



भारत का राजपत्र The Gazette of India

सी.जी.-डी.एल.-सा.-30082025-265823
CG-DL-W-30082025-265823

प्राधिकार से प्रकाशित
PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY
साप्ताहिक
WEEKLY

सं. 32]

नई दिल्ली, अगस्त 17—अगस्त 23, 2025, शनिवार/भाद्र 1, 1947

No. 32]

NEW DELHI, AUGUST 17—AUGUST 23, 2025, SATURDAY/BHADRA 1, 1947

इस भाग में भिन्न पृष्ठ संख्या दी जाती है जिससे कि यह पृथक संकलन के रूप में रखा जा सके
Separate Paging is given to this Part in order that it may be filed as a separate compilation

भाग II—खण्ड 3—उप-खण्ड (ii)
PART II—Section 3—Sub-section (ii)

भारत सरकार के मंत्रालयों (रक्षा मंत्रालय को छोड़कर) द्वारा जारी किए गए सांविधिक आदेश और अधिसूचनाएं
Statutory Orders and Notifications Issued by the Ministries of the Government of India
(Other than the Ministry of Defence)

वित्त मंत्रालय
(वित्तीय सेवाएं विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 18 अगस्त 2025

का.आ. 1563.—भारतीय निर्यात-आयात बैंक अधिनियम, 1981 (1981 का 28) की धारा 6 की उप-धारा (1) के खंड (ड.) के उप-खंड (ii) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, एतद्वारा, श्री एम.वी. राव के स्थान पर श्री रजनीश कर्नाटक, प्रबंध निदेशक एवं मुख्य कार्यकारी अधिकारी, बैंक ऑफ इंडिया को तत्काल प्रभाव से और अगले आदेशों तक भारतीय निर्यात-आयात बैंक (एक्जिम बैंक) के निदेशक मण्डल में निदेशक के पद पर नामित करती है।

[फा. सं. 9/1/2022-आईएफ-1]

अनिल कुमार, अवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF FINANCE
(Department of Financial Services)

New Delhi, the 18th August, 2025

S.O. 1563.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-clause (ii) of clause (e) of sub-section (1) of section 6 of the Export-Import Bank of India Act, 1981 (No. 28 of 1981), the Central Government hereby nominates Shri Rajneesh Karnatak, MD & CEO, Bank of India, as Director on the Board of Directors of Export Import Bank of India (Exim Bank), with immediate effect and until further orders, *vice* Shri M V Rao.

[F. No. 9/1/2022-IF-I]

ANIL KUMAR, Under Secy.

(व्यय विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 20 अगस्त, 2025

का.आ. 1564.—केन्द्र सरकार, एतद् द्वारा राजभाषा (संघ के शासकीय प्रयोजनों के लिए प्रयोग) नियमावली, 1976 के नियम 10 के उप-नियमों (2) एवं (4) के अनुसरण में, भारतीय लेखापरीक्षा एवं लेखा विभाग के प्रधान महालेखाकार (लेखापरीक्षा), के कार्यालय मेघालय, शिलांग जिसमें अस्सी प्रतिशत से अधिक कर्मचारियों ने हिंदी का कार्यसाधक ज्ञान प्राप्त कर लिया है, को अधिसूचित करती है।

[फा. सं. ए-12034/03/2025-ईजी]

रामेश्वर कुमार, अवर सचिव

(Department of Expenditure)

New Delhi, the 20th August, 2025

S.O. 1564.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-rules (2) and (4) of rule 10 of the Official Languages (Use for Official Purposes of the Union) Rules, 1976, the Central Government hereby notifies the office of the Principal Accountant General (Audit), Meghalaya, Shillong under the Indian Audit and Accounts Department wherein eighty per cent. of the staff have acquired working knowledge of Hindi.

[F. No. A-12034/03/2025-EG]

RAMESHWAR KUMAR, Under Secy.

विदेश मन्त्रालय

(सी. पी. वी. प्रभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 18 अगस्त, 2025

का.आ. 1565.—राजनयिक और कंसुलीय अधिकारी (शपथ एवं फीस) के अधिनियम, 1948 की धारा 2 के खंड (क) के अनुसरण में वैधानिक आदेश।

एतद्द्वारा, केंद्र सरकार, अगस्त 18, 2025 से कांसुलर सेवाएं के निर्वहन करने के लिए विदेश में भारतीय मिशन/पोस्टों में सहायक कांसुलर अधिकारियों के रूप में इस मंत्रालय के नीचे उल्लिखित अधिकारियों की नियुक्ति करता है:

क्रम सं.	अधिकारी का नाम और पद	मिशन / पोस्ट जिसमें सहायक कांसुलर अधिकारी के रूप में नियुक्त किया गया है
1	श्री मोहित पंवार, सहायक अनुभाग अधिकारी	भारतीय दूतावास, रीगा, लातविया
2	श्री अनिल बनर्जी, सहायक अनुभाग अधिकारी	भारतीय दूतावास, सिओल
3	श्री सतीश कुमार मौर्य, सहायक अनुभाग अधिकारी	भारतीय दूतावास, बाकू
4	श्री अंकित शर्मा, वैक्तिक सहायक	भारत के प्रधान कंसलावास, मेदान

5	श्री लवमीत, सहायक अनुभाग अधिकारी	भारत के प्रधान कौंसलावास, दुबई
6	सुश्री शीतल, सहायक अनुभाग अधिकारी	
7	श्री जैकब जॉर्ज, वैक्तिक सहायक	
8	श्री रमन दीप सिंह, वैक्तिक सहायक	
9	श्री सुनील कौल, सहायक अनुभाग अधिकारी	भारतीय दूतावास, हानोई
10	श्री वैभव राणा, सहायक अनुभाग अधिकारी	भारतीय उच्चायोग, माल्टा

[फा. सं. टी. 4330/01/2025(34)]

नबा कुमार पाल, निदेशक (सीपीवी)

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS
(CPV Division)

New Delhi, the 18th August, 2025

S.O. 1565.—Statutory Order in pursuance of clause (a) of the Section 2 of the Diplomatic and Consular Officers (Oaths and fees) Act, 1948 (41 of 1048), the Central Government hereby appoints the below mentioned officials of this Ministry, as Assistant Consular Officers in Indian Missions/Posts abroad to perform Consular services with effect from August 18, 2025:

S. No	Name & Rank of the Officer	Mission/Post wherein appointed as Assistant Consular Officer
1	Shri Mohit Panwar, Assistant Section Officer	Embassy of India, Riga, Latvia
2	Shri Anindya Banerjee, Assistant Section Officer	Embassy of India, Seoul
3	Shri Sateesh Kumar Maurya, Assistant Section Officer	Embassy of India, Baku
4	Shri Ankit Sharma, Personal Assistant	Consulate General of India, Medan
5	Shri Lovemeet, Assistant Section Officer	Consulate General of India, Dubai
6	Ms. Sheetal, Assistant Section Officer	
7	Shri Jacob George, Personal Assistant	
8	Shri Raman Deep Singh, Personal Assistant	
9	Shri Sunil Koul, Assistant Section Officer	Embassy of India, Hanoi
10	Shri Vaibhav Rana, Assistant Section Officer	High Commission of India, Malta

[F. No.T.4330/01/2025 (34)]

NABA KUMAR PAL, Director (CPV)

श्रम और रोजगार मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 11 अगस्त, 2025

का.आ. 1566.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार वेस्टर्न कोलफील्ड्स लिमिटेड के प्रबंधन के संबंधित नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण - सह - श्रम न्यायालय, नागपुर के पंचाट (सीजीआईटी/एनजीपी/47/2015-16) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 08/08/2025 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-22012/110/2015-आई.आर.(सी.एम-II)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT

New Delhi, the 11th August, 2025

S.O. 1566.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (CGIT/NGP/47/2015-16) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-

cum-Labour Court, Nagpur as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the Management of Western Coalfields Ltd. and their workmen, received by the Central Government on 08/08/2025

[No. L-22012/110/2015 – IR (CM-II)]
SALONI, Deputy Director

ANNEXURE

BEFORE SHRI SHIV SHANKER PRASAD PRESIDING OFFICER, CGIT-CUM-LABOUR COURT, NAGPUR

Case No. CGIT/NGP/47/2015-16

Date: 11.07.2025.

Party No.1: 1. The General Manager,
Wani North Area, Western Coalfields Limited,
Post Bhalar, Teh. Wani,
Distt. Yavatmal – 445304

V/s.

Party No.2: The Working President
Koyala Shramik Sabha(HMS), Ward No. 1
Tilaknagar, Wani, Tah: Wani
Distt. Yavatmal - 445304

AWARD

(Dated: 11th July, 2025)

In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2(A) of section 10 of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) ("the Act" in short), the Central Government has referred the Industrial dispute between the employers, in relation to the management of WCL and their Workman Shri Sukhranjan Nikunj Biswas for adjudication, as per letter **No.L-22012/110/2015 (IR(CM-II)) dated 20/01/2016**, with the following schedule:-

"Whether the demands raised by Shri Sukhranjan Nikunj Biswas, applicant for correction in date of birth on the basis of School Certificate or sending his case to Medical Board for determination of his age and the demands supported by the Working President, Koyla Sharmik Sabha (HMS), at Wani, Yavatmal is just fair & Legal ? If yes, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled?"

2. Case is called out. Rutej R. Pimpalkhute Learned counsel put in appearance on behalf of respondent today in court and filed his vakaltnama which is taken on record but none is present on behalf of the petitioner. From perusal of record, it is apparent that the petitioner is not responding and attending the court since 04/03/2020. i.e near about more than 5 years. Although statement of claim and written statement have been filed by the parties respectively. Petitioner has filed his affidavit as an evidence to prove his case, but petitioner has not come to the court to prove the contents of the affidavit as well as contents of the statement o claim. Petitioner is not coming to the court since long back. It appears that, he is not interested to contest the case further more. claim of the petitioner is not proved. So it is closed.

Hence, it is ordered.

ORDER

"The demands raised by Shri Sukhranjan Nikunj Biswas, applicant for correction in date of birth on the basis of School Certificate or sending his case of Medical Board for determination of his age and the demands supported by the Working President, Koyla Sharmik Sabha (HMS), at Wani, Yavatmal is unjust unfair & illegal. The Workman is not entitled to any relief."

Justice (Retd.) SHIV SHANKER PRASAD, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 11 अगस्त, 2025

का.आ. 1567.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार वेस्टर्न कोलफील्ड्स लिमिटेड के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण – सह – श्रम

न्यायालय, नागपुर के पंचाट (सीजीआईटी/एनजीपी/11/2021-22)को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 08/08/2025 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल. 22012/28/2021-आई.आर.(सी.एम-II)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 11th August, 2025

S.O. 1567.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (CGIT/NGP/11/2021-22) of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Nagpur** as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the Management of **Western Coalfields Ltd.** and their workmen, received by the Central Government on **08/08/2025**.

[No. L-22012/28/2021-IR (CM-II)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

BEFORE SHRI SHIV SHANKER PRASAD PRESIDING OFFICER, CGIT-CUM-LABOUR COURT, NAGPUR

Case No. CGIT/NGP/11/2021-22

Date: 11.07.2025

Party No.1:

1. The Supdt. Of Mines/Manager,
WCL, Walni Mines, Kamptee Sub Area,
Tah. – Kamptee, Distt. – Nagpur - 441404.
2. The Dy. C.M.E/ Manager,
WCL, Sillewara Colliery, At/Post: Sillewara,
Tah. – Saoner, Distt. – Nagpur - 441107.
3. The Sr. Manager (Mines)/ Mine Manager,
WCL, Sillewara Mines, At & Post: Sillewara,
Tah. – Saoner, Distt. – Nagpur – 441107.

V/s.

Party No.2:

1. Sh. Moinuddin S/o Mohammad Hasan Siddiqui,
R/o Plot No. 184, House No. – 1650, Sayeed Nagar,
Ranala, Kamptee, Distt. – Nagpur – 441001.
2. The Branch Secretary,
AB Incline Branch, INTUC Union,
Chankapur Colony, Qtr. No. 143/4, Tah. – Saoner,
Distt. – Nagpur – 441109.

AWARD

(Dated: 11th July, 2025)

In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2(A) of section 10 of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) (“the Act” in short), the Central Government has referred the industrial dispute between the employers, in relation to the management of Western Coalfields Limited, and their workman Shri Moinuddin S/o Mohammad Hasan Siddiqui, for adjudication, as per letter No. L-22012/28/2021-IR(CM-II) dated 19.07.2021, with the following schedule:-

“Whether the action of the respondents/management i.e.1) Western Coalfields Ltd., Walni Mines, Kamptee Sub Area, Tah. Kamptee, Distt. Nagpur through its Supdt. Of Mines/Manager, 2) Western Coalfields Ltd., Sillewara Colliery, At & Post: Sillewara, Tah. Saoner, Distt. Nagpur through its Dy C.M.E/Manager & 3) Western Coalfields Ltd., Sillewara Mines, At & Post: Sillewara, Tah. Saoner,

distt. Nagpur through its Sr. Manager (Mines)/ Mine Manager in not restoring the pay scale category and grade and not releasing the difference of arrears of wages with all consequential benefits with interest @18% per annum in respect of the workman Shri Moinuddin S/o Mohammad Hasan Siddiqui is just, fair & legal? If not, as to what relief the workman/Union is entitled to?"

2. Case is called out. Learned Counsel Abhishek Sunil Deshpande has put in appearance on behalf of respondent and filed his memo of appearance, which is taken on record, but none is present on behalf of petitioner.

From perusal of the record it is apparent that petitioner is not coming to Court Since 28/09/2021 i.e. near about more than three years. No Statement of Claim and Written Statement have been filed by the parties respectively till today. No other evidence has been filed by the petitioner to prove his case. Petitioner is not coming to the Court since long back. It appears that he is not interested to contest the case further more. Claim of the petitioner is not proved. So, it is closed.

Hence, it is ordered.

ORDER

The action of the respondents/management i.e.1) Western Coalfields Ltd., Walni Mines, Kamptee Sub Area, Tah. Kamptee, Distt. Nagpur through its Supdt. Of Mines/Manager,2) Western Coalfields Ltd., Sillewara Colliery, At & Post: Sillewara, Tah. Saoner, Distt. Nagpur through its Dy C.M.E/Manager&3) Western Coalfields Ltd., Sillewara Mines, At & Post: Sillewara, Tah. Saoner, distt. Nagpur through its Sr. Manager (Mines)/ Mine Manager in not restoring the pay scale category and grade and not releasing the difference of arrears of wages with all consequential benefits with interest @18% per annum in respect of the workman Shri Moinuddin S/o Mohammad Hasan Siddiqui is just, fair & legal. The workman is not entitled to any relief.

Justice (Retd.) SHIV SHANKER PRASAD, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 11 अगस्त, 2025

का.आ. 1568.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार वेस्टर्न कोलफील्ड्स लिमिटेड के प्रबंधन के संबंधित नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण सह - श्रम न्यायालय, नागपुर के पंचाट (सीजीआईटी/एनजीपी/03/2014-15)को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 08/08/2025 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-22012/26/2014-आई आर .(सी.एम-II)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 11th August, 2025

S.O. 1568.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (CGIT/NGP/03/2014-15) of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Nagpur** as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the Management of **Western Coalfields Ltd.** and their workmen, received by the Central Government on **08/08/2025**

[No. L-22012/26/2014 – IR (CM-II)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

**BEFORE SHRI SHIV SHANKER PRASAD PRESIDING OFFICER,
CGIT-CUM-LABOUR COURT, NAGPUR**

Case No. CGIT/NGP/03/2014-15

Date: 11.07.2025

Party No.1:

1. The Manager,
WCL, Kanhan Area, Dungaria,
PO: Dungaria, Ghorawadi Khan,
Chhindwara – 480553.

V/s

Party No.2:

The Joint Mahamantri,
Rashtriya Koyla Khadan Mazdoor Sangh(INTUC),
Shramik Shakti Bhawan, PO: Chandametta,
Chhindwara - 480447

AWARD(Dated: 11th July, 2025)

In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2(A) of section 10 of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) ("the Act" in short), the Central Government has referred the industrial dispute between the employers, in relation to the management of Western Coalfields Limited, and their workman Shri Sukhdev, for adjudication, as per letter **No. L-22012/26/2014-IR(CM-II) dated 09.05.2014**, with the following schedule:-

"क्या प्रबंधक, घोडावाड़ी खदान, वेस्टर्न कोलफील्ड्स लिमिटेड कन्हान क्षेत्र छिंदवाड़ा द्वारा कामगार श्री सुखदेव पिता भुगर, भू० पू० टब लोडर बैल्ट क्लीनर, घोडावाड़ी खदान, को दिनांक 02.01.2010 से 30.06.2013 तक बिना किसी कारण के ड्यूटी पर जाने की अनुमति न प्रदान करना उचित है ? यदि नहीं तो कामगार क्या अनुतोष पाने का अधिकारी है ?

2. Case is called out. Learned Counsel Shivani Kulkarni has put in appearance on behalf of respondent and filed her memo of appearance, which is taken on record. But none is present on behalf of petitioner.

From perusal of the record it is apparent that petitioner is not responding and attending the court Since 28/01/2022. Although, statement of claim has been filed by the petitioner. No written statement has been filed by the management till date. Petitioner has not filed any evidence to prove his case. Petitioner is not coming to the Court since long back. It appears that he is not interested to contest the case further more. Claim of the petitioner is not proved. So, it is closed.

Hence, it is ordered.

ORDER

" प्रबंधक, घोडावाड़ी खदान, वेस्टर्न कोलफील्ड्स लिमिटेड कन्हान क्षेत्र छिंदवाड़ा द्वारा कामगार श्री सुखदेव पिता भुगर, भू० पू० टब लोडर बैल्ट क्लीनर, घोडावाड़ी खदान, को दिनांक 02.01.2010 से 30.06.2013 तक बिना किसी कारण के ड्यूटी पर जाने की अनुमति न प्रदान करना उचित है कामगार किसी भी राहत का हकदार नहीं है

Justice (Retd.) SHIV SHANKER PRASAD, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 12 अगस्त, 2025

का.आ. 1569.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार बी सी सी एल के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण— सह - श्रम न्यायालय, धनबाद-I के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 31/2020) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 11/08/2025 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल. 22013/01/2025-आई.आर.(सी.एम-I)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 12th August, 2025

S.O. 1569.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 31/2020) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Dhanbad-I as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the Management of BCCL. and their workmen received by the Central Government on 11/08/2025.

[No. L-22013/01/2025 – IR (CM-I)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL -CUM-LABOUR COURT NO.1
DHANBAD****ID Case No. 31/2020****Sri Binod Kumar Manjhi****Vill-Beratand, P.O.- Bastora****Dist.- Bokaro,.....Applicant****Vs.****The General Manager****Kusunda Area of M/s. BCCL****P.O- Kusunda****Dist-Dhanbad..... Opposite Party****Present: Shri Sachindra Kumar Pandey****Presiding Officer****Appearances:**

For Applicant :- Sri Pintu Mandal, Representative.

For Opp. Party :- Sri D.K. Verma, Advocate

State : Jharkhand.

Industry:- Coal

Dated 14/07/2025

AWARD

2. This case has been filed under section 2A of the I.D Act, 1947 by the applicant/workman namely Binod Kumar Manjhi on 08.06.2020 against the order of his dismissal dated 01.06.2019 from his service by the General Manager, Kusunda Area of M/s. BCCL for setting aside the order of dismissal dated 01.06.2019 and reinstatement with full back wages and consequential benefits.

3. The brief facts of the case of the applicant is that he was permanent employee of M/s. BCCL and was posted at Dhansar/Industry Colliery as General Mazdoor having personnel no. 01464957. His wife was suffering from illness and he also became sick from 12.12.2018 to 19.02.2019 and due to the same he could not be able to attend his duty. Further after recovery from his sickness, he reported for duty on 20.02.2019 but the management did not allow him to resume his duty and issue charge sheet no. 300 dated 03.01.2019 illegally. After receiving the charge sheet, the applicant submitted his reply and denied the allegations levelled against him, although the explanation submitted by him was satisfactory but even then the management initiated departmental proceeding against him by appointing Enquiry Officer. Thereafter the Enquiry Officer conducted domestic enquiry in utter violation of the principle of natural justice and submitted a perverse report and relying on the same, the disciplinary authority issued him a second show cause notice on 08.05.2019. The applicant submitted his explanation to the second show cause notice on 14.05.2019 but without considering the same, the disciplinary authority imposed the penalty of dismissal which is shockingly disproportionate and illegal vide order dated 01.06.2019. After the dismissal, the applicant preferred an appeal on 11.07.2019 under order 30 of the Certified Standing Order, but the management did not dispose of his appeal as per the provision. Being aggrieved and dissatisfied with the aforesaid order the petitioner raised an industrial dispute u/s 2A before the Assistant Labour Commissioner (C), Dhanbad but due to adamant attitude of the management the Conciliation Officer issued a letter to the workman to file petition u/s 2A and therefore, he has filed the present application. The dismissal of the workman is illegal and unjustified on the following grounds:-

a) That the petitioner absented from his duty due to illness from 12.12.2018 to 19.02.2019. The above absence was beyond his control.

b) The petitioner reported for duty on 20.02.2019 but he was not allowed to resume duty.

c) The opposite party kept his application for resumption of duty pending and issued charge sheet on 03.01.2019, although the petitioner had not committed any misconduct as stated in the Certified Standing Order of the company.

d) The opposite party in utter violation of the principle of natural justice, dismissed the petitioner without giving him any opportunity to defend himself.

e) The enquiry conducted by the Enquiry Officer is not fair and proper. The enquiry report submitted by the Enquiry Officer is perverse.

f) The order of dismissal is shockingly disproportionate and in view of the matter dismissal is bad in law and the petitioner is entitled for reinstatement with full back wages.

The workman has raised the issue

“Whether the action of the management of Dhansar/Industry Colliery under Kusunda Area of M/s BCCL in dismissing Sri Binod Kumar Manjhi, Ex-General Mazdoor vide dismissal letter dated 01-06-2019, is legal and justified? And if not to what relief the workman concerned Sri Binod Kumar Manjhi is entitled?”

At last it has been submitted that the action of the management in dismissing the workman is neither legal nor justified and sought the relief to set aside the order of dismissal dated 01.06.2019, pass an order for reinstatement of the workman concerned with full back wages and other consequential benefits and pass any other order as may be deemed fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case and in the interest of justice.

4. The case of the workman was admitted, notice was issued to the opposite party who appeared before the Tribunal and filed written statement cum rejoinder dated 18.12.2020, submitting therein that the present petition of the workman is not maintainable by the law and facts. The applicant Binod Kumar Manjhi was appointed on compassionate ground on 16.12.2013 and posted at ADI Colliery. His date of birth as per the record is 06.01.1988. It has further been stated that since the appointment the applicant was habitual absentee. Several times the management imposed minor punishment for unauthorized absence from duty. The punishment imposed is mentioned below –

<u>Period of absence</u>	<u>Punishment</u>
16-08-2016 to 24-10-2016	Strong warning
11-07-2017 to 04-11-2017	Stoppage of one increment
19-02-2018 to 04-07-2018	Stoppage of one increment
02-11-2018 to 03-12-2018	Strong warning

It has further been stated that the petitioner has absented himself from his duty w.e.f 12.12.2018 without information and permission of the management. The absence without permission and information is misconduct according to CSO No. 26.1.1 of the BCCL. As the petitioner has committed misconduct, the management issued him charge sheet vide charge sheet dated 03.01.2019. The petitioner submitted his reply which was not found satisfactory and therefore, the management appointed Enquiry Officer to conduct domestic enquiry. Enquiry Officer conducted the same in presence of petitioner and submitted his report holding therein that the allegation levelled against him in the charge sheet, is proved. The management issued second show cause notice to the petitioner. The petitioner submitted his reply which was not found satisfactory. The disciplinary authority considering the past record of the petitioner and finding that there is no chance of improvement, dismissed him from the service of the company vide letter dated 01.06.2019. The enquiry conducted by the Enquiry Officer is fair, proper and in accordance with principle of natural justice. The dismissal of the petitioner is legal and justified and he is not entitled to get any relief. It has further been submitted to decide the fairness of the domestic enquiry in a preliminary hearing and if it is found that the enquiry is not fair and proper, allow the management to adduce evidence to prove the charges.

In the rejoinder it has been submitted that the statement made in Paragraph 5(i) of the application of the workman is a matter of record. He has submitted that the workman never completed 240 days attendance in any calendar year. The statement made in Paragraph 5(ii) of the application is not correct. It is pertinent to mention here that the petitioner is habitual absentee and he is making only lame excuse. The statement made in Paragraph 5(iii) of the application is not correct. The explanation submitted by the petitioner is not satisfactory. The statement made in Paragraph 5(iv), (v) and (vi) of the application, are not correct. The statement made in paragraph 5(vii) and 5(viii) of the application of the applicant, are not relevant. The ground mentioned in Paragraph 5(ix) and its sub paragraphs are not correct and relevant at all. The petitioner was habitual absentee and several times management provided him opportunity to mend himself but in spite of that he has committed same misconduct. The statement made in paragraph 6 of the application is matter of record. The statement made in paragraph 7 of the application is not correct. The dismissal of the workman is legal and justified and he is not entitled to get relief. The relief sought by the applicant in paragraph 8 of the application is not correct. He is not entitled to get any relief and at last it was prayed to hold that the dismissal of Sri Binod Kumar Manjhi, is legal and justified and he is not entitled to get any relief.

5. To prove his case, the applicant/workman has adduced the following documentary evidence:-

Exhibit W-1- Xerox copy of dismissal letter/order dated 01.06.2019.

Exhibit W-2- Xerox Copy of application for joining report dated 20.02.2019.

Exhibit W-3- Xerox copy of Medical Certificate dated 19.02.2019.

Exhibit W-4- Xerox copy of 2nd Show Cause Notice dated 08.05.2019.

Exhibit W-5- Xerox copy of Mercy Appeal dated 03/11.07.2019 before General Manager, Kusunda Area No. 6, BCCL.

Exhibit W-6- Xerox copy of application raising industrial dispute u/s 2A of the I.D. Act, 1947 before Assistant Labour Commissioner, Dhanbad dated 28.11.2019.

Exhibit W-7- Xerox copy of first page of passbook of the Bank Account of the workman, Binod Kumar Manjhi.

On the other hand, the management has adduced the following documentary evidence to prove its case.

Exhibit M-1- Office Order of the Punishment of censure dated 13/14.11.2016.

Exhibit M-2- Office Order of the Punishment of stoppage of one increment dated 05.12.2017.

Exhibit M-3- Office Order of Punishment of stoppage of one increment dated 22/23.08.2018.

Exhibit M-4- Office Order of the Punishment of warning dated 06.12.2018.

Exhibit M-5- Xerox Copy of charge sheet dated 03.01.2019.

Exhibit M-6- Reply of the charge sheet.

Exhibit M-7- Notice of Enquiry dated 25.04.2019.

Exhibit M-8- Enquiry Proceeding.

Exhibit M-9- Enquiry Report dated 05.05.2019.

Exhibit M-10- 2nd Show Cause Notice dated 08.05.2019.

Exhibit M-11- Reply of 2nd Show Cause Notice by the workman dated 14.05.2019.

Exhibit M-12- Note sheet dated 22/23.05.2019.

Exhibit M-13- Xerox copy of Dismissal order dated 01.06.2019.

6. Heard both sides and perused the materials on record.

7. The Ld. Counsel for the applicant has submitted that the applicant Binod Kumar Manjhi who was permanent employee of M/s. BCCL and his wife fell ill from 12.12.2018 to 19.02.2019 and therefore he could not attend his duty and therefore on 20.02.2019 he reported the management of BCCL with Medical Fitness Certificate to resume his duty but he was not allowed rather he was issued charge sheet dated 03.01.2019 illegally. It has further been submitted that the enquiry report submitted by the Enquiry Officer, has been admitted as fair and proper u/s 11A of the I.D. Act, 1947 by filing application before this Tribunal dated 24.03.2021 but the dismissal of the workman from his service is shockingly disproportionate and therefore, considering that the workman is very poor and he has to support his family, it was prayed to show sympathy and set aside the dismissal order and reinstate him even without back wages.

On the other hand the Ld. Counsel of the management has submitted that the applicant is a habitual delinquent and even earlier on four different occasions i.e. from 16.08.2016 to 24.10.2016, 11.07.2017 to 04.11.2017, 19.02.2018 to 04.07.2018 and 02.11.2018 to 03.12.2018 he had absented himself from his duty without any information and without permission of the management and he was given the punishment as strong warning and stoppage of one increment and thus he is habitual absentee therefore, if any mercy is shown on the workman, that will be a misplaced mercy and the order of dismissal is quite legal and proportionate and as per the law and the case of the petitioner is liable to be dismissed and he is not entitled to any relief as claimed by him.

8. After hearing the rival submissions of both the parties and perusing the materials on record the Tribunal finds that the following two issues are necessary to be decided:-

(i) Whether the domestic enquiry was fair and proper?

(ii) Whether the action of the management of Dhansar/Industry Colliery under Kusunda Area of M/s BCCL in dismissing Sri Binod Kumar Manjhi, Ex-General Mazdoor vide dismissal letter dated 01-06-2019, is legal and justified? And if not to what relief the workman concerned Sri Binod Kumar Manjhi is entitled?

As regards the first issue, the applicant/workman by filing application dated 24.03.2021, has accepted and admitted the enquiry report against him as fair and proper u/s 11A of the I.D. Act, 1947 and accordingly the Tribunal vide order dated 16.12.2021 also held that the enquiry against the applicant was fair and proper and thus

by admitting the enquiry report as fair and proper the workman has accepted that he remained absent from 12.12.2018 to 19.02.2019 from his duty without giving any prior information or taking permission of the management which comes under the category of misconduct vide Certified Standing Order No. 26.1.1 of the BCCL (Exhibit M-5).

Now, the second issue for consideration is whether the punishment imposed on the workman is legal and justified or disproportionate, in this regard the documentary evidence of the workman which has been marked as Exhibit W-1, shows that this is dismissal order dated 01.06.2019 from the service of the applicant/workman, Binod Kumar Manjhi, General Mazdoor, Dhansar Colliery and on its perusal it is evident that the workman has been dismissed from his service on the ground of being habitual absentee and in the same order it has been described that on four earlier occasions also, the workman remained absent from his duty without any prior information and permission by the management and these are from 16.08.2016 to 24.10.2016 for which he has been given strong warning for absence from his duty for about two months, from 11.07.2017 to 04.11.2017 for which his one salary increment was stopped due to absence from his duty for about four months, from 19.02.2018 to 04.07.2018 for which he was given punishment of stoppage of one salary increment for being absent for about five months, from 02.11.2018 to 03.12.2018 he was given punishment of strong warning for absence from his duty for about one month and again in the instant case he remained absent from 12.12.2018 to 19.02.2019 without any information and permission of the management and remained absent for about two months and seven days and in view of the repeated and habitual absence of the applicant from his duty, ultimately he was dismissed by the management.

As regards other documentary evidence of the workman, Exhibit W-2 is an application for joining dated 20.02.2019, Exhibit W-4 is the second show cause notice dated 08.05.2019, Exhibit W-5 is the mercy appeal dated 03.07.2019 before General Manager, Kusunda Area of M/s. BCCL, Exhibit W-6 is an application for raising the Industrial Dispute before Assistant Labour Commissioner, Dhanbad and Exhibit W-7 is the photo copy of the first page of pass book of the Bank Account of the workman but all these documents are not going to help the applicant in any way.

Now as regards the Medical Certificate which is Exhibit W-3, on its perusal it transpires that Dr. M. Prasad has certified on 19.02.2019 that the workman Binod Kumar Manjhi was suffering from Jaundice and weakness from 12.12.2018 to 19.02.2019 whereas the applicant/workman has himself stated in his rejoinder petition that he remained absent from his duty due to the illness of his wife and at the same time Exhibit M-6 and M-11 which is reply of the charge sheet and reply of 2nd show cause notice of the applicant Binod Kumar Manjhi, he has himself written in his own writing that his wife fell ill in his village and due to the same he could not perform his duty thus, these documents reveal that the ground of defence of the workman regarding his absence is self contradictory.

As regards the documentary evidences of the management, Exhibit M-1 to M-4 are the office order dated 13/14.11.2016, 05.12.2017, 22/23.08.2018 and 06.12.2018 by which the workman Binod Kumar Manjhi has been earlier punished due to his absence from his duty without information and prior permission, so these documents reveal that the workman has been habitual absentee from his duty. Exhibit M-5 is the charge sheet dated 03.01.2019 issued by the management against the applicant Binod Kumar Manjhi. Exhibit M-6 is the reply of charge sheet dated 03.01.2019 and Exhibit M-11 is the reply of second show cause notice and in both these hand written documents the applicant has taken the defence that his wife was ill. Exhibit M-7 is notice of enquiry, Exhibit M-8 is enquiry proceeding, Exhibit M-9 is enquiry report. Exhibit M-13 is the dismissal order of the applicant which has also been submitted by the applicant and marked as Exhibit W-1 in his favour. Exhibit M-10 is a second show cause notice and Exhibit M-12 is a note sheet.

9. The Ld. Counsel for the applicant has relied on and cited the authority of the Hon'ble Karnataka High Court reported in **2018 LLR 507 (Mr. A Lokesh Vs. M/s. Otto Bliz (India) Pvt. Ltd.)** in which the Hon'ble Court has been pleased to hold that "Punishment of dismissal from service on account of sickness supported by medical certificate is not justified." but here in the instant case the facts and circumstances are completely different and it has already been proved by the rejoinder petition of the applicant as well as Exhibit M-6 and M-11 of the OP that the defence of sickness of the applicant on the ground of his Medical Certificate, is quite contradictory and discrepant as he has claimed in Exhibit M-6 and M-11 that he remained absent due to illness of his wife and on the other hand he has submitted the Medical Certificate of his own sickness and therefore, this Tribunal is of the opinion that the above authority of the Hon'ble Karnataka High Court is not applicable in the present facts and circumstances of the case of the applicant.

On the other hand, on perusal of the authority of the Hon'ble Apex Court in case of **Maan Singh vs Union of India**, reported in **AIR 2003 supreme court 1800**, it is evident that habitual absenteeism without leave is sufficient to provide major punishment of dismissal.

In another case namely **Om Prakash Vs State of Punjab & Ors** reported in **(2011) 14 SCC 682**, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that habitual absentee without leave does not deserve any sympathy from the court.

10. Considering the above facts, circumstances and evidence available on the case record (Ext. W-1, Ext. W-3, Ext. M-6 and Ext. M-11, Ext. M-1 to Ext. M-4, Ext. M-13) and hearing both sides as also considering the above quoted authorities of the Hon'ble supreme court, this Tribunal comes to the conclusion that the action of dismissal of the workman Binod Kumar Manjhi by the management of Dhansar Colliery under Kusunda Area of M/s. BCCL vide dismissal order dated 01.06.2019, is legal and justified and is quite proportionate to the repeated incorrigible misconduct committed by the workman and there is no mitigating circumstance in favour of the workman to avoid the punishment of dismissal from service and therefore, this application of the applicant/workman is liable to be dismissed.

11. Hence,

ORDERED

that the application of the applicant Binod Kumar Manjhi filed u/s 2A of I.D. Act 1947, is hereby dismissed on contest. Let the copies of Award in duplicate be sent to the Ministry of Labour & Employment, Government of India, New Delhi for information and notification.

SACHINDRA KUMAR PANDEY, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 14 अगस्त, 2025

का.आ. 1570.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार दक्षिण मध्य रेलवे के प्रबंधतंत्र, संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय हैदराबाद के पंचाट (49/2024) प्रकाशित करती है।

[सं. एल-12025/01/2025- आई आर (बी-1)-106]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 14th August, 2025.

S.O. 1570.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref.49/2024) of the *Cent.Govt.Indus.Tribunal-cum-Labour Court Hyderabad* as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of South Central Railway and their workmen.

[No. L-12025/01/2025- IR(B-1)-106]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD

Present: - **Sri IRFAN QAMAR**

Presiding Officer

Dated the 14th day of July, 2025

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. 49/2024

Between:

Sri M Srikanth,

H.No. 26-95/11/3, Balramnagar,

Plot No. 167, Safilguda,

Malkajgiri, Secunderabad-500047.

.....

Petitioner

AND

The Divisional Railway Manager,

Electrical (TRSO) Branch,

Annex. To Sanchalan Bhavan,

S.C Railway, Secunderabad-500071.

... Respondents

Appearances:

For the Petitioner : Shri Macharla Rangaiah, advocate

For the Respondent: Shri Ravinder Viswanath, advocate

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No.8/29/2024-B1 dated 18/10/2024 referred the following dispute under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for adjudication to this Tribunal between the management of South Central Railway and their workmen. The reference is,

SCHEDULE

“Whether the action of the management of South Central Railway, Secunderabad in dismissing the services of Sri M. Srikanth, Ex-Technician-IIELS/LSD is legal and justified? If not, what relief the workman is entitled to?”

The reference is numbered in this Tribunal as I.D. No. 49/2024 and notices were issued to the parties concerned.

2. Petitioner absent on the date fixed for filing of claim statement and documents. Despite sufficient opportunity on Petitioner but none present on behalf of Petitioner. Therefore, in absence of Petitioner and non-filing of claim statement by the Petitioner, the case is ‘No Claim’ award is passed.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Shri Vinay Panghal, Lower Division Clerk, corrected by me on this the 14th day of July, 2025.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the

Witnesses examined for the

Petitioner

Respondent

NIL

NIL

Documents marked for the Petitioner

NIL

Documents marked for the Respondent

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 14 अगस्त, 2025

का.आ. 1571.— औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार भारतीय स्टेट बैंक के प्रबंधतंत्र, संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय हैदराबाद के पंचाट (28/2021) प्रकाशित करती है।

[सं. एल-12025/01/2025- आई आर (बी-1)-107]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 14th August, 2025.

S.O. 1571.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. 28/2021) of the *Cent.Govt.Indus.Tribunal-cum-Labour Court Hyderabad* as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of State Bank of India and their workmen.

[No. L-12025/01/2025- IR(B-1)-107]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE**IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT AT
HYDERABAD**

Present: - **Sri IRFAN QAMAR**

Presiding Officer

Dated the 10th day of July, 2025**INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. 28/2021**

Between:

Smt. Nayani Pradhan,
W/o Sri Anil Apato,
R/o Plot No. 62, Sai Baba
Officers colony, Sainikpuri,
Secunderabad-500094.

.....

.... Petitioner

AND

1. The Assistant General Manager (Law),
State Bank of India, Gun Foundry,
Hyderabad-500001.
2. The Chief General Manager (IR),
State Bank of India, Head Office,
Amaravathi Gunfoundary,
Hyderabad-500001.
3. The Assistant General Manager,
State Bank of India, Commerical
Branch, Surya Towers,
Secunderabad-500003.

....Respondent

Appearances:

For the Petitioner : Shri G. Udayasri, Advocate

For the Respondent: Shri Y. Ranjeeth Reddy, advocate

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its No. 7(22)/2021-B1 dated 10.03.2021 referred the following dispute under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for adjudication to this Tribunal between the management of M/s. State Bank of India, and their workmen. The reference is,

SCHEDULE

“Whether the action of the management of State Bank of India, Hyderabad in terminating the services on the grounds of absenteeism of Smt. Nayani Pradhan, Ex- employee is legal and justified. If not, what relief the workmen is entitled to?”

The reference is numbered in this Tribunal as I.D. No 28/2021 and notices were issued to the parties concerned.

2. Petitioner absent. Respondent refused to adduce any evidence. Hence Respondent evidence closed. Perused the record. The claim of petitioner has not been substantiated by any evidence. Hence, a Nil Award is passed.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Shri Vinay Panghal, LDC corrected and signed by me on this the 10th day of July, 2025.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the
Petitioner
NIL

Witnesses examined for the
Respondent
NIL

Documents marked for the Petitioner

NIL

Documents marked for the Respondent

NIL