

(2012) 12 KAR CK 0042

In the Karnataka High Court

Case No : Writ Petition No. 86662 of 2012 (L-KSRTC)

Rudragouda

APPELLANT

Vs

The Divisional Controller, N.E.K.R.T.C.

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 10-12-2012

Acts Referred:

Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 — Section 33 (2) (b), 33 A

Citation : (2012) 12 KAR CK 0042

Hon'ble Judges : S. Abdul Nazeer, J

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : Krupa Sagar Pail, for the Appellant; Sudhi Singh, Vijapur, for the Respondent

Judgement

S. Abdul Nazeer, J.—This Writ petition is directed against the award in KID No. 158/2011 dated 14.3.2012 passed by the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Gulbarga. The petitioner had been working with the respondent Corporation as a Conductor. Disciplinary proceedings was initiated against him and it was alleged that he had not issued tickets to two passengers despite collection of the fare. After holding an enquiry, the Corporation dismissed him from service on 27.5.2011. The petitioner challenged the said order by filing a claim petition before the Labour Court in KID No. 158/2011. The Labour Court has dismissed the said petition by its order at Annexure-D dated 14.3.2012.

2. I have heard the learned Counsel for the parties.

3. It is not in dispute that an industrial dispute relating to charter of demands in I.D. No. 148/2005 in which the workman is concerned is pending before the Industrial Tribunal at Bangalore. The workman was dismissed from service during the pendency of the said dispute. It is also not in dispute that the Corporation has not complied with the statutory requirements contained in the proviso to Section 33(2)(b) of Industrial Disputes Apt, 1947 (for short "the Act") before, passing, the order of dismissal.

4. In North West Karnataka Road Transport Corporation Vs. Sadashiv (W.P. No. 63003/2011 disposed of on 7.8.2012), this Court has considered an identical matter. Relying on the decision of the Constitution Bench of the Apex Court in Jaipur Zila Sahakari Bhoomi Vikas Bank Ltd. Vs. Ram Gopal Sharma and Others, and the decision of this Court in Sanjay and Others Vs. The Management of NWKRTC in W.P. No. 65378/2011 and other connected matters disposed of on 26.6.2012, it was held that the termination of the workman from service without compliance: of the statutory requirements contained in the proviso to Section 33(2)(b) of the Act is void and inoperative.

5. In Sri M.M. Narayana and B.R. Devalasetty Vs. The Management of Ksrtc, (W.P. Nos. 24118-120/2009 and other connected matters disposed of on 11.7.2012), this Court has held that an order of discharge or dismissal passed against a workman without obtaining approval u/s 33(2)(b) would be nonest. If the management/employer does not seek approval of the Board, Arbitrator, Court/Tribunal, etc., as required u/s 33(2)(b) on the ground that such aggrieved workman has a remedy tinder Section 33A of the Act, it-would not validate such order of discharge or dismissal and in such cases, order of discharge or dismissal would be nonest and void.

6. Therefore, the award of the Labour Court in KID No. 158/2011 at Annexure-D dated 14.3.2012 cannot be sustained.

7. Learned Counsel for the petitioner-workman submits that the petitioner is not insisting for payment of any back wages provided the Corporation reinstates him within a time frame. The submission of the learned Counsel for the petitioner-workman is placed on record. In the light of the above discussion, I pass the following order:

The award of the Labour Court at Annexure-D dated 14.3.2012 in KID No. 158/2011 is hereby quashed. The respondent Corporation is directed to reinstate the petitioner into service within a period of eight weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order with continuity of service and other consequential benefits. However, the petitioner is not entitled for any backwages. Writ petition is disposed of accordingly. No costs.