

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

Writ Petition (L) No. 298 of 2014

1. State of Chhattisgarh through the Secretary Department of Water Resources, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, Naya Raipur (CG).
The petitioner No.1 was not a party before the Labour Court but has been impleaded as petitioner No.1 in the instant petition as the proper course is to implead the State Govt. through the Secretary of the concerned department.
2. Executive Engineer, Hasdeo Nahar Jal Prabandh Sambhag, Janjgir, District Janjgir Champa (CG).

---Petitioner(s)

Versus

1. Arjun Lal Yadav S/o Ashok Yadav, aged about 40 years, R/o Khokhsa, PS & Tehsil Janjgir, District Janjgir Champa (CG).

---Respondents

For Petitioner-State	:	Ms. Sunita Jain, Govt. Advocate.
For Respondent	:	Shri SP Kale, Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy

Order on Board

07.06.2021

1. The present writ petition was filed challenging the award dated 13.05.2014, pronounced on 18.06.2014, passed by the Labour Court, Janjgir Champa in case No.61/ID Act/2013 (Ref.).
2. The respondent worker involved in the present case was working under the petitioners as daily wage employee from 1982 to 1995 and since June, 1996 the services of the respondent stood discontinued. The dispute was raised before the Industrial Court and the matter stood referred to the Labour Court in the year, 2013 and the award was passed by the Labour Court on 13.05.2014 reinstating the services of the respondent without backwages.
3. Today when the matter was taken up for hearing, learned counsel for the respondent worker submits that the worker involved in the present dispute Arjun Lal Yadav-respondent herein, has since been regularized by the State Govt. pending the writ petition vide order dated 29.02.2020. It was

further contention of the respondent that the award under challenge in the present writ petition was immediately complied with by the petitioner- State Govt. and the worker was reinstated in service w.e.f. July, 2014 onwards and since then the worker has been continuously working under the petitioner.

4. Given the aforesaid submission by the counsel for the respondent-worker, particularly taking note of the fact that he stood reinstated in service from July, 2014 and continued in service pending the writ petition and the petitioners have now also ordered for regularization of his services, the law of equity demands that the award of the Labour Court need not be interfered at this juncture any further.
5. Under the circumstances, this court is inclined to dispose of the 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.
6. The writ petition accordingly stands disposed of.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge