paid to the temporary staff of the Bank discharging the same duties of the Peon but he was paid only wages on Collector Rate, which is unjust and illegal, the Union has prayed that the Workman be paid its all wages accordingly.

**Case of the Management** is that the Workman was appointed for total period of about 2 weeks, on a leave vacancy for which he was paid scale wages. Thereafter, he worked as a daily wager for which he was paid wages on Collector Rates. It is further the case of the Management that the scale wages according to bi partite settlement are admissible to the Regularly Appointed staff and not to the daily wager.

**Both the parties** have filed their affidavits. They have cross-examined by their adversaries. They have filed some certain documents which were referred to as and when require.

**I have heard** argument of Learned Counsel Mr. Arun Patel for the Workman and Mr. Pranay Choubey for the Management Bank and have gone through the record.

**The reference itself is the issue for determination in the case in hand.**

**The main question involve** for consideration is whether the bi-partite settlement applies to the daily wager also or not. The workman side could not cite any provisions in the bi partite settlement in this respect. It also comes out from perusal of the bi partite settlement that, it is applicable to the staff who are on regular appointment may be as a permanent or a temporary workers. Hence, the claim of the Workman with respect to the period in which he has worked as a daily wager with the Bank is not admissible in law with regard to parity to the wages paid to the regular employees.

**With regard to period** he was appointed on temporary basis on leave vacancy, was for two times as mentioned in his statement of claim. The workman side itself admits that he was paid scale wage for this period.

In the light of above discussion and evidence the reference is answered as follows.

### **AWARD**

***Holding the demand of Union claiming difference of wages in favour of Sh. Radheshyam Rathore daily wage employee from 16.05.83 to 05.01.11 is unjustified and against law. The Workman is entitled to no relief.***

***No order as to cost.***

**DATE:- 06.02.2026**

**(P.K.SRIVASTAVA)  
PRESIDING OFFICER**