

Division Serich (Civil)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF MADHYA PRADES AT JABALPUR

Misc.Petition No. 2087 of 1992.

Petitioner

Raghueir Singh Dilliwar,
S/o Shri Mohan Singh Dhilliwar,
aged about 44 years, Jeep Driver,
Public Works Department, Division
No.1, Durg, Distt.Durg (M.P.).
Address: Near Deawar Derha,
Phokatpara, Kasaridih, P.O.Kasaridih,
Durg, Distt.Durg (M.P.).

Versus

Respondents

- 1. The Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Durg, Distt.Durg (M.P.)
- 2. The Executive Engineer, Public Works Department, Division No.1, Opposite: Govt. Main Hospital, G.E.Road, Durg, Distt.Durg (M.P.).

PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA.

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ, बिलासपुर

मामला क्रमांक ^{W.P.No.2089 | 92} सन् 200

आदेश पत्रक (पूर्वानुबद्ध)		
आदेश का दिनांक तथा आदेश क्रमांक	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश	
	30.06.2005 Mr. H.B. Agrawal, Sr. Advocate with Ms. Sangeeta Mishra, learned counsel for the petitioner.	
	Mr. Akhil Agrawal, learned Panel Lawyer for the State / respondent No.2.	
	This writ petition is filed under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India against the impugned award dated 01.10.1991	
	(Annexure-III) passed by the Labour Court, Durg in Case No.1/90/ID Act (Ref.). The undisputed facts in very narrow	
	compass are that the petitioner was appointed on the post of Jeep Driver in Public Works Department, Division No.1, Durg, District	
	Durg in the year 1982-83 on daily wages by respondent No.2. By order dated 30.12.1987 (Annexure-I) the services of the petitioner	
	was regularized and he was granted pay scale of Rs.870-1420/-along with other admissible allowances on the post of Jeep Driver.	
	By order dated 01.04.1988 the petitioner was removed from the service. The petitioner challenged the said removal by approaching	
	the Deputy Labour Commissioner, Chhattisgarh Region, Durg under the provisions of Industrial Disputes Act. The Deputy Labour	
	Commissioner while exercising his power under Section 10(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, referred the dispute to the Labour	
	Court, Durg for decision. The Labour Court by award dated 01.10.1991 after hearing	
	both the parties came to the conclusion that removal of services of the petitioner from the post of Jeep Driver was illegal and improper	

and respondent No.2 was directed to reinstate the petitioner in the

service.

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ, बिलासपुर

मामला क्रमांक १००० २०४१ सन् 200

आदेश पत्रक (पूर्वानुबद्ध)

आदेश का दिनांक तथा आदेश कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश

Learned counsel for the petitioner has challenged non-grant of back wages despite the issue of reference was made by the Deputy Labour Commissioner and issue raised in the statement of

Labour Commissioner reads as under:

"Whether removal of Shri Raghubir Singh from the services is legal and proper? If not, what relief he is entitled to and what direction can be issued to the employer?"

claim. The issue referred to the Labour Court by the Deputy

In the statement of claims at para-9, the petitioner has raised the issue of payment of back wages is as under:

"9. That in view of the facts stated hereinbefore, the action of the second party in discontinuing/ terminating the services of the first party w.e.f. 1.4.1988 is absolutely illegal, unjustified, invalid and inoperative. The first party therefore, deserves to be reinstated with back wages from 1.4.1988 till his reinstatement alongwith other benefits."

After hearing both the parties and perusing the records, I have noticed that the Labour Court has not discussed the issue of back wages at all in its award and without considering the issue of back wages, the Labour Court has passed the impugned award. It is the case where the Labour Court has failed to consider the issue

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ, बिलासपुर

मामला क्रमांक ७.२.०० २०४० १२ सन् 200

आदेश पत्रक (पूर्वानुबद्ध)

আইং। अभिकान हस्ताक्षर सहित आवेश of back wages raised in the Labour Court has passed the final order without passing any order on the issue of back wages. confines the challenge in the passed, by the Labour Court. In view of the facts as stated above, the matter is remitted back to the Labour Court for Other part of the order with regard to re-instatement is upheld as there is no challenge by the respondent No.2 against the award in petitioner in service. With the aforesaid direction, the petition stands disposed of.	of back wages raised in the claims as well as in the reference. Labour Court has passed the final order without passing any order on the issue of back wages. Learned counsel for the petitioner confines the challenge in the present petition only to the effect that the issue of back wages have not been considered and no order has been passed, by the Labour Court. In view of the facts as stated above, the matter is remitted back to the Labour Court for deciding the issue of back wages. Other part of the order with regard to re-instatement is upheld as there is no challenge by the respondent No.2 against the award in respect of re-instatement of the petitioner in service. With the aforesaid direction, the petition stands disposed of. Sd!- Satish K. Agnihotri Judge	and the state of t	
Labour Court has passed the final order without passing any order on the issue of back wages. Learned counsel for the petitioner confines the challenge in the present petition only to the effect that the issue of back wages have not been considered and no order has been passed, by the Labour Court. In view of the facts as stated above, the matter is remitted back to the Labour Court for deciding the issue of back wages. Other part of the order with regard to re-instatement is upheld as there is no challenge by the respondent No.2 against the award in respect of re-instatement of the petitioner in service. With the aforesaid direction, the petition stands disposed of. Sdl- Satish K. Agnihotri Judge	Labour Court has passed the final order without passing any order on the issue of back wages. Learned counsel for the petitioner confines the challenge in the present petition only to the effect that the issue of back wages have not been considered and no order has been passed, by the Labour Court. In view of the facts as stated above, the matter is remitted back to the Labour Court for deciding the issue of back wages. Other part of the order with regard to re-instatement is upheld as there is no challenge by the respondent No.2 against the award in respect of re-instatement of the petitioner in service. With the aforesaid direction, the petition stands disposed of. Sdl- Satish K. Agnihotri Judge		। हरताक्षर सहित अदर्श
on the issue of back wages. Learned counsel for the petitioner confines the challenge in the present petition only to the effect that the issue of back wages have not been considered and no order has been passed, by the Labour Court. In view of the facts as stated above, the matter is remitted back to the Labour Court for deciding the issue of back wages. Other part of the order with regard to re-instatement is upheld as there is no challenge by the respondent No.2 against the award in respect of re-instatement of the petitioner in service. With the aforesaid direction, the petition stands disposed of. Sd/- Satish K. Agnihotri Judge	on the issue of back wages. Learned counsel for the petitioner confines the challenge in the present petition only to the effect that the issue of back wages have not been considered and no order has been passed, by the Labour Court. In view of the facts as stated above, the matter is remitted back to the Labour Court for deciding the issue of back wages. Other part of the order with regard to re-instatement is upheld as there is no challenge by the respondent No.2 against the award in respect of re-instatement of the petitioner in service. With the aforesaid direction, the petition stands disposed of. Sd/- Satish K. Agnihotri Judge		of back wages raised in the claims as well as in the reference.
on the issue of back wages. Learned counsel for the petitioner confines the challenge in the present petition only to the effect that the issue of back wages have not been considered and no order has been passed, by the Labour Court. In view of the facts as stated above, the matter is remitted back to the Labour Court for deciding the issue of back wages. Other part of the order with regard to re-instatement is upheld as there is no challenge by the respondent No.2 against the award in respect of re-instatement of the petitioner in service. With the aforesaid direction, the petition stands disposed of. Sd/- Satish K. Agnihotri Judge	on the issue of back wages. Learned counsel for the petitioner confines the challenge in the present petition only to the effect that the issue of back wages have not been considered and no order has been passed, by the Labour Court. In view of the facts as stated above, the matter is remitted back to the Labour Court for deciding the issue of back wages. Other part of the order with regard to re-instatement is upheld as there is no challenge by the respondent No.2 against the award in respect of re-instatement of the petitioner in service. With the aforesaid direction, the petition stands disposed of. Sd/- Satish K. Agnihotri Judge		Labour Court has passed the final order without passing any order
confines the challenge in the present petition only to the effect that the issue of back wages have not been considered and no order has been passed, by the Labour Court. In view of the facts as stated above, the matter is remitted back to the Labour Court for deciding the issue of back wages. Other part of the order with regard to re-instatement is upheld as there is no challenge by the respondent No.2 against the award in respect of re-instatement of the petitioner in service. With the aforesaid direction, the petition stands disposed of. Sd/- Satish K. Agnihotri Judge	confines the challenge in the present petition only to the effect that the issue of back wages have not been considered and no order has been passed, by the Labour Court. In view of the facts as stated above, the matter is remitted back to the Labour Court for deciding the issue of back wages. Other part of the order with regard to re-instatement is upheld as there is no challenge by the respondent No.2 against the award in respect of re-instatement of the petitioner in service. With the aforesaid direction, the petition stands disposed of. Sd/- Satish K. Agnihotri Judge		
the issue of back wages have not been considered and no order has been passed, by the Labour Court. In view of the facts as stated above, the matter is remitted back to the Labour Court for deciding the issue of back wages. Other part of the order with regard to re-instatement is upheld as there is no challenge by the respondent No.2 against the award in respect of re-instatement of the petitioner in service. With the aforesaid direction, the petition stands disposed of. Sd/- Satish K. Agnihotri Judge	the issue of back wages have not been considered and no order has been passed, by the Labour Court. In view of the facts as stated above, the matter is remitted back to the Labour Court for deciding the issue of back wages. Other part of the order with regard to re-instatement is upheld as there is no challenge by the respondent No.2 against the award in respect of re-instatement of the petitioner in service. With the aforesaid direction, the petition stands disposed of. Sdi-Satish K. Agnihotri Judge		
has been passed, by the Labour Court. In view of the facts as stated above, the matter is remitted back to the Labour Court for deciding the issue of back wages. Other part of the order with regard to re-instatement is upheld as there is no challenge by the respondent No.2 against the award in respect of re-instatement of the petitioner in service. With the aforesaid direction, the petition stands disposed of. Sd/- Satish K. Agnihotri Judge	has been passed, by the Labour Court. In view of the facts as stated above, the matter is remitted back to the Labour Court for deciding the issue of back wages. Other part of the order with regard to re-instatement is upheld as there is no challenge by the respondent No.2 against the award in respect of re-instatement of the petitioner in service. With the aforesaid direction, the petition stands disposed of. Sd/- Satish K. Agnihotri Judge		
In view of the facts as stated above, the matter is remitted back to the Labour Court for deciding the issue of back wages. Other part of the order with regard to re-instatement is upheld as there is no challenge by the respondent No.2 against the award in respect of re-instatement of the petitioner in service. With the aforesaid direction, the petition stands disposed of. Sdl- Satish K. Agnihotri Judge	In view of the facts as stated above, the matter is remitted back to the Labour Court for deciding the issue of back wages. Other part of the order with regard to re-instatement is upheld as there is no challenge by the respondent No.2 against the award in respect of re-instatement of the petitioner in service. With the aforesaid direction, the petition stands disposed of. Sdl- Satish K. Agnihotri Judge		the issue of back wages have not been considered and no order
back to the Labour Court for deciding the issue of back wages. Other part of the order with regard to re-instatement is upheld as there is no challenge by the respondent No.2 against the award in respect of re-instatement of the petitioner in service. With the aforesaid direction, the petition stands disposed of. Sd/- Satish K. Agnihotri Judge	back to the Labour Court for deciding the issue of back wages. Other part of the order with regard to re-instatement is upheld as there is no challenge by the respondent No.2 against the award in respect of re-instatement of the petitioner in service. With the aforesaid direction, the petition stands disposed of. Sd/- Satish K. Agnihotri Judge		has been passed, by the Labour Court.
Other part of the order with regard to re-instatement is upheld as there is no challenge by the respondent No.2 against the award in respect of re-instatement of the petitioner in service. With the aforesaid direction, the petition stands disposed of. Sd/- Satish K. Agnihotri Judge	Other part of the order with regard to re-instatement is upheld as there is no challenge by the respondent No.2 against the award in respect of re-instatement of the petitioner in service. With the aforesaid direction, the petition stands disposed of. Sd/- Satish K. Agnihotri Judge	<u>)</u>	In view of the facts as stated above, the matter is remitted
Other part of the order with regard to re-instatement is upheld as there is no challenge by the respondent No.2 against the award in respect of re-instatement of the petitioner in service. With the aforesaid direction, the petition stands disposed of. Sd/- Satish K. Agnihotri Judge	Other part of the order with regard to re-instatement is upheld as there is no challenge by the respondent No.2 against the award in respect of re-instatement of the petitioner in service. With the aforesaid direction, the petition stands disposed of. Sd/- Satish K. Agnihotri Judge		back to the Labour Court for deciding the issue of back wages.
there is no challenge by the respondent No.2 against the award in respect of re-instatement of the petitioner in service. With the aforesaid direction, the petition stands disposed of. Sd/- Satish K. Agnihotri Judge	there is no challenge by the respondent No.2 against the award in respect of re-instatement of the petitioner in service. With the aforesaid direction, the petition stands disposed of. Sd/- Satish K. Agnihotri Judge		
respect of re-instatement of the petitioner in service. With the aforesaid direction, the petition stands disposed of. Sd/- Satish K. Agnihotri Judge	respect of re-instatement of the petitioner in service. With the aforesaid direction, the petition stands disposed of. Sd/- Satish K. Agnihotri Judge		
With the aforesaid direction, the petition stands disposed of. Sd/- Satish K. Agnihotri Judge	With the aforesaid direction, the petition stands disposed of. Sd/- Satish K. Agnihotri Judge		there is no challenge by the respondent No.2 against the award in
Sd/- Satish K. Agnihotri Judge	Sd/- Satish K. Agnihotri Judge		respect of re-instatement of the petitioner in service.
Sd/- Satish K. Agnihotri Judge	Sd/- Satish K. Agnihotri Judge		With the aforesaid direction, the petition stands disposed of.
Satish K. Agnihotri Judge	Satish K. Agnihotri Judge		
Judae	Judae		
Sarma	Sarma		
		Sarma	Judge

SP/FS/2005 - 20,000