

**BEFORE CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM –
LABOUR COURT NO. II, NEW DELHI**

I.D. no. 116/2021

Sh. Ram Raj & 03 Ors. vs. B.H.E.L. and Ors.

Counsels:

For Claimants:

Sh. S.B. Shaily, Ld. AR.

For Management/ Respondent:

Sh. A.K. Roy, Ld. AR for management-1 (BHEL).

Order dated: 12.06.2026

This order shall dispose of an application filed by management-1 (BHEL), seeking review of the order dated 17.12.2024 passed on their application for adjudication on maintainability of claim qua BHEL.

It is prayed in the application that the following errors in the order dated 17.12.2024 may be corrected:

Firstly, it is submitted that the Cause title in the order dated 17.12.2024 be corrected, because it is mentioned '*Ramraj & 03 ors. vs. B.H.E.L.*' whereas two other contractors have also been impleaded as parties. Secondly, it is submitted that at no point of time had management-1 (BHEL) admitted that the services of the claimants had been terminated on a particular date, as opposed to what is recorded in the said order. Thirdly, in Para C of the application, it is prayed that it may be clarified that the limitation period had 'elapsed' on 30.06.2020, whereas the word 'enacted' word has been used in the order.

The above said application has been opposed by the Ld. AR for the claimants, who filed a reply thereof. It is contended that the present application is not maintainable and is liable to be dismissed, as the management by way of this application seeks review the order dated 17.12.2024, which is beyond the powers conferred upon this Tribunal. It is further submitted that only the issue of limitation was decided by this

Tribunal in the light of the judgment passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Suo Motu Writ Petition no. 03 of 2020 dated 10.01.2022*, whereby the period from 15.03.2020 to 28.02.2022 was excluded for the purpose of limitation.

I have heard the arguments at bar and gone through the order passed by the Tribunal on 17.12.2024. First of all, the plea of the management for review of the said order is liable to be dismissed, as the power of review doesn't exist with this Tribunal. Only clerical or typographical mistakes can be corrected.

With regard to the contention of the applicant/management-1, relating to amendment of the cause title, no further order is required. Since the claim was filed against three respondent, including BHEL, so the order shall be read referring to all three respondents impleaded in the matter. No formal correction is, therefore, necessary.

Secondly, in Para 8 of the order, this Tribunal didn't intend to record that management-1 had admitted that the services of the claimants were terminated on 01.07.2017. Rather, it was intended to imply the stand taken by the claimants that their services had been terminated on the said date.

So far so Para no. C is concerned, it is evident that the limitation period prescribed under section 2A(3) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for filing the claim as provided under had come to an end on 30.06.2020. A clerical mistake had been erupted in the order, whereby the word 'enacted' was typed instead of 'elapsed'.

In view of the above discussion, the application stands disposed of.

Dated 12.06.2026

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