

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

WPS No. 7499 of 2017

Bhanu Yadav S/o Pardeshi Ram Yadav, Aged About 49 Years R/o Ward No. 5,
Ganesh Nagar, A. C. C. Jamul, Jamul, Jamul Cement Works, District Durg
Chhattisgarh.

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Chhattisgarh Through Labour Secretary And Labour
Commissioner, Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh.
2. President, State Industrial Court Of Chhattisgarh At Raipur, Mahanadi Khand,
Near D. K. S. Bhawan, Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh.
3. Pragatisheel Cement Shramik Sangh, Labour Camp, Jamul, Bhilai, District Durg
Chhattisgarh.
4. General Manager (Now Vice President), The Associated Cement Companies
Limited, Registered Under Indian Companies Act With The Registrar Of
Companies, Bombay, Registered Office At Cement House 121, Maharshi Karve
Road, Mumbai - 20 Carrying On Manufacture Of Cement In The Name Of
Jamul, Cement Works At Jamul, Tahsil And District Durg Chhattisgarh Through
Its Vice President I. M. Sharma.

---- Respondents

For Petitioner : Mr. Punit Ruparel, Advocate.

For State : Mr. Majid Ali, Dy. GA

Hon'ble Shri Justice Manindra Mohan Shrivastava

Order on Board

09/01/2018

1. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the issue raised in this writ
petition is squarely covered by an order passed by this Court on 17.11.2017 in WPS
No. 6107 of 2017 (Ghanaram Verma Vs State of Chhattisgarh & Ors)
2. Learned State counsel would submit that the present appears to be the dispute
between the Management of the Associated Cement Companies Ltd, and its
Workmen, therefore, State has no role to play in the said dispute.

3. In the matter of Ghanaram Verma (supra) the following order has been passed by the Coordinate Bench of this Court on 17.11.2017.

“ It appears that the petitioner is the member of the Union, which was before this Court in the Writ Petition No. 1659 of 2006 (General Manager, the Associated Cement Companies Limited Vs. State of Chhattisgarh & Ors.) decided on 22.03.2011, in which, this Court upheld the award, though in part, which is executable. The petitioner should take steps for execution of the award as per the order passed by this Court, referred to above. With liberty to approach the appropriate authority for execution of award, the petition is dismissed.”

4. As prayed by learned counsel for the petitioner, the present writ petition is also disposed of in the same terms as in the matter of Ghanaram Verma.

5. A copy of the order passed in Ghanaram Verma is retained in the record of this writ petition.

Sd/-

(Manindra Mohan Shrivastava)

Judge

Rohit