

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**WPL No. 299 of 2014**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh, Through The Secretary, Department Of Water Resources, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya Naya Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Executive Engineer, Hasdeo Nahar Jal Prabandh Sambhag, Janjgir, District Janjgir-Champa Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioners**Versus**

Kanhaiya Lal Kashyap S/o Late Ramratan Kashyap, Aged About 40 Years, R/o Post Khisora, P.S. Navagarh, Tahsil Pamgarh, District Janjgir Champa, Chhattisgarh

----Respondents

For Petitioners-State	:	Ms. Sunita Jain, G.A.
For Respondent	:	Mr. S.P. Kale, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order on Board****16/07/2021**

1. The present writ petition was filed challenging the award dated 13.05.2014 passed by the Labour Court, Janjgir-Champa in case No. 62/I.D. Act/2013 (Ref.). Vide the impugned award, the Labour Court has granted relief of reinstatement without back-wages.
2. The respondent worker involved in the present case is said to have employed as daily wage worker under the petitioners from 1980 to 1989. Thereafter he was discontinued from service abruptly. The worker thereafter raised a dispute under the Industrial Disputes Act and the matter stood referred to the Labour Court. The Labour Court taking into consideration the pleadings and the evidence which have been brought on record on either side, vide impugned award has answered the reference in the affirmative holding that

the respondent worker is entitled for the benefit of reinstatement without back-wages.

3. The impugned award dated 13.05.2014 was challenged by way of present writ petition which was filed by the petitioners on 15.12.2014.
4. From the documents enclosed along with the writ petition itself it shows that the respondent worker was reinstated by the authorities as early as on 01.07.2014 and from 01.07.2014 onwards the worker has been continuously working under the petitioners. Today when the matter is taken up for final hearing, the counsel for the respondent worker submits that pending the writ petition before this court the State Government itself has vide order dated 14.02.2020 regularized the services of the worker and since then he is working as a regular employee under the petitioners.
5. Given the aforesaid submission by the counsel for the respondent-worker, particularly taking note of the fact that he stood reinstated in service pending the writ petition, the equity stands in favour of the worker who firstly was reinstated immediately by the petitioners w.e.f. 01.07.2014 and since then he has put in a decade of continuous service and meanwhile he also stands regularized under the petitioners. Moreover, by efflux of time as the respondent worker also has served the petitioners for quite some time and is at the fag end of his service career where only few years of service is left for his retirement.
6. Under the circumstances, this court is inclined to dispose of the writ petition holding that the award passed by the Labour Court does not

warrant any interference at this stage in the light of subsequent development that has transpired particularly in favour of the respondent-worker.

7. The writ petition accordingly stands disposed of maintaining the award passed by the Labour Court.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge