

NAFR**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR****Writ Petition (L) No. 69 of 2018**

Surendra Kumar Navarang S/o Shri Motilal Nawrang, aged about 33 years, Posted in Boys Hostel Jareli, Takhatpur, R/o Village Mochh, Tahsil Takhatpur, District Bilaspur, Civil and Reveune District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. Assistant Commissioner, Tribal Development Department Bilaspur, District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh
2. Superintendant, Govt. Post Metric Scheduled Caste Boys Hoster, Jareli, Takhatpur District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh
3. Deputy Commissioner, Indrawati Bhavan, New Raipur, District New Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Shri M. K. Sinha, Advocate
For Respondent/State	:	Smt. M. Asha, Panel Lawyer

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order On Board****21/02/2018**

Present writ petition has been filed seeking for a direction to the respondents for issuance of an order in writing to show that the petitioner has been taken back in employment pursuant to the order of the Labour Court dated 11.05.2015 passed in Case No.3/I.D.Act/Reference/2014 wherein the Labour Court has passed an award in favour of the petitioner granting benefit of reinstatement in employment with 25% of back wages.

2. Counsel for the petitioner submits that the back wages part has already been paid and the petitioner has also been taken back in employment. He submits that the only apprehension is that there is no order in writing issued

by the respondents showing compliance of the award of the Labour Court nor is there any document with which it can be established that the petitioner has been reinstated in service. He further submits that the petitioner is also not permitted to put his signature in the attendance register and he is being victimized on account of the fact that he had initiated prosecution case against the officers of the respondent department.

3. At this juncture, learned State counsel submits that the petitioner need not have any such apprehension. She has specific instructions from the Authority concerned that the order of the Labour Court has been duly complied with and the entire back wages awarded has already been paid to the petitioner. She submits that the attendance of the petitioner is also being maintained by the Department as is evident from Exhibit P-8. She further states that since the petitioner has been reinstated in service by virtue of the compliance of the order of the Labour Court, the petitioner's status stands restored as it stood prior to 07.07.2013 when he was orally discontinued from service.

4. Given the aforesaid submissions made by the learned State counsel, this Court is of the opinion that nothing further remains to be adjudicated upon in the present petition. In the light of the statement made by the State counsel, it is presumed that the respondents have duly complied with the award of the Labour Court by reinstating the petitioner in service and further, the attendance of the petitioner would also be maintained by the Officers of the respondents in accordance with the prevailing norms and rules applicable to the similarly placed persons.

5. The writ petition thus stands disposed of.

**Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
JUDGE**