
(2015) 05 SHI CK 0048
In the High Court Of Himachal Pradesh
Case No : CWP No. 7429 of 2011

Mohinder Singh

APPELLANT

Vs

Himachal Pradesh State Electricity Board Limited and Others

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 04-05-2015

Acts Referred:

Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 — Section 10(1)(c), 25(F), 25(H)

Citation : (2015) 146 FLR 858 : (2015) 2 LLJ 696 : (2015) 4 LLN 687 : (2015) LLR 833

Hon'ble Judges : Rajiv Sharma, J

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : R.L. Chaudhary, for the Appellant; Richa Sharma, Advocates for the Respondent

Final Decision : Allowed

Judgement

Rajiv Sharma, J.—Petitioner was engaged by the respondent-Board on 17.12.1997. He was retrenched in violation of section 25(F), (G) and (H) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 on 24.10.2001. Petitioner came to know subsequently that persons, namely, Uma Devi, Jagdish and Kashmir were retained and were permitted to complete requisite number of years for regularization. Petitioner raised industrial dispute. The matter was referred to the Conciliation Officer-cum-Labour Officer. He submitted the failure report. The Labour Commissioner refused to make the reference vide order dated 24.3.2011 on the ground that there was delay of seven years.

2. Respondents No. 1 and 2 have filed the reply. It is stated in para No. 3 of the reply that petitioner has left the job of his own volition and persons junior to him, namely, Jagdish Kumar and Kashmir Singh continuously remained in service and have completed requisite number of years towards regularization and subsequently they have been regularized. So far as Uma Devi wife of Parminder Kumar is concerned, she was engaged on 2.12.1998 and conferred with work charge status on 14.1.2009 as T-Mate. Petitioner was not issued any show cause

notice for re-engagement when Uma Devi was engaged on 2.12.1998. The retrenchment of the petitioner was in violation of section 25(F) and (G) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. The principles of "last come first go" have not been followed. There is violation of section 25(H) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, which gives continuous cause of action to the petitioner.

3. The demand notice should be raised within a reasonable period. But in this case, taking into consideration the facts and circumstances of the case, mentioned herein above, delay cannot be held to be inordinate.

4. Their lordships" of the Hon"ble Supreme Court in the case of Raghubir Singh Vs. General Manager, Haryana Roadways, (2014) AIRSCW 5515 : (2014) 10 SCALE 135 , have held that the State Government can make the reference at any time. Their Lordships have held as under:

13. In the case on hand, no doubt there is a delay in raising the dispute by the appellant; the Labour Court nevertheless has the power to mould the relief accordingly. At the time of adjudication, if the dispute referred to the Labour Court is not adjudicated by it, it does not mean that the dispute ceases to exist. The appropriate government in exercise of its statutory power under Section 10(1)(c) of the Act can refer the industrial dispute, between the parties, at any time, to either the jurisdictional Labour Court/Industrial Tribunal as interpreted by this Court in the Avon Services case referred to supra. Therefore, the State Government has rightly exercised its power under Section 10(1)(c) of the Act and referred the points of dispute to the Labour Court as the same are in accordance with the law laid down by this Court in Avon Services and Sapan Kumar Pandit cases referred to supra.

14. Further, the workman cannot be denied to seek relief only on the ground of delay in raising the dispute as held in the case of S.M. Nilajkar and Others Vs. Telecom, District Manager, Karnataka, AIR 2003 SC 3553 : (2003) 97 FLR 608 : (2003) 3 JT 436 : (2003) 2 LLJ 359 : (2003) 3 SCALE 533 : (2003) 4 SCC 27 : (2003) SCC(L&S) 380 : (2003) 3 SCR 156 : (2003) AIRSCW 2196 : (2003) 3 Supreme 53 it was held by this Court as follows-

17. It was submitted on behalf of the respondent that on account of delay in raising the dispute by the appellants the High Court was justified in denying relief to the appellants. We cannot agree..... In Ratan Chandra Sammanta and others Vs. Union of India and others, AIR 1993 SC 2276 : (1993) 3 JT 418 : (1993) LabIC 1672 : (1993) 2 LLJ 676 : (1993) 2 SCALE 974 : (1993) 4 SCC 67 Supp : (1993) 3 SCR 751 , it was held that a casual labourer retrenched by the employer deprives himself of remedy available in law by delay itself, lapse of time results in losing the remedy and the right as well. The delay would certainly be fatal if it has resulted in material evidence relevant to adjudication being lost and rendered not available. However, we do not think that the delay in the case at hand has been so culpable as to disentitle the appellants for any relief.....

(Emphasis laid by the Court)

14.1 In view of the legal principles laid down by this Court in the above judgment, the reference of the industrial dispute made in the case on hand by the State Government to the Labour Court to adjudicate the existing industrial dispute between the parties was made within a reasonable time, considering the circumstances in which the workman was placed, firstly, as there was a criminal case pending against him and secondly, the respondent had assured the workman that he would be reinstated after his acquittal from the criminal case. Moreover, it is reasonable to adjudicate the industrial dispute in spite of the delay in raising and referring the matter, since there is no mention of any loss or unavailability of material evidence due to the delay. Thus, we do not consider the delay in raising the industrial dispute and referring the same to the Labour Court for adjudication as gravely erroneous and it does not debar the workman from claiming rightful relief from his employer.

42. It is an undisputed fact that the dispute was raised by the workman after he was acquitted in the criminal case which was initiated at the instance of the respondent. Raising the industrial dispute belatedly and getting the same referred from the State Government to the Labour Court is for justifiable reason and the same is supported by law laid down by this Court in Calcutta Dock Labour Board (supra). Even assuming for the sake of the argument that there was a certain delay and laches on the part of the workman in raising the industrial dispute and getting the same referenced for adjudication, the Labour Court is statutorily duty bound to answer the points of dispute referred to it by adjudicating the same on merits of the case and it ought to have moulded the relief appropriately in favour of the workman. That has not been done at all by the Labour Court. Both the learned single Judge as well as the Division Bench of the High Court in its Civil Writ Petition and the Letters Patent Appeal have failed to consider this important aspect of the matter. Therefore, we are of the view that the order of termination passed by the respondent, the award passed by the Labour Court and the judgment and order of the High Court are liable to be set aside. When we arrive at the aforesaid conclusion, the next aspect is whether the workman is entitled for reinstatement, back wages and consequential benefits. We are of the view that the workman must be reinstated. However, due to delay in raising the industrial dispute, and getting it referred to the Labour Court from the State Government, the workman will be entitled in law for back wages and other consequential benefits from the date of raising the industrial dispute i.e. from 02.03.2005 till reinstatement with all consequential benefits.

5. Moreover, the issue of delay can always be considered by the Labour Court-cum-Industrial Tribunal at the time of answering the reference by moulding relief.

6. Accordingly, the writ petition is allowed. Annexure P-4 dated 24.3.2011 is quashed and set aside. The Labour Commissioner is directed to make a reference to the Labour Court-cum-Industrial Tribunal within a period of four weeks from today and the Labour Court-cum-Industrial Tribunal shall decide the same within a period of six months after the receipt of reference. Pending application(s), if

any, also stands disposed of. No costs.