
(2012) 12 MP CK 0025
In the Madhya Pradesh High Court

Managing Director, MPSRTC and Another	APPELLANT
Vs	
Mohammed Jamil	RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 10-12-2012

Acts Referred:

Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 — Section 33(C)(2)

Citation : (2012) 12 MP CK 0025

Hon'ble Judges : Rajendra Menon, J

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : P.K. Mishra, for the Appellant;

Final Decision : Dismissed

Judgement

Rajendra Menon, J.—Challenging an order passed by the Labour Court, Khandwa in a proceeding initiated before him u/s 33(C)(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and the order for payment of Rs. 10,351/- to the respondent/workman, this writ petition has been filed. Respondent was working as a Driver in the MP State Road Transport Corporation and was granted retirement under the VRS Scheme. As his pensionary claim and post retiral dues were not paid, it seems that he initiated proceedings u/s 33(C)(2) of the ID Act. It was his contention that he was entitled to a sum of Rs. 6,20,784/-, out of which only a sum of Rs. 2,23,498/- has been paid. Accordingly, seeking payment of the remaining amount of Rs. 3,97,355/-, the application was filed and after adjudication of the dispute in question, initially in the original application and subsequently in the review application vide orders - Annexures P/2 and P/3, a sum of Rs. 10,351/- is directed to be paid to respondent.

2. Having heard learned counsel for the petitioners and on going through the order passed by the Labour Court, it is seen that the direction for payment of Rs. 10,351/- has been issued based on the admission made by the petitioner/ Corporation in the written statement filed before the Labour court. Once the amount determined for payment i.e..... Rs. 10,351/-, is based on the admission made by the petitioners themselves, in the proceedings held before the Labour

Court, I see no reason to interfere into the matter. It is clear from the records that the petitioners in the proceedings held before the Labour Court had made an admission that respondent is entitled to the sum of Rs. 10,351/- and based on such an admission when the amount is determined and directed to be paid, I am of the considered view that the Labour Court has not committed any error warranting interference. Accordingly, finding no merit in the claim made by the petitioners, this writ petition stands dismissed.