

(1995) 11 GUJ CK 0014
In the Gujarat High Court

Case No : Misc. Civil Application (Contempt Petition) No. 225 of 1990

General Secretary, Gujarat Mineral Development Corporation APPELLANT
Employees Union

Vs

P.G. Ramrakhiyani RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 07-11-1995

Acts Referred:

Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 — Section 10, 7, 7A

Citation : (1996) 3 GLR 112

Hon'ble Judges : S.M. Soni, J; R.R. Jain, J

Bench : Division Bench

Judgement

S.M. Soni, J.—In all these matters, common question involved is whether Labour Court or an Industrial Tribunal is a "Court" within the meaning of "subordinate Court" as contemplated in Section 10 of the Contempt of Courts Act. Labour Court is established u/s 7 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 ("Act" for short) and Industrial Tribunal is established u/s 7A of the Act. If one also looks at the powers which they can exercise, they are given power to exercise for the matters pertaining to different Schedules. If one reads Secs. 7 and Section 7A, they are *pari materia*, Secs. 7 of the Act empowers Labour Court to adjudicate disputes specified in the Second Schedule and for performing such other functions as may be assigned to them under the said Act. Tribunals established u/s 7A of the Act empower adjudication of disputes relating to and specified in the Second Schedule or Third Schedule and for performing such other functions as may be assigned to them under the said Act. Therefore, on reading Section 7 and Section 7A, it is clear that the Tribunal u/s 7A can adjudicate all the disputes specified in Second Schedule as well as Third Schedule while the Labour Court's powers are limited to Second Schedule only. Labour Court as well as Tribunals can also perform such other functions as may be assigned to them under the said Act. Thus, it cannot be said that there is any difference or distinction between Labour Courts and Tribunals, except powers that they are required to exercise as qualified in the section itself.

2. Supreme Court in the case of Alahar Co-operative Credit Service Society v. Sham Lal, reported in 1995 (2) GLH 550, has held that the Labour Court is not a "Court" subordinate to the High Court in the sense the Contempt of Courts Act makes provision requiring the High Court to deal with contempt of its subordinate Courts. It is also clear that Industrial Disputes Act provides for execution of the orders, either by way of Civil action or by way of penal action. Thus, Industrial Disputes Act has provided for the execution of the orders that may be passed by the Labour Courts or the Tribunals. Thus, Supreme Courts in the aforesaid case has further held that contempt proceedings are again not intended to be a substitute of the execution process. Thus, in view of the Supreme Court judgment in case of Alahar Co-operative Credit Service Society (supra), these petitions are not maintainable in law, as Labour Court and the Industrial Tribunals are not Court subordinate to High Court as required u/s 10 of the Contempt of Courts Act. In view of this fact, these petitions are not maintainable and are liable to be dismissed and are hereby dismissed. Rule is discharged in each of the petitions with no order as to costs.

3. Petition dismissed.