

**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**

**WPS No. 7510 of 2017**

Jeevan Lal Nirmalkar Son Of Ramadhin Nirmalkar, Aged About 56 Years R/o Vishvakarmachauk, Ward No. 2, Jamul, Tahsil And 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