

**THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL  
TRIBUNAL, JABALPUR**

**CGIT/LC/RC/05/2024**

**Present: P.K.Srivastava**

**H.J.S..(Retd)**

**Aman Chauhtel,  
S/o Shri Sandeep Chauhtel,  
Aged about 25 years,  
Resident- H.No.- 45, Cantonment Board Sadar,  
High Court, Jabalpur, M.P.**

**Workman**

**Versues**

- 1. Regional Manager,  
Bank of Maharashtra Right Town  
Jabalpur (M.P.)**
- 2. Branch Manager,  
Bank of Maharashtra Branch  
Narayan (645) Tilwara, Jabalpur (M.P.)**
- 3. The Chief Manager,  
Bank of Maharashtra Head Office,  
Lok Mangal-1501, Shivaji Nagar,  
Pune (Maharashtra)**

**Management**

**AWARD**

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

The workman Aman Chauhtel has filed this petition under *Section 2(A) (2&3) of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (in short the 'Act') as amended by Amendment Act of 2010*, seeking reinstatement of his services with the Management Bank with allegation that he had worked with the Bank as a Daily Wager from November, 2019 to 31<sup>st</sup> June, 2022 without interruption and was paid his wages by Bank. He was also paid bonus for the period he worked as a Sub-staff, he used to do cleaning and housekeeping in the Branch. His services were terminated by the Bank without any notice or compensation. At present the services of Cleaner are being taken through

Outsourced employees. He did appear in the recruitment process of the Bank for the recruitment of sub-staff of Cleaners and Messengers, but could not be selected.

According to the Workman, he first filed a **Writ Petition W.P. No. 3174/2022**, which was dismissed after hearing on the ground of alternate remedy. Thereafter, he raised a dispute before concerned Labour Commissioner, which could not be conciliated within 45 days of raising the dispute hence, he filed the present petition after obtaining a Certificate from the Office of concerned Labour Commissioner in this respect. According to the Applicant Workman, termination of his services is unjust, illegal and arbitrary and is in violation of Section 25F and 25G of the Act. He has prayed that he be reinstated with back wages and benefits.

**Case of the Management Bank** is that at present post of part-time sub-staff Cleaner is not in existence, vide order dated 25.11.2021, all part time sub-staff were converted into full time staff by Management. At present the services of cleaning and housekeeping are taken through outsourcing agencies. The Applicant is neither temporary nor permanent employee of the Bank hence, is not a '*workman*' as defined under Section 2(s) of the Act. He has never worked continuously for 240 days in any year as claimed by him. Hence, there is no question of termination of his services by the Bank.

In evidences, the Workman filed his affidavit has his examination in chief, but he never appeared for cross-examination. He filed photocopy documents which he also never cared to prove. Management also did not file any affidavit.

**On argument stage** none appeared for both the sides and I have gone through the record.

The initial burden to proof his continuous engagement for 240 days in a year is on Workman. He has failed to prove it because his affidavit on which no opportunity of cross examination was available to Management as the Workman did not appear for cross-examination, cannot be read in support of his application. Photocopy documents are also not proved as per law hence, they are also not read in evidence.

*In the light of above discussion, holding that the applicant workman has failed to prove his case, the petition is held liable to be dismissed.*

**ORDER**

*Petition dismissed.*

*No order as to cost.*

**DATE:- 06/07/2026**

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

