

**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**

**Writ Petition (L) No. 108 of 2013**

1. State of Chhattisgarh through the Secretary, Department of Water Resources, Mahanadi Bhawan, Naya Mantralaya, Naya Raipur, PS Mandir Hasaud, Raipur (CG)  
(Petitioner No.1 was not a party before the learned Labour Court but has been impleaded as petitioner No.1 herein as it is necessary to implead the State Govt. through the Secretary of the concerned department.)
2. The Executive Engineer, Hasdeo Barrage, RBC, Water Resources Department, Rampur, P.S. Rampur, District Korba (CG)

**---Petitioner(s)**

**Versus**

1. Chandra Kumar Pandey S/o Damru Prasad Pandey, R/o Irrigation Colony, Near Darri Thana, P.S. Darri, Tahsil- Katghora, District Korba (CG).
2. The Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Korba, P.S. Korba, District Korba (CG)

**---Respondents**

---

|                      |   |                                 |
|----------------------|---|---------------------------------|
| For Petitioner-State | : | Ms. Sunita Jain, Govt. Advocate |
| For Respondent no.1  | : | Shri S. P. Kale, Advocate.      |

---

**Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**

**Order on Board**

**21.06.2021**

1. The present writ petition was filed challenging the award dated 09.01.2013 passed by the Labour Court, Korba in case No.09/ID Act/ 2011 (Ref.). Vide the impugned award, the Labour Court has granted the relief of reinstatement without backwages.

2. The respondent-worker involved in the present case is said to have employed as daily wage worker under the petitioners during 01.02.1992 to 28.02.1995. 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 backwages.
3. The impugned award dated 09.01.2013 was challenged by way of present writ petition which was filed by the petitioners on 14.06.2013.
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 11.04.2013 and from 11.04.2013 onward the worker has been continuously working under the petitioners.
5. Today when the matter is taken up for final hearing, counsel for the respondent worker submits that pending the writ petition before this Court the State Government itself has vide order dated 28.02.2020 regularized the services of the worker and since then he is working as a regular employee under the petitioners.
6. Given the aforesaid submission by the counsel for the respondent-worker, particularly taking note of the fact that the petitioner 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. 11.04.2013 and since then he has put in more than 8 years of continuous service and meanwhile he also stands

regularized under the petitioners. Moreover, by efflux of time the respondent worker has also 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.

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

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

Khatai