



2024:DHC:7203



\$~82

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

%

Date of Order: 19.09.2024

+

W.P.(C) 11009/2024 & CM Appl.45426/2024**RAVI KUMAR**

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Anil Kumar and Mr. Narender
Kumar, Adv.

versus

JAIN COOPERATIVE BANK LTD.

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Abhinav Sharma and Mr. Ravi
Singh Chhikara, Adv.**CORAM:****HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE TARA VITASTA GANJU****TARA VITASTA GANJU, J.: (ORAL)**

1. The present Petition has been filed on behalf of the Petitioner impugning the Award dated 07.11.2023 [hereinafter referred to as “the Impugned Award”] passed by the learned Additional District and Sessions Judge, POLC-8, Rouse Avenue District Courts, Delhi. By the Impugned Award, the complaint filed by the Petitioner/Workman was dismissed by the learned Labour Court on the applicability of the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, in view of the specific bar as placed by the provisions of Section 70(1)(b) of the Delhi Cooperative Societies Act, 2003 [hereinafter referred to as “DCS Act”].

2. Notice in the present Petition was issued on 08.08.2024. Pursuant thereto, the Respondent sought time to examine the matter and take instructions, and if necessary, file a Counter-Affidavit. No Counter-Affidavit has been filed by the Respondent till today.

2.1 Learned Counsel for the Respondent submits that no Counter-



2024:DHC:7203



Affidavit is necessary to be filed and he will make oral submissions.

3. With the consent of the parties, the matter is taken up for hearing and disposal today.

4. The brief facts are that the Petitioner was working as a peon with the Respondent since the year 2001. Pursuant to a disciplinary action initiated against the Petitioner, the Petitioner was removed from the services of the Respondent. The Petitioner raised an industrial dispute *inter alia* alleging that his services have been terminated illegally or unjustifiably and also filed a Petition before the Industrial Tribunal.

4.1 By the Impugned Award, the learned Labour Court found that the action of the Respondent/Bank of terminating the services of the Petitioner comes within purview of Section 70(1)(b) of the DCS Act and that only the Registrar of Cooperative Societies Act is competent to decide such a dispute, dismissing the claim petition filed by the Petitioner.

5. Learned Counsel for the Petitioner has made the following submissions; it is contended that so far as it concerns the bar in Section 70(1) of the DCS Act, there is an exception, which is a dispute regarding disciplinary action, and which is present in the Section itself and that the action taken against the Petitioner was a disciplinary action. Hence, the provision is inapplicable.

5.1 Learned Counsel submits that the Petitioner was removed from the services pursuant to a disciplinary action initiated by the Respondent. In this regard he seeks to rely upon the Reply dated 03.02.2023 filed by the Respondent before the learned Labour Court wherein the Respondent has admitted in Paragraph 3 that the services of the claimant were terminated due to his behaviour and on initiation of a disciplinary action.



“3. ... It is pertinent to note that the services of the claimant were terminated due to his indecent, disorderly and negligent behavior due to which punishment in the form of termination was inflicted as a disciplinary action against the claimant as prescribed under Chapter II, Section IV (g) of Employees Services Rules and therefore shall not come within the purview of retrenchment. Moreover, the claimant has not challenged the vires of the applicable service rules and in absence of that the present claim is not maintainable. It will be relevant to highlight Section IV (g) of Employees Services Rules:

“Section-4: Termination/Tenure of Service

Without prejudice to any other provisions of these rules; the Competent Authority- with the approval of the Board of Directors or that of the Chairman may terminate the tenure of employment of an employee or prematurely retire an employee on the following occasions, irrespective of his/her terms and conditions of appointment:

g) When an employee has lost the pleasure and confidence of the Board of Directors/the Chairman due to any act(s) of misconduct and or any reason(s) detrimental to the interest of the Bank without any notice...”

[Emphasis supplied]

5.2 Learned Counsel for the Petitioner further seeks to rely upon the judgment passed by the Supreme Court in the matter titled as ***K.A. Annamma v. Secretary, Cochin Co-operative Hospital Society Ltd.***¹, to submit that the learned Labour Court has concurrent jurisdiction with the Cooperative Societies Act and that the Tribunal can adjudicate upon such a dispute provided it is satisfied that the employee concerned is a ‘Workman’ and that the dispute raised by him is an ‘Industrial Dispute’. Learned Counsel for the Petitioner submits that both these pre-requisites stand satisfied in the present case and that the Respondent has not raised any objection with regard either to the status of the Petitioner as being a workman or that this is not an industrial dispute.

¹ (2018) 2 SCC 729



6. Learned Counsel for the Respondent on the other hand submits that the issue with respect to jurisdiction of the learned Labour Court is a legal issue, which has been correctly decided by the learned Labour Court.

6.1 Relying on the judgment of the Supreme Court in *Cooperative Central Bank Ltd. and Ors. v. Additional Industrial Tribunal, Andhra Pradesh and Ors.*², it is submitted that the disputes of this nature are required to be adjudicated upon by the Registrar of Cooperative Societies himself. It is further contended that the Kerala Co-operative Societies Act, 1969 [hereinafter referred to as “Kerala Act”], which is referred to in the *K.A. Annamma* case does not contain the words “disciplinary action” thus, the case is not applicable to the present case. Lastly, it is contended that whether or not it is a “disciplinary action”, is something to be decided by the learned Labour Court.

7. In the Rejoinder, learned Counsel for the Petitioner submits that so far as it concerns the judgment in the *Cooperative Central Bank* case, the same is not applicable as it was in essence in the context of a reference made with respect to service conditions and with respect to conditions in relation to transfer of employees of two banks. It is submitted that it was on the basis of these issues that the entire judgment is premised.

7.1 In addition, it is contended that the words “disciplinary actions”, form part of Section 70(1) of the DCS Act, which by itself makes it clear that an exception has been carved out for the same. He reiterates that *K.A. Annamma* case also sets out that the Registrar and the learned Labour Court have concurrent jurisdiction and it is the discretion of the Workman to

² (1969) 2 SCC 43



choose his forum for adjudication.

8. This Court is unable to agree with the submissions of the Respondent. The reasons are being explained hereafter. The record shows that the Petitioner was removed from the services of the Respondent for misconduct. The Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of the Respondent passed, an order dated 28.04.2021, directing that the services of the Petitioner be terminated on account of his indecent and disorderly behaviour and insubordination. This contention has also been set out by the Respondent in paragraph 3 of the Reply to the Statement of Claim filed before the learned Labour Court which is reproduced above. It sets out that the action taken by the Respondent was in the nature of disciplinary action and on account of misconduct. A review of the Reply shows that there is an admission on the part of the Respondent that the services of the Petitioner were terminated by the Respondent in pursuance of a disciplinary action initiated against the Petitioner.

9. Sub-Section (1) of Section 70 of the DCS Act provides for a bar on a Civil Court from entertaining certain disputes. It *inter alia* states that where a dispute touching the business of a Cooperative Society amongst its members, past members or between two Cooperative Societies exists, the dispute shall be referred to the Registrar for such a decision. The Section contains within itself an exception, which is with respect to a dispute regarding a disciplinary action against action taken by the Cooperative Society against a paid employee. Section 70(1) is set out below:

“70. Disputes which may be referred for arbitration.

(1) Notwithstanding anything contained in any law for the time being in force, if any dispute touching the constitution, management or the



business of a co-operative society other than a dispute regarding disciplinary action taken by the cooperative society or its committee against a paid employee of the co-operative society arises -

(a) among members, past members and persons claiming through members, past members and deceased members; or

(b) between a member, past member or person claiming through a member, past member or deceased member and the co-operative society, its committee or any officer, agent or employee of the co-operative society or liquidator, past or present; or

(c) between the co-operative society or its committee and any past committee, any officer, agent or employee, or any past officer, past agent or past employee or the nominee, heirs or legal representatives of any deceased officer, deceased agent, or deceased employee of the co-operative society; or

(d) between the co-operative society and any other co-operative society, between a co-operative society and liquidator of another co-operative society or between the liquidator of one co-operative society and the liquidator of another co-operative society;

such disputes shall be referred to the Registrar for decision and no court shall have jurisdiction to entertain any suit or other proceedings in respect of such disputes.”

[Emphasis supplied]

9.1 A plain reading of the aforesaid Section shows that where there is a dispute which relates to disciplinary action taken by the Cooperative Society against a paid employee, such a dispute will not be barred by the provisions of Section 70(1) of the DCS Act.

9.2 Learned Counsel for the Respondent has contended that the **K.A. Annamma** case is not applicable to the facts of the present case as the *pari materia* Section (Section 69) of the Kerala Act (as amended in 2003) is different from Section 70 of the DCS Act. Section 69 of the Kerala Act is set



out below:

“69. Disputes to be decided by Cooperative Arbitration Court and Registrar.—

(1) Notwithstanding anything contained in any law for the time being in force, if a dispute arises—

(a) among members, past members and persons claiming through members, past members and deceased members; or

(b) between a member, past member or person claiming through a member, a past member or deceased member and the society, its committee or any officer, agent or employee of the society; or

(c) between the society or its committee and any past committee any officer, agent or employee or any past officer, past agent or past employee or the nominee, heirs or legal representatives of any deceased officer, deceased agent or deceased employee of the society; or

(d) between the society and any other society; or

(e) between a society and the members of a society affiliated to it; or

(f) between the society and a person, other than a member of the society, who has been granted a loan by the society or with whom the society has or had business transactions or any person claiming through such a person; or

(g) between the society and a surety of a member, past member, deceased member or employee or a person, other than a member, who has been granted a loan by the society, whether such a surety is or is not a member of the society; or

(h) between the society and a creditor of the society, such dispute shall be referred to the Cooperative Arbitration Court constituted under Section 70-A in the case of non-monetary disputes and to the Registrar, in the case of monetary disputes; and the Arbitration Court, or the Registrar, as the case may be, shall decide such dispute and no other court or other authority shall have jurisdiction to entertain any suit or other proceedings in respect of such dispute.

(2) For the purposes of sub-section (1), the following shall also be deemed to be disputes, namely—



(a) a claim by the society for any debt or demand due to it from a member or the nominee, heirs or legal representatives of a deceased member, whether such debt or demand be admitted or not;

(b) a claim by a surety against the principal debtor, where the society has recovered from the surety any amount in respect of any debt or demand due to it from the principal debtor, as a result of the default of the principal debtor, whether such debt or demand is admitted or not;

(c) any dispute arising in connection with the election of the Board of Management or any officer of the society;

Explanation.—A dispute arising at any stage of an election commencing from the convening of the general body meeting for the election, shall be deemed to be a dispute arising in connection with the election;

(d) any dispute arising in connection with employment of officers and servants of the different classes of societies specified in sub-section (1) of Section 80, including their promotion and inter se seniority.

(3) No dispute arising in connection with the election of the Board of Management or an officer of the society shall be entertained by the Cooperative Arbitration Court unless it is referred to it within one month from the date of the election. ”

9.3 A careful review of this Section shows that the bar of jurisdiction under the Kerala Act refers to disputes arising amongst various categories which are set out in Para (a) to (h) of Sub-Section (1) of Section 69 of the Kerala Act. Amongst these disputes are disputes amongst members *inter se*, both past and present, disputes between the society and its Committee, between two different societies, between a society and its members where such member has taken a loan and between the societies a creditor of society of such society etc. There is no reference in this sub-Section to exclusion of disputes between a society and a paid employee in relation to a disciplinary action. Thus, even under the Kerala Act, Section 69 would not oust the



jurisdiction of the Civil Court.

10. The Supreme Court in the ***K.A. Annamma*** case has held that both the Kerala Act and the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 possess concurrent jurisdiction to decide a service dispute between a Cooperative society employee and his employer. The Court has also held that the employee has the right to approach either the Labour Court/Industrial Tribunal or Registrar, both of whom have concurrent jurisdiction. The Labour Court/Tribunal can adjudicate upon a dispute provided, it is specified that the employee concerned is a workman and the dispute raised by him is an ‘industrial dispute’. The relevant extract is below:

“67. In the light of the foregoing discussion, we are of the considered opinion that the view of majority Judges cannot be upheld whereas the view of the minority Judges in Santhosh case deserves to be upheld and is accordingly upheld. We accordingly hold that the KCS Act and the ID Act both possess and enjoy the concurrent jurisdiction to decide any service dispute arising between the cooperative society’s employee and his/her employer (cooperative society).”

68. We also hold that it is the choice of the employee concerned to choose any one forum out of the two forums available to him/her under the two Acts (the KCS Act and the ID Act) to get his/her service dispute decided. It is, however, subject to satisfying the test laid down under the ID Act that the employee concerned is a “workman”, the dispute raised by him/her is an “industrial dispute” and the cooperative society (employer) is an “industry” as defined under the ID Act.”

[Emphasis supplied]

10.1 So far as concerns the reliance placed by Respondent on the ***Cooperative Central Bank*** case, the subject matter of the dispute was service conditions, such as salary, skills, dearness allowance, other special allowances, etc. and in relation to *inter-se* transfers between the Banks. The case was filed in the context of the Andhra Pradesh Cooperative Societies



2024:DHC:7203



Act, 1964 [hereinafter referred to as “Andhra Pradesh Act”] and the question formulated under the judgement was with respect to the provisions of Section 61 of the Andhra Pradesh Act. The Court held that, in the context of service conditions and transfer of employees, the Industrial Tribunal under the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 would have jurisdiction. Thus, the judgement in the ***Cooperative Central Bank*** case is inapplicable to the circumstances of the present case.

11. Undisputedly, in the present case, the Petitioner was working as a peon with the Respondent since the year 2001 and was terminated pursuant to disciplinary action as initiated against him under the Staff Service Rules of the Bank for misconduct. As discussed above, such action does not fall within the definition of Section 70(1) of the DCS Act.

12. For the reasons as set out above, the Petition is allowed. The matter is remanded to the learned Labour Court for a *de novo hearing* to adjudicate the matter afresh.

13. It is clarified that the dispute has not been examined on merits by the Court and all rights and contentions of both parties are left open in this regard.

14. Parties will act based on the digitally signed copy of the order.

TARA VITASTA GANJU, J

SEPTEMBER 19, 2024/r

Click here to check corrigendum, if any