

NAFR**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR****W.P.(L) No. 2284 of 2009**

State of Chhattisgarh, through Divisional Forest Officer, Forest Division,
Dawardha, District Kabirdham (CG)

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. Maniram S/o Itwari Ram Yadav, R/o Ganga Nagar, Kawardha, District Kabirdham (CG)
2. The Labour Court, Rajnandgaon (CG)

---- Respondents

For Petitioner/State	:	Shri Vinod Deshmukh, Dy. G.A.
For Respondent no.1	:	Shri Ajit Singh, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order On Board****27.11.2015**

The State through the present writ petition has challenged the award dated 05.06.2008 passed by the Labour Court, Rajnandgaon in Case no. 64/ID/2007 (Ref.) whereby the services of respondent no.1 have been directed to be reinstated without back wages.

2. Brief facts, relevant for disposal of the petition are that a reference was made to the Labour Court, Rajnandgaon by the office of Assistant Labour Commissioner on 7.5.2007 in the following terms :

“Whether the termination of services of respondent No.1 is proper and legal? If not, what relief he is entitled for and what direction in this regard should be issued to the petitioner.”

On receiving the said terms of reference, the Labour Court, Rajnandgaon registered a case and called upon the parties to submit their respective claims.

3. Respondent no.1 who was first party before the Court below submitted his statement of claim stating that he was engaged as a Chowkidar on Daily Wages in July 1989 with the petitioner department and continued his services without any interruption on the said post. However, all of a sudden, without following the mandatory provisions of Section 25F of Industrial Dispute Act, his services were terminated and therefore he raised an industrial dispute challenging the illegal termination.

4. The petitioner herein who was second party before the Court below

submitted its written submission categorically denying the submissions made by the workman/respondent no.1 in his statement of claim. The employment and continuous service of more than 11 years of the first party has also been denied by the second party in their written statement.

5. The first party i.e. Respondent No.1 while giving evidence before the Court below categorically submitted that he was initially engaged as Chowkidar on daily wage at forest depot, Kawardha in the year 1989 and continuously worked on the said post till 18.02.2000 when his services were terminated. The workman in his evidence had stated that at the time of termination of his services, the mandatory provisions of Section 25F of ID Act and the other provisions under chapter V were not complied with. However, much after his termination, he has been paid an amount of Rs.18,000 as compensation. He had further deposed before the Court below that subsequent to his termination, he was not gainfully employed in any other institution and therefore he is entitled for full consequential benefits.

6. One Shri B. R. Khunte appearing on behalf of the State Govt. in his deposition could not produce any documentary proof so far as the denial part of the employment of respondent no.1 for a continuous period of more than 11 years is concerned. The petitioner has also not been able to substantiate its contention regarding respondent no.1 having continuously not worked between 1989 to 2000. On the contrary, the witness of the State Govt. admitted the fact that the respondent no.1 was engaged as a contingency worker on daily wages. He further admitted that he has not brought the muster roll and therefore is not able to state the actual number of days worked. In the absence of any evidence on behalf of the State Govt. before the Court below, the only inference which could be drawn on the basis of the statement of respondent no.1 and the witness of the Govt. that he has continuously worked for 1989 to 2000 is correct. The employment part was admitted by the State Govt. before the Court below in its evidence. Thus, the State Govt. failing to produce any evidence before the Court below to disprove the contention put forth by respondent no.1 worker, it can be held that the finding of the Labour Court is a finding of fact based on the evidences which have come on record and it is a settled position law that finding of fact should not be interfered as a matter of routine.

7. The petitioner even during the course of hearing of this petition also is not in a position to disprove the finding of the Labour Court by leading any documentary evidence to contradict the finding arrived at by the Labour Court. It is also settled position of law that under the writ jurisdiction, this court would not interfere with the order passed by the Labour Court sitting as an Appellate

Authority particularly in a case under ID Act. The interference would be only to a limited extent where there is perversity in the finding arrived at by the Court below or the Court has exercised its jurisdiction beyond the powers conferred upon it. The High Court can interfere with factual aspect only when it is convinced that the Labour Court has made patent mistakes in admitting evidence illegally or the Court has committed a grave error in law in coming to its conclusions.

8. The jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India in examining the correctness of the order of the Labour Court was confined to errors in the decision making process and not on the merits of the decision itself. This Court does not find any infirmity in the decision making process warranting interference.

9. The Supreme Court in the case of Harjinder Singh v. Punjab State Warehousing Corpn. reported in (2010) 3 SCC 192 in paragraph 21 held as under:-

“Before concluding, we consider it necessary to observe that while exercising jurisdiction under Articles 226 and /or 227 of the Constitution in matters like the present one, the High Courts are duty-bound to keep in mind that the Industrial Disputes Act and others similar legislative instruments are social welfare legislative instruments and the same are required to be interpreted keeping in view the goals set out in the Preamble of the Constitution and the provisions contained in Part IV thereof in general and Articles 38, 39(a) to (e), 43 and 43-A in particular, which mandate that the State should secure a social order for the promotion of welfare of the people, ensure equality between men and women and equitable distribution of material resources of the community to subserve the common good and also ensure that the workers get their dues. More than 41 years ago, Gajendragadkar, J. opined that:

'10. The concept of social and economic justice is a living concept of revolutionary import; it gives sustenance to the rule of law and meaning and significance to the ideal of welfare State.'

(State of Mysore v. Workers of Gold Mines¹, AIR p.928, para 10.)”

This view has further been reiterated in the case of Bhuvnesh Kumar Dwivedi v. Hindalco Industries Limited reported in (2014) 11 SCC 85.

10. The State Govt. through the present writ petition has failed to show either there being any perversity in the finding or the Court below having exceeded its jurisdiction. In the absence of the two, the finding arrived at by the Labour Court has to be accepted to be proper, legal and justified.

11. Another fact which is pertinent to mention that subsequent to the award

1 AIR 1958 SC 923

passed on 05.06.2008, the State Govt. has also reinstated the services of respondent no.1 in November, 2008 itself and since then he is working. This all the more requires no interference in the present writ petition at this juncture.

12. Thus, the instant writ petition being devoid of merit, deserves to be and is accordingly dismissed.

Sd/-
P. Sam Koshy
Judge

Bhola