

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL -CUM- LABOUR COURT,
ASANSOL.**

PRESENT: Shri Ananda Kumar Mukherjee,
Presiding Officer,
C.G.I.T-cum-L.C., Asansol.

REFERENCE CASE NO. 08 OF 2023

PARTIES: Ashok Kumar Bahadur Nepali
Vs.
Management of Central Kajora Colliery, ECL

REPRESENTATIVES:

For the Union/Workman: Mr. Rakesh Kumar, President, Koyala Mazdoor Congress.
For the Management of ECL: Mr. P. K. Das, Advocate.

INDUSTRY: Coal

STATE: West Bengal.

Dated: 20.08.2025

(Contd. Page – 2)

A W A R D

In exercise of powers conferred under clause (d) of Sub-section (1) and Sub-section (2A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Government of India through the Ministry of Labour, vide its Order **No. L-22012/06/2023-IR(CM-II)** dated 27.01.2023 has been pleased to refer the following dispute between the employer, that is the Management of Central Kajora Colliery under Kajora Area of Eastern Coalfields Limited and their workman for adjudication by this Tribunal.

THE SCHEDULE

“ Whether the action of the management of Central Kajora Colliery, Kajora Area of M/s. E.C.Ltd. in dismissal from service to Sri Ashok Kumar Bahadur Nepali, Tyndal Zamadar (U. Man No.553656) vide order No. ECL/KA/APM/C-6/2019/10/3514 dated 07/12/2019 is proper, legal and justified? If not, what relief the workman concerned is entitled to and what directions are necessary to the management in this respect? ”

1. On receiving Order **No. L-22012/06/2023-IR(CM-II)** dated 27.01.2023 from the Government of India, Ministry of Labour, New Delhi for adjudication of the dispute, a Reference case was registered on 30.01.2023 and an order was passed for issuing notice to the parties through registered post, directing them to appear and submit their written statements along with relevant documents in support of their claims.
2. Ashok Kumar Bahadur Nepali filed written statement on 29.03.2023 through Mr. Rakesh Kumar, President, Koyala Mazdoor Congress. Management

of Eastern Coalfields Limited (hereinafter referred to as ECL) contested the claim by filing their written statement on the same date i.e., 29.03.2023. Fact of the case as disclosed in the written statement filed by the union is that Ashok Kumar Bahadur Nepali was posted as Tyndal Zamadar, bearing U.M. No. 553656 at Central Kajora Colliery under Kajora Area of ECL. He could not attend his duty from 10.06.2017 due to illness. After recovery he reported for his duty but the management of ECL did not allow him to join. The management instead issued a Charge Sheet bearing No. CKC/P&IR/C-6/2017/84 dated 10.07.2017. It is contended that the Charge Sheet and Notice of enquiry were not served upon the workman and the enquiry proceeding was held ex-parte, keeping the workman in the dark. The Enquiry Officer did not ensure service of Notice and concluded the enquiry proceeding without providing opportunity to the workman to represent his case. No second Show Cause Notice was served upon him and management dismissed him from service of the company by issuing letter No. ECL/KA/APM/C-6/2019/10/3514 dated 07.12.2019 which is illegal. Order of dismissal was not served upon the workman. Subsequently, when he learnt about the order of dismissal, he requested the management for considering his case and allow him to join. According to the workman he was absent from duty for only one month i.e., from 10.06.2017 to 10.07.2017 which was not under his control but the management imposed a disproportionate and harsh punishment of dismissal against him. It is claimed that the record of his past service was good and he was no a habitual absentee and the punishment of dismissal should not be awarded against him. The workman submitted a mercy petition before the management of ECL praying for allowing him to join duty but his appeal was not considered. Further case of the workman is that there was violation of natural justice and an extreme punishment of dismissal has been awarded. The workman has no source of income for his livelihood and also claimed that his attendance in the year 2014, 2015 and 2016 was good but in the year 2017 due to his illness he could not

attend his duty. workman prayed for allowing him to join his duty with full back wages and consequential benefits.

3. Management contested the case assailing the claim of the workman. It is admitted that Ashok Kumar Bahadur Nepali was working as Tyndal Jamadar, a permanent employee at Central Kajora Colliery. As per record of the colliery the workman unauthorizedly was absent from duty from 10.06.2017, without any leave or information to the appropriate authority. He was chargesheeted for his unauthorized absence and habitual absence under Clause 26.23 and 26.29 of the Certified Standing Orders bearing Charge Sheet No. CKC/P&IR/C-6/2017/84 dated 10.07.2017. A domestic enquiry was initiated against the workman for his dereliction. Four Notice of enquiry were sent to his home address on 17.07.2017, 05.12.2017, 10.08.2018 and 19.09.2019 but the workman neither appeared before the Enquiry Officer nor did he send any information to the appropriate authority. The enquiry proceeding was conducted ex-parte on 23.10.2019. He was given full opportunity to defend. In course of the enquiry proceeding charges levelled against the workman was proved beyond doubt and subsequently a second Show Cause Notice was issued to him bearing No. ECL/CKC/P&IR/C-6/2019/2747 dated 14.11.2019. The workman did not submit any reply to the second Show Cause Notice. The General Manager considering the findings of the Enquiry Officer dismissed the workman from service by issuing a letter bearing No. ECL/KA/APM/C-6/2019/10/3514 dated 07.12.2019. Management contended that absenteeism is a serious offence as it hampers the work of the employer and also the production process. On previous occasion the workman was given opportunity to rectify him and due to his absence, a punishment was imposed against him whereby two annual increments of the workman were stopped with cumulative effect vide letter KA/PM/C-6/17(a)/3161 dated 21.03.2005. The management inter-alia claimed that the dismissed workman submitted an application dated 18.09.2020 for his

reinstatement in service. He also submitted some documents relating to his medical treatment, purported to be issued from Central Hospital, Kalla. On receipt of his medical documents the same were forwarded to the Chief Medical Officer, Central Hospital, Kalla for verification of their genuineness. The medical documents filed by Ashok Kumar Bahadur Nepali were verified by the Chief Medical Officer (Clinical), Central Hospital, Kalla and they were found to be false and it was communication to the office of the management vide letter ECL/CHK/Verification/2020/2662 dated 08.10.2020 that Ashok Kumar Bahadur Nepali committed fraud with the company by producing such manufactured document, as such the workman cannot be reinstated in the company. Management cited a decision of the Hon'ble High Court at Calcutta in the Charge Sheet of **Dayanand Paswan Vs. Coal India Limited and Others [W.P. No. 874 of 2014]**, which upheld the action of ECL in dismissing the workman concerned as justified. Management asserted that the punishment awarded against the workman is proportionate to the misconduct of unauthorized absence and prayed for dismissal of the Industrial Dispute.

4. The point for consideration in this case is whether dismissal of Ashok Kumar Bahadur Nepali from the service of ECL is proper, legal and justified. If not, what relief the workman is entitled to.

5. The union in support of their pleading examined Ashok Kumar Bahadur Nepali, the dismissed workman as Workman Witness No. 1 and filed his affidavit-in-chief. The following documents have been produced by the workman witness :

- (i) Copy of the Charge Sheet dated 10.07.2017 has been produced as Exhibit W-1.
- (ii) Copy of the Order of dismissal dated 07.12.2019, as Exhibit W-2.
- (iii) Copy of the Mercy Petition dated 18.09.2020 submitted by the

workman before the Manager, Central Kajora Colliery, as Exhibit W-3.

(iv) Copy of the letter dated 16.01.2023 issued by the Assistant Labour Commissioner (Central) and Conciliation Officer, Raniganj at Durgapur to the Secretary, the Government of India, informing about failure of conciliation, as Exhibit W-4.

6. In cross-examination of Workman Witness No. 1, on behalf of the management the workman deposed that he was unable to attend his duty as he was suffering from injury on his hip. He also received medical treatment at Central Hospital, Kalla for three to four months and could file his Health Card to show that he received medical treatment during the period of his absence. The workman stated that he submitted application on 18.09.2020 for his reinstatement i.e., long after his dismissal. The workman stated that he submitted his medical document before the company along with the application for reinstatement but he was not aware that those documents were sent to Central Hospital, Kalla for verification or after verification the documents were found to be fake. The witness denied the suggestion that the Charge Sheet, Notice of enquiry, second Show Cause Notice and Order of dismissal were served upon him. In course of his cross-examination the witness admitted that he did not submit any application before the management, informing about his illness or the reason for which he could not attend his duty. He denied the suggestion that he intentionally remained away from enquiry, for which the enquiry proceeding was held ex-parte.

7. Management examined Mr. Proloy Dasgupta as Management Witness No. 1 and filed affidavit-in-chief. In his examination-in-chief the witness produced the following documents :

(i) Copy of the Charge Sheet dated 10.07.2017 has been produced as Exhibit M-1.

- (ii) Copy of the Notice of enquiry dated 17.07.2017, 05.12.2017, 10.08.2018 and 19.09.2019, as Exhibit M-2 (collectively).
- (iii) Copy of the clipping of Shilpanchal Newspaper dated 27.09.2019 where final Notice of enquiry dated 19.09.2019 was published, as Exhibit M-3.
- (iv) Copies of the Enquiry Proceeding dated 15.09.2017, 12.04.2018, 21.02.2019, 23.10.2019 are marked as Exhibit M-4,4/1,4/2 and 4/3.
- (v) Copy of the Enquiry Report dated 07.11.2019, as Exhibit M-5.
- (vi) Copy of the second Show Cause Notice dated 14.11.2019, as Exhibit M-6.
- (vii) Copy of the letter of dismissal dated 07.12.2019, as Exhibit M-7.
- (viii) Copy of the application dated 18.09.2020 submitted by the workman before the Manager, Central Kajora Colliery along with medical papers, as Exhibit W-8 (collectively in eleven pages).
- (ix) Copy of the letter dated 24/25.09.2020 issued by the Dy. Manager (P), Central Kajora Colliery addressed to the Chief Medical Officer, Central Hospital, Kalla for verification of medical treatment papers submitted by the workman has been marked as Exhibit M-9.
- (x) Copy of the letter dated 08.10.2020 issued by the Chief Medical Officer (Clinical), Central Hospital, Kalla addressed to the Dy. Manager (P), Central Kajora Colliery regarding genuineness of the treatment papers, as Exhibit M-10.

The witness deposed that the copy of Charge Sheet dated 10.07.2017 was issued to the workman but he had no document to show as to how Charge Sheet was served upon the workman. Notice of enquiry were issued to the workman on four occasions but no document could be produced to show that such Notice of enquiry were served upon the workman, nor could he state the mode of transmission of the same. It transpires from the examination of

management witness that the final Notice dated 19.09.2019 was published in the Newspaper namely, Shilpanchal on 27.09.2019, copy of the same has been produced as Exhibit M-3. The workman did not participate in the enquiry proceeding held by Mr. Ashish Mohan, Enquiry Officer. In that enquiry Mr. T. K. Show was the Management Representative and copies of Enquiry Proceeding has been marked as Exhibit M-4 to M4/3. The Enquiry Report in this case has been marked as Exhibit M-5. The witness also identified a copy of second Show Cause Notice dated 14.11.2019 as Exhibit M-6. Once again, the witness deposed that he has no document show that the second Show Cause Notice was served upon the workman. It is gathered form his testimony that the workman was dismissed from his service w.e.f. 06.12.2019 on the basis letter of dismissal dated 07.12.2019, marked as Exhibit M-7. A copy of application dated 18.09.2020 accompanied with some medical documents submitted by Ashok Kumar Bahadur Nepali has been produced as Exhibit M-8. A Copy of the letter dated 24/25.09.2020 issued by the Dy. Manager (P), Central Kajora Colliery addressed to the Chief Medical Officer, Central Hospital, Kalla for verification of medical treatment papers submitted by the dismissed workman appeared to be issued by the Central Hospital, Kalla from 12.06.2017 to 18.09.2020 has been produced as Exhibit M-9. The witness deposed that the Chief Medical Officer (Clinical), Central Hospital, Kalla issued a letter to the Dy. Manager (P), Central Kajora Colliery dated 08.10.2020, informing that the treatment papers produced are totally false and no entries to that effect was found in the Central Hospital Kalla Admission Register. Copy of the reply is marked as Exhibit M-10. The witness deposed that the punishment of dismissal imposed for unauthorized and habitual absence upon the workman is proportionate to the misconduct and there is no illegality in dismissing the workman from service.

8. In course of cross-examination the union representative made no attempt to dislodge the evidence of the management witness that the medical documents

submitted with the application for reinstatement dated 18.09.2020 were totally false as no entries are made in the hospital on those days. The union confronted the management witness on the point that the Charge Sheet and second Show Cause Notice were not served upon the workman and no document could be produced by the management to prove service of the same. The union refuted the dismissal of the workman by suggesting that the punishment of dismissal was disproportionate to the charge of unauthorized absence of one month.

9. Mr. Rakesh Kumar, Union representative advancing his argument on behalf of the dismissed workman submitted that the workman was unable to attend his duty only for one month i.e., from 10.06.2017 to 10.07.2017 due to his illness but the management without serving any Charge Sheet, Notice of enquiry and Second Show Cause Notice dismissed him from the service of the company on the basis of ex-parte enquiry proceeding. It is submitted that the workman was posted as Tyndal Jamadar and was an underground worker and he was required to perform hard physical labour. From the Charge Sheet it would appear that charge was levelled against him for unauthorized absence under Clause 26.29 and habitual absence under Clause 26.23 of the Certified Standing Orders. He attended duty on 226 days in the year 2014, 239 days in the year 2015 and 186 days in the year 2016. It is claimed that as an underground worker a person completes his continuous service in a year as soon as he completes 190 days. In the year 2017 till June, he had served for 81 days. Mr. Kumar argued that there is no reason to level a charge against him for habitual absence. The union representative further submitted that in the year 2005, two increments of his pay were reduced on the ground of unauthorized absence. It is argued that there has been violation of natural justice by holding ex-parte domestic enquiry against the workman, without ensuring service of Charge Sheet and Notice of enquiry upon him. It is submitted that on 18.09.2020 the workman after being informed about his dismissal from service

submitted an application for his reinstatement and at the relevant time produced some supporting documents related to his illness which were said to have been verified by the management and declared as fake and false without examining the hospital authorities before this Tribunal. Mr. Rakesh Kumar, Union representative further argued that the medical documents were not under consideration of the Enquiry Officer and the Disciplinary Authority before passing the ex-parte order of dismissal against the workman. Therefore, such documents cannot be a matter of consideration in an Industrial Dispute which has been raised challenging the enquiry proceeding. Mr. Kumar submitted that the workman is going to cross his age of superannuation in July 2025 and he has been highly prejudiced due to his dismissal after rendering dedicated service for several years. It is urged that the order of dismissal is not maintainable as it violative of natural justice and the same is liable to be set aside and the workman should be allowed to receive his normal benefit arising out of long service under ECL.

10. Mr. P. K. Das, learned advocate for the management of ECL, refuting the claim of the union argued that the workman was chargesheeted for his long unauthorized and habitual absence. According to the management copy of Charge Sheet was sent to the workman at his postal address and four Notice of enquiry were also issued by the Enquiry Officer followed by a publication of such Notice in the local newspaper but the workman did not participate in the enquiry proceeding. It is argued that had the workman turned up after one month of his absence, he would have been aware that an enquiry proceeding was initiated against him but he was actually absent for more than one month due to which he has claimed to be absolutely unaware about several Notice of enquiry which were issued to him. The First Notice of enquiry dated 17.07.2017 by which date of enquiry was fixed on 15.09.2017, second Notice of enquiry dated 05.12.2017 which fixed the date of enquiry as 12.04.2018, third Notice of

enquiry dated 10.08.2018 which fixed the date of enquiry as 21.02.2019, and fourth and Final Notice of enquiry dated 19.09.2019 fixing the date of enquiry as 23.10.2019 (Exhibit M-2 series) were sent to the workman and a Notice of enquiry was published in the Shilpanchal Newspaper on 27.09.2019 (copy of publication was produced as Exhibit M-3). Learned advocate submitted that the workman did not appear on the basis of such Notice and the management was constrained to proceed ex-parte. Referring to the Enquiry Report (Exhibit M-5) learned advocate submitted that the Enquiry Officer found Ashok Kumar Bahadur Nepali, the chargesheeted employee guilty of misconduct in respect of the charge mentioned in the Charge Sheet. Learned advocate further referred to Exhibit M-6 and argued that a Second Show Cause Notice was issued to the workman, which was sent to him under registered post and on considering the Enquiry Proceeding and all other materials, the General Manager issued an order on 07.12.2019, dismissing the charged employee from the service of the company w.e.f. 06.12.2019. Learned advocate argued that the enquiry proceeding was held in proper manner, in consonance with the principles of natural justice and the workman is not entitled to any relief of reinstatement.

11. I have considered the argument advanced by the learned advocate and union representative in the backdrop of the facts and circumstances disclosed in the pleadings of the parties and evidence adduced by the workman and management witness. It is evident from the admission of the management witness that they were unable to produce any document to establish that the Charge Sheet and Notice of enquiry were served upon the workman at his home address under registered post or upon him in any manner. The management witness in cross-examination also admitted that he was unable to produce any document to show that the Charge Sheet was served upon the workman. It is crystal clear from the evidence that the workman did not have the opportunity to participate in the enquiry proceeding held by Mr. Ashish Mohan, Enquiry

Officer. Mr. T. K. Show, the management representative was examined on 23.10.2019. During his examination the management representative stated that Ashok Kumar Bahadur Nepali worked for the last time on 09.06.2017 and thereafter absented from 10.06.2017 without any information on sanction of leave from the colliery authority. The management representative deposed that a copy of the Charge Sheet was sent to his home address through registered post but he did not reply to the Charge Sheet. There is no disclosure in the evidence of management that the Charge Sheet was actually served upon the workman or the same was returned unserved. No postal document has been produced by the management representative in support of his claim that the Charge Sheet was sent to the workman. On a close scrutiny of the Enquiry Report it is gathered that though the Charge Sheet was issued on 10.07.2017 the enquiry proceeding was concluded after two years. Had the workman returned for his duty after one month, he would have sufficient information about the Charge Sheet and Notice of enquiry issued for this purpose. It is a clear case where the charged employee was absent for more than two years and he could not deny having knowledge of the enquiry proceeding. On the other hand, the procedure adopted by the management is also vitiated due to absolute absence of service of Charge Sheet and Notice of enquiry upon the dismissed workman. The management has failed to prove that the second Show Cause Notice dated 14.11.2019 was served upon the workman. It is abundantly clear that the management did not comply the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the case of **Union of India and Others Vs. Mohd. Ramzan Khan [AIR (1991) SC 471]**, where the Hon'ble Apex court held that :

“ When the Inquiry Officer is not the Disciplinary Authority, the delinquent employee has a right to receive a copy of the inquiry officer’s report before the Disciplinary Authority arrives at its conclusion with regard to the charges levelled against him. A denial of the inquiry officer’s report before the Disciplinary Authority takes its decision on the charges, is denial of opportunity to the employee to prove his innocence and is a breach of principles of natural justice.”

Furthermore, it has not followed the mandate in the Circular of Coal India Limited bearing No. CIL C-5A(vi)/50774/28 dated 12.05.1994, wherein it has been clearly stated a 2nd Show Cause Notice along with Enquiry Proceeding and Enquiry Report had to be supplied to the chargesheeted employee and before imposing any punishment of dismissal from service the charged employee should be given an opportunity to submit his representation against the findings of the Enquiry Officer. In my considered view the dismissal of the workman loses its legitimacy on account of absence of *prima facie* and rudimentary evidence regarding service of Charge Sheet, Notice of enquiry and second Show Cause Notice upon the workman.

12. The workman after his dismissal on 17.12.2019 submitted a mercy petition dated 18.09.2020, enclosing several papers related to his medical treatment from 12.06.2017 to 18.09.2020. The mercy petition along with documents were collectively marked as Exhibit M-8. The medical documents consisting of tickets for outdoor patients of Central Hospital, Kalla, ECL and also bears signature and seal. The management witness in his affidavit-in-chief as well as in his examination-in-chief has stated that after receiving the letter from Ashok Kumar Bahadur Nepali on 18.09.2020 the treatment papers were sent for verification and the Chief Medical Officer (Clinical), Central Hospital, Kalla in his letter dated 08.10.2020 addressed to the Deputy Manager (Personnel), Central Kajora Colliery informed that the treatment papers produced were totally false as no entries were made in their OPD Register on those days. A copy of the reply dated 08.10.2020 has been admitted in evidence as Exhibit M-10. In the instant case the management has not produce the Chief Medical Officer (Clinical), Central Hospital, Kalla who has opined in his letter dated 08.10.2020 that the treatment papers are totally false. The dismissed workman and the union representing him did not have the opportunity to cross-examination the Chief Medical Officer (Clinical), Central Hospital, Kalla on his

opinion about the documents produced by the workman. Besides, the documents were filed by the workman after the enquiry proceeding was complete. Therefore, at this juncture the mercy petition as well as the accompanying documents serve no purpose and have significance in determining the question as to whether the enquiry proceeding was conducted in a proper manner or not. I therefore, hold that the contention of the management that the workman produced false documents along with his mercy petition has no relevance and serves no purpose in determining the legality of the enquiry proceeding.

13. In the case of **State Bank of Patiala and Others Vs. S. K. Sharma** [(1996) 3 SCC 364] it was held that :

- “ (1) *An order passed imposing a punishment on an employee consequent upon a disciplinary / departmental enquiry in violation of the rules / regulations / statutory provisions governing such enquiries should not be set aside automatically. The Court or the Tribunal should enquire whether (a) the provision violated is of a substantive nature or (b) whether it is procedural in character.*
- (2) *A substantive provision has normally to be complied with as explained hereinbefore and the theory of substantial compliance or the test of prejudice would not be applicable in such a case.*
- (3) *In the case of violation of a procedural provision, the position is this: procedural provisions are generally meant for affording a reasonable and adequate opportunity to the delinquent officer / employee. They are, generally speaking, conceived in his interest. Violation of any and every procedural provision cannot be said to automatically vitiate the enquiry held or order passed except cases falling under 'no notice', 'no opportunity' and 'no hearing' categories, the complaint of violation of procedural provision should be examined from the point of view of prejudice, viz.,*

whether such violation has prejudiced the delinquent officer / employee in defending himself properly and effectively. If it is found that he has been so prejudiced, appropriate orders have to be made to repair and remedy the prejudicement, including setting aside the enquiry and/or the order of punishment. If no prejudice is established to have resulted therefrom, it is obvious, no interference is called for.”

14. It appears to me that this is a case where the charged employee has been prejudiced due to violation of procedural provision, where the entire enquiry proceeding was conducted without service of Charge Sheet, Notice of enquiry and Second Show Cause Notice. The facts and circumstances of the case clearly reveal that the enquiry proceeding was held in violation of principles of natural justice without ensuring service of Charge Sheet and any Notice upon the workman. The workman therefore hold a genuine grievance that he did not have reasonable opportunity to represent his case. The management further faulted due to non-service of second Show Cause Notice upon the workman before issuing the final order of dismissal. In such view of matter the order of dismissal of the workman bearing No. ECL/KA/APM/C-6/2019/10/3514 dated 07.12.2019 issued by the General Manager, Kajora Area is found arbitrary, untenable and the same is liable to be set aside. Mr. Rakesh Kumar, Union representative submitted that the workman has already crossed the age of superannuation in July 2025, therefore, he is not entitled to be reinstated in service. I also find that though the enquiry proceeding and the order of dismissal is not found legally tenable due to its inherent defects discussed earlier, the lapses on the part of the workman who has admittedly absented from duty of the company from 10.06.2017 remained unexplained. Workman did not report to the management till conclusion of the enquiry proceeding in October 2019. A workman who is not sincere in his duty cannot be entitled to back wages for the period of his long absence for more than two years. However,

bearing in mind that the workman had rendered service to the company for several years, he shall be entitled only to his normal benefits like Provident Fund, Gratuity and other consequential dues for the past service. The Industrial Dispute is accordingly decided in part, in favour of the workman.

Hence,

ORDERED

that the Industrial Dispute is allowed in part, on contest. The order of dismissal bearing No. ECL/KA/APM/C-6/2019/10/3514 dated 07.12.2019 issued by the General Manager, dismissing the workman from service w.e.f. 06.12.2019 is not tenable and the same is set aside. The workman having attained the age of superannuation in July 2025, shall only be entitled to his normal benefits like Provident Fund, Gratuity and other consequential dues, arising out of his past service and not to any back wages. Let an award be drawn up in light of my above findings. Let copies of the Award in duplicate be sent to the Ministry of Labour, Government of India, New Delhi for information and Notification.

Sd/-
(ANANDA KUMAR MUKHERJEE)
Presiding Officer,
C.G.I.T.-cum-L.C., Asansol.