

 $\$ \sim$

*** IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

%

Judgment reserved on: 25.10.2024
Judgment pronounced on: 06.11.2024

+ **W.P.(C) 15094/2024**

RAVINDER MANDAL

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Pulkit Prakash and Mr. Arjun
Mohan, Advocates

versus

M/S D.L.F. UNIVERSAL LTD.

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Varun Kumar, Advocate

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GIRISH KATHPALIA

J U D G M E N T

GIRISH KATHPALIA, J.:

1. This writ action brought under Articles 226 read with 227 of the Constitution of India assails the Labour Court Award dated 24.04.2024, whereby after full dress trial the learned Labour Court answered the Labour Court Reference against the petitioner workman, holding that his services were not terminated by the respondent management under the garb of transfer order dated 18.01.2021. On the basis of advance intimation the respondent management entered appearance through counsel, who accepted notice. At request of both sides, I heard final arguments at initial stage itself

W.P.(C) 15094/2024


Page 1 of 8 pages

GIRISH
KATHPALIA

Digitally signed by GIRISH KATHPALIA
DN: c=IN, ou=HIGH COURT OF DELHI, ou=DELHI HIGH COURT,
2.5.4.20=8401d8b8627a7b2f65ff64efec45569d37962c5b64
835d435f97626cacc, postalCode=110003, st=DELHI,
serialNumber=D3B86796451EC45C07B5D1570996B40F80CB
D2EE66402C487665FF801E24FA, cn=GIRISH KATHPALIA
Date: 2024.03.16 14:56:10 +0530

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed
By:NEETUN NAIR
Signing Date:06.11.2024
16:11:09





2024:DHC:8540



facilities related to transfer as per the HR Manual of the respondent; that he was stopped from continuing his duty at the Delhi site and was directed to immediately report at Chennai.

2.2 In response before the Labour Court, the respondent management filed their written statement, denying the pleadings of the petitioner workman. In written statement the respondent management claimed that the petitioner was not a “workman” within the meaning of Section 2(s) of the Industrial Disputes Act, as he was a Senior Foreman; and further explained that services of the petitioner workman had never been terminated though he had been transferred to Chennai due to administrative exigencies, as he was on transferable job, but despite repeated reminders he did not join duty at the transferee place of posting.

2.3 The petitioner workman filed a rejoinder, thereby denying the pleadings of the respondent management and reaffirmed the claim contents.

2.4 On the basis of above rival pleadings, the Labour Court framed the following issues:

- (i) *Whether the claimant had worked with the management w.e.f 25.09.2007 and his services have been illegally and unjustifiably terminated under the garb of transfer from Capital Green Project, Delhi to IT Park Project, Chennai vide transfer order dated 18.01.2017? OPW*
- (ii) *Whether the claimant is workman within the meaning of Section 2(S) of the Industrial Dispute Act? OPW*
- (iii) *Whether the claimant has caused professional damages to the reputation of th management? OPM*

W.P.(C) 15094/2024

Page 3 of 8 pages

GIRISH
KATHPALIA

Signature Not Verified
Digitally Signed
By: NEETU N NAIR
Signing Date: 06.11.2024
16:11:09

Digitally signed by GIRISH KATHPALIA
DN: cn=GIRISH KATHPALIA, o=DELHI HIGH COURT,
2.5.4.20=8471a888b27a77b3888a4e410d0a7892a8a8
3b4e0f7b3a8a, postalCode=110002, st=DELHI
serialNumber=C28E8794611C4C07D5D1570998A78D3C
C28E8794611C4C07D5D1570998A78D3C, cn=GIRISH KATHPALIA
Date: 2024.11.06 16:11:02 +0530



2024:DHC:8540



(iv) *Relief*

2.5 After conducting trial on the above issues and hearing both sides, the learned Labour Court passed the impugned Award, thereby holding that the respondent management had failed to prove the nature of duties assigned to the petitioner to be of managerial tone, so it cannot be denied that he was a “workman” within the meaning of Section 2(s) of the Act; and that the evidence on record establishes that the respondent management had not terminated services of the petitioner workman and had only transferred him to Chennai due to administrative exigencies in terms of his appointment, but he opted not to join there.

3. Hence, the present petition.

4. During arguments, learned counsel for petitioner took me through above mentioned rival pleadings as well as evidence and contended that the impugned Award is not sustainable in the eyes of law. Learned counsel for petitioner contended that the order of transfer of petitioner to Chennai was vindictive as he had refused to help the respondent management in conversion of currency upon demonetization and shifting to Chennai in January month would have harmed studies of his children. It was further argued that the respondent management did not pay the shifting expenses to the petitioner, so he could not be held guilty of having not complied with the transfer order.


W.P.(C) 15094/2024


Page 4 of 8 pages

GIRISH
KATHPALIA


Digitally signed by GIRISH KATHPALIA
DN: cn=GIRISH KATHPALIA, o=HIGH COURT OF DELHI, ou=DELHI HIGH COURT, email=girishkathpalia@delhihighcourt.org, c=IN
c=IN, email=girishkathpalia@delhihighcourt.org, ou=DELHI HIGH COURT, o=HIGH COURT OF DELHI, cn=GIRISH KATHPALIA
Date: 2024.11.06 14:16:29 +05'30'

Signature Not Verified
Digitally Signed
By: NEETU N NAIR
Signing Date: 06.11.2024
16:11:09





Digitally signed by GRISH KATHPALIA
DN: c=IN, o=HIGH COURT OF DELHI, ou=DELHI HIGH COURT,
2.5.4.20=8401d889b27a277b26f5f0fa4afa4c556af3962c5fb4
835d433f97626acca, postalCode=110003, st=DELHI,
serialNumber=D31E8796451EC45C07B5D1557096640F80CB
D2EE8E0602C487965F501A2F6A, cn=GRISH KATHPALIA
Date: 2023.11.16 14:43:55 +0530



across the country. By way of order dated 18.01.2017 Ex. WW1/3 (*pdf page 189*), the petitioner workman was transferred from Capital Green Project, Delhi to IT Park, Chennai with immediate effect and was relieved from his duties and was also informed the specific official at Chennai to whom he had to report. The petitioner himself pleaded that efforts were done by the respondent management to serve the said transfer order on him on 20.01.2017 but he refused to accept the same. That, in itself would be a serious misconduct on his part. Admittedly, the petitioner did not comply with the said transfer order and did not report at Chennai office.

10. The petitioner workman alleges that his transfer from Delhi to Chennai was basically tool of terminating his services illegally, because he refused to oblige the respondent management in the conversion of currency after demonetization. But in his representation dated 23.01.2017 Ex. MW1/6 (*pdf page 190*), the petitioner did not make even a whisper of this allegation. The learned Labour Court rightly found the said allegation not believable.

11. In his representation dated 23.01.2017 Ex. MW1/6, the petitioner workman mainly expressed his difficulties in complying with the transfer order, which representation was rejected by the respondent management vide letter dated 27.01.2017 Ex. WW1/5 (*pdf page 194*), informing him of his eligibility for his travel facility to which he and his family are entitled. The petitioner workman ought to have reported at Chennai office forthwith and ought to have sought reimbursement of his expenses. Not only this,

W.P.(C) 15094/2024

Page 7 of 8 pages

GIRISH
KATHPALIA

Digitally signed by GRIISH KATHPALIA
DN: c=IN, o=HIGH COURT OF DELHI, ou=DELHI HIGH COURT,
2.5.4.20=8401d88b27a77b2b65ff04efac45569a3962c8fb4835
643597626acca, postalCode=110003, st=DELHI,
serialNumber=D3EB6796451EC45C07B5D15570996B40F80C8D2
EE66403D2C48795FF801B2E2FA, cn=GRIISH KATHPALIA
Date: 2003.03.23 06:43:30 +05'30'



2024:DHC:8540



according to the HR Manual (*pdf page 182*), copy whereof was filed by the petitioner workman, it was his duty to prepare an estimate of shifting expenses and to get the same approved from the authorized officer of the management, but he did not do so.

12. As regards the difficulties qua education of petitioner's children, learned Labour Court in the impugned order correctly recorded that children of the petitioner being aged 6 and 4 years, no academic damage would have been caused to their career had the petitioner complied with the transfer order. The petitioner workman having consciously joined a job that was transferable across the country could not have refused to comply with the transfer order.

13. I find no infirmity in the impugned award, so the same is upheld and the present petition is dismissed.

**GIRISH
KATHPALIA**

Digitally signed by GIRISH KATHPALIA
DN: c=IN, o=HIGH COURT OF DELHI,
ou=DELHI HIGH COURT,
2.5.4.20=8401dd889b27a77b2f65ffffe4af
ec45569af3962c6fb4835d435f97626cacc
a, postalCode=110003, st=DELHI,
serialNumber=D3E86796451EC45C07B5
D15570996B40F80CBD2EEE60402C48796
5FF801E26FA, cn=GIRISH KATHPALIA
Date: 2024.11.06 14:17:06 +05'30'

**GIRISH KATHPALIA
(JUDGE)**

NOVEMBER 06, 2024/ry

W.P.(C) 15094/2024

Page 8 of 8 pages