



भारत का राजपत्र The Gazette of India

सी.जी.-डी.एल.-सा.-07012026-269129
CG-DL-W-07012026-269129

प्राधिकार से प्रकाशित
PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY
साप्ताहिक
WEEKLY

सं. 51] नई दिल्ली, दिसम्बर 28, 2025—जनवरी 3, 2026, शनिवार/पौष 7—पौष 13, 1947
No. 51] NEW DELHI, DECEMBER 28, 2025—JANUARY 3, 2026, SATURDAY/PAUSHA 7—PAUSHA 13, 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)

गृह मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 4 दिसम्बर, 2025

का.आ. 2205.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, सरकारी स्थान (अप्राधिकृत अधिभोगियों की बेदखली) अधिनियम, 1971 (1971 का 40) की धारा 3 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए नीचे सारणी के स्तम्भ (1) में वर्णित अधिकारी को, जो सरकार के राजपत्रित अधिकारी की रैंक के समतुल्य अधिकारी है, उक्त अधिनियम के प्रयोजन के लिए संपदा अधिकारी नियुक्त करती है, जो उक्त सारणी के स्तम्भ (2) में तत्स्थानी प्रविष्टियों में विनिर्दिष्ट सरकारी स्थानों की बाबत अपने अधिकारिता की स्थानीय सीमाओं के भीतर उक्त अधिनियम द्वारा या उसके अधीन संपदा अधिकारियों को प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग और उन पर अधिरोपित कर्तव्यों का पालन करेंगे, अर्थात्:-

सारणी

अधिकारी का पदनाम

सरकारी स्थानों के प्रवर्ग और अधिकारिता की स्थानीय सीमाएं

(1)

(2)

1. द्वितीय कमान अधिकारी,
राष्ट्रीय सुरक्षा गार्ड रीजनल हब,
लेखावाड़ा, गाँधीनगर, गुजरात

लेखावाड़ा, गाँधीनगर, गुजरात स्थित
राष्ट्रीय सुरक्षा गार्ड के परिसर

[फा. सं. 27012/27/2023/पीएफ-V (E-3638976)]

दीपक कुमार, निदेशक (पुलिस वित्त)

MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS

New Delhi, the 4th December, 2025

S.O. 2205.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 3 of the Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorised Occupants) Act, 1971 (40 of 1971), the Central Government hereby appoints the Officer mentioned in column (1) of the Table below, being the Officer equivalent to the rank of Gazetted Officer to the Government, to be Estate Officer for the purpose of the said Act, who shall exercise the powers conferred and perform the duties imposed on Estate Officer, by or under the said Act, within the local limits of his jurisdiction in respect of the public premises as specified in column (2) of the said Table, namely:-

TABLE

Designation of officer.	Categories of public premises and local limits of jurisdiction.
(1)	(2)
Second-in-Command, National Security Guard, Regional Hub, Lekhawada, Gandhinagar, Gujarat.	National Security Guard premises at Lekhawada, Gandhinagar, Gujarat.

[F. No. 27012/27/2023/PF-V (E CF-3638976)]

DEEPAK KUMAR, Director (Police Finance)

वित्त मंत्रालय

(वित्तीय सेवाएं विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 30 सितम्बर, 2025

का.आ. 2206.—भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक अधिनियम, 1934 की धारा 8 की उपधारा (4) के साथ पठित धारा 8 की उपधारा (1) के खंड (क) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, एतद्वारा श्री शिरिश चन्द्र मुर्मू (जन्म तिथि: 5.4.1968), कार्यपालक निदेशक, भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक को दिनांक 9.10.2025 को अथवा उसके बाद कार्यभार ग्रहण करने की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की अवधि के लिए अथवा अगले आदेशों तक, जो भी पहले हो, भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक में उप-गवर्नर के पद पर नियुक्त करती है।

[ई फा. सं. 1/1/2023-बीओ-I]

संजय कुमार मिश्र, अवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF FINANCE

(Department of Financial Services)

New Delhi, the 30th September, 2025

S.O. 2206.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (a) of sub-section (1) of section 8 of The Reserve Bank of India Act, 1934, read with sub-section (4) of Section 8 thereof, the Central Government hereby appoints Shri Shirish Chandra Murmu (DoB: 05.04.1968), Executive **Director, Reserve Bank of India**, to the post of Deputy Governor, Reserve Bank of India, for a period of three years from the date of joining the post on or after 09.10.2025 or until further orders, whichever is earlier.

[eF. No. 1/1/2023-BO-I]

SANJAY KUMAR MISHRA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 30 सितम्बर, 2025

का.आ. 2207.—बैंककारी कंपनी (उपक्रमों का अर्जन और अंतरण) अधिनियम, 1970 की धारा 9 की उपधारा (3) के खंड (क) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, एतद्द्वारा, श्री आशीष पाण्डेय (जन्म तिथि: 24.6.1971), कार्यपालक निदेशक, बैंक आफ महाराष्ट्र को कार्यभार ग्रहण करने की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की अवधि के लिए अथवा अगले आदेशों तक, जो भी पहले हो, यूनियन बैंक आफ इंडिया में प्रबंध निदेशक और मुख्य कार्यकारी अधिकारी के पद पर नियुक्त करती है।

[ई फा. सं. 4/3/(i)/2024-बीओ-I]

संजय कुमार मिश्र, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 30th September, 2025

S.O. 2207.—In exercise of powers conferred by clause (a) of sub-section (3) of section 9 of the Banking Companies (Acquisition and Transfer of Undertakings) Act, 1970, the Central Government hereby appoints Shri Asheesh Pandey (DoB: 24.06.1971), Executive Director, Bank of Maharashtra, as Managing Director and Chief Executive Officer, Union Bank of India, for a period of three years with effect from the date of his assumption of charge of the office, or until further orders, whichever is earlier.

[eF. No. 4/3/(i)/2024-BO-I]

SANJAY KUMAR MISHRA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 30 सितम्बर, 2025

का.आ. 2208.—बैंककारी कंपनी (उपक्रमों का अर्जन और अंतरण) अधिनियम, 1970 की धारा 9 की उपधारा (3) के खंड (क) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, एतद्द्वारा, श्री कल्याण कुमार (जन्म तिथि: 10.1.1969), कार्यपालक निदेशक, पंजाब नैशनल बैंक को कार्यभार ग्रहण करने की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की अवधि के लिए अथवा अगले आदेशों तक, जो भी पहले हो, सेन्ट्रल बैंक आफ इंडिया में प्रबंध निदेशक और मुख्य कार्यकारी अधिकारी के पद पर नियुक्त करती है।

[ई फा. सं. 4/3/(ii)/2024-बीओ-I]

संजय कुमार मिश्र, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 30th September, 2025

S.O. 2208.—In exercise of powers conferred by clause (a) of sub-section (3) of section 9 of the Banking Companies (Acquisition and Transfer of Undertakings) Act, 1970, the Central Government hereby appoints Shri Kalyan Kumar (DoB: 10.01.1969), Executive Director, Punjab National Bank, as Managing Director and Chief Executive Officer, Central Bank of India, for a period of three years with effect from the date of his assumption of charge of the office, or until further orders, whichever is earlier.

[eF. No. 4/3/(ii)/2024-BO-I]

SANJAY KUMAR MISHRA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 24 नवम्बर, 2025

का.आ. 2209.—राष्ट्रीयकृत बैंक (प्रबंध और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध) स्कीम, 1970 (दिनांक 17.11.2022 की अधिसूचना के माध्यम से संशोधित) के पैरा 8 (1) के साथ पठित बैंककारी कंपनी (उपक्रमों का अर्जन और अंतरण) अधिनियम, 1970 की धारा 9 की उपधारा (3) के खंड (क) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, एतद्वारा, पंजाब नैशनल बैंक के मुख्य महाप्रबंधक श्री अमित कुमार श्रीवास्तव (जन्म तिथि: 29.9.1970) को कार्यभार ग्रहण करने की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की अवधि के लिए अथवा अगले आदेशों तक, जो भी पहले हो, पंजाब नैशनल बैंक में कार्यपालक निदेशक के पद पर नियुक्त करती है।

[ई फा. सं. 4/4/(i)/2024-बीओ-I]

संजय कुमार मिश्र, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 24th November, 2025

S.O. 2209.—In exercise of powers conferred by clause (a) of sub-section (3) of section 9 of the Banking Companies (Acquisition and Transfer of Undertakings) Act, 1970, read with paragraph 8 (1) of the Nationalised Banks (Management and Miscellaneous Provisions) Scheme, 1970 (amended *vide* notification dated 17.11.2022), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri Amit Kumar Srivastava (DoB: 29.09.1970), Chief General Manager, Punjab National Bank as Executive Director in Punjab National Bank for a period of three years with effect from the date of assumption of charge of the office, or until further orders, whichever is earlier.

[eF. No. 4/4/(i)/2024-BO-I]

SANJAY KUMAR MISHRA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 24 नवम्बर, 2025

का.आ. 2210.—राष्ट्रीयकृत बैंक (प्रबंध और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध) स्कीम, 1970 (दिनांक 17.11. 2022 की अधिसूचना के माध्यम से संशोधित) के पैरा 8 (1) के साथ पठित बैंककारी कंपनी (उपक्रमों का अर्जन और अंतरण) अधिनियम, 1970 की धारा 9 की उपधारा (3) के खंड (क) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, एतद्वारा, सेन्ट्रल बैंक आफ इंडिया के मुख्य महाप्रबंधक श्री ई. रतन कुमार (जन्म तिथि: 12.1.1969) को कार्यभार ग्रहण करने की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की अवधि के लिए अथवा अगले आदेशों तक, जो भी पहले हो, सेन्ट्रल बैंक आफ इंडिया में कार्यपालक निदेशक के पद पर नियुक्त करती है।

[ई फा. सं. 4/4/(ii)/2024-बीओ-I]

संजय कुमार मिश्र, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 24th November, 2025

S.O. 2210.—In exercise of powers conferred by clause (a) of sub-section (3) of section 9 of the Banking Companies (Acquisition and Transfer of Undertakings) Act, 1970, read with paragraph 8 (1) of the Nationalised Banks (Management and Miscellaneous Provisions) Scheme, 1970 (amended *vide* notification dated 17.11.2022), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri E. Ratan Kumar (DoB: 12.01.1969), Chief General Manager, Central Bank of India as Executive Director in Central Bank of India for a period of three years with effect from the date of assumption of charge of the office, or until further orders, whichever is earlier.

[eF. No. 4/4/(ii)/2024-BO-I]

SANJAY KUMAR MISHRA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 24 नवम्बर, 2025

का.आ. 2211.—राष्ट्रीयकृत बैंक (प्रबंध और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध) स्कीम, 1970 (दिनांक 17.11.2022 की अधिसूचना के माध्यम से संशोधित) के पैरा 8 (1) के साथ पठित बैंककारी कंपनी (उपक्रमों का अर्जन और अंतरण) अधिनियम, 1970 की धारा 9 की उपधारा (3) के खंड (क) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, एतद्वारा, पंजाब

नैशनल बैंक के मुख्य महाप्रबंधक श्री अमरेश प्रसाद (जन्म तिथि: 2.10.1968) को कार्यभार ग्रहण करने की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की अवधि के लिए अथवा उनकी अधिवर्षिता की आयु प्राप्त करने की तारीख अर्थात् 31.10.2028 तक अथवा अगले आदेशों तक, जो भी पहले हो, यूनियन बैंक आफ इंडिया में कार्यपालक निदेशक के पद पर नियुक्त करती है।

[ई फा. सं. 4/4/(iii)/2024-बीओ-I]

संजय कुमार मिश्र, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 24th November, 2025

S.O. 2211.—In exercise of powers conferred by clause (a) of sub-section (3) of section 9 of the Banking Companies (Acquisition and Transfer of Undertakings) Act, 1970, read with paragraph 8 (1) of the Nationalised Banks (Management and Miscellaneous Provisions) Scheme, 1970 (amended *vide* notification dated 17.11.2022), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri Amresh Prasad (DoB: 02.10.1968), Chief General Manager, Punjab National Bank as Executive Director in Union Bank of India for a period of three years with effect from the date of assumption of charge of the office, or till the date of his attaining the age of superannuation i.e., 31.10.2028 or until further orders, whichever is earlier.

[eF.No. 4/4/(iii)/2024-BO-I]

SANJAY KUMAR MISHRA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 24 नवम्बर, 2025

का.आ. 2212.—राष्ट्रीयकृत बैंक (प्रबंध और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध) स्कीम, 1970 (दिनांक 17.11.2022 की अधिसूचना के माध्यम से संशोधित) के पैरा 8 (1) के साथ पठित बैंककारी कंपनी (उपक्रमों का अर्जन और अंतरण) अधिनियम, 1970 की धारा 9 की उपधारा (3) के खंड (क) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, एतद्वारा, बैंक आफ इंडिया के मुख्य महाप्रबंधक श्री प्रमोद कुमार द्विवेदी (जन्म तिथि: 22.6.1968) को कार्यभार ग्रहण करने की तारीख से उनकी अधिवर्षिता की आयु प्राप्त करने की तारीख अर्थात् 30.6.2028 तक अथवा अगले आदेशों तक, जो भी पहले हो, बैंक आफ इंडिया में कार्यपालक निदेशक के पद पर नियुक्त करती है।

[ई फा. सं. 4/4/(iv)/2024-बीओ-I]

संजय कुमार मिश्र, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 24th November, 2025

S.O. 2212.—In exercise of powers conferred by clause (a) of sub-section (3) of section 9 of the Banking Companies (Acquisition and Transfer of Undertakings) Act, 1970, read with paragraph 8 (1) of the Nationalised Banks (Management and Miscellaneous Provisions) Scheme, 1970 (amended *vide* notification dated 17.11.2022), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri Pramod Kumar Dwivedi (DoB: 22.06.1968), Chief General Manager, Bank of India as Executive Director in Bank of India with effect from the date of assumption of charge of the office till the date of his attaining the age of superannuation i.e., 30.06.2028 or until further orders, whichever is earlier.

[eF.No. 4/4/(iv)/2024-BO-I]

SANJAY KUMAR MISHRA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 24 नवम्बर, 2025

का.आ. 2213.—राष्ट्रीयकृत बैंक (प्रबंध और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध) स्कीम, 1970 (दिनांक 17.11.2022 की अधिसूचना के माध्यम से संशोधित) के पैरा 8 (1) के साथ पठित बैंककारी कंपनी (उपक्रमों का अर्जन और अंतरण) अधिनियम, 1970 की धारा 9 की उपधारा (3) के खंड (क) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, एतद्वारा, पंजाब नैशनल बैंक के मुख्य महाप्रबंधक श्री सुनील कुमार चुध (जन्म तिथि: 3.5.1969) को कार्यभार ग्रहण करने की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की अवधि के लिए अथवा अगले आदेशों तक, जो भी पहले हो, केनरा बैंक में कार्यपालक निदेशक के पद पर नियुक्त करती है।

[ई फा. सं. 4/4/(v)/2024-बीओ-I]

संजय कुमार मिश्र, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 24th November, 2025

S.O. 2213.—In exercise of powers conferred by clause (a) of sub-section (3) of section 9 of the Banking Companies (Acquisition and Transfer of Undertakings) Act, 1970, read with paragraph 8 (1) of the Nationalised Banks (Management and Miscellaneous Provisions) Scheme, 1970 (amended *vide* notification dated 17.11.2022), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri Sunil Kumar Chugh (DoB: 03.05.1969), Chief General Manager, Punjab National Bank as Executive Director in Canara Bank for a period of three years with effect from the date of assumption of charge of the office, or until further orders, whichever is earlier.

[eF. No. 4/4/(v)/2024-BO-I]

SANJAY KUMAR MISHRA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 24 नवम्बर, 2025

का.आ. 2214.—राष्ट्रीयकृत बैंक (प्रबंध और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध) स्कीम, 1970 (दिनांक 17.11.2022 की अधिसूचना के माध्यम से संशोधित) के पैरा 8 (1) के साथ पठित बैंककारी कंपनी (उपक्रमों का अर्जन और अंतरण) अधिनियम, 1970 की धारा 9 की उपधारा (3) के खंड (क) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, एतद्वारा, बैंक आफ बड़ौदा की मुख्य महाप्रबंधक सुश्री मिनी टी एम (जन्म तिथि: 30.5.1970) को कार्यभार ग्रहण करने की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की अवधि के लिए अथवा अगले आदेशों तक, जो भी पहले हो, इंडियन बैंक में कार्यपालक निदेशक के पद पर नियुक्त करती है।

[ई फा. सं. 4/4/(vi)/2024-बीओ-I]

संजय कुमार मिश्र, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 24th November, 2025

S.O. 2214.—In exercise of powers conferred by clause (a) of sub-section (3) of section 9 of the Banking Companies (Acquisition and Transfer of Undertakings) Act, 1970, read with paragraph 8 (1) of the Nationalised Banks (Management and Miscellaneous Provisions) Scheme, 1970 (amended *vide* notification dated 17.11.2022), the Central Government hereby appoints Ms. Mini T M (DoB: 30.05.1970), Chief General Manager, Bank of Baroda as Executive Director in Indian Bank for a period of three years with effect from the date of assumption of charge of the office, or until further orders, whichever is earlier.

[eF. No. 4/4/(vi)/2024-BO-I]

SANJAY KUMAR MISHRA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 24 नवम्बर, 2025

का.आ. 2215.—राष्ट्रीयकृत बैंक (प्रबंध और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध) स्कीम, 1970 (दिनांक 17.11.2022 की अधिसूचना के माध्यम से संशोधित) के पैरा 8 (1) के साथ पठित बैंककारी कंपनी (उपक्रमों का अर्जन और अंतरण) अधिनियम, 1970 की धारा 9 की उपधारा (3) के खंड (क) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, एतद्वारा, केनरा बैंक के मुख्य महाप्रबंधक श्री प्रभात किरण (जन्म तिथि: 15.10.1971) को कार्यभार ग्रहण करने की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की अवधि के लिए अथवा अगले आदेशों तक, जो भी पहले हो, बैंक आफ महाराष्ट्र में कार्यपालक निदेशक के पद पर नियुक्त करती है।

[ई फा. सं. 4/4/(vii)/2024-बीओ-I]

संजय कुमार मिश्र, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 24th November, 2025

S.O. 2215.—In exercise of powers conferred by clause (a) of sub-section (3) of section 9 of the Banking Companies (Acquisition and Transfer of Undertakings) Act, 1970, read with paragraph 8 (1) of the Nationalised Banks (Management and Miscellaneous Provisions) Scheme, 1970 (amended *vide* notification dated 17.11.2022), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri Prabhat Kiran (DoB: 15.10.1971), Chief General Manager, Canara Bank as Executive Director in Bank of Maharashtra for a period of three years with effect from the date of assumption of charge of the office, or until further orders, whichever is earlier.

[eF. No. 4/4/(vii)/2024-BO-I]

SANJAY KUMAR MISHRA, Under Secy.

राजस्व विभाग
(केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर बोर्ड)

नई दिल्ली, 23 दिसम्बर, 2025

का.आ. 2216.—केंद्र सरकार, राजभाषा (संघ के शासकीय प्रयोजनों के लिए प्रयोग) नियम, 1976 के नियम 10 के उप-नियम (4) के अनुसरण में, राजस्व विभाग के केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर बोर्ड के अधीन निम्नलिखित कार्यालयों, जिनके 80 प्रतिशत से अधिक कर्मचारियों/अधिकारियों ने हिंदी का कार्य साधक ज्ञान प्राप्त कर लिया है, को उक्त नियम के तहत अधिसूचित करती है:

कार्यालय प्रधान मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त, पटना

क्रम संख्या.	कार्यालय का नाम
1	कार्यालय प्रधान आयकर आयुक्त, पटना
2	कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त, परिक्षेत्र-1, पटना
3	कार्यालय सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, अंचल-1, पटना
4	कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी वार्ड-1(1), पटना
5	कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी वार्ड-2(1), पटना
6	कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी वार्ड-2(3), बिहारशरीफ
7	कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी वार्ड-1(3), वैशाली
8	कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी वार्ड-1(4), आरा
9	कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी वार्ड-1(5), बक्सर
10	कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त, परिक्षेत्र-4, पटना
11	कार्यालय सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, अंचल-4, पटना
12	कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी वार्ड-4(1), पटना
13	कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी वार्ड-5(1), पटना
14	कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी वार्ड-6(1), पटना
15	कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी वार्ड-3(1), गया
16	कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी वार्ड-3(4), सासाराम
17	कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी वार्ड-3(3), औरंगाबाद
18	कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त, परिक्षेत्र-1, मुजफ्फरपुर
19	कार्यालय सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, अंचल-1, मुजफ्फरपुर
20	कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी वार्ड-1(1), मुजफ्फरपुर
21	कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी वार्ड-1(3), मोतीहारी
22	कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी वार्ड-1(5), बेतीया
23	कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी वार्ड-2(5), सीतामढ़ी
24	कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी वार्ड-3(1), दरभंगा
25	कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी वार्ड-3(3), समस्तीपुर
26	कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी वार्ड-2(2), छपरा

27	कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी वार्ड-2(3),सिवान
28	कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी वार्ड-3(5),मधुबनी
29	कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त, परिक्षेत्र-1, भागलपुर
30	कार्यालय सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, अंचल-1,भागलपुर
31	कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी वार्ड-1(1), भागलपुर
32	कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी वार्ड-3(1), पुर्णिया
33	कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी वार्ड-1(5), कटिहार
34	कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी वार्ड-3(4), सहरसा
35	कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी वार्ड-2(1), बेगुसराय
36	कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी वार्ड-1(4), मुंगेर
37	कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी वार्ड-2(5), लखीसराय
38	कार्यालय प्रधान आयकर आयुक्त, धनबाद
39	कार्यालय संयुक्त आयकर आयुक्त, परिक्षेत्र-1, धनबाद
40	कार्यालय सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, अंचल-1, धनबाद
41	कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी वार्ड-1(1), धनबाद
42	कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी वार्ड-2(1), धनबाद
43	कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी वार्ड-3(1), देवघर
44	कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी वार्ड-3(3), दुमका
45	कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी वार्ड-3(4),गिरीडीह
46	कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी वार्ड-3(5),साहेबगंज
47	कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त, परिक्षेत्र-1, हजारीबाग
48	कार्यालय सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, अंचल-1, हजारीबाग
49	कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी वार्ड-1(1), हजारीबाग
50	कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी वार्ड-1(5),कोडरमा
51	कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी वार्ड-2(1), हजारीबाग
52	कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी वार्ड-2(3), रामगढ़
53	कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी वार्ड-3(1), बोकारो
54	कार्यालय प्रधान आयकर आयुक्त, रांची
55	कार्यालय अपर/संयुक्त आयकर आयुक्त परिक्षेत्र-1, रांची
56	कार्यालय अपर/संयुक्त आयकर आयुक्त परिक्षेत्र-1, जमशेदपुर

57	कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, डाल्टेनगंज
58	कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, चाईबासा
59	कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (डी.आर.) आई.टी.ए.टी., पटना
60	कार्यालय अपर/संयुक्त आयकर आयुक्त (डी.आर.) आई.टी.ए.टी., रांची
61	कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (अंकेक्षण), पटना
62	कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त (अंकेक्षण), पटना
63	कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, आई.ए.पी., यूनिट-1, पटना
64	कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, आई.ए.पी., यूनिट, धनबाद
65	कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, आई.ए.पी., यूनिट, जमशेदपुर
66	कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, आई.ए.पी., यूनिट, मुजफ्फरपुर
67	कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, आई.ए.पी., यूनिट, हजारीबाग
68	कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, आई.ए.पी., यूनिट, भागलपुर
69	कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, आई.ए.पी., यूनिट, रांची
70	कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (अपील) यूनिट-1, पटना
71	कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (अपील) यूनिट-2, पटना
72	कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (अपील) यूनिट-1, भागलपुर
73	कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (अपील) यूनिट-1, रांची
74	कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (अपील) यूनिट-1, जमशेदपुर
75	कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (अपील) यूनिट-1, धनबाद
76	कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (अपील) यूनिट-1, हजारीबाग
77	कार्यालय आयकर महानिदेशक (अन्वे.), पटना
78	कार्यालय प्रधान आयकर आयुक्त, (केंद्रीय), पटना
79	कार्यालय संयुक्त आयकर आयुक्त, केंद्रीय परिक्षेत्र-1, पटना
80	कार्यालय सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, केंद्रीय अंचल-1, पटना
81	कार्यालय उप आयकर आयुक्त, केंद्रीय अंचल-2, पटना
82	कार्यालय सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, केंद्रीय अंचल-3, पटना
83	कार्यालय सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, केंद्रीय अंचल, मुजफ्फरपुर
84	कार्यालय संयुक्त आयकर आयुक्त, केंद्रीय परिक्षेत्र-2, रांची
85	कार्यालय आयकर उपायुक्त, केंद्रीय अंचल-1, पटना

86	कार्यालय आयकर उपायुक्त, केंद्रीय अंचल-2, पटना
87	कार्यालय आयकर उपायुक्त, केंद्रीय अंचल, जमशेदपुर
88	कार्यालय सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, केंद्रीय अंचल, धनबाद
89	कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी, केंद्रीय, पटना
90	कार्यालय प्रधान आयकर निदेशक(अन्वे.), पटना
91	कार्यालय संयुक्त आयकर निदेशक(अन्वे.), पटना
92	कार्यालय संयुक्त आयकर निदेशक(बी.पी.यू.), पटना
93	कार्यालय संयुक्त आयकर निदेशक (अन्वे.), रांची
94	कार्यालय संयुक्त आयकर निदेशक (अन्वे.)-एफएआईयू, पटना
95	कार्यालय सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, (बी.पी.यू.), पटना
96	कार्यालय सहायक आयकर निदेशक (एफएआईयू), पटना
97	कार्यालय सहायक आयकर निदेशक (अन्वे.)-I, पटना
98	कार्यालय सहायक आयकर निदेशक (अन्वे.)-II, पटना
99	कार्यालय सहायक आयकर निदेशक (अन्वे.), मुजफ्फरपुर
100	कार्यालय सहायक आयकर निदेशक (अन्वे.), भागलपुर
101	कार्यालय सहायक आयकर निदेशक (अन्वे.), धनबाद
102	कार्यालय सहायक आयकर निदेशक (अन्वे.)-I, रांची
103	कार्यालय सहायक आयकर निदेशक (अन्वे.)-II, रांची
104	कार्यालय सहायक आयकर निदेशक (अन्वे.), जमशेदपुर
105	कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी (बी.पी.यू.), पटना

[फा. सं. ई-30018/1/2024- डीडी (ओएल) डीओआर]

प्रीति सेलारे, उप निदेशक (राजभाषा)

(Department of Revenue)
(CENTRAL BOARD OF DIRECT TAXES)

New Delhi, the 23rd December, 2025

S.O. 2216.—In pursuance of sub-rule (4) of Rule 10 of the Official Language (Use for Official Purpose of the Union) Rules, 1976, the Central Government, hereby notifies the following offices under Central Board of Direct Taxes, Department of Revenue, where more than 80% staff has acquired the working knowledge of Hindi:

PRINCIPAL CHIEF COMMISSIONER OF INCOME TAX, PATNA

S. No.	Name of Office
1	O/o The Principal commissioner of Income Tax, Patna
2	O/o The Additional Commissioner of Income Tax, Range-1, Patna
3	O/o The Assistant Commissioner of Income Tax, Circle-1, Patna
4	O/o The Income Tax Officer, ward-1(1), Patna
5	O/o The Income Tax Officer, ward-2(1), Patna
6	O/o The Income Tax Officer, ward-2(3), Biharsharif

7	O/o The Income Tax Officer, ward-1(3), Vaishali
8	O/o The Income Tax Officer, ward-1(4), Arah
9	O/o The Income Tax Officer, ward-1(5), Buxar
10	O/o The Additional Commissioner of Income Tax, Range-4, Patna
11	O/o The Assistant Commissioner of Income Tax, Circle-4, Patna
12	O/o The Income Tax Officer, ward-4(1), Patna
13	O/o The Income Tax Officer, ward-5(1), Patna
14	O/o The Income Tax Officer, ward-6(1), Patna
15	O/o The Income Tax Officer, ward-3(1), Gaya
16	O/o The Income Tax Officer, ward-3(4), Sasaram
17	O/o The Income Tax Officer, ward-3(3), Aurangabad
18	O/o The Additional Commissioner of Income Tax, Range-1, Muzzaffarpur
19	O/o The Assistant Commissioner of Income Tax, Circle-1, Muzzaffarpur
20	O/o The Income Tax Officer, ward-1(1), Muzzaffarpur
21	O/o The Income Tax Officer, ward-1(3), Motihari
22	O/o The Income Tax Officer, ward-1(5), Bettiah
23	O/o The Income Tax Officer, ward-2(5), Sitamarhi
24	O/o The Income Tax Officer, ward-3(1), Darbhanga
25	O/o The Income Tax Officer, ward-3(3), Samastipur
26	O/o The Income Tax Officer, ward-2(2), Chapra
27	O/o The Income Tax Officer, ward-2(3), Siwan
28	O/o The Income Tax Officer, ward-3(5), Madhubani
29	O/o The Additional Commissioner of Income Tax, Range-1, Bhagalpur
30	O/o The Assistant Commissioner of Income Tax, Circle-1, Bhagalpur
31	O/o The Income Tax Officer, ward-1(1), Bhagalpur
32	O/o The Income Tax Officer, ward-3(1), Purnea
33	O/o The Income Tax Officer, ward-1(5), Katihar
34	O/o The Income Tax Officer, ward-3(4), Saharsa
35	O/o The Income Tax Officer, ward-2(1), Begusarai
36	O/o The Income Tax Officer, ward-1(4), Munger
37	O/o The Income Tax Officer, ward-2(5), Lakhisarai
38	O/o The Principal commissioner of Income Tax, Dhanbad
39	O/o The Joint Commissioner of Income Tax, Range-1, Dhanbad
40	O/o The Assistant Commissioner of Income Tax, Circle-1, Dhanbad
41	O/o The Income Tax Officer, ward-1(1), Dhanbad
42	O/o The Income Tax Officer, ward-2(1), Dhanbad
43	O/o The Income Tax Officer, ward-3(1), Deoghar

44	O/o The Income Tax Officer, ward-3(3), Dumka
45	O/o The Income Tax Officer, ward-3(4), Giridih
46	O/o The Income Tax Officer, ward-3(5), sahibhanj
47	O/o The Additional Commissioner of Income Tax, Range-1, Hazaribagh
48	O/o The Assistant Commissioner of Income Tax, Circle-1, Hazaribagh
49	O/o The Income Tax Officer, ward-1(1), Hazaribagh
50	O/o The Income Tax Officer, ward-1(5), Koderma
51	O/o The Income Tax Officer, ward-2(1), Hazaribagh
52	O/o The Income Tax Officer, ward-2(3), Ramgarh
53	O/o The Income Tax Officer, ward-3(1), Bokaro
54	O/o The Principal Commissioner of Income Tax, Ranchi
55	O/o The Additional/Joint Commissioner of Income Tax, Range-1, Ranchi
56	O/o The Additional/Joint Commissioner of Income Tax, Range-1, Jamshedpur
57	O/o The Income Tax Officer, Daltongange
58	O/o The Income Tax Officer, Chaibasa
59	O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (D.R.) I.T.A.T., Patna
60	O/o The Additional/Joint Commissioner of Income Tax (D.R.) I.T.A.T., Ranchi
61	O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, (Audit), Patna
62	O/o The Additional Commissioner of Income Tax, (Audit), Patna
63	O/o The Income Tax Officer, IAP, Unit-1, Patna
64	O/o The Income Tax Officer, IAP, Unit, Dhanbad
65	O/o The Income Tax Officer, IAP, Unit, Jamshedpur
66	O/o The Income Tax Officer, IAP, Unit, Muzzaffarpur
67	O/o The Income Tax Officer, IAP, Unit, Hazaribagh
68	O/o The Income Tax Officer, IAP, Unit, Bhagalpur
69	O/o The Income Tax Officer, IAP, Unit, Ranchi
70	O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, (Appeal) Unit-1, Patna
71	O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, (Appeal) Unit-2, Patna
72	O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, (Appeal) Unit-1, Bhagalpur
73	O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, (Appeal) Unit-1, Ranchi
74	O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, (Appeal) Unit-1, Jamshedpur
75	O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, (Appeal) Unit-1, Dhanbad
76	O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, (Appeal) Unit-1, Hazaribagh
77	O/o The Director General of Income Tax(Inv.), Patna
78	O/o The Principal Commissioner of Income Tax(Central), Patna
79	O/o The Joint Commissioner of Income Tax, Central Range-1, Patna
80	O/o The Assitt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Central Circle-1, Patna
81	O/o The Deputy Commissioner of Income Tax, Central Circle-2, Patna

82	O/o The Assitt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Central Circle-3, Patna
83	O/o The Assitt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Central Circle, Muzaffarpur
84	O/o The Joint Commissioner of Income Tax, Central Range-2, Ranchi
85	O/o The Deputy Commissioner of Income Tax, Central Circle-1, Patna
86	O/o The Deputy Commissioner of Income Tax, Central Circle-2, Patna
87	O/o The Deputy Commissioner of Income Tax, Central Circle, Jamshedpur
88	O/o The Assitt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Central Circle, Dhanbad
89	O/o The Tax Recovery Officer, Central, Patna
90	O/o The Principal Director of Income Tax(Inv.), Patna
91	O/o The Joint Director of Income Tax (Inv.), Patna
92	O/o The Joint Director of Income Tax (BPU), Patna
93	O/o The Joint Director of Income Tax (Inv.), Ranchi
94	O/o The Joint Director of Income Tax (Inv.)- FAIU, Patna
95	O/o The Assistant Commissioner of Income Tax , BPU, Patna
96	O/o The Assistant Director of Income Tax (FAIU), Patna
97	O/o The Assistant Director of Income Tax (Inv.)-I, Patna
98	O/o The Assistant Director of Income Tax (Inv.)-II, Patna
99	O/o The Assistant Director of Income Tax (Inv.), Muzaffarpur
100	O/o The Assistant Director of Income Tax (Inv.), Bhagalpur
101	O/o The Assistant Director of Income Tax (Inv.), Dhanbad
102	O/o The Assistant Director of Income Tax (Inv.)-I, Ranchi
103	O/o The Assistant Director of Income Tax (Inv.)-II, Ranchi
104	O/o The Assistant Director of Income Tax (Inv.), Jamshedpur
105	O/o The Income Tax Officer (BPU), Patna

[F. No. E-30018/1/2024 DD(OL) DOR]

PREETI SELLARE, Dy. Director(OL)

(व्यय विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 22 दिसम्बर, 2025

का.आ. 2217.—केन्द्र सरकार, एतद्वारा 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 कार्यालय महालेखाकार (लेखा एवं हकदारी), कर्नाटक, बेंगलूरु जिसमें अस्सी प्रतिशत से अधिक अधिकारियों/कर्मचारियों ने हिंदी का कार्यसाधक ज्ञान प्राप्त कर लिया है, को अधिसूचित करती है।

[फा. सं. ए-12034/05/2025-ईजी]

रामेश्वर कुमार, अवर सचिव

(Department of Expenditure)

New Delhi, the 22nd December, 2025

S.O. 2217.—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 Accountant General (A and E), Karnataka, Bengaluru under the Indian Audit and Accounts Department wherein eighty per cent. of the staff have acquired working knowledge of Hindi.

[F. No. A-12034/05/2025-EG]

RAMESHWAR KUMAR, Under Secy.

विदेश मन्त्रालय

(सी.पी.वी. प्रभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 22 दिसम्बर, 2025

का.आ. 2218.—राजनयिक और कौंसुलीय अधिकारी (शपथ एवं फीस) के अधिनियम, 1948 की धारा 2 के खंड (क) के अनुसरण में वैधानिक आदेश।

एतद्वारा, केंद्र सरकार, दिसंबर 22, 2025 से कांसुलर सेवाएं के निर्वहन करने के लिए विदेश में भारतीय मिशनों/पोस्टों में सहायक कांसुलर अधिकारियों के रूप में इस मंत्रालय के निम्नलिखित 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 अनुज कुमार वर्मा, निजी सहायक	भारत के प्रधान कौंसलावास, बाली
2	श्री पंकज कुमार, सहायक अनुभाग अधिकारी	भारतीय दूतावास, बर्न
3	श्री नरेश कुमार, सहायक अनुभाग अधिकारी	भारतीय दूतावास, डमस्कस

[फा. सं. टी. 4330/01/2025(40)]

तरुण कुमार, अवर सचिव [सीपीवी-II]

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

(CPV Division)

New Delhi, the 22nd December, 2025

S.O. 2218.—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 December 22, 2025:

S. No	Name & Rank of the Officer	Mission/Post wherein appointed as Assistant Consular Officer
1	Mr. Anuj Kumar Verma, Personal Assistant	Consulate General of India, Bali
2	Mr. Pankaj Kumar, Assistant Section Officer	Embassy of India, Berne
3	Mr. Naresh Kumar, Assistant Section Officer	Embassy of India, Damascus

[F. No. T. 4330/01/2025 (40)]

TARUN KUMAR, Under Secy. (CPV-II)

कार्मिक, लोक शिकायत और पेंशन मंत्रालय

(कार्मिक और प्रशिक्षण विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 9 दिसम्बर, 2025

का.आ. 2219.—केंद्रीय सरकार, भारतीय नागरिक सुरक्षा संहिता, 2023 (2023 का 46) की धारा 18 की उपधारा (8) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, श्री भासुरन एस, श्री जिविन जोसेफ के.ए, सुश्री सुजा एन, सुश्री दीप्ति. बी और श्री रेवी कुमार आर. अधिवक्ताओं को, नीचे दी गई सारणी में यथा उल्लिखित न्यायालयों में दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापन (केंद्रीय अन्वेषण ब्यूरो) द्वारा संस्थित केंद्रीय अन्वेषण मामलों के अभियोजन का और इन मामलों से

उद्भूत, अपील, पुनरीक्षण या अन्य मामलों का तत्समय प्रवृत्त विधि द्वारा स्थापित किसी न्यायालय में संचालन करने हेतु प्रभार ग्रहण करने की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की अवधि के लिए या अगले आदेश तक, इनमें से जो भी पूर्वतर हो, विशेष लोक अभियोजक के रूप में नियुक्त करती है, अर्थात् :-

क्र. सं.	न्यायालय का नाम
1.	विशेष न्यायाधीश, (एसपीई/सीबीआई)-I, एर्नाकुलम, केरल
2.	विशेष न्यायाधीश, (एसपीई/सीबीआई)-II, एर्नाकुलम, केरल
3.	विशेष न्यायाधीश, (एसपीई/सीबीआई)-III, एर्नाकुलम, केरल
4.	मुख्य न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट न्यायालय, एर्नाकुलम
5.	अपर मुख्य न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट न्यायालय (आर्थिक अपराध), एर्नाकुलम, केरल
6.	जिला और सेशन न्यायाधीश, कवरथी, लक्षद्वीप संघ राज्यक्षेत्र
7.	जिला और सेशन न्यायालय, कलपेट्टा, वायनाड, केरल
8.	अपर सत्र न्यायालय-III (बीयुडीएस अधिनियम, 2019 का विशेष न्यायालय), पलक्कड़
9.	मुख्य न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, अमिनी, केन्द्र शासित प्रदेश लक्षद्वीप
10.	अपर सेशन न्यायालय-III (बीयुडीएस अधिनियम, 2019 के लिए विशेष न्यायालय) मंजेरी, मलप्पुरम
11.	अतिरिक्त सेशन न्यायालय-III (बीयुडीएस अधिनियम, 2019 के लिए विशेष न्यायालय) त्रिशूर
12.	अतिरिक्त सेशन न्यायालय (बीयुडीएस अधिनियम, 2019 के लिए विशेष न्यायालय) अलप्पुझा
13.	अतिरिक्त सेशन न्यायाधीश-V (बीयुडीएस अधिनियम, 2019 के लिए विशेष न्यायालय) कोझीकोड

[फा. सं. 225/24/2025-एवीडी-II]

सत्यम श्रीवास्तव, अवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF PERSONNEL, PUBLIC GRIEVANCES AND PENSIONS**(Department of Personnel and Training)**

New Delhi, the 9th December, 2025

S.O. 2219.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (8) of Section 18 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (46 of 2023), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri Bhasuran. S, Sh. Jibin Joseph K. A, Ms. Suja N, Ms. Deepthy. B and Sh. Revi Kumar R, Advocates, as Special Public Prosecutors for conducting prosecution of the cases instituted by the Delhi Special Police Establishment (Central Bureau of Investigation) in the courts as mentioned in the table below, and appeals, revisions or other matters arising out of such cases before any court established by law for the time being in force, for a period of three years from the date of assumption of charge or till further orders, whichever is earlier, namely:—

Sl. No.	Name of courts
1.	Special Judge, (SPE/CBI)-I, Ernakulam, Kerala
2.	Special Judge, (SPE/CBI)-II, Ernakulam, Kerala
3.	Special Judge, (SPE/CBI)-III, Ernakulam, Kerala
4.	Chief Judicial Magistrate Court, Ernakulam
5.	Addl. Chief Judicial Magistrate Court (Economic Offence), Ernakulam, Kerala
6.	District and Sessions Judge, Kavarathi, UT of Lakshadweep
7.	District and Sessions Court, Kalpetta, Wayanadu, Kerala

8	Addl. Sessions Court-III (Special Court of BUDS Act, 2019), Palakkad
9	Chief Judicial Magistrate, Amini, UT of Lakshadweep
10	Addl. Sessions Court-III (Spl. Court for BUDS Act, 2019) Manjeri, Malappuram
11	Addl. Sessions Court-III (Spl. Court for BUDS Act, 2019) Thrissur
12	Addl. Sessions Court (Spl. Court for BUDS Act, 2019) Alappuzha
13	Addl. Session Judge-V (Spl. Court for BUDS Act, 2019) Kozhikode

[F. No. 225/24/2025-AVD-II]

SATYAM SRIVASTAVA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 9 दिसम्बर, 2025

का.आ. 2220.—केंद्रीय सरकार एतद् द्वारा दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापन अधिनियम, 1946 (1946 का केन्द्रीय अधिनियम 25) की धारा 5 की उप-धारा (1) सपठित धारा 6 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए आदेश संख्या एचडी 94 सीओडी 2023, बेंगलुरु, दिनांक 12.02.2024 एवं अनुशेष आदेश संख्या:एचडी 94 सीओडी 2023, बेंगलुरु, दिनांक 17.10.2025 के माध्यम से जारी कर्नाटक राज्य सरकार की सम्मति से पॉपुलर फ्राइनेंस ग्रुप ऑफ कंपनी के निदेशकों, साझेदारों और मालिकों तथा बेंगलुरु के विभिन्न पुलिस स्टेशनों में मेसर्स पॉपुलर फ्राइनेंस ग्रुप ऑफ कंपनीज के विरुद्ध माननीय प्रधान नगर सिविल एवं सत्र न्यायाधीश, बेंगलुरु सिटी के दिनांक 03.09.2025 के आदेश द्वारा अद्यतन किए गए विधि एवं अधिनियमों की संगत धाराओं सहित दर्ज 66 एफआईआर के संदर्भ में कथित धोखाधड़ी में संलिप्त व्यक्तियों द्वारा किए गए करोड़ों रुपये की धोखाधड़ी का अन्वेषण करने के लिए दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापन के सदस्यों की शक्तियों और क्षेत्राधिकार का विस्तार करती है। दिनांक 03.09.2025 के आदेश द्वारा अद्यतन किए गए विधि एवं अधिनियमों की संगत धाराओं सहित दर्ज 66 एफआईआर की सूची जो **अनुबंध-क** के रूप में संलग्न है। उक्त 66 एफआईआर में से 65 एफआईआर को माननीय प्रधान नगर सिविल एवं सत्र न्यायाधीश, बेंगलुरु सिटी के दिनांक 09.11.2023 के आदेश द्वारा बेंगलुरु के यशवंतपुर पुलिस स्टेशन में दर्ज अपराध संख्या 168/2020 के साथ जोड़ दिया गया था।

[फा. सं. 228/95/2025-एवीडी-II]

सत्यम श्रीवास्तव, अवर सचिव

अनुबंध-क

बेंगलुरु सिटी में मेसर्स पॉपुलर फाइनेंस एंड ग्रुप ऑफ कंपनीज के विरुद्ध दर्ज मामलों की सूची।

क्र.सं.	पुलिस स्टेशन का नाम (बेंगलुरु सिटी)	एफआईआर संख्या और कानून की धारा (अन्वेषण के दौरान जोड़ी गई कानून की धारा सहित)।	कानून की धारा (माननीय प्रधान नगर सिविल एवं सत्र न्यायाधीश, बेंगलुरु सिटी की अनुमति के अनुसार, दिनांक 03.09.2025 के आदेश के माध्यम से अद्यतन)
01	यशवंतपुरा पुलिस स्टेशन	168/2020, भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 34, 406, 420 के तहत	भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 406, 420 सपठित 34 और कर्नाटक वित्तीय प्रतिष्ठानों में जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9 तथा अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध, 2019 की धारा 21, 23,

			25 के तहत।
02	यशवंतपुरा पुलिस स्टेशन	209/2020, कर्नाटक जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9, अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध अध्यादेश, 2019 की धारा 21, 22, 23 के तहत, भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 406, 34, 420 के तहत	भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 406, 420 सपठित ³⁴ और कर्नाटक वित्तीय प्रतिष्ठानों में जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9 तथा अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध, 2019 की धारा 21, 23, 25 के तहत।
03	यशवंतपुरा पुलिस स्टेशन	339/2021, भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 120बी, 406, 409, 419, 420, 471, 468 के तहत	भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 120बी, 406, 409, 419, 420, 471, 468 और कर्नाटक वित्तीय प्रतिष्ठानों में जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9 तथा अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध, 2019 की धारा 21, 23, 25 के तहत।
04	यशवंतपुरा पुलिस स्टेशन	340/2021, कर्नाटक जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9, अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध अध्यादेश, 2019 की धारा 3, 4, भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 120बी, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 के तहत	भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 120बी, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 471, 468 और कर्नाटक वित्तीय प्रतिष्ठानों में जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9 तथा अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध, 2019 की धारा 21, 23, 25 के तहत।
05	यशवंतपुरा पुलिस स्टेशन	342/2021, कर्नाटक आवश्यक वस्तु लाइसेंसिंग आदेश, 1986 की धारा 9, अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध अधिनियम, 2019 की धारा 3, 4, भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 120बी, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 के तहत	अपराध संख्या: 342/2021, भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 120बी, 406, 409, 419, 420, 421, 465, 468, 471 और कर्नाटक वित्तीय प्रतिष्ठानों में जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9 तथा अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध, 2019 की धारा 21, 23, 25 के तहत।
06	यशवंतपुरा पुलिस स्टेशन	343/2021, कर्नाटक जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9, अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध अध्यादेश, 2019 की धारा 3, 4, भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 120बी, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468 के तहत।	भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 120बी, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468 और कर्नाटक वित्तीय प्रतिष्ठानों में जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9 तथा अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध, 2019 की धारा 21, 23, 25 के तहत।

[illegible]

12	यशवंतपुरा पुलिस स्टेशन	349/2021, कर्नाटक जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9, अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध अध्यादेश, 2019 की धारा 3, 4, भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 120बी, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 के तहत।	भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 120बी, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 और कर्नाटक वित्तीय प्रतिष्ठानों में जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9 तथा अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध, 2019 की धारा 21, 23, 25 के तहत।
13	यशवंतपुरा पुलिस स्टेशन	350/2021, भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 120बी, 406, 409, 419, 420, 468, 471 के तहत।	भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 120बी, 406, 409, 419, 420, 468, 471 और कर्नाटक वित्तीय प्रतिष्ठानों में जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9 तथा अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध, 2019 की धारा 21, 23, 25 के तहत।
14	यशवंतपुरा पुलिस स्टेशन	351/2021, कर्नाटक जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9, अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध अध्यादेश, 2019 की धारा 3, 4, भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 120बी, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 के तहत।	भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 120बी, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 और कर्नाटक वित्तीय प्रतिष्ठानों में जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9 तथा अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध, 2019 की धारा 21, 23, 25 के तहत।
15	यशवंतपुरा पुलिस स्टेशन	352/2021, भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 120बी, 406, 409, 419, 420, 468, 471 और अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध अधिनियम की धारा 3, 4 तथा कर्नाटक वित्तीय प्रतिष्ठानों में जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9 के तहत।	भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 120बी, 406, 409, 419, 420, 468, 471 और कर्नाटक वित्तीय प्रतिष्ठानों में जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9 तथा अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध, 2019 की धारा 21, 23, 25 के तहत।
16	यशवंतपुरा पुलिस स्टेशन	353/2021, भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 120बी, 406, 409, 419, 420, 468, 471 और अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध अधिनियम की धारा 3, 4 तथा कर्नाटक वित्तीय प्रतिष्ठानों में जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का	भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 120बी, 406, 409, 419, 420, 468, 471 और कर्नाटक वित्तीय प्रतिष्ठानों में जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9 तथा अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध, 2019 की धारा 21, 23, 25 के तहत।

		संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9 के तहत।	
17	यशवंतपुरा पुलिस स्टेशन	354/2021, कर्नाटक जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9 और अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध अधिनियम, 2019 की धारा 3, 4 तथा भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 120बी, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 के तहत।	भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 120बी, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 और कर्नाटक वित्तीय प्रतिष्ठानों में जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9 तथा अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध, 2019 की धारा 21, 23, 25 के तहत।
18	यशवंतपुरा पुलिस स्टेशन	355/2021, भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 120बी, 406, 409, 419, 420, 471, 468 और अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध अधिनियम की धारा 3, 4 तथा कर्नाटक वित्तीय प्रतिष्ठानों में जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9 के तहत।	भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 120बी, 406, 409, 419, 420, 471, 468 और कर्नाटक वित्तीय प्रतिष्ठानों में जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9 तथा अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध, 2019 की धारा 21, 23, 25 के तहत।
19	यशवंतपुरा पुलिस स्टेशन	356/2021, कर्नाटक जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9, अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध अधिनियम, 2019 की धारा 3, 4, भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 120बी, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 के तहत।	भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 120बी, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 और कर्नाटक वित्तीय प्रतिष्ठानों में जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9 तथा अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध, 2019 की धारा 21, 23, 25 के तहत।
20	यशवंतपुरा पुलिस स्टेशन	360/2021, कर्नाटक जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9, अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध अध्यादेश, 2019 की धारा 3, 4, भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 120बी, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 के तहत।	भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 120बी, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 421, 465, 468, 471 और कर्नाटक वित्तीय प्रतिष्ठानों में जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9 तथा अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध, 2019 की धारा 21, 23, 25 के तहत।
21	यशवंतपुरा पुलिस स्टेशन	361/2021, कर्नाटक जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9, अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध अध्यादेश, 2019 की धारा 3, 4,	भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 120बी, 406, 409, 419, 420, 468, 471 और कर्नाटक वित्तीय प्रतिष्ठानों में जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9 तथा

		भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 120बी, 406, 409, 419, 420, 468, 471 के तहत।	अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध, 2019 की धारा 21, 23, 25 के तहत।
22	यशवंतपुरा पुलिस स्टेशन	362/2021, कर्नाटक जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9, अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध अध्यादेश, 2019 की धारा 3, 4, भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 120बी, 406, 409, 419, 420, 468, 471 के तहत।	भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 120बी, 406, 409, 419, 420, 468, 471 और कर्नाटक वित्तीय प्रतिष्ठानों में जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9 तथा अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध, 2019 की धारा 21, 23, 25 के तहत।
23	यशवंतपुरा पुलिस स्टेशन	363/2021, कर्नाटक जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9, अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध अध्यादेश, 2019 की धारा 3, 4, भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 120बी, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 के तहत।	भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 120बी, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 और कर्नाटक वित्तीय प्रतिष्ठानों में जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9 तथा अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध, 2019 की धारा 21, 23, 25 के तहत।
24	यशवंतपुरा पुलिस स्टेशन	364/2021, कर्नाटक जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9, अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध अध्यादेश, 2019 की धारा 3, 4, भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 120बी, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 के तहत।	भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 120बी, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 और कर्नाटक वित्तीय प्रतिष्ठानों में जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9 तथा अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध, 2019 की धारा 21, 23, 25 के तहत।
25	यशवंतपुरा पुलिस स्टेशन	366/2021, भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 120बी, 406, 409, 419, 420, 471, 468 और अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध अधिनियम की धारा 3, 4 तथा कर्नाटक जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9 के तहत।	भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 120बी, 406, 409, 419, 420, 471, 468 और कर्नाटक वित्तीय प्रतिष्ठानों में जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9 तथा अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध, 2019 की धारा 21, 23, 25 के तहत।
26	यशवंतपुरा पुलिस स्टेशन	367/2021, कर्नाटक जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9, अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध अध्यादेश, 2019 की धारा 3, 4,	भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 120बी, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 और कर्नाटक वित्तीय प्रतिष्ठानों में जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9

		भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 120बी, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 के तहत।	तथा अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध, 2019 की धारा 21, 23, 25 के तहत।
27	यशवंतपुरा पुलिस स्टेशन	368/2021, भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 120बी, 406, 409, 419, 420, 471, 468 और अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध अधिनियम की धारा 3, 4 तथा कर्नाटक जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9 के तहत।	भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 120बी, 406, 409, 419, 420, 471, 468 और कर्नाटक वित्तीय प्रतिष्ठानों में जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9 तथा अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध, 2019 की धारा 21, 23, 25 के तहत।
28	यशवंतपुरा पुलिस स्टेशन	369/2021, कर्नाटक जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9, अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध अध्यादेश, 2019 की धारा 3, 4, भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 120बी, 406, 409, 419, 420, 461, 465, 468, 471 के तहत।	भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 120बी, 406, 409, 419, 420, 461, 465, 468, 471 और कर्नाटक वित्तीय प्रतिष्ठानों में जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9 तथा अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध, 2019 की धारा 21, 23, 25 के तहत।
29	यशवंतपुरा पुलिस स्टेशन	370/2021, भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 120बी, 406, 409, 419, 420, 471, 468 और अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध अध्यादेश, 2019 की धारा 3, 4 तथा कर्नाटक जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9 के तहत।	भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 120बी, 406, 409, 419, 420, 471, 468 और कर्नाटक वित्तीय प्रतिष्ठानों में जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9 तथा अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध, 2019 की धारा 21, 23, 25 के तहत।
30	यशवंतपुरा पुलिस स्टेशन	371/2021, कर्नाटक जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम 2004 की धारा 9, अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध अध्यादेश 2019 की धारा 3, 4, भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 120बी, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 के तहत।	भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 120बी, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 और कर्नाटक वित्तीय प्रतिष्ठानों में जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9 तथा अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध, 2019 की धारा 21, 23, 25 के तहत।
31	यशवंतपुरा पुलिस स्टेशन	373/2021, भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 120बी, 406, 409, 419, 420, 468, 471 और अनियमित जमा योजना प्रतिबंध अधिनियम-2019 की धारा 3, 4	भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 120बी, 406, 409, 419, 420, 468, 471 और कर्नाटक वित्तीय प्रतिष्ठानों में जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9 तथा

		और कर्नाटक जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम 2004 की धारा 9 के तहत।	अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध, 2019 की धारा 21, 23, 25 के तहत।
32	यशवंतपुरा पुलिस स्टेशन	374/2021, भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 120बी, 406, 409, 419, 420, 468, 471 और अनियमित जमा योजना प्रतिबंध अधिनियम-2019 की धारा 3, 4 और कर्नाटक जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम 2004 की धारा 9 के तहत।	भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 120बी, 406, 409, 419, 420, 468, 471 और कर्नाटक वित्तीय प्रतिष्ठानों में जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9 तथा अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध, 2019 की धारा 21, 23, 25 के तहत।
33	यशवंतपुरा पुलिस स्टेशन	375/2021, भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 120बी, 406, 409, 419, 420, 468, 471 और अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध अधिनियम-2019 की धारा 3, 4 और कर्नाटक जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम 2004 की धारा 9 के तहत।	भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 120बी, 406, 409, 419, 420, 468, 471 और कर्नाटक वित्तीय प्रतिष्ठानों में जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9 तथा अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध, 2019 की धारा 21, 23, 25 के तहत।
34	यशवंतपुरा पुलिस स्टेशन	376/2021, कर्नाटक वित्तीय प्रतिष्ठानों में जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम 2004 की धारा 9, अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध अधिनियम 2019 की धारा 3, 4, भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 120बी, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 के तहत।	भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 120बी, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 और कर्नाटक वित्तीय प्रतिष्ठानों में जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9 तथा अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध, 2019 की धारा 21, 23, 25 के तहत।
35	यशवंतपुरा पुलिस स्टेशन	377/2021, कर्नाटक जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9, अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध अध्यादेश, 2019 की धारा 3, 4, भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 120बी, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 के तहत।	भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 120बी, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 और कर्नाटक वित्तीय प्रतिष्ठानों में जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9 तथा अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध, 2019 की धारा 21, 23, 25 के तहत।
36	यशवंतपुरा पुलिस स्टेशन	378/2021, कर्नाटक जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की	भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 120बी, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 और

		धारा 9, अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध अध्यादेश, 2019 की धारा 3, 4, भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 120बी, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 के तहत।	कर्नाटक वित्तीय प्रतिष्ठानों में जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9 तथा अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध, 2019 की धारा 21, 23, 25 के तहत।
37	यशवंतपुरा पुलिस स्टेशन	380/2021, कर्नाटक जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9, अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध अध्यादेश, 2019 की धारा 3, 4, भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 120बी, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 के तहत।	भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 120बी, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 और कर्नाटक वित्तीय प्रतिष्ठानों में जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9 तथा अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध, 2019 की धारा 21, 23, 25 के तहत।
38	यशवंतपुरा पुलिस स्टेशन	381/2021, भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 120बी, 406, 409, 419, 420, 468, 471 और अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध अधिनियम-2019 की धारा 3, 4 और कर्नाटक वित्तीय प्रतिष्ठानों में जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9 के तहत।	भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 120बी, 406, 409, 419, 420, 468, 471 और कर्नाटक वित्तीय प्रतिष्ठानों में जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9 तथा अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध, 2019 की धारा 21, 23, 25 के तहत।
39	यशवंतपुरा पुलिस स्टेशन	382/2021, भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 120बी, 406, 409, 419, 420, 468, 471 और अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध अधिनियम-2019 की धारा 3, 4 तथा कर्नाटक जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9 के तहत।	भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 120बी, 406, 409, 419, 420, 468, 471 और कर्नाटक वित्तीय प्रतिष्ठानों में जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9 तथा अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध, 2019 की धारा 21, 23, 25 के तहत।
40	यशवंतपुरा पुलिस स्टेशन	383/2021, कर्नाटक जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9, अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध अध्यादेश, 2019 की धारा 3, 4, भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 120बी, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 के तहत।	भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 120बी, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 और कर्नाटक वित्तीय प्रतिष्ठानों में जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9 तथा अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध, 2019 की धारा 21, 23, 25 के तहत।

46	यशवंतपुरा पुलिस स्टेशन	04/2022, कर्नाटक जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9, अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध अध्यादेश, 2019 की धारा 3, 4, भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 120बी, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 के तहत।	भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 120बी, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 और कर्नाटक वित्तीय प्रतिष्ठानों में जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9 के अंतर्गत तथा अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध, 2019 की धारा 21, 23, 25 के तहत
47	यशवंतपुरा पुलिस स्टेशन	05/2022, कर्नाटक जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9, अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध अध्यादेश, 2019 की धारा 3, 4, भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 120बी, 406, 409, 419, 420, 468, 471 के तहत	भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 120बी, 406, 409, 419, 420, 468, 471 के तहत और कर्नाटक वित्तीय प्रतिष्ठानों में जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9 के अंतर्गत और अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध, 2019 की धारा 21, 23, 25 के तहत
48	एच.एस.आर. लेआउट पुलिस स्टेशन	156/2020, भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 406, 420 और कर्नाटक वित्तीय प्रतिष्ठानों में जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9 तथा अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध अधिनियम, 2019 की धारा 23, 26 के तहत।	भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 406, 420 और कर्नाटक वित्तीय प्रतिष्ठानों में जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9 तथा अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध, 2019 की धारा 21, 23, 25 के तहत
49	एच.एस.आर. लेआउट पुलिस स्टेशन	157/2020, भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 406, 420, कर्नाटक वित्तीय प्रतिष्ठानों में जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9 और अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध अधिनियम, 2019 की धारा 23, 26 के तहत	भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 406, 420 और कर्नाटक वित्तीय प्रतिष्ठानों में जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9 तथा अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध अधिनियम, 2019 की धारा 21, 23, 25 के तहत
50	एच.एस.आर. लेआउट पुलिस स्टेशन	158/2020, भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 406, 420, कर्नाटक वित्तीय प्रतिष्ठानों में जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9 और अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध अधिनियम, 2019 की धारा 23, 26 के तहत	भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 406, 420 और कर्नाटक वित्तीय प्रतिष्ठानों में जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9 और अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध अधिनियम, 2019 की धारा 21, 23, 25 के तहत

[illegible]

56	मडिवाला पुलिस स्टेशन	226/2020, भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 406, 420, 34 और कर्नाटक जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9 के तहत	भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 406, 420 सपठित धारा 34 और कर्नाटक वित्तीय प्रतिष्ठानों में जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9 तथा अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध, 2019 की धारा 21, 23, 25 के तहत
57	मगदी रोड पुलिस स्टेशन	157/2020, भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 420 और अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध अधिनियम की धारा 21 तथा केपीआईडी अधिनियम की धारा 09 के तहत	भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 420 और कर्नाटक वित्तीय प्रतिष्ठानों में जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9 तथा अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध, 2019 की धारा 21, 23, 25 के तहत
58	चंद्रा लेआउट पुलिस स्टेशन	244/2020, भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 406, 420, 34, अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध अधिनियम-2019 की धारा 21 और केपीआईडी अधिनियम-2004 की धारा 09 के तहत	भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 406, 420 सहपठित 34 तथा कर्नाटक वित्तीय प्रतिष्ठानों में जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9 तथा अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध, 2019 की धारा 21, 23, 25 के तहत
59	जीवनबीम नगर पुलिस स्टेशन	187/2020 भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 406, 420, 34 और केपीआईडी अधिनियम 2004 की धारा 9 के तहत	भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 406, 420 सहपठित 34 और कर्नाटक वित्तीय प्रतिष्ठानों में जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9 तथा अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध, 2019 की धारा 21, 23, 25 के तहत
60	बानसवाडी पुलिस स्टेशन	552/2020, भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 406, 409, 420, अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध अधिनियम-2019 की धारा 21, 22, 23 और केपीआईडी अधिनियम-2004 की धारा 9 के तहत	भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 406, 409, 420 और कर्नाटक वित्तीय प्रतिष्ठानों में जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9 तथा अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध, 2019 की धारा 21, 23, 25 के तहत
61	बानसवाडी पुलिस स्टेशन	553/2020, भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 406, 409, 420, जमा योजनाओं	भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 406, 409, 420 और कर्नाटक वित्तीय प्रतिष्ठानों में जमाकर्ताओं

		पर प्रतिबंध अधिनियम-2019 की धारा 21, 22, 23 और केपीआईडी अधिनियम-2004 की धारा 9 के तहत	के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9 तथा अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध, 2019 की धारा 21, 23, 25 के तहत
62	बानसवाड़ी पुलिस स्टेशन	358/2020, भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 406, 420, 34 के तहत	भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 406, 420 सहपठित 34 और कर्नाटक वित्तीय प्रतिष्ठानों में जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9 तथा अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध, 2019 की धारा 21, 23, 25 के तहत
63	विद्यारण्यपुरा पुलिस स्टेशन	157/2020, भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 406, 409, 420 के तहत	भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 406, 409, 420 और कर्नाटक वित्तीय प्रतिष्ठानों में जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9 तथा अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध, 2019 की धारा 21, 23, 25 के तहत
64	महादेवपुरा पुलिस स्टेशन	253/2020, भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 406, 420, 34 और कर्नाटक जमाकर्ताओं के हित संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9 के तहत	भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 406, 420 सहपठित धारा 34 और कर्नाटक वित्तीय प्रतिष्ठानों में जमाकर्ताओं के हित संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9 तथा अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध, 2019 की धारा 21, 23, 25 के तहत
65	येलहंका न्यू टाउन पुलिस स्टेशन	120/2020, भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 420, 34 और अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध अधिनियम की धारा 21, 22, 23 और केपीआईडी अधिनियम की धारा 9 के तहत	भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 420 सपठित धारा 34 और कर्नाटक वित्तीय प्रतिष्ठानों में जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9 तथा अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध, 2019 की धारा 21, 23, 25 के तहत
66	संपांगीरामा नगर पुलिस स्टेशन	15/2021, भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 420, 34 और अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध अधिनियम की धारा 3, 4 तथा केपीआईडी अधिनियम की धारा 9 के तहत	भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 420 सपठित 34 और कर्नाटक वित्तीय प्रतिष्ठानों में जमाकर्ताओं के हितों का संरक्षण अधिनियम, 2004 की धारा 9 तथा अनियमित जमा योजनाओं पर प्रतिबंध, 2019 की धारा 21, 23, 25 के तहत

New Delhi, the 9th December, 2025

S.O. 2220.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 5 read with section 6 of the Delhi Special Police Establishment Act, 1946 (Central Act 25 of 1946), the Central Government with the consent of the State Government of Karnataka, issued vide order No. HD 94 COD 2023, Bengaluru dated 12.02.2024 and Addendum Order No:HD 94 COD 2023, Bengaluru dated 17.10.2025, hereby extends the powers and jurisdiction of the members of the Delhi Special Police Establishment for investigation of multi-crores fraud committed by Directors, Partners and Owners of Popular Finance Group of Companies and the persons involved in connection with alleged fraud in respect of 66 FIRs registered against M/s. Popular Finance Group Companies at various police stations at Bengaluru alongwith corresponding sections of law and Acts as updated vide order dated 03.09.2025 of the Hon'ble Principal City Civil and Session Judge, Bengaluru City. The list of 66 FIRs along with corresponding sections of law and acts as updated vide order dated 03.09.2025 is attached as **Annexure-A**. Out of 66 FIRs, 65 of the said FIRs were clubbed with Crime No. 168/2020 registered at Yeshwanthapura Police Station Bengaluru vide order dated 09.11.2023 of the Hon'ble Principal City Civil and Session Judge, Bengaluru City.

[F. No. 228/95/2025-AVD-II]

SATYAM SRIVASTAVA, Under Secy.

Annexure-A**List of cases registered against M/s. Popular finance and group of companies in Bengaluru City.**

SI/ No.	Name of the police Station (Bengaluru City) `	FIR number and Section of law (including Section of law added during investigation).	Section of Law (Updated as per the permission of Hon'ble Court of Prl.C.C. & S.J. Bengaluru City, vide order dated 03.09.2025)
01	Yeshwanthapura Police Station	168/2020, U/S 34, 406, 420 IPC.	u/s 406, 420 R/w 34 IPC & u/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial Establishments Act, 2004 & U/s 21, 23, 25 of The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes, 2019.
02	Yeshwanthapura Police Station	209/2020, U/S 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest Depositors Exorbitant Act 2004, u/s 21, 22, 23 The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes Ordinance, 2019, U/s 406, 34, 420 IPC	u/s 406, 420 R/w 34 IPC & u/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial Establishments Act, 2004 & U/s 21, 23, 25 of The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes, 2019.
03	Yeshwanthapura Police Station	339/2021 U/s 120B, 406, 409, 419, 420, 471, 468 IPC.	U/s 120B, 406, 409, 419, 420, 471, 468 IPC & U/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial Establishments Act, 2004 & U/s 21, 23, 25 of The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes, 2019.
04	Yeshwanthapura Police Station	340/2021 U/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest Depositors Exorbitant Act 2004, u/s 3, 4 The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes ordinance 2019, U/s 120B, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 IPC	U/s 120B, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 471, 468 IPC & u/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial Establishments Act, 2004 & U/s 21, 23, 25 of The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes, 2019.
05	Yeshwanthapura Police Station	342/2021 U/S 9 Of Karnataka Essential Commodities Licensing order 1986, U/s 3, 4 of The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes act 2019, U/s 120B, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 IPC.	U/s 120B, 406, 409, 419, 420, 421, 465, 468, 471 IPC & u/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial Establishments Act, 2004 & U/s 21, 23, 25 of The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes, 2019.

06	Yeshwanthapura Police Station	343/2021 U/S 9 Of Karnataka Protection of Interest Depositors Exorbitant Act 2004, u/s 3, 4 The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes ordinance 2019, U/s 120B, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468 IPC,	U/s 120B, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468 IPC & u/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial Establishments Act, 2004 & U/s 21, 23, 25 of The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes, 2019.
07	Yeshwanthapura Police Station	344/2021 U/S 9 Of Karnataka Protection of Interest Depositors Exorbitant Act 2004, u/s 3, 4 The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes ordinance 2019, U/s 120B, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 IPC.	U/s 120B, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 IPC & u/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial Establishments Act, 2004 & U/s 21, 23, 25 of The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes, 2019.
08	Yeshwanthapura Police Station	345/2021 U/S. 9 Of Karnataka Protection of Interest Depositors Exorbitant Act 2004, u/s 3, 4 The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes ordinance 2019, U/s 120B, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 IPC.	U/s 120B, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 IPC u/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial Establishments Act, 2004 & U/s 21, 23, 25 of The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes, 2019.
09	Yeshwanthapura Police Station	346/2021 U/S 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest Depositors Exorbitant Act 2004, U/s 3, 4 The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes ordinance 2019, U/s 120B, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 IPC.	U/s 120B, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 IPC & u/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial Establishments Act, 2004 & U/s 21, 23, 25 of The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes, 2019.
10	Yeshwanthapura Police Station	347/2021 U/S 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest Depositors Exorbitant Act 2004, U/s 3, 4 The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes ordinance 2019, U/s 120B, 406, 409, 419, 420, 461, 465, 468, 471 IPC.	U/s 120B, 406, 409, 419, 420, 461, 465, 468, 471 IPC & u/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial Establishments Act, 2004 & U/s 21, 23, 25 of The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes, 2019.
11	Yeshwanthapura Police Station	348/2021 U/S 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest Depositors Exorbitant Act 2004, U/s 3, 4 The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes ordinance 2019, U/s 120B, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 468, 471 IPC.	U/s 120B, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 468, 471 IPC & u/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial Establishments Act, 2004 & U/s 21, 23, 25 of The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes, 2019.
12	Yeshwanthapura Police Station	349/2021 U/S 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest Depositors Exorbitant Act 2004, u/s 3, 4 The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes ordinance 2019, U/s 120B, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 IPC.	U/s 120B, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 IPC & u/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial Establishments Act, 2004 & U/s 21, 23, 25 of The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes, 2019.
13	Yeshwanthapura Police Station	350/2021 U/s 120B, 406, 409, 419, 420, 468, 471 IPC	U/s 120B, 406, 409, 419, 420, 468, 471 IPC & u/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial Establishments Act, 2004 & U/s 21, 23, 25 of The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes, 2019.
14	Yeshwanthapura Police Station	351/2021 U/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest Depositors Exorbitant Act 2004, U/s 3, 4 The Banning of Unregulated Deposit	U/s 120B, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 IPC & u/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial Establishments Act, 2004 &

		Schemes ordinance 2019, U/s 120B, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 IPC,	U/s 21, 23, 25 of The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes, 2019.
15	Yeshwanthapura Police Station	352/2021 U/s 120B, 406, 409, 419, 420, 468, 471 IPC & U/s 3, 4 Buds Act & U/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest Depositors Exorbitant Act 2004.	U/s 120B, 406, 409, 419, 420, 468, 471 IPC & u/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial Establishments Act, 2004 & U/s 21, 23, 25 of The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes, 2019.
16	Yeshwanthapura Police Station	353/2021 U/s 120B, 406, 409, 419, 420, 468, 471 IPC & U/s 3, 4 Buds Act & U/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest Depositors Exorbitant Act 2004.	U/s 120B, 406, 409, 419, 420, 468, 471 IPC & u/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial Establishments Act, 2004 & U/s 21, 23, 25 of The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes, 2019.
17	Yeshwanthapura Police Station	354/2021 U/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors Exorbitant Act 2004 & U/s 3, 4 The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes act 2019 & U/s 120B, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 IPC.	U/s 120B, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 IPC & u/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial Establishments Act, 2004 & U/s 21, 23, 25 of The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes, 2019.
18	Yeshwanthapura Police Station	355/2021 U/S 120B, 406, 409, 419, 420, 471, 468 IPC & U/s 3, 4 Buds Act & U/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest Depositors Exorbitant Act 2004.	U/s 120B, 406, 409, 419, 420, 471, 468 IPC & u/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial Establishments Act, 2004 & U/s 21, 23, 25 of The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes, 2019.
19	Yeshwanthapura Police Station	356/2021 U/S 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors Exorbitant Act 2004, U/s 3, 4 The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes act 2019, U/s 120B, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 IPC.	U/s 120B, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 IPC & u/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial Establishments Act, 2004 & U/s 21, 23, 25 of The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes, 2019.
20	Yeshwanthapura Police Station	360/2021 U/S 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors Exorbitant Act 2004, U/s 3, 4 The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes Ordinance 2019, U/s 120B, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 IPC.	U/s 120B, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 421, 465, 468, 471 IPC & u/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial Establishments Act, 2004 & U/s 21, 23, 25 of The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes, 2019.
21	Yeshwanthapura Police Station	361/2021 U/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors Exorbitant Act 2004, U/s 3, 4 The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes Ordinance 2019, U/s 120B, 406, 409, 419, 420, 468, 471 IPC.	U/s 120B, 406, 409, 419, 420, 468, 471 IPC & u/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial Establishments Act, 2004 & U/s 21, 23, 25 of The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes, 2019.
22	Yeshwanthapura Police Station	362/2021 U/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors Exorbitant Act 2004, U/s 3, 4 The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes Ordinance 2019, U/s 120B, 406, 409, 419, 420, 468, 471 IPC.	U/s 120B, 406, 409, 419, 420, 468, 471 IPC & u/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial Establishments Act, 2004 & U/s 21, 23, 25 of The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes, 2019.
23	Yeshwanthapura Police Station	363/2021 U/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors Exorbitant Act, 2004, U/s 3, 4 The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes Ordinance 2019, U/s 120B,	U/s 120B, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 IPC & u/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial Establishments Act, 2004 & U/s 21, 23, 25 of The Banning of Unregulated

		421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 IPC.	Deposit Schemes, 2019.
24	Yeshwanthapura Police Station	364/2021 U/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors Exorbitant Act 2004, U/s 3, 4 The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes Ordinance 2019, U/s 120B, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 IPC.	U/s 120B, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 IPC & u/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial Establishments Act, 2004 & U/s 21, 23, 25 of The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes, 2019.
25	Yeshwanthapura Police Station	366/2021 U/s 120B, 406, 409, 419, 420, 471, 468 IPC & U/s 3, 4 Buds Act & U/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors Exorbitant Act 2004.	U/s 120B, 406, 409, 419, 420, 471, 468 IPC & U/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial Establishments Act, 2004 & U/s 21, 23, 25 of The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes, 2019.
26	Yeshwanthapura Police Station	367/2021 U/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors Exorbitant Act 2004, U/s 3, 4 The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes Ordinance 2019, U/s 120B, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 IPC.	U/s 120B, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 IPC & u/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial Establishments Act, 2004 & U/s 21, 23, 25 of The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes, 2019.
27	Yeshwanthapura Police Station	368/2021 U/s 120B, 406, 409, 419, 420, 471, 468 IPC & U/s 3, 4 Buds Act & U/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors Exorbitant Act 2004.	U/s 120B, 406, 409, 419, 420, 471, 468 IPC & u/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial Establishments Act, 2004 & U/s 21, 23, 25 of The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes, 2019.
28	Yeshwanthapura Police Station	369/2021 U/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors Exorbitant Act 2004, U/s 3, 4 The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes Ordinance 2019, U/s 120B, 406, 409, 419, 420, 461, 465, 468, 471 IPC.	U/s 120B, 406, 409, 419, 420, 461, 465, 468, 471 IPC & u/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial Establishments Act, 2004 & U/s 21, 23, 25 of The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes, 2019.
29	Yeshwanthapura Police Station	370/2021 U/s 120B, 406, 409, 419, 420, 471, 468 IPC & U/s 3, 4 Buds Act-2019 & U/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors Exorbitant Act 2004.	U/s 120B, 406, 409, 419, 420, 471, 468 IPC & u/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial Establishments Act, 2004 & U/s 21, 23, 25 of The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes, 2019.
30	Yeshwanthapura Police Station	371/2021 U/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors Exorbitant Act 2004, U/s 3, 4 The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes Ordinance 2019, U/s 120B, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 IPC.	U/s 120B, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 IPC & u/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial Establishments Act, 2004 & U/s 21, 23, 25 of The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes, 2019.
31	Yeshwanthapura Police Station	373/2021 U/s 120B, 406, 409, 419, 420, 468, 471 IPC & U/s 3, 4 Buds Act-2019 & U/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors Exorbitant Act 2004.	U/s 120B, 406, 409, 419, 420, 468, 471 IPC & u/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial Establishments Act, 2004 & U/s 21, 23, 25 of The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes, 2019.
32	Yeshwanthapura Police Station	374/2021 U/s 120B, 406, 409, 419, 420, 468, 471 IPC & U/s 3, 4 Buds Act-2019 & U/s 9 of Karnataka	U/s 120B, 406, 409, 419, 420, 468, 471 IPC & u/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial

		Protection of Interest of Depositors Exorbitant Act 2004.	Establishments Act, 2004 & U/s 21, 23, 25 of The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes, 2019.
33	Yeshwanthapura Police Station	375/2021 U/s 120B, 406, 409, 419, 420, 468, 471 IPC & U/s 3, 4 Buds Act-2019 & U/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors Exorbitant Act 2004.	U/s 120B, 406, 409, 419, 420, 468, 471 IPC & u/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial Establishments Act, 2004 & U/s 21, 23, 25 of The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes, 2019.
34	Yeshwanthapura Police Station	376/2021 U/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors Financial Establishment Act 2004, U/s 3, 4 The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes act 2019, U/s 120B, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 IPC.	U/s 120B, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 IPC & u/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial Establishments Act, 2004 & U/s 21, 23, 25 of The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes, 2019.
35	Yeshwanthapura Police Station	377/2021 U/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors Exorbitant Act 2004, U/s 3, 4 The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes Ordinance 2019, U/s 120B, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 IPC.	U/s 120B, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 IPC & u/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial Establishments Act, 2004 & U/s 21, 23, 25 of The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes, 2019.
36	Yeshwanthapura Police Station	378/2021 U/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors Exorbitant Act 2004, U/s 3, 4 The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes Ordinance 2019, U/s 120B, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 IPC.	U/s 120B, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 IPC & u/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial Establishments Act, 2004 & U/s 21, 23, 25 of The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes, 2019.
37	Yeshwanthapura Police Station	380/2021 U/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors Exorbitant Act 2004, U/s 3, 4 The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes Ordinance 2019, U/s 120B, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 IPC.	U/s 120B, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 IPC & u/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial Establishments Act, 2004 & U/s 21, 23, 25 of The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes, 2019.
38	Yeshwanthapura Police Station	381/2021 U/s 120B, 406, 409, 419, 420, 468, 471 IPC & U/s 3, 4 Buds Act- 2019 & U/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors Exorbitant Act 2004.	U/s 120B, 406, 409, 419, 420, 468, 471 IPC & u/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial Establishments Act, 2004 & U/s 21, 23, 25 of The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes, 2019.
39	Yeshwanthapura Police Station	382/2021 U/s 120B, 406, 409, 419, 420, 468, 471 IPC & U/s 3, 4 Buds Act- 2019 & U/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors Exorbitant Act 2004.	U/s 120B, 406, 409, 419, 420, 468, 471 IPC & u/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial Establishments Act, 2004 & U/s 21, 23, 25 of The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes, 2019.
40	Yeshwanthapura Police Station	383/2021 U/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors Exorbitant Act 2004, U/s 3, 4 The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes Ordinance 2019, U/s 120B, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 IPC.	U/s 120B, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 IPC & u/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial Establishments Act, 2004 & U/s 21, 23, 25 of The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes, 2019

41	Yeshwanthapura Police Station	384/2021 U/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors Exorbitant Act 2004, U/s 3, 4 The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes Ordinance 2019, U/s 120B, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 IPC.	U/s 120B, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 IPC & u/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial Establishments Act, 2004 & U/s 21, 23, 25 of The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes, 2019.
42	Yeshwanthapura Police Station	385/2021 U/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors Exorbitant Act 2004, U/s 3, 4 The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes Ordinance 2019, U/s 120B, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 IPC.	U/s 120B, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 IPC & u/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial Establishments Act, 2004 & U/s 21, 23, 25 of The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes, 2019.
43	Yeshwanthapura Police Station	387/2021 U/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors Exorbitant Act 2004, U/s 3, 4 The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes Ordinance 2019, U/s 120B, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 IPC.	U/s 120B, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 IPC & u/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial Establishments Act, 2004 & U/s 21, 23, 25 of The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes, 2019.
44	Yeshwanthapura Police Station	388/2021 U/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors Exorbitant Act 2004, U/s 3, 4 The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes Ordinance 2019, U/s 120B, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 IPC.	U/s 120B, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 IPC & u/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial Establishments Act, 2004 & U/s 21, 23, 25 of The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes, 2019.
45	Yeshwanthapura Police Station	389/2021 U/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors Exorbitant Act 2004, U/s 3, 4 The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes Ordinance 2019, U/s 120B, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 IPC.	U/s 120B, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 IPC & u/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial Establishments Act, 2004 & U/s 21, 23, 25 of The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes, 2019.
46	Yeshwanthapura Police Station	04/2022 U/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors Exorbitant Act 2004, U/s 3, 4 The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes Ordinance 2019, U/s 120B, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 IPC.	U/s 120B, 421, 406, 409, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 IPC & u/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial Establishments Act, 2004 & U/s 21, 23, 25 of The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes, 2019.
47	Yeshwanthapura Police Station	05/2022 U/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors Exorbitant Act 2004, U/s 3, 4 The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes Ordinance 2019, U/s 120B, 406, 409, 419, 420, 468, 471 IPC.	U/s 120B, 406, 409, 419, 420, 468, 471 IPC & u/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial Establishments Act, 2004 & U/s 21, 23, 25 of The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes, 2019.
48	H.S.R. Layout Police Station	156/2020 U/s 406, 420 IPC and U/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors Exorbitant Act 2004 & U/s 23, 26 of Buds act-2019	U/s 406, 420 IPC & u/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial Establishments Act, 2004 & U/s 21, 23, 25 of The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes, 2019.
49	H.S.R. Layout Police Station	157/2020 U/s 406, 420 IPC and U/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors Exorbitant Act 2004 & U/s 23, 26 of Buds act-2019	U/s 406, 420 IPC & u/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial Establishments Act, 2004 & U/s 21, 23, 25 of The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes, 2019.

50	H.S.R. Layout Police Station	158/2020 U/s 406, 420 IPC and U/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors Exorbitant Act 2004 & U/s 23, 26 of Buds act-2019	U/s 406, 420 IPC & u/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial Establishments Act, 2004 & U/s 21, 23, 25 of The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes, 2019.
51	H.S.R. Layout Police Station	169/2020 U/s 406, 420 IPC and U/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors Exorbitant Act 2004 & U/s 21, 22, 23, 26 of Buds act-2019	U/s 406, 420 IPC & u/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial Establishments Act, 2004 & U/s 21, 23, 25 of The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes, 2019.
52	H.S.R. Layout Police Station	170/2020 U/s 406, 420 IPC and U/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors Exorbitant Act 2004 & U/s 21, 22, 23, 26 of Buds act-2019	U/s 406, 420 IPC & u/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial Establishments Act, 2004 & U/s 21, 23, 25 of The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes, 2019.
53	H.S.R. Layout Police Station	184/2020 U/s 406, 420, 34 IPC and U/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors Exorbitant Act 2004 & U/s 21, 22, 23, 26 of Buds act-2019	U/s 406, 420 r/w 34 IPC & u/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial Establishments Act, 2004 & U/s 21, 23, 25 of The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes, 2019.
54	H.S.R. Layout Police Station	202/2020 U/s 406, 420 IPC and U/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors Exorbitant Act 2004 & U/s 21, 22, 23, 26 of Buds act-2019	U/s 406, 420 IPC & u/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial Establishments Act, 2004 & U/s 21, 23, 25 of The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes, 2019.
55	H.S.R. Layout Police Station	203/2020 U/s 406, 420 IPC and U/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors Exorbitant Act 2004 & U/s 21, 22, 23, 26 of Buds act-2019	U/s 406, 420 IPC & u/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial Establishments Act, 2004 & U/s 21, 23, 25 of The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes, 2019.
56	Madivala Police Station	226/2020 U/s 406, 420, 34 IPC and U/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors Exorbitant Act 2004	U/s 406, 420 r/w 34 IPC & u/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial Establishments Act, 2004 & U/s 21, 23, 25 of The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes, 2019.
57	Magadi Road Police Station	157/2020 U/s 420 IPC and u/s 21 of BUDS act and U/s 09 of KPID act.	U/s 420 IPC & u/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial Establishments Act, 2004 & U/s 21, 23, 25 of The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes, 2019.
58	Chandra Layout Police Station	244/2020 U/s 406, 420, 34 IPC & U/s 21 Buds act-2019 and U/s 09 of KPID Act-2004.	U/s 406, 420 r/w 34 IPC & u/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial Establishments Act, 2004 & U/s 21, 23, 25 of The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes, 2019.
59	Jeevanbeema Nagar Police Station	187/2020 U/s 406, 420, 34 IPC & U/s 9 KPID act 2004.	U/s 406, 420 r/w 34 IPC & u/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial Establishments Act, 2004 & U/s 21, 23, 25 of The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes, 2019.
60	Banasavadi Police Station	552/2020 U/s 406, 409, 420 IPC & U/s 21, 22, 23 Buds act-2019 and U/s 9 KPID Act-2004.	U/s 406, 409, 420 IPC & u/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial Establishments Act, 2004 & U/s 21, 23, 25 of The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes, 2019.

61	Banasavadi Police Station	553/2020 U/s 406, 409, 420 IPC & U/s 21, 22, 23 Buds act-2019 and U/s 9 KPID Act-2004.	U/s 406, 409, 420 IPC & u/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial Establishments Act, 2004 & U/s 21, 23, 25 of The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes, 2019.
62	Banasavadi Police Station	358/2020 U/s 406, 420, 34 IPC	U/s 406, 420 r/w 34 IPC & u/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial Establishments Act, 2004 & U/s 21, 23, 25 of The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes, 2019.
63	Vidyaranyapura Police Station	157/2020 U/s 406, 409, 420 IPC	U/s 406, 409, 420 IPC u/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial Establishments Act, 2004 & U/s 21, 23, 25 of The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes, 2019.
64	Mahadevapura Police Station	253/2020 U/s 406, 420, 34 IPC and U/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest Depositors Exorbitant Act 2004.	U/s 406, 420 r/w 34 IPC & u/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial Establishments Act, 2004 & U/s 21, 23, 25 of The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes, 2019.
65	Yelahanka New Town Police Station	120/2020 u/s 420, 34 IPC & U/s 21, 22, 23 BUDS act and 9 of KPID act.	U/s 420 r/w 34 IPC & u/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial Establishments Act, 2004 & U/s 21, 23, 25 of The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes, 2019.
66	Sampangirama Nagar Police Station	15/2021 u/s 420, 34 IPC & U/s 3, 4 BUDS act & 9 of KPID act.	U/s 420 r/w 34 IPC & u/s 9 of Karnataka Protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial Establishments Act, 2004 & U/s 21, 23, 25 of The Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes, 2019.

नई दिल्ली, 12 दिसम्बर, 2025

का.आ. 2221.—केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्द्वारा दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापन अधिनियम, 1946 (1946 का केन्द्रीय अधिनियम 25) की धारा 5 की उप-धारा (1) सपठित धारा 6 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए आदेश सं. एचडी 104 सीओडी 2025, बेंगलुरु, दिनांक 07.11.2025 के माध्यम से जारी कर्नाटक राज्य की सम्मति से गूगल प्ले स्टोर में “गलद अरब” एप्लीकेशन के मालिकों, निर्माणकर्ताओं एवं प्रचालकों तथा अन्य अज्ञात व्यक्तियों के विरुद्ध भारतीय न्याय संहिता, 2023 की धारा 61(2), 111 एवं 204 और सूचना प्रौद्योगिकी अधिनियम, 2000 की धारा 66डी के तहत अपराध(धों) तथा अन्वेषण के दौरान सामने आने वाले अन्य अपराध का पंजीकरण एवं अन्वेषण करने के लिए दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापन के सदस्यों की शक्तियों और क्षेत्राधिकार का विस्तार करती है।

[फा. सं. 228/97/2025-एवीडी-II]

सत्यम श्रीवास्तव, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 12th December, 2025

S.O. 2221.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 5 read with section 6 of the Delhi Special Police Establishment Act, 1946 (Central Act 25 of 1946), the Central Government with the consent of the State Government of Karnataka, issued vide Order No. HD 104 COD 2025, Bengaluru, dated 07.11.2025, hereby

extends the powers and jurisdiction of the members of the Delhi Special Police Establishment for registration and investigation of offence against the owners, developers and operators of “GALAD ARAB” application in Google Play Store and other unknown persons for offence(s) under section 61(2), 111 and 204 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and section 66D of the Information Technology Act, 2000 and any other offence that may come to light during investigation.

[F. No. 228/97/2025-AVD-II]

SATYAM SRIVASTAVA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 17 दिसम्बर, 2025

का.आ. 2222.—केंद्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापन अधिनियम, 1946 (1946 का केन्द्रीय अधिनियम XXV) की धारा 5 की उप-धारा (1) सपठित धारा 6 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए पुलिस उप महानिरीक्षक/शाखा प्रमुख, सीबीआई, एसीबी, रांची के दिनांक 19.11.2025 के पत्र संख्या 979/सीओ-13/2025-आर द्वारा किए गए अनुरोध पर झारखंड राज्य सरकार की अधिसूचना ज्ञापन सं.-10/सी.बी.आई.-430/2025-7229/ रांची, दिनांक 28.11.2025, गृह, कारागार और आपदा प्रबंधन विभाग के माध्यम से जारी सम्मति से निम्न संदिग्ध व्यक्तियों :-

1. श्री संदीप रंजन, 21सी(जीडी), रेजीमेंटल सं. 111110658, एसएचक्यू (पटना), आईटीबीपी।
2. श्री आशुतोष कुनाल गुप्ता, सुपुत्र श्री बिदेश्वरी, पुलिस आरक्षक (जीडी), रेजीमेंटल सं. 090180277, 40 बीएन , आईटीबीपी, निवासी ग्राम – सरसादाये, पोस्ट - बेलहर, जिला – बांका (बिहार)
3. श्री मनोज कुमार, सुपुत्र श्री अजय प्रसाद माथुरी, पुलिस आरक्षक (जीडी) रेजीमेंटल सं. 130460704, एस एचक्यू (पटना), आईटीबीपी, निवासी ग्राम – अजमतगंज परईया, पोस्ट - परईया , तेह-तिकरी, जिला – गया (बिहार)
4. अज्ञात गैर सेवकों एवं विभिन्न सीएपीएफ से निजी व्यक्ति एवं अन्य अज्ञात के विरुद्ध भारतीय न्याय संहिता की धारा 61(2) सपठित भ्रष्टाचार निवारण अधिनियम, 1988 (2018 में यथा संशोधित) की धारा 07, 07-ए, 08 & 12 के तहत अपराध करने के लिए साथ ही इस मामले के अन्वेषण के दौरान प्रकाश में आए किन्हीं अन्य अपराधों एवं ऐसे एक या उससे अधिक अपराधों से जुड़े या उससे संबद्ध किसी दुष्प्रयास, दुष्प्रेरणा और षड्यंत्र एवं/अथवा उसी संव्यवहार में किए गए या उन्हीं तथ्यों से उत्पन्न किसी अन्य अपराध(धों) के लिए नियमित मामला के पंजीकरण हेतु दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापन के सदस्यों की शक्तियों और क्षेत्राधिकार का विस्तार झारखंड राज्य में करती है।

[फा. सं. 228/99/2025-एवीडी-II]

सत्यम श्रीवास्तव, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 17th December, 2025

S.O. 2222.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 5 read with section 6 of the Delhi Special Police Establishment Act, 1946 (25 of 1946), the Central Government with the consent of the State Government of Jharkhand, issued vide Notification Memo No.-10/C.B.I.-430/2025-7229/Ranchi, Dated 28.11.2025, Home, Prisons and Disaster Management Department upon request made vide letter No. 979/CO-13/2025-R, dated 19.11.2025 of DIG of Police/Head of Branch, CBI, ACB, Ranchi, hereby extends the powers and jurisdiction to all the members of Delhi Special Police Establishment in the State of Jharkhand for registration of regular case against the following suspect persons :-

1. Sh. Sandeep Ranjan, 21C(GD), Regtl. No. 111110658, SHQ (Patna), ITBP.
2. Sh. Ashutosh Kunal Gupta, S/o Sh. Bindeshwari, Constable (GD), Regti. No. 090180277, 40 Bn, ITBP, R/o Vill-Sarsaddaeh, PO-Belhar, Distt-Banka (Bihar).
3. Sh. Manoj Kumar, S/o Sh. Ajay Prasad Mathuri, Constable (GD) Regti. No. 130460704, SHQ(Patna), ITBP, R/o Vill-Ajmatganj Paraiya, PO-Paraiya, Teh-Tikari, Distt-Gaya(Bihar).
4. Unknown public servants and personnel from various CAPFs & unknown others.

for committing offences u/s 61(2) BNS r/w Sec. 07, 07-A, 08 & 12 of PC Act, 1988 (As amended in 2018) and any other offence(s) that may come into light during investigation of case including any attempt, abetment and conspiracy in relation to or in connection with one or more such offences and/or any other offence(s) committed in the course of the same transaction or arising out of the same facts.

[F. No. 228/99/2025-AVD-II]

SATYAM SRIVASTAVA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 17 दिसम्बर, 2025

का.आ. 2223.—केंद्रीय सरकार, दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापन अधिनियम, 1946 (1946 का केंद्रीय अधिनियम 25) की धारा 5 की उप-धारा (1) सपठित धारा 6 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए अधिसूचना सं. जी.ओ.(2डी).सं.57, दिनांक 03.03.2025, गृह (नागरिकता) विभाग, संशोधित अधिसूचना सं. जी.ओ.(2डी).सं.168, दिनांक 10.06.2025, गृह (नागरिकता) विभाग, संशोधित अधिसूचना सं. जी.ओ.(2डी).सं.380, दिनांक 25.11.2025, गृह (नागरिकता) विभाग के माध्यम से जारी तमिलनाडु राज्य सरकार की सम्मति से मेसर्स सेल्वी अर्थ मूवर्स एवं ट्रांसपोर्टर्स प्राइवेट लिमिटेड एवं उनके निदेशकगण श्री ई.आनंदराज, श्री. ई.आनन्द कुमार, श्री. वी.एलुमलाई गारंटीकर्ता/मोरगेजर, नंबर -1, मरियम्मन कोली स्ट्रीट, काल्लादीकुप्पम, विल्लुपुरम जिला एवं इंडियन बैंक के अज्ञात अधिकारियों के विरुद्ध इंडियन बैंक को 3.56 करोड़ रुपये की धोखाधड़ी करने हेतु भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 120-बी सपठित धाराएँ 420 एवं 406, भ्रष्टाचार निवारण अधिनियम, 1988 की धारा 13(2) सपठित धारा 13(1)(घ) एवं भ्रष्टाचार निवारण अधिनियम, 1988 (वर्ष 2018 में यथासंशोधित) की धारा 13(2) सपठित 13(1)(क) के तहत केन्द्रीय अन्वेषण ब्यूरो, विशेष कार्य शाखा, चेन्नई द्वारा इसका अन्वेषण करने के लिए प्रथम सूचना रिपोर्ट के पंजीकरण हेतु दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापन के सदस्यों की शक्तियों और क्षेत्राधिकार का विस्तार समस्त तमिलनाडु राज्य में करती है।

[फा. सं. 228/98/2025-एवीडी-II]

सत्यम श्रीवास्तव, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 17th December, 2025

S.O. 2223.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 5 read with section 6 of the Delhi Special Police Establishment Act, 1946 (Central Act 25 of 1946), the Central Government with the consent of the State Government of Tamil Nadu, issued vide Notification No. G.O.(2D).No.57, Dated 03.03.2025, Home (Citizenship) Department, Amendment Notification No. G.O.(2D).No.168, Dated 10.06.2025, Home (Citizenship) Department and Amendment Notification No. G.O.(2D).No.380, Dated 25.11.2025, Home (Citizenship) Department, hereby extends the powers and jurisdiction of members of the Delhi Special Police Establishment in the whole of the State of Tamil Nadu for registration of First Information Report (FIR) for investigation by Central Bureau of Investigation, Special Task Branch, Chennai under section 120-B read with sections 420 and 406 of the Indian Penal Code, section 13(2) read with section 13(1)(d) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 and section 13(2) read with section 13(1)(a) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 (as amended in 2018) against M/s. Selvi Earth Movers & Transports Private Ltd., and their Directors Shri. E.Anandraj, Shri. E.Anand Kumar, Shri. V.Elumalai Guarantor / Mortgagor, of No.1, Mariamman Koil Street, Kalladikuppam, Villupuram District and unknown Bank Officials of Indian Bank for cheating the Indian Bank to a tune of Rs. 3.56 crores.

[F. No. 228/98/2025-AVD-II]

SATYAM SRIVASTAVA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 22 दिसम्बर, 2025

का.आ. 2224.—केंद्रीय सरकार, भारतीय नागरिक सुरक्षा संहिता, 2023 (2023 का 46) की धारा 18 की उपधारा (8) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, भारत के राजपत्र, भाग II, खंड 3, उपखंड (ii) में संख्यांक का.आ. 732, तारीख 23 दिसंबर, 2023 द्वारा प्रकाशित भारत सरकार के कार्मिक, लोक शिकायत और पेंशन मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना में निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है, अर्थात्:-

उक्त अधिसूचना की सारणी में,-

(क) श्री अजय चौधरी से संबंधित क्रम संख्यांक 1 और उससे संबंधित प्रविष्टियों का तारीख 23 अक्टूबर, 2024 से लोप किया जाएगा।

(ख) श्री मृणाल कान्ति देव से संबंधित क्रम संख्यांक 6 और उससे संबंधित प्रविष्टियों का तारीख 01 जनवरी, 2025 से लोप किया जाएगा।

(ग) श्री अविजित बरन दास से संबंधित क्रम संख्यांक 7 और उससे संबंधित प्रविष्टियों का तारीख 20 जनवरी, 2024 से लोप किया जाएगा।

[फा. सं. 225/44/2022-एवीडी-II]

सत्यम श्रीवास्तव, अवर सचिव

[टिप्पण:- मूल अधिसूचना भारत के राजपत्र, भाग II, खंड 3, उपखंड (ii) में संख्यांक का.आ. 732, तारीख 23 दिसंबर, 2023 द्वारा प्रकाशित की गई थी]

New Delhi, the 22nd December, 2025

S.O. 2224.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (8) of section 18 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (46 of 2023), the Central Government hereby makes the following amendments in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Personnel Public Grievances and Pensions, published in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3, Sub-section (ii), vide number S.O. 732, dated the 23rd December, 2023, namely: -

In the said notification, in the Table,-

- (a) serial number 1 relating to Shri Ajay Chaudhuri and the entries relating thereto, shall be omitted with effect from 23rd October, 2024;
- (b) serial number 6 relating to Shri Mrinal Kanti Deb and the entries relating thereto, shall be omitted with effect from 1st January, 2025;
- (c) serial number 7 relating to Shri Avijit Baran Das and the entries relating thereto, shall be omitted with effect from 20th January, 2024.

[F. No. 225/44/2022-AVD-II]

SATYAM SRIVASTAVA, Under Secy.

[Note: The principal notification was published in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3, Sub-section (ii), vide number S.O. 732, dated the 23rd December, 2023]

नई दिल्ली, 24 दिसम्बर, 2025

का.आ. 2225.—केंद्रीय सरकार, भारतीय नागरिक सुरक्षा संहिता, 2023 (2023 का 46) की धारा 18 की उपधारा (8) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, भारत के राजपत्र, भाग II, खंड 3, उपखंड (ii) में, संख्यांक का.आ. 238, तारीख 5 जनवरी, 2023 द्वारा प्रकाशित भारत सरकार के कार्मिक, लोक शिकायत और पेंशन मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना को, उन बातों के सिवाय, जो ऐसे विखंडन से पूर्व की गई हैं या जिनके किए जाने का लोप किया गया है, विखंडित करती है।

[फा. सं. 225/17/2022-एवीडी-II]

सत्यम श्रीवास्तव, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 24th December, 2025

S.O. 2225.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (8) of section 18 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (46 of 2023), the Central Government hereby rescinds the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Personnel Public Grievances and Pensions, published in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3, Sub-section (ii), vide number S.O. 238, dated the 5th January, 2023, except as respects things done or omitted to be done before such rescission.

[F. No. 225/17/2022-AVD-II]

SATYAM SRIVASTAVA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 24 दिसम्बर, 2025

का.आ. 2226.—केंद्रीय सरकार, भारतीय नागरिक सुरक्षा संहिता, 2023 (2023 का 46) की धारा 18 की उपधारा (8) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, भारत के राजपत्र, भाग II, खंड 3, उपखंड (ii) में, संख्यांक

का.आ. 7, तारीख 28 दिसंबर, 2015 द्वारा प्रकाशित भारत सरकार के कार्मिक, लोक शिकायत और पेंशन मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना में निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है, अर्थात्:-

उक्त अधिसूचना में, श्री भारत भूषण शर्मा से संबंधित क्रम संख्या 5 और उससे संबंधित प्रविष्टि का लोप किया जाएगा।

[फा. सं. 225/21/2015-एवीडी-II]

सत्यम श्रीवास्तव, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 24th December, 2025

S.O. 2226.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (8) of section 18 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (46 of 2023), the Central Government hereby makes the following amendment in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Personnel Public Grievances and Pensions, published in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3, Sub-section (ii), vide number S.O. 7, dated the 28th December, 2015, namely: -

In the said notification, serial number 5 relating to Sh. Bharat Bhushan Sharma and the entry relating thereto shall be omitted.

[F. No. 225/21/2015-AVD-II]

SATYAM SRIVASTAVA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 24 दिसम्बर, 2025

का.आ. 2227.—केंद्रीय सरकार, भारतीय नागरिक सुरक्षा संहिता, 2023 (2023 का 46) की धारा 18 की उपधारा (8) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, मध्य प्रदेश सरकार द्वारा अधिसूचना सं. 1/5/96/एक्सएक्स-बी(वन)/2220/2015 तारीख 28 जुलाई, 2015 द्वारा अधिसूचित विचारण न्यायालयों में अभियोजन करने से श्री रंजन शर्मा और श्री मुकेश कुमार मिश्रा, लोक अभियोजकों के नामों को तत्काल प्रभाव से हटाती है और इस प्रयोजन के लिए भारत सरकार के कार्मिक, लोक शिकायत और पेंशन मंत्रालय, कार्मिक और प्रशिक्षण विभाग की अधिसूचना संख्यांक का.आ. 1923, तारीख 1 अक्तूबर, 2015 में निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है, अर्थात्:-

उक्त अधिसूचना की में, निम्नलिखित क्रमांक संख्याओं और उनसे संबंधित प्रविष्टियों का लोप किया जाएगा, अर्थात्:-

3. श्री रंजन शर्मा; और

5. श्री मुकेश कुमार मिश्रा।

[फा. सं. 225/19/2015-एवीडी-II]

सत्यम श्रीवास्तव, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 24th December, 2025

S.O. 2227.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (8) of section 18 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (46 of 2023), the Central Government hereby makes the following amendment in the notification of the Government of India, in the Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pensions, Department of Personnel and Training number S.O. 1923, dated the 1st October, 2015, namely: -

In the said notification, the following serial numbers and the entry relating thereto shall be omitted with immediate effect, namely: -

Sl. No.	Name of Special Public Prosecutor
3.	Shri Ranjan Sharma
5.	Shri Mukesh Kumar Mishra

[F. No. 225/19/2015-AVD-II]

SATYAM SRIVASTAVA, Under Secy.

श्रम एवं रोजगार मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 23 दिसम्बर, 2025

का.आ. 2228.— औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार उत्तर रेलवे के प्रबंधतंत्र, संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय लखनऊ के पंचाट (68/2012) प्रकाशित करती है

[सं. एल- 41012/27/2012-आई आर (बी-1)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT

New Delhi, the 23rd December, 2025

S.O. 2228.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. 68/2012) of the *Cent.Govt.Indus.Tribunal-cum-Labour Court Lucknow* as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of Northern Railway and their workmen.

[No. L-41012/27/2012– IR(B-1)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE**CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, LUCKNOW****I.D.NO. 68 of 2012****(Reference No. L-41012/27/2012-IR(B-I)Dated 30.08.2012)****Shri Sheetla Prasad,**

Son of late Ramanand,

Village- Bharthi Saraiya,

Post- Makdoom Nagar,

District- Sultanpur.

.....Appellant

Versus**Divisional Railway Manager,**

Northern Railway,

Muradabad Division,

Muradabad(UP).

.....Respondent

JUDGMENT

By means of order/reference no. L-41012/27/2012-IR(B1) dated 30.08.2012, the Central Government considered it desirable to refer the dispute for adjudication to the following effect:-

"Whether the action of the management of Northern Railway, Muradabad in terminating the services of Shri Sheetala Prasad S/o Shri Ramanand w. e. f 22/12/1986, is legal and justified? To what relief the workman is entitled?"

In pursuance to the said reference I.D. Case No. 68/2012 registered before this tribunal.

Thereafter claimant filed his statement of claim before this tribunal on 24.09.2012 in which it has been stated that Shri Sheetal Prasad/ workman was initially engaged as casual labour on 16.01.1975 and in the said capacity work till 21.12.1986 however, his services were retrenched/termination on 22.12.1986.

Further in claim statement the relief as claimed by workman is that his termination/retrenchment, order dated 22.12.1986 may be set aside, he may be reinstated service with all constitutional benefit.

The respondent has filed written statement and thereafter the rejoinder and documents/evidence have been exchanged between parties.

On behalf of respondent a plea was taken that as per the case of workman, his services was retrenchment on 22.12.1986, for redressed of his grievances approached the authority in the year 2012.

Thereafter reference was made on 30.08.2012, so the case filed by the workman is able to be dismissed on the ground of delay and he is not entitled for any relief.

FINDING AND CONCLUSION

As per to the admitted facts of the present case, the claimant/workman was engaged as casual labour on 24.09.2012, and his services was retrenched/terminated on 22.12.1986.

Thereafter for redressal of his grievances approached the authority in the year 2012, the present reference has been made on 30.08.2012, filed his claim statement on 24.09.2012, before this tribunal.

In view of the said facts the claim statement filed by workman against his retrenchment/termination, dated 22.12.1986, was after 16 years, so the same is highly belated as such he is not entitled for any relief in view of the law which are quoted here in below:

In **Nedungadi Bank Ltd. vs. K.P. Madhavankutty and Ors. 2000 (2) SCC 455** it was noted at paragraph 6 as follows:

"6. Law does not prescribe any time-limit for the appropriate Government to exercise its powers under Section 10 of the Act. It is not that this power can be exercised at any point of time and to revive matters which had since been settled. Power is to be exercised reasonably and in a rational manner. There appears to us to be no rational basis on which the Central Government has exercised powers in this case after a lapse of about seven years of the order dismissing the respondent from service. At the time reference was made no industrial dispute existed or could be even said to have been apprehended. A dispute which is stale could not be the subject-matter of reference under Section 10 of the Act. As to when a dispute can be said to be stale would depend on the facts and circumstances of each case. When the matter has become final, it appears to us to be rather incongruous that the reference be made under Section 10 of the Act in the circumstances like the present one. In fact it could be said that there was no dispute pending at the time when the reference in question was made. The only ground advanced by the respondent was that two other employees who were dismissed from service were reinstated. Under what circumstances they were dismissed and subsequently reinstated is nowhere mentioned. Demand raised by the respondent for raising an industrial dispute was ex-facie bad and incompetent."

Further, in **S.M. Nilajkar and Ors. v. Telecom District Manager, Karnataka 2003 (4) SCC 27** the position was reiterated as follows: (at para 17)

"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. It is true, as held in M/s. Shalimar Works Ltd. v. Their Workmen (supra) AIR 1959 SC 1217, that merely because the Industrial Disputes Act does not provide for a limitation for raising the dispute it does not mean that the dispute can be raised at any time and without regard to the delay and reasons therefor. There is no limitation prescribed for reference of disputes to an industrial tribunal, even so it is only reasonable that the disputes should be referred as soon as possible after they have arisen and after conciliation proceedings have failed particularly so when disputes relate to discharge of workmen wholesale. A delay of 4 years in raising the dispute after even reemployment of the most of the old workmen was held to be fatal in M/ s. Shalimar Works Limited v. Their Workmen (supra) AIR 1959 SC 1217, In Nedungadi Bank Ltd. v. K.P. Madhavankutty and others (supra) AIR 2000 SC 839, a delay of 7 years was held to be fatal and disentitled to workmen to any relief. In Ratan Chandra Samanta and others v Union of India and others (supra) 1993 AIR SCW 2214, 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. Although the High Court has opined that there was a delay of 7 to 9 years in raising the dispute before the Tribunal but we find the High Court factually not correct. The employment of the appellants was terminated sometime in 1985-86 or 1986-87. Pursuant to the judgment in Daily Rated Casual Employees Under P&T Department v. Union of India (supra) AIR 1987 SC 2342, the department was formulating a scheme to accommodate casual labourers and the appellants were justified in awaiting the outcome thereof. On 16-1-1990 they were refused to be accommodated in the scheme. On 28-12-1990 they initiated the proceedings under the Industrial Disputes Act followed by conciliation proceedings and then the dispute was referred to the Industrial Tribunal cum-Labour Court. We do not think that the appellants deserve to be non suited on the ground of delay."

The Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **Krishi Utpadan Mandi Samity vs. Pahal Singh reported in 2007 12 SCC 193** and more particularly paragraph Nos. 10, 11, which read as under:-

"10. The Labour Court was also under an obligation to consider as to whether any relief, if at all could be granted in favour of the workman in view of the fact that the industrial dispute had been raised after 18 years. It was obligatory on the part of the Labour Court to consider that the respondent was in employment for very short period. It had also not arrived at a finding that the respondent was in continuous service within the meaning of Section 2(g) of the U.P. Industrial Disputes Act or for that matter in terminating the services of the respondent, the appellant did not comply with the requirements of law particularly Section 6-N thereof. In absence of such a finding, the High Court in our opinion should have interfered with the Award.

11. It is now well-settled principle of law that "delay de-feats equity".

(see also **Haryana State Co-operative Land Development Bank vs. Neelam (2005) 5 SCC 91**)

Further, in the present case, it is also not in dispute rather admitted by the workman has raised his grievance to be included in screening for year 1983-84 by means of raising industrial dispute in the year 2003, which was referred to this Tribunal after 20 years, as such, he is not entitled for any relief. Because, Hon'ble Rajasthan High Court, Jaipur Bench, in the case of **M.D./Chief Manager, Jaipur Agar, Rajasthan State Road Transport Corp., Jaipur vs. General Secretary, Rajasthan Transport Workers Organisation, Jaipur, 2024 (182) FLR 892**, has held as under:

"6. In the case at hand, the respondent-workman was appointed on the post of Driver vide order dated 17.12.1986. Accordingly, the benefit of first selection scale became due after nine years, sometime in 2004-2005. The same was not done and neither was the non-grant of the benefit at the time was challenged by the respondent-workman. The benefit of first selection scale was only granted vide order dated 06.04.2004. This deferment was also not challenged immediately and was only challenged for the first time in 2013. The first issue that is to be decided by this Court is what effect, if any, would this delay have on the merits of the case.

7. To decide the first issue, recourse may be taken to Hon'ble Supreme Court judgment of Mohan Lal (*supra*), the relevant portion of which is reproduced as under:

"19. We are clearly of the view that though the Limitation Act, 1963 is not applicable to the reference made under the ID Act but delay in raising industrial dispute is definitely an important circumstance which the Labour Court must keep in view at the time of exercise of discretion irrespective of whether or not such objection has been raised by the other side. The legal position laid down by this Court in *Gitam Singh [Asstt. Eng., Rajasthan Development Corpn. v. Gitam Singh]*, that before exercising its judicial discretion, the Labour Court has to keep in view all relevant factors including the mode and manner of appointment, nature of employment, length of service, of service, the ground on which termination has been set aside and the delay in raising industrial dispute before grant of relief in an industrial dispute, must be invariably followed.

20. Now, if the facts of the present case are seen, the position that emerges is this: the workman worked as a work-charged employee for a period from 1.11.1984 to 17.2.1986 (in all he worked for 286 days during his employment). The services of the workman were terminated with effect from 18.2.1986. The workman raised the industrial dispute in 1992 i.e. after 6 years of termination. The Labour Court did not keep in view admitted delay of 6 years in raising the industrial dispute by the workman. The judicial discretion exercised by the Labour Court is, thus, flawed and unsustainable. The Division Bench of the High Court was clearly in error in restoring the award of the Labour Court whereby reinstatement was granted to the workman. Though, the compensation awarded by the Single Judge was too low and needed to be enhanced by the Division Bench but surely reinstatement of the workman in the facts and circumstances is not the appropriate relief."

Further, the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Sadhu Singh (supra)*, held as under:

"6. We shall at the outset deal with the issue of limitation. The respondent was retired compulsorily from service on 4.1.2003. Original Civil Suit No. 41 of 2010 was instituted in 2010. The trial Judge as well as the first appellate court were of the view that the suit was not barred by limitation since the representation of the respondent for the grant of the three selection grades was rejected on 18.1.2010. The first appellate court, while concurring with the trial Judge also noted that the "final request" made by the respondent-plaintiff on 18.1.2010 was rejected and hence the suit was within limitation.

7. The respondent waited for seven long years after his retirement to pursue a claim for the grant of selection grade. This was clearly beyond the residuary period of limitation of three years provided in Article 137 of the Schedule to the Limitation Act, 1963. That apart, in the decision of this Court in *State of Rajasthan v. Shankar Lal Parmar*, the Court has considered the ambit of the scheme for selection grade. This Court has held thus:

"6. Another important and relevant clause in the said order for our perusal is Clause 7, which is also reproduced hereinbelow:

7. Selection grades in terms of this order shall be granted only to those employees whose record of service is satisfactory. The record of service which makes one eligible for promotion on the basis of seniority shall be considered to be satisfactory for the purpose of grant of the selection grade.

7. Clause 7 makes it clear that only those employees would be entitled for grant of selection grades, whose service record has been satisfactory and are otherwise eligible for promotion on the basis of seniority but have not been able to get the same as there might not be any channel of promotion or for want of sanctioned posts in the cadre."

8. The Court held that in terms of Clause 7, only those employees whose service record has been satisfactory could be entitled to be granted selection grade. In this context, the Court held:

"17. Clause 7 further makes it clear that only those/such employees would be entitled to be granted selection grade whose service record has been satisfactory. This implicitly shows that the person who has an untainted, unblemished, clean and unpolluted record in service would be treated on a higher pedestal than those who have either tainted, blemished, unclean or polluted record. This obviously appears to be a reasonable classification and is under the ambit and touchstone of Article 14 of the Constitution. There is neither any ambiguity nor any doubt in the same."

9. On the touchstone of the above principles, it is evident that the respondent had been subjected to several disciplinary proceedings and as many as 19 charge- sheets were issued against him which resulted in penalties of a varying nature. The service record of the respondent cannot be regarded as untainted or clean.

10. Ms Nidhi, learned counsel for the respondent submitted that some of the penalties which were imposed on the respondent were without cumulative effect. The consequence of the withholding of increments without cumulative effect is that after the period prescribed, the respondent would be entitled to restoration of the original pay scale or the original pay. However, this does not obviate the position that the imposition of the penalty itself indicates that the service record of the employee was not satisfactory. Another submission which has been urged is that the penalties were of a minor nature. Assuming that to be so, it is evident that for the grant of selection grade, the respondent did not fulfil the requirements of a clean record of service. The grant of the selection grade is not a matter of right and was subject to the terms and conditions which were stipulated. The respondent failed to fulfil these terms and conditions.

11. For the above reasons, we are of the view that both on the question of limitation as well as on merits, the respondent was not entitled to the relief which was sought. The suit instituted by the respondent resp seven years after he had demitted office was barred by limitation. That apart, the respondent failed to meet the basic requirements for the selection grade." (Emphasis supplied)

Further, the Hon'ble Supreme Court, in Bichitrananda Behera (supra), after considering the erstwhile judgments of Union of India v. Tarsem Singh, Union of India v. N. Murugesan, and Chairman, State Bank of India v. M.J. James, concluded that delay and laches are vital in service matters, and can be seen as acquiescence."

AWARD

For the foregoing reasons the workman is not entitled for any relief as per the Reference No. L-41012/27/2012-IR(B-I) dated 30.08.2012 and the same is answered accordingly.

Let two copies of this award be sent to the Ministry for publication.

Date: 15.07.2025

Justice ANIL KUMAR, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 23 दिसम्बर, 2025

का.आ. 2229.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार जम्मू और कश्मीर बैंक लिमिटेड का कॉर्पोरेट कार्यालय के प्रबंधतंत्र, संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय **चंडीगढ़- II** के पंचाट (23/2024) प्रकाशित करती है।

[सं. एल- 12025/01/2025-आई आर (बी-I)-146]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 23rd December, 2025

S.O. 2229.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. 23/2024) of the *Cent.Govt.Indus.Tribunal-cum-Labour Court Chandigarh-II* as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of Jammu and Kashmir Bank Limited Corporate Office and their workmen.

[No. L-12025/01/2025- IR (B-I)-146]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE
IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT-II,
CHANDIGARH
(Presided over by Mr. Kamal Kant).

ID No.23/2024

Mohd Iqbal Shanawaz and others Snagram Bhata Kishtwar, Jammu and Kashmir.

----- Workman

Versus

1. The Chairman, Jammu and Kashmir Bank Limited Corporate Office, MA Road, Srinagar, UT of Jammu and Kashmir.
2. M/s AP Securities Private Ltd. Babliana Road, Gangyal Pully Jammu-180010.

----Respondents

Present:- None for workman.

Sh. S C Gupta, AR for respondent no.1.

Sh. Puneet Kumar, AR for respondent no.2.

Award : 24.10.2025

Central Government vide Notification No.08(30)/2024/RLC/Jmu dated 24.09.2024, under sub-section (5) of Section 12 read with sub-section (2A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter called the Act), has referred the following Industrial dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal:-

- 1) *“Whether the action of management of the Chairman, Jammu and Kashmir Bank Limited Corporate Office, MA Road, Srinagar, UT of Jammu and Kashmir and Shri Vicky Singh, M/s AP Securities Private Ltd. Babliana Road, Gangyal Pully Jammu-180010 for not regularize service of security guards who are performing duty on perennial nature of job is legal and justified? If not, then to what relief the concerned workmen are entitled to and from which date?”*
- 2) *The Jammu and Kashmir Bank not come under Scheduled Employment of Central Minimum Wages Act, 1948. However, whether the action of management of the Chairman, Jammu and Kashmir Bank Limited Corporate Office, MA Road, Srinagar, UT of Jammu and Kashmir and Shri Vicky Singh, M/s AP Securities Private Ltd. Babliana Road, Gangyal Pully Jammu-180010 for implementing Central Minimum Wages in respect of all security guards is legal and justified? If not, then to what relief the concerned workmen are entitled to and from which date?”*
- 3) *Whether the action of management of the Chairman, Jammu and Kashmir Bank Limited Corporate Office, MA Road, Srinagar, UT of Jammu and Kashmir and Shri Vicky Singh, M/s AP Securities Private Ltd. Babliana Road, Gangyal Pully Jammu-180010 for not giving payment of overtime for Sundays/holiday duty to its security guards is legal and justified? If not, then to what relief the concerned workmen are entitled to and from which date?”*
- 4) *Whether the action of management of the Chairman, Jammu and Kashmir Bank Limited Corporate Office, MA Road, Srinagar, UT of Jammu and Kashmir and Shri Vicky Singh, M/s AP Securities Private Ltd. Babliana Road, Gangyal Pully Jammu-180010 for not implementing insurance coverage of its security guards is legal and justified? If not, then to what relief the concerned workmen are entitled to and from which date?”*
- 5) *Whether the action of management of the Chairman, Jammu and Kashmir Bank Limited Corporate Office, MA Road, Srinagar, UT of Jammu and Kashmir and Shri Vicky Singh, M/s AP Securities*

- Private Ltd. Babliana Road, Gangyal Pully Jammu-180010 for not giving payment of risk allowances @Rs.1000/- as per past practice to its security guards is legal and justified? If not, then to what relief the concerned workmen are entitled to and from which date?*
- 6) *Whether the action of management of the Chairman, Jammu and Kashmir Bank Limited Corporate Office, MA Road, Srinagar, UT of Jammu and Kashmir and Shri Vicky Singh, M/s AP Securities Private Ltd. Babliana Road, Gangyal Pully Jammu-180010 for not giving all kind of leave as per past practice to its security guards is legal and justified? If not, then to what relief the concerned workmen are entitled to and from which date?*
 - 7) *Whether the action of management of the Chairman, Jammu and Kashmir Bank Limited Corporate Office, MA Road, Srinagar, UT of Jammu and Kashmir and Shri Vicky Singh, M/s AP Securities Private Ltd. Babliana Road, Gangyal Pully Jammu-180010 for not giving termination benefits like notice pay, retrenchment benefits to its security guards is legal and justified? If not, then to what relief the concerned workmen are entitled to and from which date?*
 - 8) *The demand raised by applicant's is not fit for reference for adjudication. However, the both opponent's were directed during conciliation proceedings to stop the victimization of security guards under pretext of fabricated allegations. Both opponents replied that management is committed for no victimization of all workmen in their management. However, they will keep close watch in future also for no victimization of any workmen.*
 - 9) *Whether the action of management of the Chairman, Jammu and Kashmir Bank Limited Corporate Office, MA Road, Srinagar, UT of Jammu and Kashmir and Shri Vicky Singh, M/s AP Securities Private Ltd. Babliana Road, Gangyal Pully Jammu-180010 for not giving HRA or house accommodations/transport allowance to its security guards job is legal and justified? If not, then to what relief the concerned workmen are entitled to and from which date?*
 - 10) *Whether the action of management of the Chairman, Jammu and Kashmir Bank Limited Corporate Office, MA Road, Srinagar, UT of Jammu and Kashmir and Shri Vicky Singh, M/s AP Securities Private Ltd. Babliana Road, Gangyal Pully Jammu-180010 for not giving good quality of uniform for summer and winter season two pairs per year to its security guards is legal and justified? If not, then to what relief the concerned workmen are entitled to and from which date?*
 - 11) *Whether the action of management of the Chairman, Jammu and Kashmir Bank Limited Corporate Office, MA Road, Srinagar, UT of Jammu and Kashmir and Shri Vicky Singh, M/s AP Securities Private Ltd. Babliana Road, Gangyal Pully Jammu-180010 for not giving pay slip, I card, employment card duly countersigned by principal employer to its security guards is legal and justified? If not, then to what relief the concerned workmen are entitled to and from which date?"*

1. On receipt of the reference, notice was issued to the workman for 20.12.2024 for appearance and for filing claim statement. However, no one turned up on behalf of workman on 20.12.2024 despite of service. Fresh notice was issued to the workman on 20.12.2024 for 04.03.2025. However, no one turned up on 04.03.2025 on behalf of workman and registered notice was issued on 04.03.2025 for 03.07.2025. Notice issued for 03.07.2025 was duly served on the address of workman on 10.05.2025 as per track report. However, no one turned up on behalf of workman on 03.07.2025 also and fresh registered notice was again issued for 24.10.2025 for appearance and for filing claim statement. The notice is not received back, therefore, it is presumed that the service is complete. However, today also no one has turned up on behalf of workman despite of service. The workman has been given sufficient opportunities for appearance and for filing claim statement, but he did not turned up in spite of the opportunities afforded to him for filing claim statement, which shows that he is not interested in adjudication of the matter on merit.

2. In such circumstances, this Tribunal is left with no choice, except to pass a 'No Claim Award'. Accordingly, 'No Claim Award' is passed in the present reference.

3. Let copy of this award be sent to the Appropriate Government as required under Section 17 of the ID Act for publication.

KAMAL KANT, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 23 दिसम्बर, 2025

का.आ. 2230.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार मिलिट्री फार्म्स, वेस्टर्न कमांड मुख्यालय, चंडीमंदिर, जिला पंचकुला के प्रबंधतंत्र, संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय **चंडीगढ़- II** के पंचाट (06/2009) प्रकाशित करती है।

[सं. एल- 14011/7/2008-आई आर (बी-1)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 23rd December, 2025

S.O. 2230.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. 06/2009) of the *Cent.Govt.Indus.Tribunal-cum-Labour Court Chandigarh-II* as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of Military Farms, Western Command Headquarters, Chandimandir Distt. Panchkula and their workmen.

[No. L-14011/7/2008- IR (B-I)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT-II, CHANDIGARH

(Present:- Mr. Kamal Kant, Presiding Officer).

ID No.06/2009

Registered on:-10.06.2009

1. Jarnail Singh S/o Sh. Banwari Lal
2. Bhim Singh S/o Sh. Mangat Ram
3. Suresh Kumar S/o Sh. Mam Chand
4. Jagdish S/o Sh. Babu Ram
5. Ram Singh S/o Sh. Parkash Chand
6. Amar Singh S/o Sh. Pannu Ram.

----- Applicants/Workmen

Versus

1. Deputy Director, Military Farms, Western Command, Headquarters, Chandimandir, Distt. Panchkula.
2. Officer Incharge Military Farm, Bir Dhanur PO Shahbad Markanda, Distt. Kurukshetra.

----Respondents

Present:- Sh. R P Rana, AR for workmen.

Sh. Arun Batra, AR for respondent no.1 & 2.

Award :24.11.2025

Central Government vide Notification No.L-14011/7/2008-IR(DU) dated 20.05.2009, under sub-section (1) and sub-section (2A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter called the Act), has referred the following Industrial dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal:-

“Whether the demand of S/Shri Jarnail Singh S/o Banwari Lal, (ii) Bhim Singh S/o Mangata Ram, (iii) Suresh Kumar S/o Mam Chand, (iv) Jagdish S/o Babu Ram, (v) Ram Singh S/o Prakash Chand, (vi) Amar Singh S/o Pannu Ram, for engagement in the Military Farm, Bir Dhantauri/Ambala is just and fair? If yes, what relief the concerned are entitled to and from which date?”

1. The brief facts, related to the case are that the workmen were employed with respondent no.2 w.e.f. 07.04.1990 as farms hands. All of them were sponsored by the employment exchange against the requisition sent by the respondent no.2 and after proper screening and scrutiny by a duly constituted committee were appointed on daily wage basis. The workmen were also granted temporary status under the Scheme dated 01.09.1993 of the Government of India. The workmen were governed by the Model Standing Orders issued by the respondents under the Industrial Employment (Standing Orders) Act, 1946 in 1982. Under these statutory orders, the workman engaged through employment exchange, who has been in continuous service for 6 months was to be brought on to the regular establishment. It was also a condition that no recruitment is to be made otherwise that through the employment exchange by issuing executive instructions from time to time. The seniority of all workmen is to be on all India Basis. It is also policy that surplus are to be transferred and adjusted at other stations and not to be retrenched. The work is of permanent and perennial nature and includes agriculture and other diary functions. Vide order dated 19.03.1999, services of all the workmen were retrenched on the ground of reduction in workload with a specific assurance that they would be considered for re-engagement as per their seniority as and when regular vacancy occurs. They may also take up job basis work to the extent available. On 28.07.1999, the farm was stated to have been closed due to some administrative decisions, which are not on record. However, immediately thereafter the farm was revived. The disbanding and closing of the farm was only a sham transaction to dispense with the services of the workmen.

2. The applicants filed OA No.1138-HR-92 before Hon'ble Central Administrative Tribunal, Chandigarh (hereinafter called as Hon'ble CAT, Chandigarh) and Hon'ble CAT, Chandigarh vide order dated 23.09.1992 give directions to the respondent to maintain status quo qua the present applicants and the said order was modified vide order dated 31.05.1993 with the direction to the respondent not to terminate services of the applicants as long as requirement of work is there. Thereafter, vide order dated 28.07.1999 (Ex. WW1/6), the Hon'ble Tribunal dispose of the aforesaid OA No.1138-HR-92 with the direction that party would be bound by the observation and direction given in this case not to terminate the services of the workmen. The workmen filed CWP No.16420 of 1999 before the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court against the decision dated 28.07.1999 (Ex. WW1/6) of Hon'ble CAT, Chandigarh. The said CWP was dismissed on 30.08.2006 by the Hon'ble High Court. The management in its written statement filed before the Hon'ble High Court had stated that the Dhantauri Farm had been revived in the year 2001. It was therefore imperative on them to have offered the job to the workmen as required under Section 25H of the Act. In view of the order of retrenchment dated 19.03.1999, the management was under an obligation to re-engage/re-appoint them on the revival of the farm. It is prayed that the workmen be reinstated in service from the date new hands have been employed/engaged.

3. Notice of claim was given to the respondent no.1 & 2, who filed reply thereof maintaining therein that the workmen were retrenched in the year 1999 due to non availability of work. The job in which the workmen were employed was not a regular nature and they were not engaged against any regular post with the military department. They worked as daily wager against casual work, which does not come within the purview of the Act. It is also maintained that the respondent no.1 and 2 does not fall within the definition of 'Industry' as defined under the Act. Due to reduction of work at military farm at Bir Dhantauri, the workmen were retrenched after paying due compensation admissible in the rules. The seniority of casual labour is counted in farm enrolment and not on All India Basis as per rules. There is no existence of military farm at Bir Dhantauri at present. The said unit has been disbanded and remains closed w.e.f. 01.04.2005. The land/assets of military farm at Bir Dhantauri have been transferred to local military authority, Station HQ Ambala Cantt. and army guard has already been deployed by 40 Arty Division at Bir Dhantauri. As per orders of the higher authorities, the military department has been permitted to rear cattle in order to facilitate watch and ward of land/assets to avoid any encroachment and to avoid loss to the state till land and assets are not acquired by LMA. The routine work of rearing young stock is being done by outsourcing as per Government Policy on part of Military Farm, Ambala till permitted by the LMA. The Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that Government offices/state offices are not covered under the category of Industrial Establishments and as such labour court has no jurisdiction. The claim of applicants has already been dismissed by the Hon'ble CAT, Chandigarh and same order has been upheld by the Hon'ble High Court of Punjab & Haryana. It is prayed that the claim of applicants/workmen be dismissed.

4. Parties were given opportunities to lead evidence.

Evidence of workman:

5. Workman Sh. Jarnail Singh has examined himself as W1 and filed his affidavit in evidence as Ex.WW1 and has been cross-examined by the AR of respondent no.1 & 2. AR for workman closed the evidence on behalf of workman on 23.05.2014.

6. In order to clarify the fact, applicants have filed affidavit of Sh. Jarnail Singh S/o Sh. Banwari Lal on 10.09.2025, which is taken on record as Ex.P1 and opportunity was given to the respondents to file counter affidavit. However, in response thereof, no counter affidavit was filed. Simple reply was filed by the AR for respondents on 31.10.2025, which is taken on record as Ex.M2. Workmen in their evidence has relied upon following documents:-

Sr. No.	Document	Date	Ex./Annexure
1.	Award	11.11.2010	WW1/1
2.	Attendance Register		WW1/2
3.	Payment Voucher		WW1/3
4.	Seniority list		WW1/4 along with Annexure P2 & P3
5.	Order in LPA 754/2010	29.11.2014	WW1/5
6.	CAT order	28.07.1999	WW1/6
7.	Order in CWP No.16420/1999	30.08.2006	WW1/7
8.	Claim Statement		Annexure A
9.	Retrenchment order	19.03.1999	Annexure B
10.	Order	25.08.2010	Annexure C

11.	-	Order of CAT, Chandigarh in OA No.1129/2017	18.02.2019	Annexure E
12.		Order of CAT in MA No.952/2019	12.03.2025	Annexure F
13.		Order in CWP No.22648/2025	13.08.2025	Annexure G
14.		Affidavit of Jarnail Singh	10.09.2025	Ex.P1

Evidence of respondents:-

7. The respondents have filed affidavit of Lt. Col SA Patil, Officer Incharge, Military Farm, Ambala Cantt., who filed his affidavit in evidence as Ex.RX and has been cross-examined by the learned counsel of workman. AR for respondents closed the evidence on 14.07.2016 and the case was fixed for arguments. Respondent in its evidence has relied upon the following documents:-

Sr. No.	Document	Date	Ex./Annexure
1.	Provisions of Administrative Tribunal Act		Annexure R-1
2.	Letter	20.09.1967	Annexure R-2
3.	Extract from gazette of India	01.11.1975	Annexure R-3
4.	Letter	17.07.1998	Annexure R-4
5.	Reply to affidavit dated 10.09.2025 of Jarnail Singh	31.10.2025	Ex.M2

Submissions of applicants:-

8. While arguing the case, ld. counsel for the applicants contended that applicants were employed by respondent no.2 w.e.f. 07.04.1990 as farm hand through employment exchange after appropriate screening committee on daily wage basis. Workmen worked as such and they filed case before Hon'ble CAT, Chandigarh (OA NO.1138-HR-92) as they were apprehending their termination by the respondent no.2. On 23.09.1992, Hon'ble CAT Chandigarh ordered that status quo be maintained by the respondents and workmen may not be terminated. However, their request for regularization was not accepted as per order dated 28.07.1999 (Ex.WW1/6). Against the order of the Hon'ble CAT, Chandigarh, workmen filed CWP No.16420 of 1999 before the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High. However, Hon'ble High Court dismissed the said CWP on 30.08.2006. In the meanwhile, workmen were removed from the services vide letter dated 19.03.1999 (Annexure B only of one workman placed on record and remaining letters are alike Annexure B) by maintaining that they are being removed from the services due to reduction of work and in the retrenchment order of each workman, it was stated as follows:-

"2. You would be considered for re-engagement as per your seniority as and when regular vacancy occurs. You may also take up "Job Basis" work to the extent available."

9. AR for workmen further contended that after the dismissal of the CWP, it came to the knowledge of the workmen that junior to the applicants were also retrenched on 19.03.1999/23.03.1999. He further contended that workmen were senior to the said workmen namely Ramcharan and 18 others. The said Junior of the workmen Sh. Ramcharan and 18 others filed a claim statement on 13.05.2010 and in the said case, CGIT-I, Chandigarh passed order in view of the settlement dated 25.08.2010 (Annexure C) done by the respondent no. 1 & 2 with those juniors. In this way, juniors to the workmen continued to work with respondents. However, workmen were not called for any work. He further contended that in the year 2017, juniors to the workmen apprehend that they were likely to be retrenched, they filed OA No.060/1129/2017 before the Hon'ble CAT Chandigarh and Hon'ble CAT Chandigarh vide order dated 18.02.2019 (Annexure E) directed to the respondent to constitute a committee and ordered their continuation in the service. However, later on, nothing was done by the respondents and therefore execution was filed by the said juniors in MA No.952 of 2019 in the Hon'ble CAT, Chandigarh (Annexure F), in which it is held as under:-

21. After going through the detailed objections filed by the respondents and the subsequent rebuttal to the same, we feel that the order dated 18.02.2019 passed in OA No.060/1129/2017 has not been complied with in its letter and spirit in the light of record of applicants, orders passed by respondents relating to age and grant of Temporary Status and in the interest of justice, equity and fair-play.

22. In view of the forgoing, all these Executions Applications are allowed. Respondents are directed for strict compliance of the order dated 18.02.2019 in its true letter and spirit within two months of the date of receipt of this order.

10. Thereafter, respondents had gone in writ petition bearing CWP No.22648 of 2025 against the said order and Hon'ble High Court in its decision dated 13.08.2025 (Annexure G) has held that directions given by Hon'ble CAT Chandigarh on 12.03.2025 (Annexure F) to implement order dated 18.02.2019 (Annexure E) be complied with and has dismissed the appeal of Union of India. He thus contended that in this case, present workmen, who were senior as per seniority list (Ex.WW1/4) were entitled to be kept in services, however, it has not been done, which is violation of Section 25H and 25T of the Act. Thus, prayed for reinstatement of the present workmen from the date when juniors were kept in service and for payment of all consequential benefits.

11. On the other hand, ld. counsel for the management contended that compensation was paid to the applicants along with other workers at the time of their retrenchment. The applicants were purely daily wagers and now the military farm stands closed. Hence, the applicants are not entitled for their continuation in the service and cannot be granted any relief.

12. I have given due consideration to the arguments advanced by AR for both the parties.

13. Before entering into the actual controversy between the parties, it will be pertinent to mention those facts which are admitted between the parties. It has been admitted by both the parties that currently Bir Dhantauri Military Farm stands closed. Under these circumstances, we are to see if applicants are workmen and respondent is an industry and if so, whether workmen are entitled for reinstatement from the date when their juniors were kept in service and all consequential benefits or otherwise what relief can be given to them.

14. Now first question is whether the applicants are workman. In this regard, it is pertinent to mention here that onus to prove that workman are in the employment of respondent is always on the workmen/claimants and it is for the workmen to adduce evidence to prove the factum of his employment with the respondent. There is hardly any dispute with the preposition of law as propounded by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in several cases. In the present case, it has clearly been admitted by the respondents that applicants were appointed w.e.f. 07.04.1990 as farm hand (daily wager) and they were retrenched in the year 1999 and all the workmen were appointed through employment exchange. As such, it clearly establishes the relationship of employee and employer between the applicants and respondents. In this regard, reference can be made to the decision in the case of Devinder Singh Versus Municipal Council, Sanaur, AIR 2011 Supreme Court 2532, wherein the Hon'ble Apex Court while interpreting the provisions of Section 2(S) of Act which deals with the definition of "workman" has observed as follows:-

"The source of employment, the quantum of recruitment, the terms & conditions of employment/contract of service, the quantum of wages/pay and mode of payment are not at all relevant for deciding whether or not a person is a workman within the meaning of Section 2(s) of the Act. The definition of workman also does not make any distinction between full time and part time employee or a person appointed on contract basis. There is nothing in the plain language of Section 2(s) from which it can be inferred that only person employed on regular basis or a person employed for doing whole time job is a workman and the one employed on temporary, part time or contract basis on fixed wages or as a casual employee or for doing duty for fixed hours is not a workman."

15. It is clear from the perusal of aforesaid observation that even if a person is engaged on temporary, part time daily wages or contract basis or for doing any other kind of work and is duly paid wages for the said work, in that eventuality such a person would be covered by the definition of "workman" as provided under Section 2(s) of the Act. Thus, it is held that workmen were engaged on temporary basis. However, they fall under the definition of workman as stated above under Section 2(s) of the Act.

16. The question which arises for consideration is whether the establishment Military Farm is an industry. The Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of Banglore Water Supply & Sewerage Board Vs. A. Rajappa 1978(36) FLR 266 dealt at length with the ambit and scope of expression "industry" as defined in Section 2(J) of the Act, and has laid down triple test for determining whether a particular establishment is industry or not. The triple test is where (a) systematic activity (b) organized by cooperation between employer and employee (the direct and substantial element is commercial) (c) for the production or distribution of goods and services to calculated to satisfy human wants and wishes prima facie is an "Industry" in that enterprise. Coming into the case in hand, the work assigned to the workmen relates to do work of catering animals and other related work for production of milk with the cooperation of the workmen and respondent. Thus, all the necessary ingredients of the above judgment are satisfied.

17. It is also mentioned here that workmen were not regular employees of the respondent as regular employees are governed by Central Civil Service Rules. The workmen, who were casual workers, are not governed by the aforesaid rules and are governed by the Act and if any dispute arises, the same is governed by the Act.

18. Further, Hon'ble Supreme Court in case titled as Chief Conservator of Forest Versus Jagannath Maruti Kondhare (1996 (2) SCT 164), has held that work, which was not be regarded as a part of inalienable of inescapable

function of the State and which work can be well undertaken by a private agency does not require an instrumentality of State, such functions of the State fall within the ambit of Industry. Thus, function of doing diary cannot be said to be sovereign function of the State and thus for this purpose of industrial dispute, respondents would be termed as industry.

19. Now next question, which arise for consideration is that whether workmen who were retrenched vide order dated 19.03.1999 (Annexure B) and their juniors were also retrenched on the same date, they have not been offered employment in view of the Section 25H of the Act, which read as follows:-

25H. Re-employment of retrenched workmen.—Where any workmen are retrenched, and the employer proposes to take into his employ any persons, he shall, in such manner as may be prescribed, give an opportunity 2 [to the retrenched workmen who are citizens of India to offer themselves for reemployment and such retrenched workman] who offer themselves for re-employment shall have preference over other persons.

20. Admittedly, in this case, workmen were removed vide retrenchment order dated 19.03.1999. One of the order has been placed on file (Annexure B) by the AR for workmen, operative part of which is reproduced as under:-

1. Due to reduction of work, your casual employment is hereby terminated with immediate effect. One month salary in lieu of notice and compensation @15 days salary at current rate for each completed year with 240 days attendance is enclosed vide cheque no.170972 dated 23.03.1999 for Rs.14602.00.

2. You would be considered for re-engagement as per your seniority as and when regular vacancy occurs. You may also take up "Job Basis" work to the extent available.

21. In the retrenchment order it is mentioned that the workmen would be considered as and when regular vacancy occur, respondent were required to engage them.

However, in this case, junior to the workmen were retained in service and present workmen were senior to the said workmen as is clear from the seniority list placed on file by the applicants as Ex.WW1/4. Name of the present workmen are at Sr. No.10 to 12 and 14 to 16 and name of junior to the present workmen is at Sr. No.17 to 19, 21 to 24, 26 to 31, 32 & 35 as per the said seniority list (Ex.WW1/4). The same is also been highlighted by the applicant in Annexure P-2 and P-3 (part of Ex.WW1/4).

22. It is further mentioned here that junior of the applicant were also removed in the month of March 1999 and the said junior to the workmen, who were 19 in number, filed a claim statement on 13.05.1990 in the CGIT-I, Chandigarh and the matter was settled there on 25.08.2010 (Annexure C). Relevant part of the order is as follows:

"Case taken up in Lok Adalat for conciliation. It is agreed upon that all the 19 workers whose name figured in the list supplied by the Ministry with reference shall visit the office of the prescribed authority, Shri Pradeep Bahuguna at about 10:30 AM on 26.08.2010. It is further agreed that the prescribed authority shall make an endeavor to settle all the claim of the persons whose name figured in the list as per the availability and requirement as early as possible. The file shall be kept pending for the next Lok Adalat for further discussion in Lok Adalat through conciliation proceedings. List case on 15.09.2010 in Lok Adalat."

23. Thus, in this way, junior to the present applicants continued with the work, however seniors (present applicants) were retrenched and were not called for any work. In the year 2017, juniors apprehended that they would be retrenched, they filed OA No.1222 of 2017 and OA No.1115 of 2017 before CAT, Chandigarh and CAT, Chandigarh vide order dated 18.02.2019 (Annexure E) directed the respondents to constitute a committee within a period of three weeks, relevant para of which is reproduced as under:

11. Accordingly, the OAs are disposed of by directing the respondents to constitute a committee within a period of three weeks from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order, which will conduct and conclude its proceedings within two months thereafter. If applicants wish to submit anything before committee, the committee may also consider their pleas, before passing the final order.

24. Later on, nothing was done by the respondent, Thereafter, execution was filed by the aforesaid juniors in MA No.954 of 2019 in OA No.1222 of 2017 and MA No.956 of 2019 in OA No.1115 of 2017, which were allowed vide order dated 12.03.2025 (Annexure F) directing the respondents to strict compliance of order dated 18.02.2019 (Annexure E) in true letter and spirit within two months of the date of receipt of that order. Relevant part of order dated 12.03.2025 (Annexure F) passed in MA No.954/956 of 2019 is reproduced as under:-

"21.After going through the detailed objections filed by the respondents and the subsequent rebuttal to the same, we feel that the order dated 18.02.2019 passed in OA No.060/1129/2017 has not been complied with in its letter and spirit in the light of record of applicants, order passed by respondents relating to age and grant of Temporary Status and in the interest of justice, equity and fair-play.

22.In view of the foregoing, all these Execution Applications are allowed. Respondents are directed for strict compliance of the order dated 18.02.2019 in its true letter and spirit within two months of the date of receipt of this order."

25. Thereafter, respondent had gone in writ petition bearing CWP No.22648 of 2025 and Hon'ble High Court in its decision has held that direction given by the CAT Chandigarh vide order dated 12.03.2025 (Annexure F) to implement the order dated 18.02.2019 (Annexure E) and appeal of the respondent was dismissed. In this way, junior to the applicant continued in service, whereas applicants were retrenched, who were senior as per seniority list (Ex.WW1/4), were entitled to be kept in service, which is clear violation of Section 25T and Section 25H of the Act. Section 25T of the Act provides as under:-

“25T. Prohibition of unfair labour practice.—No employer or workman or a trade union, whether registered under the Trade Unions Act, 1926 (18 of 1926), or not, shall commit any unfair labour practice.”

26. It is also added here that applicants had filed OA No.1138-HR-92 seeking their regularization before the Hon'ble CAT, Chandigarh and vide order dated 28.07.1999 (Ex. WW1/6), the OA was dismissed. However, they remained in service due to status quo given vide order dated 23.09.1992. However, due to dismissal of the OA vide order dated 28.07.1999 (Ex.WW1/6), they were removed from service on the same date on 28.07.1999. Even CWP filed against the order dated 28.07.1999 (Ex. WW1/6) was dismissed vide order dated 30.08.2006. However, main question involved in the said litigation was regarding the regularization. However, in the present case, applicants have sought relief of unfair labour practice under Section 25T and retaining of juniors under Section 25H of the Act.

27. Thus, in view of the above, workmen were entitled for continuity in service as and when vacancy arises. However, this fact can also not be ignored that junior to the workmen were retained in service ignoring applicant. At this stage, Bir Dhanturi Military Farm does not exist. Hence, only remedy left with this Tribunal is to grant them compensation.

28. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case, each applicant is entitled for Rs.50,000/- along with interest @6% from the date of reference of this case till the payment is made.

29. Let copy of this award be sent to the Appropriate Government as required under Section 17 of the Act for publication.

KAMAL KANT, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 24 दिसम्बर, 2025

का.आ. 2231.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, मुख्य कार्यकारी अधिकारी, मेसर्स रैटल हाइड्रो पावर कॉर्पोरेशन, शालीमार, किश्तवार, जम्मू और कश्मीर; मुख्य महाप्रबंधक, मेसर्स मेघा इंफ्रास्ट्रक्चर इंजीनियरिंग लिमिटेड, रैटल एचई प्रोजेक्ट, दराबशाला, जिला किश्तवार, केंद्र शासित प्रदेश जम्मू और कश्मीर और रवि कुमार शर्मा, कंपनी, एनएचपीसी वर्कर्स यूनियन, जम्मू और कश्मीर मुख्यालय, कर्मचारी के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण- सह- श्रम न्यायालय-II चंडीगढ़ पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या- 22/2024) को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है।

[सं. एल- 42025/07/2025/267-आईआर (डीयू)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 24th December, 2025

S.O. 2231.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 22/2024) of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court – II Chandigarh** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **The Chief Executive Officer, M/s Rattle Hydro Power Corp. Shalimar, Kishtwar, Jammu and Kashmir The Chief General Manager, M/s Megha Infrastructure Engineering Ltd. Rattle HE Project, Darabshalla, Distt. Kishtwar, UT Jammu and Kashmir and Ravi Kumar Sharma Co NHPC Workers Union JK Head Office Kishtwar, workman.**

[No. L-42025/07/2025/267-IR (DU)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE
IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT-II,
CHANDIGARH

(Presided over by Mr. Kamal Kant).

ID No.22/2024

Ravi Kumar Sharma Co NHPC Workers Union JK Head Office Kishtwar, Jammu and Kashmir-182206.

----- Workman

Versus

1. The Chief Executive Officer, M/s Rattle Hydro Power Corp. Shalimar, Kishtwar, Jammu and Kashmir.
2. The Chief General Manager, M/s Megha Infrastructure Engineering Ltd. Rattle HE Project, Darabshalla, Distt. Kishtwar, UT Jammu and Kashmir.

----Respondents

Present:- None for workman.

None for respondent no.1 & 2.

Award : 27.10.2025

Central Government vide Notification No.08(03)/2024/RLC/Jmu dated 24.09.2024, under sub-section (5) of Section 12 read with sub-section (2A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter called the Act), has referred the following Industrial dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal:-

- i. *Whether the action of The Chief Executive Officer, M/s Rattle Hydro Power Corporation Shalimar, Kishtwar and The Chief General Manager, M/s Megha Infrastructure Engineering Limited, Rattle HE Project, Darabshalla, District Kishtwar, UT of Jammu and Kashmir for not giving skilled classification to workers who have their Job experience and performing the duty of skilled work and Highly skilled classification to workers who have experience to perform the certain tasks including work intensive technical and practical work experience to certain responsibility to its workers is legal and justified? If not, then to what relief the concerned workmen are entitled to and from which date?*
- ii. *Whether the action of The Chief Executive Officer, M/s Rattle Hydro Power Corporation Shalimar, Kishtwar and The Chief General Manager, M/s Megha Infrastructure Engineering Limited, Rattle HE Project, Darabshalla, District Kishtwar UT or Jammu and Kashmir for not giving Tunnel Allowance to all workers @20% who are working inside the tunnel or associated with the tunnel/underground work and washing allowance is legal and justified? If not, then to what relief the concerned workmen are entitled to and from which date?*
- iii. *Whether the action of The Chief Executive Officer, M/s Rattle Hydro Power Corporation Shalimar, Kishtwar and The Chief General Manager, M/s Megha infrastructure Engineering Limited, Rattle HE Project, Darabshalla, District Kishtwar UT and Jammu and Kashmir for not giving Local allowances in the shape of hardship allowance @ 20 % of Basic Wage rate increased annually as the Price index to its workers is legal and justified? If not, then to what relief the concerned workmen are entitled to and from which date?*
- iv. *Whether the action of The Chief Executive Officer, M/s Rattle Hydro Power Corporation, Shalimar, Kishtwar and The Chief General Manager, M/s Megha Infrastructure Engineering Limited, Rattle HE Project, Darabshalla, District Kishtwar, UT of Jammu and Kashmir for not giving increment @8% of Basic Wage Rate to all workers as well as contractual employees/Engineers/Officials of the company is legal and justified? If not, then to what relief the concerned workmen are entitled to and from which date?*
- v. *Whether the action of The Chief Executive Officer, M/s Rattle Hydro Power Corporation Shalimar, Kishtwar and The Chief General Manager, M/s Megha Infrastructure Engineering Limited, Rattle HE Project, Darabshalla, District Kishtwar, UT of Jammu and Kashmir for not giving overtime to all workers including mess workers depending on their actual overtime performed and other Sundays/Holidays etc. Is legal and justified? If not, then to what relief the concerned Workmen are entitled to and from which date?*
- vi. *Whether the action of The Chief Executive Officer, M/s Rattle Hydro Power Corporation, Shalimar, Kishtwas and The Chief General Manager, M/s Megha Infrastructure Engineering Limited, Rattle HE*

- Project, Darabshalla, district Kishtwar, UT of Jammu and Kashmir for not implementing Central Minimum Wages revised by Govt. of India is legal and justified? If not, then to what relief the concerned workmen are entitled to and from which date?*
- vii. *Whether the action of the Chief Executive Officer, M/s Rattle Hydro Power Corporation Shalimar, Kishtwar and The Chief General Manager, M/s Megha Infrastructure Engineering Limited, Rattle HE Project, Darabshalla, District Kishtwar, UT of Jammu and Kashmir for not giving Night Shift allowance to those workers deployed in Night Shift is legal and justified? If not, then to what relief the concerned workmen are entitled to and from which date?*
- viii. *Whether the action of The Chief Executive Officer, M/s Rattle Hydro Power Corporation Shalimar, Kistwar and The Chief General Manager, M/s Megha infrastructure Engineering Limited, Rattle HE, Project, Darabshalla, District Kishtwar, UT of Jammu and Kashmir for not giving two sets of Uniform once in a year to all its workers is legal| and justified? If not, then to what relief the concerned workmen are entitled to and from which date?*
- ix. *Whether the action of The Chief Executive Officer, M/s Rattle Hydro Power Corporation Shalimar, Kishtwar and The Chief General Manager, M/s Megha Infrastructure Engineering Limited, Ratle HE Project, Darabshalla, District Kishtwar UT of Jammu and Kashmir for not giving Medical Facilities/Reimbursement of medical bills to all its workers and their dependents is legal and justified? If not, then to what relief the concerned workmen are entitled to and from which date?*
- x. *Whether the action of The Chief Executive Officer, M/s Rattle Hydro Power Corporation Shalimar, Kishtwar and The Chief General Manager, M/s Megha Infrastructure Engineering Limited, Rattle HE Project, Darabshalla, District Kishtwar, UT of Jammu and Kashmir for not giving safety Equipment's to all its workers and not appointing Safety Officer at work place is legal and justified? If not, then to what relief the concerned workmen are entitled to and from which date?*
- xi. *Union was advised to file EPF claim before Appropriate Authority.*
- xii. *The management submitted that all workers were given wages slips and union confirmed the same.*
- xiii. *Whether the action of The Chief Executive Officer, M/s Rattle Hydro Power Corporation Shalimar, Kishtwar and The Chief General Manager, M/s Megha Infrastructure Engineering Limited, Rattle HE Project, Darabshalla District Kishtwar, UT of Jammu and Kashmir for not giving Earned Leave, Casual Leave and Medical Leave to all its workers is legal and justified? If not, then' to what relief the concerned workmen are entitled to and from which date?*
- xiv. *Unions demand for not giving promotion to A categories who have completed one year of service with good performance is not genuine as not referred for adjudication.*
- xv. *Whether the action of The Chief Executive Officer, M/s Rattle Hydro Power Corporation Shalimar, Kishtwar and The Chief General Manager, M/s Megha Infrastructure Engineering Limited, Rattle HE Project, Darabshalla, District Kishtwar, UT or Jammu and Kashmir for not giving Transport Facilities/Transport subsidies to all those workers who are locals or who have not given accommodation by the company and residing outside is legal and justified? If not, then to what relief the concerned workmen are entitled to and from which date?*
- xvi. *Whether the action of The Chief Executive Officer, M/s Rattle Hydro Power Corporation, Shalimar, Kishtwar and The Chief General Manager, M/s Megha Infrastructure Engineering Limited, Rattle HE Project, Darabshalla, District Kishtwar, UT of Jammu and Kashmir for not giving appointment orders to is workers as per their job specification is legal and justified? If not, then to what relief the concerned workmen are entitled to and from which date?*
- xvii. *Whether the action of The Chief Executive Officer, M/s Rattle Hydro Power Corporation, Shalimar, Kishtwar and The Chief General Manager, M/s Megha Infrastructure Engineering Limited, Rattle HE Project, Darabshalla, District Kishtwar, UT of Jammu and Kashmir for not regularizing all temporary/contract workers in the company who have completed one year service is legal and justified? If not, then to what relief the concerned workmen are entitled to and from which date?*
- xviii. *Whether the action The Chief Executive Officer, M/s Rattle Hydro Power Corporation Shalimar; Kishtwar and The Chief General Manager, M/s Megha Infrastructure Engineering Limited, Rattle HE Project, Darabshalla, District Kishtwar, UT of Jammu and Kashmir for not granting accidental group insurance scheme to all is workers for Accidental death or severe injuries a 30 Lacs to 60 Lacs in case of accidental death is legal and justified? If not, then to what relief the concerned workmen are entitled to and from*

- xix. Whether the action The Chief Executive Officer, M/s Rattle Hydro Power Corporation Shalimar, Kishtwar and The Chief General Manager, M/s Megha Infrastructure Engineering Limited, Rattle HE Project, Darabshalla, District Kishtwar, UT of Jammu and Kashmir for not giving Bonus to all its workers is legal and justified? If not, then to what relief the concerned workmen are entitled to and from which date?
- xx. Whether the action The Chief Executive Officer, M/S Rattle Hydro Power Corporation Shalimar, Kishtwar and The Chief General Manager, M/s Megha Infrastructure Engineering Limited, Rattle HE Project, Darabshalla, District Kishtwar, UT of Jammu and Kashmir for not giving same wages and similar benefit to workers engaged through Sub contractors with that of regular employees of the company is legal and justified? If not, then to what relief the concerned workmen are entitled to and from which date?
- xxi. Whether the action The Chief Executive Officer, M/s Rattle Hydro Power Corporation Shalimar, Kishtwar and The Chief General Manager, M/s Megha Infrastructure Engineering Limited, Rattle HE Project, Darabshalla, District Kishtwar, UT of Jammu and Kashmir for not giving regular employment to lend ousters in the joint venture/company as per R&R Policy is legal and justified? If not, then to what relief the concerned workmen are entitled to and from which date?
- xxii. The management was advised to engage local person as per their academic and professional qualification and experience. The management agreed form same.
- xxiii. The management assured to give wages to all workers in the first week of month.
- xxiv. Whether the action The Chief Executive Officer, M/s Rattle Hydro Power Corporation Shalimar, Kishtwar and The Chief General Manager, M/s Megha Infrastructure Engineering Limited, Rattle HE Project, Darabshalla, District Kishtwar, UT of Jammu and Kashmir for not giving winter allowance @ Rs.2000/- per year to all its workers is legal and justified? If not, then to what relief the concerned workmen are entitled to and from which date?"

1. On receipt of the reference, notice was issued to the workman for 20.12.2024 for appearance and for filing claim statement. However, no one turned up on behalf of workman on 20.12.2024 and fresh notice was issued to the workman on 20.12.2024 for 04.03.2025. However, n notice sent to workman received back unserved with remark 'insufficient address' and fresh notice was issued on 04.03.2025 for 07.03.2025. As per track report, notice was duly served on the address of workman on 09.05.2025. However, no one turned up on behalf of workman on 03.07.2025 also and fresh notice was again issued for 27.10.2025 for appearance and for filing claim statement, which was duly served on the address on 20.09.2025. However, today also no one has turned up on behalf of workman despite of service. The workman has been given sufficient opportunities for appearance and for filing claim statement, but he did not turned up in spite of the opportunities afforded to him for filing claim statement, which shows that he is not interested in adjudication of the matter on merit.

2. In such circumstances, this Tribunal is left with no choice, except to pass a 'No Claim Award'. Accordingly, 'No Claim Award' is passed in the present reference.

3. Let copy of this award be sent to the Appropriate Government as required under Section 17 of the Act for publication.

KAMAL KANT, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 24 दिसम्बर, 2025

का.आ. 2232.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, परियोजना प्रबंधक, टीपीटी एनएचएआई, प्रबंध निदेशक, मेघा इंजीनियरिंग एंड इंफ्रास्ट्रक्चर लिमिटेड और जगदीश शर्मा, महासचिव, कर्मचारी के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण- सह- श्रम न्यायालय-II, चंडीगढ़ पंचाट(संदर्भ संख्या- 80/2023) को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है।

[सं. एल- 42025/07/2025/229-आईआर (डीयू)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 24th December, 2025

S.O. 2232.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. **80/2023**) of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court – II Chandigarh** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **The Project Manager, TPT NHAI, Managing Director, Megha Engineering & Infrastructure Ltd.** and **Sh. Jagdish Sharma, General Secretary**, workman.

[No. L-42025/07/2025/229-IR (DU)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE
IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT-II,
CHANDIGARH

(Presided over by Mr. Kamal Kant).

ID No.80/2023

Jagdish Sharma, General Secretary, State Committee of CITU.

----- Workman

Versus

1. The Project Manager, TPT NHAI, Delhi-Amritsar-Katra Expressway PKG XIV-3225.
2. Managing Director, Megha Engineering & Infrastructure Ltd. Regd. Office S-2, Hyderabad-500037.

---- Respondents

Present:- None for workman.

None for respondent no.1 & 2.

Award : 30.10.2025

Central Government vide Notification No.08(14)/2024/RLC/Jmu dated 22.02.2024, under sub-section (5) of Section 12 read with sub-section (2A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter called the Act), has referred the following Industrial dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal:-

“Whether the action of the Managing Director, M/s Megha Engineering and Infrastructure Limited, S-2, Technocrat Industrial Estate, Balanagar, Hyderabad-500037 and the Project Manager, TPT, NHAI, Delhi-Amritsar-Katra Expressway Kathua Expressway Pkg XIV-3225, Kathua, UT of Jammu and Kashmir for not giving bonus to its workers is legal and justified? If not, then to what relief the concerned workmen are entitled to and from which date?”

1. The case was fixed for ex parte evidence of the workman. However, a letter dated 29.10.2025 received on behalf of workman maintaining therein that the dispute has been mutually settled between the management and the representatives of the workers union and it is prayed that the case may be closed as matter stands resolved to the satisfaction of all concerned.
2. In view of the letter of workman, this Tribunal is left with no choice, except to pass a 'No Claim Award'. Accordingly, 'No Claim Award' is passed in the present reference.
3. Let copy of this award be sent to the Appropriate Government as required under Section 17 of the Act for publication.

KAMAL KANT, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 24 दिसम्बर, 2025

का.आ. 2233.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार महाप्रबंधक, चमेरा पावर स्टेशन-III, एनएचपीसी लिमिटेड, जिला चंबा (हिमाचल प्रदेश) और स्वर्गीय श्री दलीप सिंह, बेलदार स्पेशल, धारवाला, जिला चंबा (हिमाचल प्रदेश), कर्मचारी के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण- सह- श्रम न्यायालय-II चंडीगढ़ पंचाट(संदर्भ संख्या 133/2024) को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है।

[सं. एल- 42025/07/2025/272-आईआर (डीयू)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 24th December, 2025

S.O. 2233.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 133/2024) of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court – II Chandigarh** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **The General Manager, Chamera Power Station-III, NHPC Ltd. District Chamba (HP)** and **Late Sh. Daleep Singh, Beldar Special, Dharwala, District Chamba (HP)**.

[No. L-42025/07/2025/272-IR (DU)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT-II, CHANDIGARH

(Present:- Mr. Kamal Kant, Presiding Officer).

ID No. 133/2024

1. Late Sh. Daleep Singh, Beldar Special, Employee No.183912-L, Chamera Power Station-III, NHPC Ltd. Dharwala, District Chamba (HP), R/o Village Daryali, PO Sarol, Tehsil and District Chamba (HP) through its LRs:-

- 1A. Smt. Chanchal Devi W/o Late Sh. Daleep Singh, Beldar Special, Employee No.183912-L, Chamera Power Station-III, NHPC Ltd. Dharwala, District Chamba (HP), R/o Village Daryali, PO Sarol, Tehsil and District Chamba (HP)
- 1B. Sh. Kartik S/o Late Sh. Daleep Singh, Beldar Special, Employee No.183912-L, Chamera Power Station-III, NHPC Ltd. Dharwala, District Chamba (HP), R/o Village Daryali, PO Sarol, Tehsil and District Chamba (HP).
- 1C. Sh. Arun S/o Late Sh. Daleep Singh, Beldar Special, Employee No.183912-L, Chamera Power Station-III, NHPC Ltd. Dharwala, District Chamba (HP), R/o Village Daryali, PO Sarol, Tehsil and District Chamba (HP)

----- Applicants

Versus

The General Manager, Chamera Power Station-III, NHPC Ltd. Dharwala, District Chamba (HP)

----Management

Present:- Sh. T R Bhardwaj, AR for applicants.

Sh. Tarun Gupta, AR for Management.

Award : 25.11.2025

1. Sh. Daleep Singh (hereinafter called as workman) has directly filed the claim statement against the management under sub-section (2) and (3) of Section 2A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter called as the Act) claiming quashing of termination order dated 09.05.2014 (Ex.W2) and his reinstatement in service w.e.f. 16.06.2010 along with full back wages and all consequential benefits.
2. It is added here during the present proceedings, workman Sh. Daleep Singh had expired on 09.01.2021 and his legal heirs were allowed to be impleaded as party vide order dated 22.11.2022.
3. It is maintained in the claim statement that workman was appointed as Beldar in Salal H.E. Project and joined the service on 02.09.1984 and thereafter remained posted in Chamera Power Station-I, Khairi, Chamera Power Station-II, Karian and since year 2005, he was working under Chamera Power Station III, Dharwala.
4. Management of Chamera Power Station-III has illegally terminated the services of workman by way of struck off his name from the roll of NHPC w.e.f. 16.06.2010 vide order dated 09.05.2014 (Ex.W2) on the ground that he is deemed to have left the service of the company of his own accord w.e.f. 16.06.2010 in terms of Rule 3.2.17 of NHPC Leaves Rules. The termination order dated 09.05.2014 (Ex.W2), was received in his home on 19.06.2014.
5. Against the illegal termination, workman filed Industrial Dispute in the office of Assistant Labour Commissioner (Central)-Cum-Conciliation Officer, Chandigarh (hereinafter called as ALC, Chandigarh) vide Demand Notice Dated 16.09.2014 (Ex.W3) on which conciliation proceedings were held but no settlement could be arrived at and mandatory period of 45 days of filing the dispute before conciliation officer as provided under Section 2A(2) of the Act has been completed on 16.11.2014 and certificate to this effect has been issued by the ALC Chandigarh on 16.12.2014.

6. It is also maintained that absence of workman from duty is not intentional but was under compelling circumstances which was beyond the control of workman as he was suffering with Schizophrenia disease since long time and was getting medical treatment from Rajpal Hospital Neuro-Psychiatric and Addiction Hospital, Pathankot from 15.06.2010 to 13.05.2014, which is evident from medical certificate dated 13.05.2014 (Ex.W4) issued by the Treating Doctor Kanwar Rajpal Singh Neuro Psychiatrist.
7. Prior to 15.06.2010, he was getting treatment of same disease from the said Doctor from the year 2008 and onward. On 15.06.2010 when he was on duty, he felt seriously ill and then family Members shifted him to Pathankot for seeking medical treatment and he remained under prolonged medical treatment till 13.05.2014.
8. In the second/third week of April 2014, there was some slight improvement in his health, then he along-with his wife went to HR wing of Chamera Power Station-III and approached to the then Senior Manager (HR) to accept his joining report but the senior manager (HR) told him that the management is not in a position to accept his joining report as matter has been referred to Corporate Office and senior manager (HR) advised him and his wife to sent his representation to the Director (Personnel) and if he so desired to meet him in person in this regard. Accordingly the workman made one representation (Annexure P-5) to the Director (Personnel) and the copy of the same was endorsed to the Executive Director (HR) NHPC Ltd. which was sent through Fax by HR Wing of the Power Station and on 22.04.2014 and 06.05.2014, the workman along with his wife and General Secretary of NHPC employees Union, Corporate Office met with General Manager (HR) and Director (Personnel) separately at Faridabad office and explained each about his genuine illness/disease and handed over a copy of aforesaid representation to them and also requested them to allow him to resume his duties but there no effect. He was simply told to go to the local project management and approach him for joining at his own level.
9. On 14.05.2014 (Ex.W6), the workman submitted his joining report to the Sr. Manager (HR), Chamera Power Station-III along with a copy of medical certificate dated 13.05.2014 (Ex.W4) but he returned the same to the workman and told that since the department has issued termination order from service on 09.05.2014 as such his joining report cannot be accepted.
10. The workman also sent various telegrams (Ex.W7) dated 08.06.2010, 20.10.2010, 15.02.2011, 06.05.2011, 01.09.2011, 21.10.2011, 29.12.2011, 23.03.2012, 21.05.2012, 12.07.2012 and thereafter his wife gave information to the then Sr. Manager (HR) on telephone every month about his ill health.
11. Before passing termination order, management was to serve charge sheet upon the workman and hold inquiry but in the present case neither management served any charge sheet nor held any enquiry. No opportunity of personal hearing was afforded to the workman before passing termination order dated 09.05.2014 (Ex.W2).
12. There is a settled law that illegal termination of service amount to retrenchment and management have to comply with the provisions of Section 25-F of the Act but in the present case Management has not issued one month notice in writing nor paid one month wages in lieu of notice period and has also not been paid any retrenchment compensation to the workman.
13. Management has not been adhered the procedure laid down in Clause 34 of Certified Standing Orders before passing final order of termination of services. Because the services of the workman is governed by Certified Standing Orders of the Chamera Power Station-III/Chamera H.E, Project Stage-III, as Such the action of management in terminating his services is illegal and clear cut violation of Certified Standing Orders and instructions issued by the Corporate office vide letter dated 21.09.1993 (Ex.W12).
14. The action of management in striking of the name of the workman from the role of the corporation w.e.f. 16.06.2010 vide order dated 09.05.2014 (Ex.W2) on the ground of unauthorized absence from duty is also arbitrary and unjustified. The workman is unemployed and nowhere gainfully employed since the date of his termination and having no other source of income. The workman made a representation dated 09.07.2014 (Ex.W8) to the management with the request to review order dated 09.05.2014 (Ex.W2), but the same was rejected by the Manager (M), Incharge HR by way of passing non speaking order dated 12.08.2014 (Ex.W9). It is maintained that the action of management in terminating the service is illegal and against the principle of natural justice and it is prayed that the termination order dated 09.05.2014 (Ex.W2) be quashed and workman be reinstated in service w.e.f. 16.06.2010 along with full back wages and all consequential benefits.
15. Notice of the claim petition was given to the management, who filed reply thereof maintaining therein that the workman is a habitual absentee and has remained absent from duties unauthorizedly as specified in the notice. He was absent from the duty continuously w.e.f. 16.06.2010. The workman did not respond to any of the notices issued from time to time and explain the circumstances with proof about the absence nor he cared to join duty. For this long period of absence his name was struck off from the rolls of the corporation as he was deemed to have left the services of the company on his own accord. As such striking off name of the workman from the roll is not termination as alleged by him, therefore, it is not an industrial dispute. The workman did not resume his duties, which is the prime responsibility of the bonafied employees of the corporation.

16. The workman was advised time and again by the management to submit his prescriptions of treatment so that the period of absence without permission may be considered for regularization within rules. In this connection, various correspondences were made with the workman vide various letters dated 25.06.2011 (Ex.M-3), 21.09.2011 (Ex.M-1) and 31.12.2011 (Ex.M-2) to submit the documentary proof. These letters addressed to the workman were returned back with remarks that no one was available at home of the workman to receive the letter. The workman kept on sending telegrams that he is not well and he will resume duties after fitness. Since the communications sent to the workman at his last known address were received bank unserved, the management gave public notice through publication in two regional newspapers both Hindi and English on 11.07.2012 (Ex.M-4) with the direction to resume duty within 07 days of publication notice i.e. by 18.07.2012 but the workman failed to resume duty. Thereafter, again public notice in local and national newspapers, both in Hindi and English were published on 01.02.2014 and also on 07.04.2014 (Ex.M-5) directing him to report for duty by 22.04.2014, failing which he shall be deemed to have left the services of the management on his own accord and his name will be struck off from the roll of NHPC from the date of his absence in accordance with Rule 3.2.17 of NHPC Leave Rules. Despite several efforts made by the management, the workman failed to respond to the either of the publications.
17. The workman submitted a medical certificate issued on 13.05.2014 (Ex.W4) by the doctor namely Dr. Kanwar Rajpal Singh, Neuro Psychiatric, Pathankot without any supporting documents like prescription etc. after the long span of 4 years of absence, which shows it is totally fabricated documentary evidence with ulterior motive. Mere certificate is not sufficient to prove that he was suffering from prolonged illness of Schizophrenia disease as workman has not submitted any prescription/documents regarding treatment since 2010 to 2014 for the reasons best known to the workman. In absence of any documents, it is impossible to presume that the workman is suffering from any illness or undergoing treatment. Non submission of documentary proof by the workman is violation of Rules and the Certified Standing Orders of Chamera-III Power Station. It is admitted that Standing Orders, which have been certified under the Industrial Employment (Standing Orders) Act, 1946 become part of the statutory terms and conditions of service between the employer and employee govern the relationship between the parties. But there is no provision either in this statute or in the Act which states that an order of dismissal is illegal if it is not preceded by a proper and valid domestic enquiry. The workman has fabricated the story, which is not sustainable in the eyes of law. It is maintained that the claim of the workman is baseless, without any merit and deserves to be dismissed with cost.

Evidence of parties:-

18. In order to prove claim, the workman examined himself as WW1 who filed his affidavit Ex.W1 along with documents W2 to W17 and cross examined by the AR for management. AR for claimant closed the evidence on behalf of claimant on 16.08.2018. Workman in his evidence has relied upon the following documents:-

Sr. No.	Document	Date	Exhibit
1.	Termination order	09.05.2014	Ex.W2
2.	Demand notice	16.09.2014	Ex.W3
3.	Medical certificate	13.05.2014	Ex.W4
4.	Letter		Ex.W5
5.	Letter	14.05.2014	Ex.W6
6.	Telegrams receipts		Ex.W7
7.	Representation	09.07.2014	Ex.W8
8.	Order	12.08.2014	Ex.W9
9.	Publication	20.03.2014	Ex.W10
10.	Certified standing order		Ex.W11
11.	Letter	21.09.1993	Ex.W12
12.	Medical certificate	05.04.2008	Ex.W13
13.	Medical certificate	05.04.2008	Ex.W14
14.	Medical certificate	15.07.2009	Ex.W15
15.	Medical certificate	22.11.2009	Ex.W16
16.	Medical certificate	26.01.2010	Ex.W17

19. Thereafter, respondents have examined Sh. Sunil Kumar Singh, Group Sr. Manager (HR), Emp No.102497Y, Chamera-III Power Station, Dharwala, Distt. Chamba (HP), who filed his affidavit as Ex.MW1/A along with documents Ex.M-1 to Ex.M-8 and MW1/B and MW1/C. AR for respondent closed the evidence on behalf of management on 19.06.2023. Respondents in their evidence has relied upon the following documents:-

Sr. No.	Document	Date	Exhibit
17.	Letter	21.09.2011	Ex.M-1
18.	Letter	31.12.2011	Ex.M-2
19.	Memorandum	25.06.2011	Ex.M-3
20.	Publication	11.07.2012	Ex.M-4
21.	Notice	31.01.2014	Ex.M-5
22.	Publication		Ex.M-6
23.	Leave Rules		Ex.M-7
24.	Notice	09.05.2014	Ex.M-8
25.	Group Personal Accident Insurance Scheme		Ex.MW1/B
26.	NHPC Employees Social Security Scheme Rules 2006		Ex.MW1/C

Submissions of Applicants:-

20. While arguing the case, AR for workman contended that the workman has joined as Beldar in Salal Hydro Electric Project under the respondent and lastly was working under respondent no.1 at Chamera and was removed from service illegally on vide order dated 09.05.2014 (Ex.W2). It is further stated that workman was getting treatment of Schizophrenia from Dr. Rajpal from 15.06.2010 till 13.05.2014 as OPD patient as per medical certificate dated 13.05.2014 (Ex.W4) issued by the said doctor. It is also stated that the workman has sent various telegrams 08.06.2010, 20.10.2010, 15.02.2011, 06.05.2011, 01.09.2011, 21.10.2011, 29.12.2011, 23.03.2012, 21.05.2012, 12.07.2012, receipts thereof are Ex.W/7 to the respondent. The workman was under acute mental depression as such he cannot be said to be remained unauthorized absent. Therefore, respondent without holding any inquiry, terminated the services of the workman vide order dated 09.05.2014 (Ex.W2). He further contended that workman is governed by the certified standing orders (Ex.W11). As per clause 32 provides minor and major penalty, which could have been intricate on the workman after holding domestic inquiry as per law. Clause 34 of the said standing order provides procedure how disciplinary action is to be taken against the workman the detailed procedure has been prescribed under Clause 34. As per said clause 34, no minor or major penalty can be imposed without holding any regular inquiry. For that, regular inquiry is necessitated, which was not done in this. Moreover, as per Ex.W12 issued by the project head, even if workman remains absent, he could not have been removed from service without holding inquiry and thus order is liable to be set aside.

Submissions of respondents:

21. On the other hand, AR for respondent contended that workman become absent unauthorizedly and continuously w.e.f. 16.06.2010. The workman was asked to submit documentary proof vide Ex.M-1 dated 21.09.2011, Ex.M-2 dated 31.12.2011 and Ex.M-3 dated 25.06.2011 and thereafter public notice was also given to the workman vide Ex.M-4 dated 11.07.2012 and Ex.M-5 dated 31.01.2014 through publication in newspaper and thereafter his name was struck off as per Para 3.2.17 of Leave Rule (Ex.M7), which provides as follows:-

3.2.17. If an employee willfully absents himself from duty for more than ten consecutive days without any intimation, a notice shall be issued to him, directing him to report for duty forthwith and in any case not beyond eight days after the issue of the notice. If he does not resume duty within such period the employee shall be deemed to have left the service of the Corporation of his own accord and his name shall be struck off the rolls of the Corporation with effect from the date of such absence.

22. The workman was untraceable during this period and was thus accordingly removed from service as per Rules. He thus contended that the claim petition be dismissed.
23. I have given due consideration to the arguments advanced by AR for both the parties.

24. It is added here that in this case, admittedly, workman had remained absent for the period 15.06.2010 to 13.05.2014 and as per workman, he sent various telegrams (Ex.W7) (10 in number) to the respondent. However, as per respondents, workman was asked to submit documentary proof vide Ex.M-1 dated 21.09.2011, Ex.M-2 dated 31.12.2011 and Ex.M-3 dated 25.06.2011 and thereafter public notice was also given to the workman vide Ex.M-4 dated 11.07.2012 and Ex.M-5 dated 31.01.2014 through publication in newspaper and therefore his name was struck off as per Para 3.2.17 of Leave Rule (Ex.M7). In this regard, it is pertinent to mention here that so far as sending of letters Ex.M-1 dated 21.09.2011, Ex.M-2 dated 31.12.2011 and Ex.M-3 dated 25.06.2011 are concerned, they have admittedly been received back by respondent as undelivered and admittedly all the telegrams have been received by the respondent and thus respondent was required to sent notices on the addresses from which various telegrams were received, which was admittedly not done by the respondent. The respondents have sent the notices on the last known address of the workman. Thus, in this way notice cannot of any help of the respondents.
25. Moreover, it is not disputed that workman was governed by certified standing orders and in this case, name of the workman has been struck off from the role NHPC vide notice dated 09.05.2014 (Ex.W2) without holding any regular inquiry. In this regard, clause 34 of standing orders is very material and relevant part of standing orders is reproduced as under:-

34. Disciplinary Action:-

No order imposing any of the penalties specified under S.O. No.32 shall be made unless the procedure detailed below is adhered to:-

1) *The workman/employee alleged to have committed the misconduct shall be served a chargesheet, clearly setting for the imputation of misconduct and circumstances appearing against him and requiring explanation. The charge sheet shall be issued by appointing authority or disciplinary authority or any other higher authority as authorized by the management.*

2) --- -- -- --- ---

3) --- -- -- --- ---

4) *Management Shall appoint a person (called presenting officer) to appear before the Enquiry Officer and conduct the proceedings on behalf of the management, for presenting evidence, record, witness, examination of witnesses.*

5) --- -- -- --- ---

6) --- -- -- --- ---

7) --- -- -- --- ---

13) *the inquiry officer shall on conclusion of the enquiry, submit his report in writing giving his findings with reasons thereof to the authority which appointed the inquiry officer and a copy of the proceedings is to be supplied to the concerned workman.*

14) --- -- -- --- ---

15) --- -- -- --- ---

26. It is added here that removal from service was a major penalty as per clause 32 of the certified standing orders and name of the workman has been struck off without holding any regular inquiry as per clause 34 of the certified standing orders and thus order dated 09.05.2014 (Ex.W2) is liable to be set aside.
27. So far as struck of the name of the workman as per para 3.2.17 of Leave Rules Ex.M7 is concerned, in this regard, letter (Ex.W12) was issued by the respondent. In para no.3 of the W12, it is mentioned by the respondent that in view of various judgments of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, the certified standing orders have statutory force and principle of natural justice should be followed in every case while acting on these certified standing orders. Moreover, AR for respondents made following statement:-
- Stated that the NHPC Leave Rules are made by the Board of Directors in accordance with standing orders. They are not statutory in nature.*
28. Thus Leave Rule, 3.2.17 having no force of law and cannot be relied upon and thus workman is liable to be reinstated into services when no domestic inquiry was held. Moreover, there was no compliance of the provisions of the Act prior to termination of services of the workman.
29. In view of the discussions, absence of workman from 15.06.2010 to 13.05.2014 would be treated as leave of kind dues and the order dated 09.05.2014 is set aside. The workman is entitled to reinstatement in service with

all consequential benefits. Since, the workman has expired on 09.01.2021, his legal heirs would be entitled for all benefits.

30. Let copy of this award be sent to the Appropriate Government as required under Section 17 of the Act for publication.

KAMAL KANT, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 24 दिसम्बर, 2025

का.आ. 2234.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, महाप्रबंधक बीएसएनएल, टेलीफोन एक्सचेंज, फरीदाबाद और श्री रामफल, मर्केटाइल एम्प्लॉई एसोसिएशन, फरीदाबाद के महासचिव, कर्मचारी के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण- सह-श्रम न्यायालय-II चंडीगढ़ पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 307/2013) को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है।

[सं. एल- 40011/67/2013-आईआर (डीयू)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 24th December, 2025

S.O. 2234.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. **307/2013**) of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court – II Chandigarh** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **General Manager, BSNL, Telephone Exchange, Faridabad** and **Sh. Ramphal, General Secretary, Mercantile Employees Association, Faridabad**, workman.

[No. L-40011/67/2013-IR (DU)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT-II, CHANDIGARH

(Presided over by Mr. Kamal Kant).

ID No.307/2013

Registered on : 19.12.2013

Ramphal S/o Sh. Ratan Singh, C/o Sh. Hoob Lal Yadav, General Secretary, Mercantile Employees Association, 530- Near Prem Public School, Dayal Nagar, PO Amar Nagar, Faridabad, Haryana-121007.

----- Workman

Versus

General Manager, BSNL, Telephone Exchange, Sector 15A, Faridabad-121007

----Management

Present:- Ms. Rumpa Ghorai, AR for workman.

Sh. Anish Babbar, AR for management.

Award : 19.11.2025

Central Government vide Notification No.L-40011/67/2013-IR(DU) dated 29.10.2013, under clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section (2A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter called the Act), has referred the following Industrial dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal:-

“Whether the action of management of Bharat Sanchar Nigam Ltd. (BSNL), Faridabad Haryana in terminating the services of Shri Ramphal S/o Sh. Ratan Singh, Ex-Linnman w.e.f. 09.06.2012 is legal and justified? To what relief the workman is entitled to and from what date?”

1. AR for workman on 06.03.2025 stated that the workman had expired and requested a date for filing appropriate application for impleading LRs of the deceased workman. However today, AR for workman vide her separate statement stated that she has contacted the LRS of workman and they have not shown interest in pursuing the case. Thus, it is presumed that the LRs of deceased workman are not interested in adjudication of the matter on merit
2. In these circumstances, this Tribunal is left with no choice, except to pass a 'No Claim Award'. Accordingly, 'No Claim Award' is passed in the present reference.
3. Let copy of this award be sent to the Appropriate Government as required under Section 17 of the Act for publication.

KAMAL KANT, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 24 दिसम्बर, 2025

का.आ. 2235.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय महाप्रबंधक, एसईसीएल, छत्तीसगढ़ और सचिव, भारतीय विकास ठेका मजदूर संघ, कर्मचारी के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण- सह- श्रम न्यायालय, जबलपुर पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या- 22/2019) को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है।

[सं. एल- 42011/167/2018-आईआर (डीयू)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 24th December, 2025

S.O. 2235.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 22/2019) of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Jabalpur** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **The General Manager, SECL , Chhattisgarh** and **The Secretary, Bhartiya Vikas Theka Mazdoor Union, workman.**

[No. L-42011/167/2018-IR (DU)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR

NO. CGIT/LC/R/22/2019

Present: P.K.Srivastava

H.J.S..(Retd)

**The Secretary,
Bhartiya Vikas Theka Mazdoor Union,
Add- Shivraj Hotel, Hounse No. 301,
Near Material Gate,NTPC, Seepat,
Bilaspur (Chhattisgarh)- 495001**

Workman

Vs

**The General Manager,
SECL, Central Workshop Korba Area,
Po-Korba Colliery,
Korba (Chhattisgarh)- 495450**

Management

(JUDGMENT)**(Passed on this 16th day of October, 2025)**

As per letter dated 11/01/2019 by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour, New Delhi, the reference has been made to this Tribunal under Section-10 of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (in short the 'Act') as per Notification No. L-42011/167/2018 (IR(DU)) dt. 11/01/2019. The dispute under reference relates to:

“Whether the action on the part of the management of SECL, Central Workshop, Korba (Chhattisgarh) in inflicting harsh punishment upon Sh. Raja Ram Kashtriya, Ex-clerk Grade-II by removing from service instead of giving lesser punishment on absenteeism ground is appropriate and justified? If not, what relief, Sh. Raja Ram Kashtriya espoused by the Secretary, Bhartiya Vikas theka mazdoor union are entitled to?”

After registering the case on the basis of reference, notices were issued to the parties. They appeared and filed their respective statement of claim in defense.

The case of the workman is mainly that while he was working as Clerk Grade-II with the management and was posted in Laxman Project, he was issued a charge sheet with respect to his unauthorized absence in the year 1997 and was terminated from the services. He was reinstated by management allowing his appeal and was transferred to Central Workshop. He was issued another charge sheet on 31.07.1999, with an allegation of unauthorized and wilful absence from work w.e.f., 02.06.1999 till date of charge sheet. Infact, he could not report at work place for this period of 1^{1/2} months due to illness of his father. He could not inform the management about his absence due to urgency, he filed a reply to the charge sheet admitting the charges and assured that he will not repeat it. The management terminated his service vide order dated 06.02.2001, he came to know about this order only on 22.05.2004 when he got the notice of management to vacate the accommodation allotted to him by management as he was terminated from service. He raised the dispute. After failure of conciliation, dispute was referred to this Tribunal.

According to the workman, infact, he had not admitted the charges rather he had explained his absence, which was wrongly taken by management as his admission to the charges. The management thus, acted arbitrarily treating his explanation as his admission of guilt and the punishment is also hash.

The case of the management is mainly that the services of the workman were dismissed vide order dated 06.02.2001. The present dispute has been raised in the year 2019, there is an unexplained delay of 18 years since, the records are old, they are no traceable with the management, the workman was habitual absentee. He was awarded previous punishments also for his unauthorized absence. He was once dismissed for his unauthorized absence but was reinstated allowing his mercy petition but he did not improve and absented himself unauthorizedly, an enquiry was conducted with respect to the charges of misconduct by way of absenting himself unauthorizedly from 02.06.1999 to 31.07.1999. After management received no satisfactory reply to the charge sheet in the enquiry, the workman participated, the enquiry officer submitted the enquiry report holding the charges proved. The workman was issued a show cause notice on the enquiry report and thereafter the termination order dated 06.02.2001 was passed.

The enquiry papers were never produced before this Tribunal. According to management, they have weeded out as per Rules. Before this Tribunal, the workman has filed his affidavit as his Examination-in-chief, he has been cross-examined by management. The management did not examined any witnesses before this Tribunal also in proof of the charges.

I have heard argument of Learned Counsel for workman Mr. Pranay Choubey and Mr. Neeraj Kewat, Learned Counsel for Management. I have gone through the record as well.

The facts which emerge from the evidence on record, that according to the management, an enquiry was conducted with respect to charges, the enquiry papers or any document with respect to enquiry have not been produced by management.

Case of the workman is that, no intimation was sent to him with respect to enquiry. The management had an opportunity to prove the charges before this Tribunal.

In his affidavit, the workman has stated that he communicated his apologies to management to the charges which were wrongly treated as admission and he was terminated on the said basis, he admits that earlier also he was terminated for the same misconduct but was reinstated as an act of mercy.

The absence of workman is not denied by him. It is also not his case that he had informed the management about his absence or had applied for leave or had taken any permission from management in this respect. The absence is of about two months, the workman was required to at least inform the management about his absence stating the ground of his absence. Since, he did not inform the management, with respect to his absence and did not seek any regularization of his absence, his conduct is no doubt a misconduct by way of unauthorized absence.

As regards the punishment, this is also not disputed that the workman has been punished earlier also for the same charges. Hence, since he is a habitual offender, the punishment of his removal cannot be held to be disproportionate to the charges.

This is also established that the workman has raised dispute against termination of his services after 18 years, there is no explanation for this delay. In these circumstances, the workman is held entitled to no relief.

On the basis of above discussion and findings, the reference deserves to be answered as follows:-

AWARD

Holding the action of the management of SECL, Central Workshop, Korba (Chhattisgarh) for dismissing Sh. Raja Ram Kashtriya, Ex-clerk Grade-II from services instead of giving lesser punishment on absenteeism ground, following Principles of Natural Justice is held to be legal and justified, he is entitled to no relief.

No order as to cost.

DATE:- 16-10-2025

P.K. SRIVASTAVA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 24 दिसम्बर, 2025

का.आ. 2236.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, रजिस्ट्रार, भारतीय प्रौद्योगिकी संस्थान, डीएवीवी परिसर, इंदौर, मेसर्स काप्रो मैनेजमेंट सॉल्यूशंस प्राइवेट लिमिटेड, इंदौर, मेसर्स प्राइमवन वर्कफोर्स प्राइवेट लिमिटेड, इंदौर और श्री बलराम चौहान, कर्मचारी के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण- सह- श्रम न्यायालय, जबलपुर पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या-09/2020) को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है।

[सं. एल- 42025/07/2025/266-आईआर (डीयू)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 24th December, 2025

S.O. 2236.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 09/2020) of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Jabalpur** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in **Registrar, Indian Institute of Technology, DAVV Campus, Indore, M/s Kaapro Management Solutions Pvt. Ltd., Indore, M/s PrimeOne Workforce Pvt. Ltd, Indore** and **Shri Balram Chouhan**, workman.

[No. L-42025/07/2025/266-IR (DU)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR

NO. CGIT/LC/R/09/2020

Present: P.K.Srivastava

H.J.S.(Retd.)

Shri Balram Chouhan,

S/o Hazarilal Chouhan,

242, Bicholi Hapsi,

Indore (M.P.)

Workman

Versues

1. Registrar,

Indian Institute of Technology,

DAVV Campus, Khandwa Road,

Indore (MP) – 452017

2. **M/s Kaapro Management Solutions Pvt. Ltd.,**
201, Royal Diamond, Y.N. Road,
Indore (M.P.) – 452003

3. **M/s PrimeOne Workforce Pvt. Ltd.,**
R-47, Zone-II, M.P. Nagar,
Bhopal (M.P.) - 462011

Management

(JUDGMENT)

(Passed on this 17th day of October - 2025)

As per letter dated 03/02/2020 by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour, New Delhi, the reference is made to this Tribunal under Section-10 of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (in short the 'Act') as per Notification No. J-1(1-3)/2020-IR dt. 03/02/2020. The dispute under reference relates to:

"Whether the action of the management of M/s.PrimeOne Workforce Pvt. Ltd. and M/s. Kaapro Management Solutions Pvt. Ltd. in terminating the services of workman Shri Balram Chouhan working in the establishment of Registrar, Indian Institute of Technology, Indore (M.P.) wef. 16.02.2018 and 28.04.2016 respectively, are just & proper? If yes, what relief the workman concerned is entitled to and from which date?"

Thereafter, corrigendum dated 22.07.2022 was received containing amended reference which is as follows:

"Whether the action of the management of the Registrar, Indian Institute of Technology(IIT), Indore (M.P.) / M/s.PrimeOne Pvt. Ltd. and M/s. Kaapro Management Solutions Pvt. Ltd. in terminating the services of workman Shri Balram Chouhan working in the establishment of Registrar, Indian Institute of Technology, Indore (M.P.) w.e.f. 16.02.2018 and 28.04.2016 respectively, are just and Proper? If yes, what relief the workman concerned is entitled to and from which date?"

Notices were issued to both the parties. They appeared and filed their respective statement of claim and defense.

The workman appeared and filed his statement of claim with copy of his appointment order, pay slip, dismissal order.

IIT also appeared through their counsel. But did not file any written statement of defense.

The Outsourcing Agency M/s Kaapro Industries and M/s Prime One Workforce did not appear inspite of service of notice, hence reference proceeded ex-parte against them.

In evidence, the workman filed his affidavit as his examination-in-chief. None appeared for cross-examination. He also filed photocopy of his appointment letter, pay slip and dismissal order.

I have heard argument of Learned Counsel for workman Mr. Pranay Choubey. None appeared for Management. I have gone through the record as well.

The amended reference is the issued for determination in the case in hand.

Case of the Workman is mainly that, IIT has issued an advertisement for Drivers, cleaners etc. by way of walk in interview. He appeared and was selected for cleaner. It was nowhere provided in the advertisement that he will be appointed through a private contractor. There was no role of a private contractor or outsourcing agency in his recruitment process as it was done by the IIT themselves. He was shown as outsourced employee of contractors supplied by them to IIT which is incorrect in fact, and is a camouflage adopted by Management of IIT just to deprive him of his admissible rights and benefits under the law. .

He was disengaged by the outsourcing company M/s Prime One Workforce on 15.02.2018 without any notice or compensation which is against law. He has sought his reinstatement with back wages and benefits as an employee of IIT.

In evidence, he has filed his affidavit as his examination in chief and also has filed photocopy of letter extending his work contract, experience certificates, and dismissal order.

Though, he has corroborated his allegations in his statement of claim, but the documents filed by him speak against his case. Letter of extension of his service contract dated 10.12.2014 is issued by the Outsourcing agency M/s Kaapro Management. It shows that his service contract was extended further from 11.12.2014 to 10.09.2015 on

previous conditions. Letter dated 27.04.2017 is an another extension letter issued by M/s Prime One Workforce extending his work contract from 16.04.2017 to 15.04.2018 and letter dated 28.04.2016 is the letter issued by Outsourcing Agencies M/s Kaapro Management Solutions disengaging him on expiry of his service contract. Letter dated 15.02.2018 issued by M/s Prime One Workforce Outsourcing Agency has discontinued all his engagement by none extension of service contract.

Hence, except his serving statement, there is nothing on record to show that the Workman was further employed by IIT and the Outsourcing Agency was a camouflage. It also comes out that, he was appointed by different agencies on contract basis and was discontinued on expiry of contract which is not a retrenchment as defined under **Section 2(oo)** of the Act which is being reproduced as follows:-

2 (oo) "retrenchment" means the termination by the employer of the service of a workman for any reason whatsoever, otherwise than as a punishment inflicted by way of disciplinary action but does not include –

(a) *voluntary retirement of the workman; or*

(b) *retirement of the workman on reaching the age of superannuation if the contract of employment between the employer and the workman concerned contains a stipulation in that behalf; or*

(bb) *termination of the service of the workman as a result of the non-renewal of the contract of employment between the employer and the workman concerned on its expiry or of such contract being terminated under a stipulation in that behalf contained therein; or*

(c) *termination of the service of a workman on the ground of continued ill-health;*

Also from evidence on record there is no employee employer relationship between him and the IIT is proved.

In the light of above findings, the reference deserves to be answered against the Workman and is answered accordingly.

No order as to cost.

DATE:- 17/10/2025

P.K. SRIVASTAVA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 24 दिसम्बर, 2025

का.आ. 2237.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार महाप्रबंधक (ओ एंड एम) एनटीपीसी बिलासपुर, मेसर्स यूटिलिटी पॉवरटेक लिमिटेड, बिलासपुर, सुश्री ईश्वर प्रताप सिंह एसोसिएट्स बेलौजी, मध्य प्रदेश और श्री राधाशरण वैष्णव, कर्मचारी के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण- सह- श्रम न्यायालय, जबलपुर पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या- 68/2024) को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है।

[सं. एल- 42025/07/2025/268-आईआर (डीयू)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 24th December, 2025

S.O. 2237.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 68/2024) of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Jabalpur** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **The General Manager (O&M) NTPC Bilaspur, M/s. Utility Powertech Limited, Bilaspur., Ms Ishwar Pratap Singh Associates Belauji, Madhya Pradesh and Sh. Radhasharan Vaishnaw, workman.**

[No. L-42025/07/2025/268-IR (DU)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR

NO. CGIT/LC/R/68/2024

Present: P.K.Srivastava

H.J.S.(Retd.)

Radhasharan Vaishnaw

Gupta Mohalla Sipat

Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh - 495555

Workman

Versus

1. **The General Manager (O&M)**
NTPC Sipat, Ujjwal Nagar, PO- Sipat
Bilaspur (CG)-495555
2. **M/s. Utility Powertech Limited**
Near ADM Gate, Infront of Water Tank
Inside NTPC Ltd. Plant Campus,
Ujjwal Nagar, PO- Sipat
Bilaspur (CG)-495555
3. **Ms Ishwar Pratap Singh Associates**
Belauji, Near Dairy Farm Waidhan
Singrauli, Madhya Pradesh-486886

Management**AWARD****(Passed on this 14th day of October - 2025.)**

As per letter dated **14/08/2024** by the Deputy Chief Labour Commissioner (Central) Raipur, Government of India, Ministry of Labour, New Delhi, the reference is made to this Tribunal under section-10 of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 as per reference number **RP-8(1-12)/2024-ES.III dt. 14/08/2024**. The dispute under reference related to :-

“Whether the action on the part of the management of M/s. Ishwar Pratap Singh Associates, Waidhan, Dist. Singrauli (MP) in terminating workman Shri Radhasharan Viashwnaw, Supervisor working in NTPC, Sipat, Dist. Bilaspur (CG) is legal and justified ? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled to ?”

After registering a case on the basis of the reference, notices were sent to the parties and served. None of the parties filed any Statement of Claim or Written Statement of Defense. The workman side never appeared.

Since the initial burden to prove the case lies with the workman, and he has failed to discharge this burden, the claim is held to be not proved. Accordingly, the reference is answered against the workman.

DATE: 14/10/2025

P.K. SRIVASTAVA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 24 दिसम्बर, 2025

का.आ. 2238.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय भारतीय प्रौद्योगिकी संस्थान, भिलाई के निदेशक, सिक्योरिटी एलाइड सर्विसेज प्राइवेट लिमिटेड, रायपुर के प्रधान और अखिल भारतीय केंद्रीय ट्रेड यूनियन परिषद, छत्तीसगढ़ के उपाध्यक्ष, कर्मचारी के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण- सह- श्रम न्यायालय, जबलपुर पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या- **33/2025**) को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है।

[सं. एल- 42025/07/2025/269-आईआर (डीयू)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 24th December, 2025

S.O. 2238.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. **33/2025**) of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Jabalpur** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation **The Director, Indian Institute of Technology, Bhilai; Principal Security Allied Services Pvt. Ltd., Raipur and Vice President, All India Central Council of Trade Unions, Chhattisgarh, workman.**

[No. L-42025/07/2025/269-IR (DU)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR

NO. CGIT/LC/R/33/2025

Present: P.K. Srivastava

H.J.S.(Retd.)

Vice President

All India Central Council of Trade Unions

Shanti Nagar Ward No. 10, Ambedkar Chowk

Rajnandgaon, Chhattisgarh - 491441

Workman

Versus

1. The Director

Indian Institute of Technology, Bhilai

Kohka, Jeora, Sirsa Road, Bhilai

Bhilai, Distt. Durg (CG)-491001

2. Principal Security Allied Services Pvt. Ltd.

Pandri, Near Govt. Hospital, Raipur

District Raipur (CG) - 492001

Management

AWARD(Passed on this 09th day of October - 2025.)

As per letter dated 01/01/2025 by the Deputy Chief Labour Commissioner (Central) Raipur, Government of India, Ministry of Labour, New Delhi, the reference is made to this Tribunal under section-10 of I.D. Act, 1947 as per reference number RP-8 (3-23) /2024-ES.III-ID dt. 01/01/2025. The dispute under reference related to :-

“Whether the demand of the workman for lumpsum relief compensation of Rupees One Lakh only (01 lacs only) is justified? If yes, to what all remedies, is the workman entitled to in relation to the present industrial disputes?”

After registering a case on the basis of the reference, notices were sent to the parties and served. The workman side never appeared. They did not file even any statement of claim. None of the parties filed any pleadings or evidence.

Since, the initial burden to prove its case is on the workman side in which he fails. Hence, holding the claim of the workman not proved, the reference stands answered against him.

DATE: 09/10/2025

P.K. SRIVASTAVA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 24 दिसम्बर, 2025

का.आ. 2239.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार भारतीय प्रौद्योगिकी संस्थान, इंदौर के रजिस्ट्रार, मेसर्स काप्रो मैनेजमेंट सॉल्यूशंस प्राइवेट लिमिटेड, इंदौर, मेसर्स प्राइमवन वर्कफोर्स प्राइवेट लिमिटेड, भोपाल और श्री मुकुंद शर्मा, कर्मचारी के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण- सह- श्रम न्यायालय, जबलपुर पंचाट(संदर्भ संख्या- 02/2020) को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है।

[सं. एल- 42025/07/2025/270-आईआर (डीयू)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 24th December, 2025

S.O. 2239.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. **02/2020**) of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Jabalpur** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **Registrar, Indian Institute of Technology, Indore, M/s Kaapro Management Solutions Pvt. Ltd, Indore M/s Primeone Workforce Pvt. Ltd., Bhopal and Shri Mukund Sharma**, workman.

[No. L-42025/07/2025/270-IR (DU)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR

NO. CGIT/LC/R/02/2020

Present: P.K. Srivastava

H.J.S.(Retd.)

Shri Mukund Sharma,

Karuna Sagar Township, Block No. C,

Flat No. 514, Kanadia Road Bypass,

Indore (M.P.) - 452002

Workman

Versues

1. Registrar,

Indian Institute of Technology,

DAVV Campus, Khandwa Road,

Indore (MP) – 452017

2. M/s Kaapro Management Solutions Pvt. Ltd.,

201, Royal Diamond, Y.N. Road,

Indore (M.P.) – 452003

3. M/s PrimeOne Workforce Pvt. Ltd.,

R-47, Zone-II, M.P. Nagar,

Bhopal (M.P.) - 462011

Management

(JUDGMENT)

(Passed on this 17th day of October - 2025)

As per letter dated 10/01/2020 by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour, New Delhi, the reference is made to this Tribunal under Section-10 of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (in short the 'Act') as per Notification No. J-1(1-2)/2020-IR dt. 10/01/2020. The dispute under reference relates to:

"Whether the action of the management of M/s.PrimeOne Workforce Pvt. Ltd. and M/s.Kaapro Management Solutions Pvt. Ltd. in terminating the services of workman Shri Mukund Sharma working in the establishment of Registrar, Indian Institute of Technology, Indore (M.P.) w.e.f. 16.02.2018 and 11.02.2016 respectively, are just & proper? If yes, what relief the workman concerned is entitled to and from which date?"

Thereafter, corrigendum dated 22.07.2022 was received containing amended reference which is as follows:

"Whether the action of the management of the Registrar. Indian Institute of Technology(IIT), Indore (M.P.)/ M/s.PrimeOne Pvt. Ltd. and M/s. Kaapro Management Solutions Pvt. Ltd. in terminating the services of

workman Shri Mukund Sharma working in the establishment of Registrar. Indian Institute of Technology, Indore (M.P.) w.e.f. 16.02.2018 and 11.02.2016 respectively, are just and proper? If yes, what relief the workman concerned is entitled to and from which date?"

Notices were issued to both the parties. They appeared and filed their respective statement of claim and defense.

The workman appeared and filed his statement of claim with copy of his appointment order, pay slip, dismissal order.

IIT also appeared through their counsel. But did not file any written statement of defense.

The Outsourcing Agency M/s Kaapro Industries and M/s Prime One Workforce did not appear inspite of service of notice; hence reference proceeded ex-parte against them.

In evidence, the workman filed his affidavit as his examination-in-chief. None appeared for cross-examination. He also filed photocopy of his appointment letter, pay slip and dismissal order.

I have heard argument of Learned Counsel for workman Mr. Pranay Choubey. None appeared for Management. I have gone through the record as well.

The amended reference is the issue for determination in the case in hand.

Case of the Workman as taken by him in his statement of claim is mainly that, he was appointed by IIT as a Driver on 19.05.2011 at consolidated salary and continued to work as a Driver till date of dismissal of his services which is 15.02.2018. It is then, he came to know that his services have been shown through outsourcing agencies M/s Prime One Workforce which is incorrect on facts. In fact, he was appointed by IIT and continued to work for IIT as their employee. The Contractor or Outsourcing agency was simply a camouflage to deprive him the admissible benefits under law. He has further alleged that, his termination is bad in law and has requested his reinstatement as an employee of IIT with back wages and benefits.

In his affidavit he has corroborated his allegations.

His appointment letter dated 19.05.2011, photocopy on record, filed by him, shows that it was for this month only and at consolidated pay of Rs. 10,000/- per month and for six months. Thus it was a fixed term appointment. There is nothing on record to show that this service contract was extended by IIT. The case of the Workman is further that, he was shown to be an outsourced employee, which is a camouflage as required to be proved by him, in which he has failed.

The established facts that emerge are that, after his contract with IIT came to end, he would have been engaged through Outsourcing Agencies. Hence, there is no employee-employer relationship between him and IIT at the time he was disengaged by the Outsourcing Agency M/s Prime One. Hence, IIT cannot be fastened with any liability to reinstate or to compensate him.

Since, his statement that he has worked for 240 days in a year and since 2016, in which he has been shown as outsourced employee has been uncontroverted, hence he is held to have been proved his continuous engagement with the outsourcing agency M/s Prime One for more than 240 days at least in the year preceding his disengagement since his case that no notice or compensation was paid to him on his termination, his termination is held in violation of Section 25 F and 25G of the Act.

As regards to the relief, keeping in view his tenure of engagement with the outsourcing agency M/s Prime One, he is held entitled to a lump sum compensation of Rs. 25,000/- in lieu of all his claims payable to him within 30 days from the date of publication of Award, failing which interest @6% per annum till payment.

Reference stands answered accordingly.

DATE:- 17/10/2025

P.K. SRIVASTAVA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 24 दिसम्बर, 2025

का.आ. 2240.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार बीएचईएल, भोपाल के कार्यकारी निदेशक और ठेका मजदूर संघ के अध्यक्ष, कर्मचारी के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण- सह- श्रम न्यायालय, जबलपुर पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या- 14/2025) को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है।

[सं. एल- 42025/07/2025/271-आईआर (डीयू)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 24th December, 2025

S.O. 2240.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 14/2025) of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Jabalpur** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **The Executive Director BHEL, Bhopal** and **President Theka Majdoor Sangh, workman.**

[No. L-42025/07/2025/271-IR (DU)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE**THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR****NO. CGIT/LC/R/14/2025****Present: P.K.Srivastava****H.J.S.(Retd.)****President****Theka Majdoor Sangh****LIG-27/3 C, Saket Nagar, BHEL,****Bhopal, Madhya Pradesh-462022****Workman****Versus****The Executive Director****BHEL, Bhopal****Bhopal (M.P.)-462022****Management****AWARD****(Passed on this 09th day of October - 2025.)**

As per letter dated 23/12/2024 by the Deputy Chief Labour Commissioner (Central) Jabalpur, Government of India, Ministry of Labour, New Delhi, the reference is made to this Tribunal under section-10 of I.D. Act, 1947 as per reference number **RLC-8(16)2023 dt. 23/12/2024**. The dispute under reference related to :-

“Whether the 05 points charter of demands raised by the union Theka Mazdoor Sangh against the management of BHEL, Bhopal is fair and legal ? If yes, then what relief the contract workmen are entitled to and from which date”

After registering a case on the basis of the reference, notices were sent to the parties and served. Learned Counsel Mr. Dharmendra Soni filed his Vakalatnama on behalf of the Management. None of the parties filed any Statement of Claim and Written Statement of Defense. The workman union side never appeared.

Since, the initial burden to prove its case is on the workman union side, in which it has failed to discharge. Hence, holding the claim of the workman union not proved, the reference stands answered against it.

DATE: 09/10/2025**P.K. SRIVASTAVA, Presiding Officer****नई दिल्ली, 24 दिसम्बर, 2025**

का.आ. 2241.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केंद्र सरकार, महाप्रबंधक आयुध कारखाना, जबलपुर और महासचिव, अग्निशमन विभाग कर्मचारी संघ, जबलपुर कर्मचारी के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण- सह- श्रम न्यायालय, जबलपुर पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या- 42/2021) को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है।

[सं. एल- 14011/7/2021-आईआर (डीयू)]**सलोनी, उप निदेशक**

New Delhi, the 24th December, 2025

S.O. 2241.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 42/2021) of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Jabalpur** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **The General Manager, Ordnance Factory, Jabalpur** and **The General Secretary Fire Brigade Karmachari Sangh, Jabalpur** workman.

[No. L-14011/7/2021-IR (DU)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR

NO. CGIT/LC/R/42/2021

Present: P.K.Srivastava

H.J.S.(Retd.)

The General Secretary

Fire Brigade Karmachari Sangh

1595, Dr. Ambedkar Colony,

In front of Shiv Temple, Nearby Dr. Sahu Ji

Katra, Adhartal, Jabalpur - 482004

Workman

Versus

The General Manager

Ordnance Factory, Khamaria,

Jabalpur - 482005

Management

AWARD

(Passed on this 12th day of September-2025.)

As per letter dated **01/09/2021** by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour, New Delhi, the reference is made to this Tribunal under **section-10 of I.D. Act, 1947** (in short the 'Act') as per reference number **L-14011/7/2021/IR(DU) dt. 01/09/2021**. The dispute under reference related to :-

"Whether the demand raised by Fire Brigade Karmachari Sangh, Jabalpur (M.P.) against the management of Ordnance Factory, Khamaria, Jabalpur to give 40 hours duty instead of 48 hours in a week and to give 5 days duty instead of 06 days to fire brigade section employees as per Ordnance Factory Board Letter No. 525/D/A/A(Pt)/V dated 13.05.1988, is proper, legal and justified ? If yes, to what relief the fire brigade section employees are entitled to ? What other directions, if any, are necessary in the matter ?"

After registering the case on the basis of the reference received, notices were sent to the parties and were duly served on them. They appeared and filed their respective statements of claim and defense.

In short, the case of the workman union is that the members of the union who are Fire Brigade Employees work with the management in their factory, the Defense Ordnance Factory Board issued a Circular No. 525/D/A/A(pt)/V dated 13.05.1988 for fixation of duty hours for grant of overtime allowances to four categories of its employees namely viz; Durbans, Fire Brigade Staff, Telephone Operators and Security Assistant, which provided that the these workmen shall qualify for overtime allowances for the work done above 44.15 hours which was earlier 48 hours a week. Case of the workman union is further that the management is not deputing them on work for a period more than 44.15 hours in a week just to deny them the benefits of overtime allowances, which is unjust, illegal and arbitrary.

Workman union has further prayed that the management be directed to depute the Fireman for 44 hours or more in a week of 6 days instead of 40 hours a week which is at present.

Management did not appear and did not file any written statement of defense.

The workman union filed affidavit of its Secretary and also the photocopy of the Circular mentioned above.

I have heard argument of learned Counsel Mr. Arun Patel for the workman union. Management never participated in this case. I have gone through the record as well.

The only issue of determination is whether the management can be obligated in law to depute the fireman on duty for more than 44.15 hours or 48 hours and more in a week, so that they may be entitled to overtime allowances.

Settled principle is that working hours of a workman is fixed. If management employs the workman for working hours more than fixed as maximum, it is required to pay overtime for the additional hours, the workman has been on duty. If management takes work from its employee for a period less than what is fixed, there is no law to compel the management to take work from the workman for a period more than the workman is required to work, just to enable to workman to claim overtime that too when there is no provision that the employer is bound to employ the workman for a minimum period of hours on work.

In the light of above discussion, the claim of the workman union fails and the reference is answered as follows :-

AWARD

Holding the demand raised by Fire Brigade Karmachari Sangh, Jabalpur (M.P.) against the management of Ordnance Factory, Khamaria, Jabalpur to give 40 hours duty instead of 48 hours in a week and to give 5 days duty instead of 06 days to fire brigade section employees as per Ordnance Factory Board Letter No. 525/D/A/A/A(Pt)/V dated 13.05.1988, improper, illegal and unjustified, the fire brigade section employees are entitled to no relief.

No order as to cost.

DATE: 12/09/2025

P.K. SRIVASTAVA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 24 दिसम्बर, 2025

का.आ. 2242.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार भारतीय भूवैज्ञानिक सर्वेक्षण, कोयला ड्रिलिंग प्रभाग, कोलकाता के निदेशक (ड्रिलिंग) और श्री महेश विश्वकर्मा, शाहडोल, मध्य प्रदेश कर्मचारी के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण- सह- श्रम न्यायालय, जबलपुर पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या- 26/2019) को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है।

[सं. एल- 42012/203/2018-आईआर (डीयू)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 24th December, 2025

S.O. 2242.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 26/2019) of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Jabalpur** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation **The Director (Drilling), Geological Survey of India, Coal Drilling Division, Kolkata** and **Sh. Mahesh Vishwakarma, Shahdol, Madhya Pradesh** workman.

[No. L-42012/203/2018-IR (DU)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR

NO. CGIT/LC/R/26/2019

Present: P.K.Srivastava

H.J.S..(Retd)

Sh. Mahesh Vishwakarma,

S/o Lt. Keshav Vishwakarma,

R/o Vill. & Po. Lalpur,

Distt. Shahdol (M.P.) - 484001

Workman

Versues

**The Director (Drilling),
Geological Survey of India,
Coal Drilling Division,
D.K.6, Sector,
Salt Lake City, Kolkata - 700091**

Management

(JUDGMENT)

(Passed on this 06th day of October - 2025)

As per letter dated 28/01/2019 by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour, New Delhi, the reference is made to this Tribunal under Section-10 of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (in short the 'Act') as per Notification No. L-42012/203/2018-(IR(DU)) dt. 28/01/2019. The dispute under reference relates to:

“Whether the Geological Survey of India is an Industry under the ID Act 1947, if so, whether the action of the Management of Geological Survey of India in terminating the services of Shri Mahesh Viswakarma, Drilling Helper w.e.f.30/04/2018 who was working on daily rated basis w.e.f. 04/02/1988 and completed more than 240 days in every Calendar year is fair and legal? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled to?”

Notices were issued to both the parties. They appeared and filed their respective statement of claim and defense.

Case of the Workman is mainly that, he was initially appointed as Drilling Helper by the Management vide its order dated 04.02.1988 on daily rate basis, was posted under Unit In-charge Drilling Camp, Lalpur Distt. Shahdol and worked till 30.04.2018 continuously for more than 240 days in every year. The Establishment is an 'industry' and an 'industrial establishment' is defined under the Act. The applicant is a 'Workman' as defined under the Act. The Act of termination of the Workman by Management is 'retrenchment' under the Act. According to the Workman, his termination by Management in spite of his continuous working from 04.02.1988 to 30.04.2018 without any notice or compensation is in violation of Section 25F and 25G of the Act. Also, it has been alleged that, the same category of the Workman engaged by Management after engagement of the Applicant Workman have been retained in service, hence the Management has acted in violation of Section 76 and 77 of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1956 (in short the 'Rules') in prohibiting the principle first come last go. Further, it has been alleged that the Management has adopted unfair practice by engaging the Workman as contract worker for 30 years which is prohibited under the Act. The Workman has thus prayed that holding the action of Management against law, the Workman be held entitled to be reinstated with back wages and consequential benefits.

In its written statement of defense filed by the Management, they have pleaded that they are not an 'Industry' as defined under Section 2(j) of the Act. The applicant is not a workman under the Act hence the reference is not cognizable by this Tribunal. Further, they have pleaded that, the applicant was never issued any appointment or posting letter at any point of time. He was not appointed by Management as Drilling helper vide order dated 04.02.1988 as claimed by him nor was he subsequently posted under Unit 482 as he claims. His engagement was perpetual temporary in nature for intermittent period on contract and on as and when required basis. The Management has further denied that no Workman junior to the Applicant Workman have been retained and has requested that reference be answered against the Applicant Workman.

In its rejoinder the Workman has mainly reiterated his case as taken by him in his statement of claim.

In evidence, the Workman has filed and proved sanction letter of post, two certificates with respect to engagement, work sanction orders for the period 2013, 2014, 2015, internal communications with respect to payment of muster roll of skilled drilling helper and other unskilled contract labour for the years 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, Certified statements of Accounts of Workman, marked as Ex. W-1 to W-5 respectively. The Workman has further filed his affidavit as his examination in chief. He has been cross-examined by Management.

The Management has filed affidavit of its witness Arobindo Biswas as his examination-in-chief. He has been cross-examined by Workman. The Management has filed photocopy pre-receipt bills not admitted by Workman. Management has not proved these photocopy documents.

I have heard arguments of Learned Counsel for the Workman Mr. K.B. Singh and Mr. S.K. Mishra Learned Counsel for the Management. Workman has filed written submission also. I have gone through the written submissions and record.

On perusal of record in the light of rival submission following issues arise for determination –

1. *Whether the Management is an 'Industry' under the Act and applicant is a Workman as defined under the Act?*
2. *Whether the disengagement of the Workman by Management is in violation of the Act?*
3. *Whether the Management has adopted unfair labour practice by engaging a contract Worker for a period from 1988 to 2018?*
4. *Relief if any to which the Workman may be entitled to?*

Issue No. 1 –

Before proceeding, certain provisions require to be reproduced which are as follows:

Section 2(s) – workman means any person (including an apprentice) employed in any industry to do any manual, unskilled, skilled, technical, operational, clerical or supervisory work for hire or reward, whether the terms of employment be express or implied, and for the purposes of any proceeding under this Act in relation to an industrial dispute, includes any such person who has been dismissed, discharged or retrenched in connection with, or as a consequence of, that dispute, or whose dismissal, discharge or retrenchment has led to that dispute, but does not include any such person—

- (i) *who is subject to the Air Force Act, 1950 (45 of 1950), or the Army Act, 1950 (46 of 1950), or the Navy Act, 1957 (62 of 1957); or*
- (ii) *who is employed in the police service or as an officer or other employee of a prison; or*
- (iii) *who is employed mainly in a managerial or administrative capacity; or*
- (iv) *who, being employed in a supervisory capacity, draws wages exceeding ten thousand rupees per mensem or exercises, either by the nature of the duties attached to the office or by reason of the powers vested in him, functions mainly of a managerial nature.*

Section 2(j) - Industry means any business, trade, undertaking, manufacture or calling of employers and includes any calling, service, employment, handicraft, or industrial occupation or avocation of workmen;

It has been submitted from the side of the Management that, they are not an industry as defined under the Act. Judgment of Hon'ble High Court of Andhra in the Case of **Geological Survey of India Employees Association Vs. Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) and other W.P. No. 323/1977** decided by single bench on 19.06.1978 has been referred to in this respect. The Single bench of Hon'ble High Court has held that the Geological Survey of India is not an Industry as defined under the Act. The relevant portion of the judgment is being reproduced as follows

"I do not consider it necessary to consider the question whether the Geological Survey of India exercises sovereign functions, as I am of the view that this is a case governed by separate rules and constitutional provisions. As has been already observed, its employees are governed by the Civil Service Regulations, & Fundamental rules governing Government employees and these provisions would, in the words of Justice Krishna Iyer "remove from the scope of the Act categories which otherwise may be covered thereby" (Vide IV(d) at page 596, Volume 2 of the report)."

It has been submitted from the side of the Workman that **firstly**, this Judgment is not binding on this Tribunal, rather it is only a possessive value and **secondly**, this judgment is against the statutory provisions.

The bare reading of the Section 2(j) of the Act shows that Industry is a systematic activity, carried by cooperation by Employer and its workman for production, supply or distribution of goods or services with a view to satisfy human wants or wishes. It also makes it clear that, purpose of the activity to make profit or investment of capital is not material in this respect. In the leading case of **Bangalore Water and Sewage Board V.s. A. Rajappa AIR 1978 Supreme Court 548 corresponding citation (1978) 2 SCC 213**. This judgment has been referred by the Single Bench also; the relevant portions of the judgment are being reproduced as follows:

"140. *"Industry", as defined in Section 2(j) and explained in Banerji, has a wide import.*

"(a) Where (i) systematic activity, (ii) organized by co-operation between employer and employee (the direct and substantial element is chimerical) (iii) for the production and/or distribution of goods and services calculated to satisfy human wants and wishes (not spiritual or religious but inclusive of material things or services geared to celestial bliss e.g. making, on a large scale prasad or food), prima facie, there is an 'industry' in that enterprise.

(b) Absence of profit motive or gainful objective is irrelevant, be the venture in the public, joint, private or other sector.

(c) The true focus is functional and the decisive test is the nature of the activity with special emphasis on the employer-employee relations.

(d) If the organization is a trade or business it does not cease to be one because of philanthropy animating the undertaking.”

141. Although Section 2(j) uses words of the widest amplitude in its two limbs, their meaning cannot be magnified to overreach itself.

“(a) ‘Undertaking’ must suffer a contextual and associational shrinkage as explained in Banerji and in this judgment; so also, service, calling and the like. This yields the inference that all organized activity possessing the triple elements in I, although not trade or business, may still be ‘industry’ provided the nature of the activity, viz. the employer-employee basis, bears resemblance to what we find in trade or business. This takes into the fold of ‘industry’ undertakings, callings and services, adventures ‘analogous to the carrying on the trade or business’. All features, other than the methodology of carrying on the activity viz. in organizing the co-operation between employer and employee, may be dissimilar. It does not matter, if on the employment terms there is analogy.”

142. Application of these guidelines should not stop short of their logical reach by invocation of creeds, cults or inner sense of incongruity or outer sense of motivation for or resultant of the economic operations. The ideology of the Act being industrial peace, regulation and resolution of industrial disputes between employer and workmen, the range off this statutory ideology must inform the reach of the statutory definition. Nothing less, nothing more.

“(a) The consequences are (i) professions, (ii) clubs, (iii) educational institutions, (iv) co-operatives, (v) research institutes, (vi) charitable projects, and (vii) other kindred adventures, if they fulfil the triple tests listed in I, cannot be exempted from the scope of Section 2(j).

(b) A restricted category of professions, clubs, co-operatives and even gurukulas and little research labs, may qualify for exemption if, in simple ventures, substantially and, going by the dominant nature criterion, substantively, no employees are entertained but in minimal matters, marginal employees are hired without destroying the non-employee character of the unit.

(c) If, in a pious or altruistic mission many employ themselves, free or for small honoraria or like return, mainly drawn by sharing in the purpose or cause, such as lawyers volunteering to run a free legal services clinic or doctors serving in their spare hours in a free medical centre or ashramites working at the bidding of the holiness, divinity or like central personality, and the services are supplied free or at nominal cost and those who serve are not engaged for remuneration or on the basis of master and servant relationship, then, the institution is not an industry even if stray servants, manual or technical, are hired. Such eleemosynary or like undertakings alone are exempt — not other generosity, compassion, developmental passion or project.”

143. The dominant nature test:

“(a) Where a complex of activities, some of which qualify for exemption, others not, involves employees on the total undertaking, some of whom are not ‘workmen’ as in the University of Delhi case [University of Delhi v. Ramlfath, (1964) 2 SCR 703 : AIR 1963 SC 1873 : (1963) 2 Lab LJ 335] or some departments are not productive of goods and services if isolated, even then, the predominant nature of the services and the integrated nature of the departments as explained in the Corporation of Nagpur will be the true test. The whole undertaking will be ‘industry’ although those who are not ‘workmen’ by definition may not benefit by the status.

(b) Notwithstanding the previous clauses, sovereign functions, strictly understood, (alone) qualify for exemption, not the welfare activities or economic adventures undertaken by government or statutory bodies.

(c) Even in departments discharging sovereign functions, if there are units which are industries and they are substantially severable, then they can be considered to come within Section 2(j).

(d) Constitutional and competently enacted legislative provisions may well remove from the scope of the Act categories which otherwise may be covered thereby.”

151. Thus, in order to draw the “circle of industry”, to use the expression of my learned Brother Iyer, we do not find even the term “workman” illuminating. The definition only enables us to see that certain classes of persons employed in the service of the State are excluded from the purview of industrial dispute which the Act seeks to provide for in the interests of industrial peace and harmony between the employers and employees so that the welfare of the nation is secured. The result is that we have then to turn to the preamble to find the object of the Act itself, to the legislative history of the Act, and to the socio-economic ethos and aspirations and needs of the times in which the Act was passed.

152. The method which has been followed, whether it be called interpretation or construction of a part of an organic whole in which the statute, its objectives, its past and its direction for the future, its constitutional setting are all parts of this whole with their co related functions. Perhaps it is impossible, in adopting such a method of interpretation, which some may still consider unorthodox, a certain degree of subjectivity. But, our attempt should be not to break with the well established principles of interpretation in doing so. Progressive, rational and beneficial

modes of interpretation import and fit into the body of the old what may be new. It is a process of adaptation for giving new vitality in keeping with the progress of thought in our times. All this, however, is not really novel, although we may try to say it in a new way.

153. If one keeps in mind what was laid down in Heydon case referred to by my learned Brother Krishna Iyer, the well-known principle that a statute must be interpreted as a whole, in the context of all the provisions of the statute, its objects, the preamble and the functions of various provisions, the true meaning may emerge. It may not be strictly a dictionary meaning in such cases. Indeed, even in a modern statute the meaning of a term such as “industry” may change with a rapidly changed social and economic structure. For this proposition I can do no better than to quote Subba Rao, J. speaking for this Court in *Senior Electric Inspector v. Laxmi Narayan Chopra* [AIR 1962 SC 159 : (1962) 3 SCR 146] : (SCR pp. 156-57)

“The legal position may be summarized thus: The maxim contem-poranea exposito as laid down by Coke was applied to construing ancient statutes but not to interpreting Acts which are comparatively modern. There is a good reason for this change in the mode of interpretation. The fundamental rule of construction is the same whether the Court is asked to construe a provision of an ancient statute or that of a modern one, namely, what is the expressed intention of the legislature. It is perhaps difficult to attribute to a legislative body functioning in a static society that its intention was couched in terms of considerable breadth so as to take within its sweep the future developments comprehended by the phraseology used. It is more reasonable to confine its intention only to the circumstances obtaining at the time the law was made. But in a modern progressive society it would be unreasonable to confine the intention of a legislature to the meaning attributable to the word used at the time the law was made, for a modern legislature making laws to govern a society which is fast moving must be presumed to be aware of an enlarged meaning the same concept might attract with the march of time and with the revolutionary changes brought about in social, economic, political and scientific and other fields of human activity. Indeed, unless a contrary intention appears, an interpretation should be given to the words used to take in new facts and situations, if the words are capable of comprehending them.”

161. The test indicated above would necessarily exclude the type of services which are rendered purely for the satisfaction of spiritual or psychological urges of persons rendering those services. These cannot be bought or sold. For persons rendering such services there may be no “industry”, but, for persons who want to benefit from the services rendered, it could become an “industry”. When services are rendered by groups of charitable individuals to themselves or others out of missionary zeal and purely charitable motives, there would hardly be any need to invoke the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act to protect them. Such is not the type of persons who will raise such a dispute as workmen or employees whatever they may be doing.

162. This leads one on to consider another kind of test. It is that, wherever an industrial dispute could arise between either employers and their workmen or between workmen and workmen, it should be considered an area within the sphere of “industry” but not otherwise. In other words, the nature of the activity will be determined by the conditions which give rise to the likelihood of occurrence of such disputes and their actual occurrence in the sphere. This may be a pragmatic test. For example, a lawyer or a solicitor could not raise a dispute with his litigants in general on the footing that they were his employers. Nor could doctors raise disputes with their patients on such a footing. Again, the personal character of the relationship between a doctor and his assistant and a lawyer and his clerk may be of such a kind that it requires complete confidence and harmony in the productive activity in which they may be co-operating so that, unless the operations of the solicitor or the lawyer or the doctor take an organised and systematised form of a business or trade, employing a number of persons, in which disputes could arise between employers and their employees, they would not enter the field of industry. The same type of activity may have both industrial and non-industrial aspects or sectors.

163. I would also like to make a few observations about the so-called “sovereign” functions which have been placed outside the field of industry. I do not feel happy about the use of the term “sovereign” here. I think that the term ‘sovereign’ should be reserved, technically and more correctly, for the sphere of ultimate decisions. Sovereignty operates on a sovereign plane of its own as I suggested in *Keshavananda Bharati* case [(1973) 4 SCC 225] supported by a quotation from Ernest Barker’s *Social and Political Theory*. Again, the term “Regal”, from which the term “sovereign” functions appears to be derived, seems to be a misfit in a Republic where the citizen shares the political sovereignty in which he has even a legal share, however small, inasmuch as he exercises the right to vote. What is meant by the use of the term “sovereign”, in relation to the activities of the State, is more accurately brought out by using the term “governmental” functions although there are difficulties here also inasmuch as the Government has entered largely new fields of industry. Therefore, only those services which are governed by separate rules and constitutional provisions, such as Articles 310 and 311 should, strictly speaking, be excluded from the sphere of industry by necessary implication.”

Nowhere in the Constituent Bench judgment, it has been laid down that the Rules by which an Employee is governed will be a factor to determine whether the establishment is an industry or not. Reference of Section 13B of

the Industrial Disputes Standing Order Act, 1946 is also required which is being reproduced as follows:-

13-B. Act not to apply to certain industrial establishments.--*Nothing in this Act shall apply to an industrial establishment in so far as the workmen employed therein are persons to whom the Fundamental and Supplementary Rules, Civil Services (Classification, Control and Appeal) Rules, Civil Services (Temporary Service) Rules, Revised Leave Rules, Civil Service Regulations, Civilians in Defense Service (Classification, Control and Appeal) Rules or the Indian Railway Establishment Code or any other rules or regulations than may be notified in this behalf by the appropriate Government in the Official Gazette, apply.*

A bare perusal of these provisions make it clear that, even if the Establishment is governed by Fundamental and Subsidiary Rules, Civil Services Classification Control and Appeals Rules, Civil Services Temporary Services Rules, Civil Services Regulation or India Railways Establishment code or other regulations, may be an Industry as defined under the Act. It also provides that in case the Establishment or its employees as governed by these Codes and Rules, the provisions of the Industrial Employment Standing Orders Act, 1946 will not apply.

The aforesaid analysis makes it clear that, only because the establishment is govern by CCA Rules of Fundamental and Subsidiary Rules, it does not ceases to be an Industry under Section 2(j) of the Act if it is otherwise covered under this Section.

In the light of above discussion, the referred Single Bench Judgment will not help the Management.

Management has further referred to a judgment of a coordinate Bench of this Tribunal in Bangalore wherein the Geological Survey of India has been held not an 'industry.' But, this Tribunal has held this organization as 'industry' in Case R/35/2010.

In the light of above discussion and findings, the Geological Survey of India is held an industry as defined under the Act. Consequently, the Applicant is held to be a Workman under the Act, and the dispute is held to be an Industrial Dispute under the Act cognizable by this Tribunal.

Issue No.1 is answered accordingly.

Issue No. 2 –

Two facts are to be considered while considering this issue. **First**, is whether the Workman has successfully proved his continuous engagement with the Management as defined under Section 25B of the Act for 240 days and year including the year preceding the date of his disengagement and **secondly**, whether his disengagement is in violation of Section 25F and 25G of the Act.

As regards to the first point, Section 25B of the Act is being reproduced as follows:-

25B. Definition of continuous service. -

For the purposes of this Chapter —

- (1) *a workman shall be said to be in continuous service for a period if he is, for that period, in uninterrupted service, including service which may be interrupted on account of sickness or authorised leave or an accident or a strike which is not illegal, or a lock-out or a cessation of work which is not due to any fault on the part of the workman;*
- (2) *where a workman is not in continuous service within the meaning of clause (1) for a period of one year or six months, he shall be deemed to be in continuous service under an employer—*
 - (a) *for a period of one year, if the workman, during a period of twelve calendar months preceding the date with reference to which calculation is to be made, has actually worked under the employer for not less than—*
 - (i) *one hundred and ninety days in the case of a workman employed below ground in a mine; and*
 - (ii) *two hundred and forty days, in any other case;*
 - (b) *for a period of six months, if the workman, during a period of six calendar months preceding the date with reference to which calculation is to be made, has actually worked under the employer for not less than—*
 - (i) *ninety-five days, in the case of a workman employed below ground in a mine; and*
 - (ii) *one hundred and twenty days, in any other case.*

Explanation.— *For the purposes of clause (2), the number of days on which a workman has actually worked under an employer shall include the days on which—*

- (i) *he has been laid-off under an agreement or as permitted by standing orders made under the Industrial Employment (Standing Orders) Act, 1946 (20 of 1946), or under this Act or under any other law applicable to the industrial establishment;*
- (ii) *he has been on leave with full wages, earned in the previous years;*
- (iii) *he has been absent due to temporary disablement caused by accident arising out of and in the course of his employment; and*
- (iv) *in the case of a female, she has been on maternity leave; so, however, that the total period of such maternity leave does not exceed twelve weeks.*

Case of the Workman is that, he was first engaged as a Daily Wager on 04.02.1998 and continued till 30.04.2018 i.e. the date of his disengagement.

In his affidavit, as his examination in chief he has corroborated this allegation, and has stated that he had continuously worked for 30 years ie; from 04.02.1998 and continued till 30.04.2018 & more than 240 days in every year. In his cross-examination, he has stated that, he was not issued a formal appointment letter, he denied that he was engaged by a Contractor or a labour contractor. Regarding the bills and vouchers photocopy produced by the Management, he has stated that these documents do not bear his signatures.

On the other hand, case of the Management is that, he was a daily wager engaged on as and when required basis. Management witness has stated that he was not appointed after any recruitment process. No appointment letter was issued to him. He was engaged on contractual basis for intermittent periods and his contractual employment came to end after closure of the Drilling Camp. He never worked continuously for 240 days in any year.

This witness has been confronted in his cross-examination with respect to Ex. W-1 and W-2 filed and proved by Workman. W-1 is sanction letter dated 12.03.1988 for engagement of casual labour with a list of the persons employed as casual labour containing the name of the applicant workman and W-2 is the sanction orders for the period June, 2013 to August, 2014, showing the name of the workman in the list of payments of labour contractors. This witness has stated that, he cannot tell about these documents. When confronted with Ex. W-3 and W-4 filed and proved by the Workman Ex. W-4 is the muster roll of skilled and unskilled workers total 18 in number for the period from 2007 to 2014, prepared by Management and W-5 the certified statement of the account of the Workman, this witness has stated that he cannot tell about these documents also.

It comes out that, **firstly**, the Management takes a case that the Workman was employed as a Casual Labour on as and when required basis and **secondly**, the documents specially Ex. W-2 mention that he was a Labour Contractor. These documents are the documents of the Management, there is not on record, any document filed and proved by Management with regard to contract labour or supply of contract labour by a labour contractor has been filed. Hence, the case of Management that, the Workman was labour contractor is not reliable and is doubtful. From the documents and statements as referred above, the case of the Workman that he was engaged by the Management since 04.02.1988 till 30.04.2014 is held proved. **It is also held proved that he has worked continuously with Management for the period stated above as defined under Section 25B of the Act.**

As regards to the second point, the Management witness has admitted that, no notice or compensation was given to the Workman on his disengagement. Case of Management is that the project was closed, hence the workmen were disengaged but there is no document corroborating this fact of closure. On the other hand, case of the workman is that the Work is still going on. **Hence, in the light of the these facts, the disengagement of the Workman by Management is held in violation of Section 25F and 25G of the Act.** These provisions are being reproduced as follows....

25F. Conditions precedent to retrenchment of workmen.— *No workman employed in any industry who has been in continuous service for not less than one year under an employer shall be retrenched by that employer until—*

- (a) *the workman has been given one month's notice in writing indicating the reasons for retrenchment and the period of notice has expired, or the workman has been paid in lieu of such notice, wages for the period of the notice;*
- (b) *the workman has been paid, at the time of retrenchment, compensation which shall be equivalent to fifteen days' average pay for every completed year of continuous service or any part thereof in excess of six months; and*
- (c) *notice in the prescribed manner is served on the appropriate Government or such authority as may be specified by the appropriate Government by notification in the Official Gazette.*

25G. Procedure for retrenchment.—

Where any workman in an industrial establishment, who is a citizen of India, is to be retrenched and he belongs to a particular category of workmen in that establishment, in the absence of any agreement between the

employer and the workman in this behalf, the employer shall ordinarily retrench the workman who was the last person to be employed in that category, unless for reasons to be recorded the employer retrenches any other workman.

On the basis of above discussion Issue No. 2 is answered accordingly.

Issue No. 3 –

For the sake of the convenience, Section 2(r)(a), 25T and 25U as well the 5th Schedule of the Act (relevant provisions) are being reproduced as follows:-

(ra) “unfair labour practice” means any of the practices specified in the Fifth Schedule;

25T. Prohibition of unfair labour practice.— No employer or workman or a trade union, whether registered under the Trade Unions Act, 1926 (18 of 1926), or not, shall commit any unfair labour practice.

25U. Penalty for committing unfair labour practices.— Any person who commits any unfair labour practice shall be punishable with imprisonment for a term which may extend to six months or with fine which may extend to one thousand rupees or with both.

THE FIFTH SCHEDULE

[See section 2(ra)]

UNFAIR LABOUR PRACTICES

I.—On the part of employers and trade unions of employers

(10). *To employ workmen as “badlis”, casuals or temporaries and to continue them as such for years, with the object of depriving them of the status and privileges of permanent workmen.*

From the above discussion it is held proved the Management had engaged the Workman as casual labour from 1988 to 2018. This is an unfair labour practice under 5th Schedule mentioned above.

The Act prohibits unfair labour practice and provides punishment for such practice. The Act is silent with respect to Civil consequences of unfair labour practice.

Since, unfair labour practice on the part of the Management is prohibited under the Act, the Courts and Tribunals are within their powers to undo the effect of such unfair labour practices that were adopted by the Management.

The following paragraphs of the judgment of Hon’ble Supreme Court in the case of Dharam Singh & Ors Vs State Of U.P. & Anr Civil Appeal No. 8558 of 2018 are being reproduced in this respect as follows :

“1. When public institutions depend, day after day, on the same hands to perform permanent tasks, equity demands that those tasks are placed on sanctioned posts, and those workers are treated with fairness and dignity. The controversy before us is not about rewarding irregular employment. It is about whether years of ad hoc engagement, defended by shifting excuses and pleas of financial strain, can be used to deny the rights of those who have kept public institutions running. We resolve it by insisting that public employment should be organised with fairness, reasoned decision making, and respect for the dignity of work.

11. Furthermore, it must be clarified that the reliance placed by the High Court on *Umadevi (Supra)* to non suit the appellants is misplaced. Unlike *Umadevi (Supra)*, the challenge before us is not an invitation to bypass the constitutional scheme of public employment. It is a challenge to the State’s arbitrary refusals to sanction posts despite the employer’s own acknowledgement of need and decades of continuous

reliance on the very workforce. On the other hand, *Umadevi (Supra)* draws a distinction between illegal appointments and irregular engagements and does not endorse the perpetuation of precarious employment where the work itself is permanent and the State has

failed, for years, to put its house in order. Recent decisions of this Court in *Jaggo v. Union of India* 2024 SCC OnLine SC 3826 and in *Shripal & Another v. Nagar Nigam*, 2025 SCC OnLine SC 221. Ghaziabad have emphatically cautioned that *Umadevi (Supra)* cannot be deployed as a shield to justify exploitation through long-term “ad hocism”, the use of outsourcing as a proxy, or the denial of basic Civil Appeal No. 8558 of 2018 parity where identical duties are exacted over extended periods. The principles articulated therein apply wilfull force to the present case. The relevant paras from *Shripal (supra)* have been reproduced hereunder: The Respondent Employer places reliance on *Umadevi (supra)* to contend that daily-wage or temporary employees cannot claim permanent absorption in the absence of statutory rules providing such absorption. However, as frequently reiterated, Uma Devi itself distinguishes

between appointments that are “illegal” and those that are

“irregular,” the latter being eligible for regularization if they meet certain conditions. More importantly, Uma Devi cannot serve as a shield to justify exploitative engagements persisting for years without the Employer undertaking legitimate recruitment. Given the record which shows no true contractor-based arrangement and a consistent

need for permanent horticultural staff the alleged asserted ban on fresh recruitment, though real, cannot justify indefinite daily-wage status or continued unfair practices.

15. It is manifest that the Appellant Workmen continuously rendered their services over several years, sometimes spanning more than a decade. Even if certain muster rolls were not produced in full, the Employer's failure to furnish such records despite directions to do so—allows an adverse inference under well-established labour jurisprudence. Indian labour law strongly disfavors perpetual daily-wage or contractual engagements in circumstances where the work is permanent in nature. Morally and legally, workers who fulfill ongoing municipal requirements year after year cannot be dismissed summarily as dispensable, particularly in the absence of a genuine contractor agreement. At this juncture, it would be appropriate to recall the broader critique of indefinite “temporary” employment practices as done by a recent judgment of this court in *Jaggo v. Union of India* in the following paragraphs:-

“22. The pervasive misuse of temporary employment contracts, as exemplified in this case, reflects a broader systemic issue that adversely affects workers' rights and job security. In the private sector, the rise of the gig economy has led to an increase in precarious employment arrangements, often Civil Appeal No. 8558 of 2018 characterized by lack of benefits, job security, and fair treatment. Such practices have been criticized for exploiting workers and undermining labour standards. Government institutions, entrusted with upholding the

principles of fairness and justice, bear an even greater responsibility to avoid such exploitative employment practices. When public sector entities engage in misuse of temporary contracts, it not only mirrors the detrimental trends observed in the gig economy but also sets a concerning precedent that can erode public trust in governmental operations.

25. It is a disconcerting reality that temporary employees, particularly in government institutions, often face multifaceted forms of exploitation. While the foundational purpose of temporary contracts may have been to address short-term or seasonal needs, they have increasingly become a mechanism to evade long-term obligations owed to employees. These practices manifest in several ways:-

Misuse of “Temporary” Labels: - Employees engaged for work that is essential, recurring, and integral to the functioning of an institution are often labelled as “temporary” or “contractual,” even when their roles mirror those of regular employees. Such misclassification deprives workers of the dignity, security, and benefits that regular employees are entitled to, despite performing identical tasks.

• **Arbitrary Termination:** - Temporary employees are frequently dismissed without cause or notice, as seen in the present case. This practice undermines the principles of natural justice and subjects workers to a state of constant insecurity, regardless of the quality or duration of their service.

• **Lack of Career Progression:** Temporary employees often find themselves excluded from opportunities for skill development, promotions, or incremental pay raises. They remain stagnant in their roles, creating a systemic disparity between Civil Appeal No. 8558 of 2018 them and their regular counterparts, despite their contributions being equally significant.

• **Using Outsourcing as a Shield:** - Institutions increasingly resort to outsourcing roles performed by temporary employees, effectively replacing one set of exploited workers with another. This practice not only perpetuates exploitation but also demonstrates a deliberate effort

to bypass the obligation to offer regular employment.

• **Denial of Basic Rights and Benefits:** - Temporary employees are often denied fundamental benefits such as pension, provident fund, health insurance, and paid leave, even when their tenure spans decades. This lack of social security subjects them and their families to undue hardship, especially in cases of illness, retirement, or unforeseen circumstances.””

As we have observed in both *Jaggo (Supra)* and *Shripal (Supra)*, outsourcing cannot become a convenient shield to perpetuate precariousness and to sidestep fair engagement practices where the work is inherently perennial. The Commission's further contention that the appellants are not “full-time” employees but continue only by virtue of interim orders also does not advance their case. That interim protection was granted precisely because of the long history of engagement and the pendency of the challenge to the State's refusals. It neither creates rights that did not exist nor erases entitlements that may arise upon a proper adjudication of the legality of those refusals.

Before concluding, we think it necessary to recall that the State (here referring to both the Union and the State governments) is not a mere market participant but a constitutional employer. It cannot balance budgets on the backs of those who perform the most basic and recurring public functions. Where work recurs day after day and year after year, the establishment must reflect that reality in its sanctioned strength and engagement practices. The long-

term extraction of regular labour under temporary labels corrodes confidence in public administration and offends the promise of equal protection. Financial stringency certainly has a place in public policy, but it is not a talisman that overrides fairness, reason and the duty to organise work on lawful lines.

18. Moreover, it must necessarily be noted that “ad-hocism” thrives where administration is opaque. The State Departments must keep and produce accurate establishment registers, muster rolls and outsourcing arrangements, and they must explain, with evidence, why they prefer precarious engagement over sanctioned posts where the work is perennial. If “constraint” is invoked, the record should show what alternatives were considered, why similarly placed workers were treated differently, and how the chosen course aligns with Articles 14, 16 and 21 of the Constitution of India. Sensitivity to the human consequences of prolonged insecurity is not sentimentality. It is a constitutional discipline that should inform every decision affecting

those who keep public offices running.

19. Having regard to the long, undisputed service of the appellants, the admitted perennial nature of their duties, and the material indicating vacancies and comparator regularisations, we issue the following

directions: -

i. Regularization and creation of Supernumerary posts: All appellants shall stand regularized with effect from the date on which the High Court directed a fresh recommendation by the Commission and a fresh decision by the State on sanctioning posts for the appellants. For this purpose, the State and the successor establishment (U.P. Education Services Selection Commission) shall create supernumerary

posts in the corresponding cadres, Class-III (Driver or equivalent) and Class-IV (Peon/Attendant/Guard or equivalent) without any caveats or preconditions. On regularization, each appellant shall be placed at not

less than the minimum of the regular pay-scale for the post, with protection of last-drawn wages if higher and the appellants shall be entitled to the subsequent increments in the pay scale as per the pay grade. For seniority and promotion, service shall count from the date of regularization as given above.

ii. Financial consequences and arrears: - Each appellant

shall be paid as arrears the full difference between (a) the pay and admissible allowances at the minimum of the regular pay-level for the post from time to time, and

(b) the amounts actually paid, for the period from 24.04.2002 until the date of regularization /retirement/death, as the case may be. Amounts

already paid under previous interim directions shall be so adjusted. The net arrears shall be released within three months and if in default, the unpaid amount shall carry compound interest at 6% per annum from

the date of default until payment.

iii. Retired appellants: - Any appellant who has already retired shall be granted regularization with effect from 24.04.2002 until the date of superannuation for pay fixation, arrears under clause (ii), and recalculation of pension, gratuity and other terminal dues. The revised

pension and terminal dues shall be paid within three months of this Judgement.

iv. Deceased appellants: - In the case of Appellant No. 5 and any other appellant who has died during pendency, his/her legal representatives on record shall be paid the arrears under clause (ii) up to the date of death, together with all terminal/retiral dues recalculated consistently with clause (i), within three months of this Judgement.

These propositions of law and observations fully apply in the case in hand.

In the light of above discussion and findings, the reference is answered as follows.

AWARD

The action of the Management of Geological Survey of India in terminating the services of Shri Mahesh Viswakarma, Drilling Helper w.e.f.30/04/2018 who was working on daily rated basis w.e.f. 04/02/1988 and completed more than 240 days in every Calendar year is held unfair and illegal.

The workman shall be reinstated by Management Bank with back wages and all consequential benefits. He shall stand regularized with effect from the date on which he first raised the dispute before the Conciliation Officer. He shall be paid as arrears, the full difference between the pay and admissible allowances at the minimum of the regular pay-level for the post from time to time, and the amounts actually paid, for the period until the date of regularization, as the case may be. The arrears shall be released within 30 days from the date of publication of Award. In case of default, the unpaid amount shall carry interest at 6% per annum from the date of Award until payment.

The Workman shall also be paid litigation cost Rs. 25,000/- by Management within the time framed mentioned above.

DATE:- 06/10/2025

P.K. SRIVASTAVA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 29 दिसम्बर, 2025

का.आ. 2243.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार पश्चिम रेलवे के प्रबंधतंत्र, संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय जबलपुर के पंचाट (06/2024) प्रकाशित करती है।

[सं. एल- 12025/01/2025-आईआर (बी-1)-146]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 29th December, 2025

S.O. 2243.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. 06/2024) of the *Cent.Govt.Indus.Tribunal-cum-Labour Court Jabalpur* as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of Western Railway and their workmen.

[No. L-12025/01/2025- IR(B-I)-146]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR

NO. CGIT/LC/R/06/2024

Present: P.K.Srivastava

H.J.S.(Retd.)

The General Secretary

Paschim Railway Karmchari Parishad

Ratlam, Madhya Pradesh-457001

Workman

Versus

The DRM

Western Railway, Do Batti

Ratlam.

Management

AWARD

(Passed on this 20th day of November - 2025)

As per letter dated 19/12/2023 by the Deputy Chief Labour Commissioner (Central), Jabalpur, Government of India, Ministry of Labour, the reference is made to this Tribunal under section-10 of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 as per reference number **RLC-16(07)/2019 dt. 19/12/2023**. The dispute under reference related to:-

“Whether the demand of the retired employee Sh. Gokul Singh Rathore regarding payment of CTG raised by the union General Secretary Paschim Karmachari parisadis valid ? If not what relief the workman is entitled for ?”

After registering a case on the basis of the reference, notices were sent to the parties and served. Workman side never appeared. Mr. Rakesh Soni Learned Counsel filed his Vakalatnama for management of Railways. None of the parties filed any Statement of Claim or Written Statement of Defense.

Since the initial burden to prove the case lies with the workman, and he has failed to discharge this burden, the claim is held to be not proved. Accordingly, the reference is answered against the workman.

DATE: 20/11/2025

P.K. SRIVASTAVA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 29 दिसम्बर, 2025

का.आ. 2244.—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 जबलपुर के पंचाट (94/2015) प्रकाशित करती है।

[सं. एल- 12012/96/2015-आईआर (बी-1)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 29th December, 2025

S.O. 2244.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. 94/2015) of the *Cent.Govt.Indus.Tribunal-cum-Labour Court Jabalpur* as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of State Bank of India and their workmen.

[No. L-12012/96/2015- IR(B-I)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR

NO. CGIT/LC/ R/94/2015

Present: P.K.Srivastava

H.J.S.(Retd.)

The General Secretary,

Dainik Vetan Bhogi Bank Karmchari Sangathan,

F-1, Karambhoomi, Tripti Vihar, Opp. Engg. College,

Ujjain (M.P.)

Workman

Vs

The Chief General Manager,

State Bank of India, Zonal Office,

L.H.O. Hoshangabad Road,

Bhopal (M.P.)- 11

Management

(JUDGMENT)

(Passed on this 12th day of November, 2025)

As per letter dated 30/09/2015 by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour, New Delhi, the reference has been made to this Tribunal under **Section-10 of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947** (in short the '*Act*') as per Notification **No. L-12012/96/2015 (IR(B-1))** dt. 30/09/2015. The dispute under reference relates to:-

" क्या दैनिक वेतनभोगी बैंक कर्मचारी संगठन, द्वारा श्री देवेन्द्र गौड़ को दिनांक 19.11.2005 से दिनांक 02.06.2013 तक भारतीय स्टेट बैंक, भोपाल की शाखा नई आबादी, मंदसौर में काम करना बताकर 20 प्रतिशत बोनस राशि की मांग करना नायऔचित है? अगर हां तो, श्री देवेन्द्र गौड़ किस अनुतोष के अधिकारी है"

After registering the case on the basis of reference, notices were issued to the parties. They appeared and filed their respective statement of claim in defense.

According to the workman union the claimant Devendra Goud was appointed against the vacant post of Peon by the then Branch Manager, Naiabadi Branch, Mandasaur on 19.11.2005 and worked 8 hours a day regularly till 02.06.2013, when he was disengaged by the Bank without any notice or compensation. He had worked continuously for 240 days in every year and had discharged the duties of Peon for which he was paid his wages. He was paid bonus @ 8.33% whereas he was entitled to bonus @ 20% which is being paid by the other Banks. According to the union, this action of management is unjust, illegal and arbitrary.

The union has requested that holding the action of management is unjust, illegal and arbitrary. He be held entitled to bonus @ 20%

According to the management Bank, the claimant was engaged on daily wages purely on temporary basis in the branch on, as and when required basis. He worked purely on temporary basis intermittently when there was requirement, he worked 140 days in the year 2005-06, 20 days in 2007-08, 35 days in 2008-09, 179 days in 2009-10, 144 days in 2010-11, 32 days in 2011-12 and 2 days in 2013-14, for which he was paid his wages and bonus. The management Bank has denied the claim of the workman union that the workman worked continuously for a period of 240 days and more in every calendar year.

In evidence, the workman union has filed affidavit of the workman Devendra Goud as his Examination-in-chief, he has been cross-examined by management Bank.

He filed and proved Ex-W/1, Application before Labour Commissioner with respect to payment of bonus, Ex-W/2, sheet showing details of payment of bonus from the year 2005 to 2013-14, Banker cheque with respect to bonus, circulars with respect to minimum wages issued in different years from 2005-2013, certificate issued by the Branch Manager on 14.05.2011 and note photocopy with respect to workers allotted and payment to the Bank for cleaning and certain vouchers with respect to payment, letters issued by the Branch Manager on 17.01.2013 and 03.09.2013, to the Treasury Officer authorizing the workman to receive stamps issued by treasury, around 50 payment vouchers with respect to payment for cleaning from 11.07.2009 to 2011, which are marked as Ex-W/1 to Ex-W/25. The workman had filed Application seeking production of documents from management Bank. The Bank has filed copies of payment register for the period 03.04.2010 to 06.07.2013 with respect to payments regarding cleaning of the Branch to the claimant workman and other persons total 29 pages.

Management has filed affidavit of its witness Mr. Sumit Gupta, he has been cross-examined by workman union.

I have heard argument of Learned Counsel for workman Mr. Arun Patel and Mr. Praveen Yadav, Learned Counsel for management Bank.

The reference itself is the issue for determination in the case in hand.

The minimum bonus which a management is required to pay under section 10 of Bonus Act, is 8.33%. For, payment of bonus at higher rate, there has to be an agreement between the workman and management. No such agreement has been filed. Hence, action of management Bank in not paying bonus to the applicant workman @ 20% cannot be held to be unjustified.

Hence, holding the demand of workman union for payment of bonus to the applicant workman Mr. Devendra Balram Gaud, @ 20%, unjustified, the reference stands answered accordingly.

DATE:- 12-11-2025

P.K. SRIVASTAVA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 29 दिसम्बर, 2025

का.आ. 2245.—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 जबलपुर के पंचाट (93/2015) प्रकाशित करती है।

[सं. एल- 12011/58/2015-आईआर (बी-1)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 29th December, 2025

S.O. 2245.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. 93/2015) of the *Cent.Govt.Indus.Tribunal-cum-Labour Court Jabalpur* as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of State Bank of India and their workmen.

[No. L-12011/58/2015- IR(B-I)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR

NO. CGIT/LC/ R/93/2015

Present: P.K.Srivastava

H.J.S.(Retd.)

The General Secretary,

Dainik Vetan Bhogi Bank Karmchari Sangathan,

F-1, Karambhoomi, Tripti Vihar, Opp. Engg. College,

Ujjain (M.P.)

Workman

Vs

The Chief General Manager,

State Bank of India, Zonal Office,

L.H.O. Hoshangabad Road,

Bhopal (M.P.)- 11

Management

(JUDGMENT)

(Passed on this 12th day of November, 2025)

As per letter dated 29/09/2015 by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour, New Delhi, the reference has been made to this Tribunal under **Section-10 of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947** (in short the 'Act') as per Notification **No. L-12011/58/2015(IR(B-1))** dt. 29/09/2015. The dispute under reference relates to:-

"क्या दैनिक वेतनभोगी बैंक कर्मचारी संघ द्वारा श्री देवेन्द्र बालाराम गौड़ भृत्य (को दिनांक 19.11.2005 से दिनांक 02.06.2013 तक दैनिक वेतन भोगी के रूप में काम करना बताने पर श्री देवेन्द्र बालाराम गौड़ तक पुनरीक्षित वेतनमान पाने का हकदार है? यदि हां तो श्री गौड़ वेतन में अंतर की कितनी राशि के हकदार है?"

After registering the case on the basis of reference, notices were issued to the parties. They appeared and filed their respective statement of claim in defense.

According to the workman union the claimant Devendra Goud was appointed against the vacant post of Peon by the then Branch Manager, Naiabadi Branch, Mandasaur on 19.11.2005 and worked 8 hours a day regularly till 02.06.2013, when he was disengaged by the Bank without any notice or compensation. He had worked continuously for 240 days in every year and had discharged the duties of Peon for which he was paid his wages.

According to the union, this action of management is in violation of Section 25-F and 25-G of the Act, hence is unjust, illegal and arbitrary.

The union has requested that holding the disengagement of the workman Devendra Goud, by the management Bank, against law, he be held entitled to be reinstated with all back wages and benefits.

According to the management Bank, the claimant was engaged on daily wages purely on temporary basis in the branch on, as and when required basis. He worked purely on temporary basis intermittently when there was requirement, he worked 140 days in the year 2005-06, 20 days in 2007-08, 35 days in 2008-09, 179 days in 2009-10, 144 days in 2010-11, 32 days in 2011-12 and 2 days in 2013-14, for which he was paid his wages. The management Bank has denied the claim of the workman union that the workman worked continuously for a period of 240 days and more in every calendar year.

This is also the case of the management that the claimant workman was not appointed against any regular vacancy following recruitment process. He did not worked for 240 days in any year, hence, his disengagement by the Bank cannot be faulted in law. Management has requested that the reference be answered against the workman.

In evidence, the workman union has filed affidavit of the workman Devendra Goud as his Examination-in-chief, he has been cross-examined by management Bank.

He filed and proved Ex-W/1, Application before Labour Commissioner with respect to payment of bonus, Ex-W/2, sheet showing details of payment of bonus from the year 2005 to 2013-14, Banker cheque with respect to bonus, circulars with respect to minimum wages issued in different years from 2005-2013, certificate issued by the Branch Manager on 14.05.2011 and note photocopy with respect to workers allotted and payment to the Bank for cleaning and certain vouchers with respect to payment, letters issued by the Branch Manager on 17.01.2013 and 03.09.2013, to the Treasury Officer authorizing the workman to receive stamps issued by treasury, around 50 payment vouchers with respect to payment for cleaning from 11.07.2009 to 2011, which are marked as Ex-W/1 to Ex-W/25. The workman had filed Application seeking production of documents from management Bank. The Bank has filed copies of payment register for the period 03.04.2010 to 06.07.2013 with respect to payments regarding cleaning of the Branch to the claimant workman and other persons total 29 pages.

Management has filed affidavit of its witness Sumit Gupta, he has been cross-examined by workman union.

I have heard argument of Learned Counsel for workman Mr. Arun Patel and Mr. Praveen Yadav, Learned Counsel for management Bank.

The reference itself is the issue for determination in the case.

The basis of claim of the workman with respect to regular and revised wages is the bipartite settlement. Case of the management bank is that the bipartite settlement does not apply to daily wagers rather it applies to the regular employees of the Bank. This is supported from the perusal of bipartite settlement. Hence, the claim of the workman union regarding revised wages to the applicant workman who is a daily wager casual employee is not admissible in law following judgments, cited by management bank are referred to in this respect.

1. *State of Haryana & Ors. v/s Tilak Raj & Ors., 2003 SC 2658*
2. *Himanshu Kumar Vidyarthi & Ors. v/s State of Bihar & Ors., 1997 SC 3657*
3. *State of Rajasthan & Ors. v/s Dayalal & Ors., (2011) 2 SCC 429*

Hence, holding the claim of workman union with regard to revised wages to the applicant workman, unjustified, the reference stands answered accordingly.

DATE:- 12-11-2025

P.K. SRIVASTAVA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 29 दिसम्बर, 2025

का.आ. 2246.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार भारतीय स्टेट बैंक के प्रबंधन, संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय जबलपुर के पंचाट (92/2015) प्रकाशित करती है।

[सं. एल- 12011/49/2015-आईआर (बी-1)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 29th December, 2025

S.O. 2246.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. 92/2015) of the *Cent.Govt.Indus.Tribunal-cum-Labour Court Jabalpur* as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of State Bank of India and their workmen.

[No. L-12011/49/2015- IR(B-I)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR

NO. CGIT/LC/ R/92/2015Present: P.K.SrivastavaH.J.S.(Retd.)

The General Secretary,

Dainik Vetan Bhogi Bank Karmchari Sangathan,

F-1, Karambhoomi, Tripti Vihar, Opp. Engg. College,

Ujjain (M.P.)

Workman

Vs

The Chief General Manager,

State Bank of India, Zonal Office,

L.H.O. Hoshangabad Road,

Bhopal (M.P.)- 11

Management

(JUDGMENT)(Passed on this 12th day of November, 2025)

As per letter dated 30/09/2015 by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour, New Delhi, the reference has been made to this Tribunal under **Section-10 of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947** (in short the 'Act') as per Notification No. L-12011/49/2015(IR(B-I)) dt. 30/09/2015. The dispute under reference relates to:-

" क्या दैनिक वेतनभोगी कर्मचारी संघ दावरा श्री देवेन्द्र बलराम गौड़ दैनिक वेतन भोगी, (भृत्य (भारतीय स्टेट बैंक शाखा मंदसौर को बैंक द्वारा दिनांक 19.11.05 से लगायत प्रतिवर्ष 240 दिन से अधिक कार्य करने पर दिनांक 02.06.13 से बिना सूचना, नोटिस पगार व छटनी मुआवजा दिए बैंक से पृथक करने की मांग न्यायोचित है, यदि हां तो श्री गौड़ किस अनुतोष के भागी है।"

After registering the case on the basis of reference, notices were issued to the parties. They appeared and filed their respective statement of claim in defense.

According to the workman union the claimant Devendra Goud was appointed against the vacant post of Peon by the then Branch Manager, Naiabadi Branch, Mandasaur on 19.11.2005 and worked 8 hours a day regularly till 02.06.2013, when he was disengaged by the Bank without any notice or compensation. He had worked continuously for 240 days in every year and had discharged the duties of Peon for which he was paid his wages.

According to the union, this action of management is in violation of Section 25-F and 25-G of the Act, hence is unjust, illegal and arbitrary.

The union has requested that holding the disengagement of the workman Devendra Goud, by the management Bank, against law, he be held entitled to be reinstated with all back wages and benefits.

According to the management Bank, the claimant was engaged on daily wages purely on temporary basis in the branch on, as and when required basis. He worked purely on temporary basis intermittently when there was requirement, he worked 140 days in the year 2005-06, 20 days in 2007-08, 35 days in 2008-09, 179 days in 2009-10, 144 days in 2010-11, 32 days in 2011-12 and 2 days in 2013-14, for which he was paid his wages. The management Bank has denied the claim of the workman union that the workman worked continuously for a period of 240 days and more in every calendar year.

This is also the case of the management that the claimant workman was not appointed against any regular vacancy following recruitment process. He did not work for 240 days in any year, hence, his disengagement by the Bank cannot be faulted in law. Management has requested that the reference be answered against the workman.

In evidence, the workman union has filed affidavit of the workman Devendra Goud as his Examination-in-chief, he has been cross-examined by management Bank.

He filed and proved Ex-W/1, Application before Labour Commissioner with respect to payment of bonus, Ex-W/2, sheet showing details of payment of bonus from the year 2005 to 2013-14, Banker cheque with respect to bonus, circulars with respect to minimum wages issued in different years from 2005-2013, certificate issued by the

Branch Manager on 14.05.2011 and note photocopy with respect to workers allotted and payment to the Bank for cleaning and certain vouchers with respect to payment, letters issued by the Branch Manager on 17.01.2013 and 03.09.2013, to the Treasury Officer authorizing the workman to receive stamps issued by treasury, around 50 payment vouchers with respect to payment for cleaning from 11.07.2009 to 2011, which are marked as Ex-W/1 to Ex-W/25. The workman had filed Application seeking production of documents from management Bank. The Bank has filed copies of payment register for the period 03.04.2010 to 06.07.2013 with respect to payments regarding cleaning of the Branch to the claimant workman and other persons total 29 pages.

Management has filed affidavit of its witness Sumit Gupta, he has been cross-examined by workman union.

I have heard argument of Learned Counsel for workman Mr. Arun Patel and Mr. Praveen Yadav, Learned Counsel for management Bank. Both the sides have filed written arguments which are part of record. I have perused the written argument also gone through the record as well.

On perusal of record in light of rival arguments, following Issues arises:-

- 1) ***Whether the workman union has successfully proved the engagement of the workman for 240 days in a year including the year preceding the date of his termination as per section 25-B of the Act?***
- 2) ***Whether the disengagement of the workman by management is in violation of section 25-F and 25-G of the Act?***
- 3) ***Subject to findings on issue No. 1 and 2, whether the workman is entitled to any relief?***

Issue No.1,

Section 25-B of the Act, which defines ‘*continuous service*’, is being reproduced as follows:-

“25B. Definition of continuous service.—For the purposes of this Chapter,—

- (1) ***a workman shall be said to be in continuous service for a period if he is, for that period, in uninterrupted service, including service which may be interrupted on account of sickness or authorised leave or an accident or a strike which is not illegal, or a lock-out or a cessation of work which is not due to any fault on the part of the workman;***
- (2) ***where a workman is not in continuous service within the meaning of clause (1) for a period of one year or six months, he shall be deemed to be in continuous service under an employer—***
 - (a) ***for a period of one year, if the workman, during a period of twelve calendar months preceding the date with reference to which calculation is to be made, has actually worked under the employer for not less than—***
 - (i) ***one hundred and ninety days in the case of a workman employed below ground in a mine; and***
 - (ii) ***two hundred and forty days, in any other case;***
 - (b) ***for a period of six months, if the workman, during a period of six calendar months preceding the date with reference to which calculation is to be made, has actually worked under the employer for not less than—***
 - (i) ***ninety-five days, in the case of a workman employed below ground in a mine; and***
 - (ii) ***one hundred and twenty days, in any other case.”***

Pleadings of the parties on this issue have been detailed earlier. The workman has corroborated the allegation of the union on this issued. He has been cross-examined by management. He states that there was no advertisement released for the vacancy, no test conducted and also states that payments were made to him in different names.

Learned Counsel for workman has submitted that he worked continuously with the bank for 240 days in every year and also in the year preceding the date of his termination i.e., 02.06.2013 and this fact is established from the payment vouchers filed and proved by the workman, cash remittance register from November, 2011 to December, 2011 and from cash remittance register Naiabadi Branch from 03.10.2011 to 31.05.2013 which have been filed by the Bank also in compliance of order of this Tribunal.

Firstly, it is to be mentioned here that receiving payments by workman under different name is a crime, this is cheating by way of impersonation, hence, he cannot take advantage of his this statement.

On perusal of documents filed by him in support of his statement on oath, the certificate issued by the Branch Manager, does not specifically states that the workman has been continuously working. **Secondly**, Ex-20 which is bunch of 148 photocopy documents, vouchers relating to Manish Telecom, Manish Computer, Stationery and VIP Communication shows that payments were made to the firm of Manish with respect to supply of stationery, etc. May be the payment was received by the workman, but it does not show that the workman worked as an employee of management Bank. The two documents which are authorization letter dated 17.01.2013 and 03.09.2013 authorizing the workman to receive stamp from treasury only indicates that the workman was engaged for getting stamp from treasury on these dates. Another bunch of documents is Ex-22 which are 45 photocopy receipts related to payment with respect to cleaning of the branch by the Bank to the claimant workman within the period 11.07.2009 to 2010. Thus, bunch of document also indicates that the claimant was paid for dates mentioned in these documents in different months in different years. This also does not corroborate fully the case of the workman, worked for 240 days in any year.

The payment details filed by the management Bank under order of this Tribunal, as mentioned above, contain the name of the workman as well other persons also, to whom the payments were made by the Bank. The case of the workman union is that payments were made to him by Bank under fictitious names will not be counted in his favour. Thus, these documents also do not fully corroborate the case of the workman on the point of his continuous engagement of 240 days or more in a year or year preceding the date of termination. It is the case of the workman that he was paid in different bogus names, this fact also goes against him. On the other hand, management witness has stated that the workman never worked for 240 days in any year, he has mentioned number of days in which he worked with the Bank in a year and that too for cleaning of the branch. There are photocopy vouchers filed by the workman union showing that water payments were made to the workman with respect to procurement of water cans which he received on behalf of the firm. Hence, the case laws referred to by the learned counsel for workman union in their written arguments do not support them. It is already the case of the management that the workman was engaged intermittently on as and when required basis.

Hence, in light of this nature of evidence, the claim of the workman union that the applicant workman worked continuously for 240 days in any year or in a year preceding the date of disengagement is held not proved.

Issue No. 1 is answered accordingly.

Issue No. 2,

In light of findings recorded on issue No. 1, this issue is answered against the workman, thus his disengagement is justified in law.

Issue No. 2 stands answered accordingly.

Issue No. 3

In light of aforesaid findings recorded on issue No. 1 and 2, the workman is entitled for no relief.

Issue No. 3 stands answered accordingly

In light of above discussion and findings, the reference is answered as follows.-

AWARD

“Holding the demand of Daily Wage Employees Union to separate Shri Devendra Balram Gaud, Daily Wage Employee (Peon), State Bank of India, Branch Mandsaur, from the bank with effect from 02.06.13 without notice, salary and retrenchment compensation, justified. Shri Devendra Balram Gaud is held entitled to no relief.”

No order as to cost.

DATE:- 12-11-2025

P.K. SRIVASTAVA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 29 दिसम्बर, 2025

का.आ. 2247.—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 जबलपुर के पंचाट (78/2012) प्रकाशित करती है

[सं. एल- 12011/20/2011-आईआर (बी-1)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 29th December, 2025

S.O. 2247.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. 78/2012) of the *Cent.Govt.Indus.Tribunal-cum-Labour Court Jabalpur* as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of State Bank of India and their workmen.

[No. L-12011/20/2011- IR(B-I)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR

NO. CGIT/LC/ R/78/2012Present: P.K. SrivastavaH.J.S.(Retd.)

The General Secretary,

Dainik Vetan Bhogi Karmchari Sangathan,

F-1, Tripti Vihar, Opp. Engg. College,

Ujjain (M.P.)

Workman

Vs

The Asstt. General Manager,

State Bank of India, Regional Office,

Hoshangabad Road,

Bhopal (M.P.)

Management

(JUDGMENT)**(Passed on this 06th day of November, 2025)**

As per letter dated 15/06/2012 by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour, New Delhi, the reference has been made to this Tribunal under **Section-10 of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947** (in short the 'Act') as per Notification **No. L-12011/20/2011(IR(B-I))** dt. 15/06/2012. The dispute under reference relates to:-

"Whether the demand of the Union, Dainik Vetan Bhogi Karmchari Sangathan, for appointment of Shri Santosh Kumar Sahu on regular basis w.e.f. 07/10/2007 with pay is legal and justified? To what relief the workman is entitled?"

After registering the case on the basis of reference, notices were issued to the parties. They appeared and filed their respective statement of claim in defense.

The case of the workman is mainly that he was first appointed as a daily wage Peon on 08.03.004 by the Branch Manager and worked 8 hours daily till 06.10.2007 without any notice or compensation, when he put up his claim for regularization of his service. According to the workman union, this action of management is in violation of Section 25-F and 25-G of the Act, hence unjust, illegal and arbitrary.

It is also alleged that on the basis of his continuous service with the bank for three years, he is entitled to be regularized and denial of his this claim by the management bank is unjust, illegal and arbitrary. He has prayed that holding the action of management bank in terminating his service and no regularizing his service against law, he be held entitled to be reinstated and entitled to be regularized with all back wages and benefits.

The case of the management bank is mainly that the workman was never appointed against any permanent vacancy of peon following any recruitment process. Hence, there was no occasion of his disengagement. According to the Bank, he was a daily wagger, engaged by Bank as and when required on intermittent basis for which he was paid his daily wages. He never completed 240 days in any year; management has requested that the reference be answered against the workman.

In evidence, the workman has filed and proved order of Hon'ble High Court of M.P. dated 28.01.2004 in WP No. 4811/2000, in which he was one of the petitioner's, photocopy reply of Bank filed by them before the Regional Labour Commissioner during conciliation proceedings, photocopy letter of Bank dated 03.05.2010 regarding payment of bonus to the workman, photocopy cheque of bonus amount, which are marked as Ex-W/1 to Ex-W/4. Workman union has further filed affidavit of the workman as his Examination-in-chief, he has been cross-examined by management.

Management has filed and proved Ex-M/1 and M/2 which are vouchers with respect to payment to the workman, management has further filed affidavit of its witnesses as his Examination-in-chief, he has been cross-examined by union.

I have heard argument of Learned Counsel for workman Mr. Arun Patel and Mr. Praveen Yadav, Learned Counsel for the management bank. I have gone through the record as well.

On perusal of record in light of rival arguments, following Issues came up for determination:-

- 1) ***Whether the workman has successfully proved his continuous engagement with the management Bank as defined under section 25-B of the Act?***
- 2) ***Whether the action of management in disengaging the workman is legal?***
- 3) ***Subject to findings on issue No. 1 and 2, whether the workman is entitled to any relief?***

Issue No.1.

Section 25-B of the Act, which defines '*continuous service*', is being reproduced as follows:-

"25B. Definition of continuous service.—For the purposes of this Chapter,—

- (1) ***a workman shall be said to be in continuous service for a period if he is, for that period, in uninterrupted service, including service which may be interrupted on account of sickness or authorised leave or an accident or a strike which is not illegal, or a lock-out or a cessation of work which is not due to any fault on the part of the workman;***
- (2) ***where a workman is not in continuous service within the meaning of clause (1) for a period of one year or six months, he shall be deemed to be in continuous service under an employer—***
 - (a) ***for a period of one year, if the workman, during a period of twelve calendar months preceding the date with reference to which calculation is to be made, has actually worked under the employer for not less than—***
 - (i) ***one hundred and ninety days in the case of a workman employed below ground in a mine; and***
 - (ii) ***two hundred and forty days, in any other case;***
 - (b) ***for a period of six months, if the workman, during a period of six calendar months preceding the date with reference to which calculation is to be made, has actually worked under the employer for not less than—***
 - (i) ***ninety-five days, in the case of a workman employed below ground in a mine; and***
 - (ii) ***one hundred and twenty days, in any other case."***

Pleadings of the parties on this issue have been detailed earlier. According to the workman he was appointed on the vacant post of Messenger in the branch in the year 1991 by the then Branch Manager, he worked continuously for atleast 8 hours daily in the Bank. His services were earlier terminated by the Bank, he filed a writ petition No. 4811/2000, he was reemployed by the Bank on 08.03.2004 in compliance of the order of Hon'ble High Court dated 28.01.2004 and he worked continuously after his repayment till date of disengagement i.e., 06.10.2007.

He has further stated that he was paid bonus, also in his cross-examination, he has stated the he came to know about the vacancy from an advertisement released by the Bank, he had filled the form for appointment, he was interviewed by the Branch Manager, his name was not sponsored by employment ex-change, no interview letter was sent by the Bank. The Bank did not issue any appointment letter.

He further states in his cross-examination that he did job of carrying documents from one counter to other, sent daak, carry cheques to clearing house and other works for which he was paid by the Bank. He admits that there was a canteen in the branch and he used to bring tea and snacks for the bank employees from the canteen.

There is on record, certified statement regarding payment to the workman which shows that during the period he was paid different amounts ranging from Rs. 30/- to Rs. 50/- by way of different vouchers for carrying cheques or other bank documents as well instruments to different places and visiting different places for bank works. There are also payments vouchers with respect to payment to him for filling water in the bank coolers etc. These vouchers show that he was paid the traveling expenses through these vouchers. When it is established that he had been reimbursed his travelling expenses during the period from 2004 to 2007 for visiting different places for banking work naturally, he would have been paid his wages also from the Bank, after all it cannot be assumed that he was doing this job only for reimbursement of his travelling expenses. These facts establish his engagement by the bank and also establish that he was engaged by the Bank in whatever capacity may be a daily wager.

He has been paid bonus also, this fact also corroborates his statement with regard to his engagement with the Bank. On the other hand, there is on record affidavit of the management witness as his Examination-in-chief and his cross-examination in which he has stated that the workman was only assigned the work of Hamali as and when required basis and was paid remuneration for the work. Also that he worked only for 2 to 3 hours in a day. Infact, he was engaged as canteen boy by the local implementation committee for providing tea, water and snacks to the members, no appointment letter was issued by the Bank nor did he worked 240 days or more in any year.

The witness also states that he did not follow the recruitment process. In his cross-examination, this witness states that it will be correct to say on the basis of salary payment reduced and available records that the workman was working in the same branch since 1991 but he was working in which canteen, no record is available in this respect. He pleads ignorance that the Bank had taken an interview test of the workman for sub-staff in the year 1997 and states that there is no record of employment of the workman management by local implementation committee, this witness further pleads ignorance regarding vacancy of peon in the said branch.

On a comparative statement and evidence from both sides as mentioned above, it comes out that the case of management Bank that the workman was employed by the committee cannot be believed because there is no evidence except the statement of the management witness. There is no document in this respect, there is no evidence also in this respect. The management witness also admits that the workman used to do the Bank related works for which he was paid, his only point is that he did not work continuously for 240 days in a year. The documents in form of vouchers which show reimbursement of the workman on different dates with respect to the amount he incurred in travelling for the Bank work, that he worked regularly during the period from 2004 to 2007 these are the Bank certified documents.

Thus, he is held to be a workman continuously for 240 days and more in every year including the year preceding the date of his disengagement as defined under section 25-B of the Act and the Bank is held to be his employer under the Act.

Issue No. 1 is answered accordingly.

Issue No. 2,

Section 25-F & 25-G of the Act, is being reproduced as follows:

25F. Conditions precedent to retrenchment of workmen.

No workman employed in any industry who has been in continuous service for not less than one year under an employer shall be retrenched by that employer until-

- (a)** *the workman has been given one month's notice in writing indicating the reasons for retrenchment and the period of notice has expired, or the workman has been paid in lieu of such notice, wages for the period of the notice;*
- (b)** *the workman has been paid, at the time of retrenchment, compensation which shall be equivalent to fifteen days' average pay for every completed year of continuous service or any part thereof in excess of six months; and*
- (c)** *notice in the prescribed manner is served on the appropriate Government or such authority as may be specified by the appropriate Government by notification in the Official Gazette.*

25G. Procedure for retrenchment.—*Where any workman in an industrial establishment, who is a citizen of India, is to be retrenched and he belongs to a particular category of workmen in that establishment, in the absence of any agreement between the employer and the workman in this behalf, the employer shall ordinarily retrench the workman who was the last person to be employed in that category, unless for reasons to be recorded the employer retrenches any other workman.*

It is undisputed that no notice was issued to the workman before his disengagement nor was he paid any compensation. Hence his disengagement is held in violation of the act.

Issue No. 2 stands answered accordingly.

Issue No. 3

In light of aforesaid findings, the question arises as to relief to which the workman may be held entitled. Management, learned counsel has submitted that there is nothing on record to show that there was a regular vacancy at the time of his appointment, he was not sponsored by employment ex-change and he did not follow the recruitment process. Hence, his appointment is illegal. Thus he should not be reinstated on the finding forced in this argument from the side of the Bank.

Learned counsel for the workman has stated that he has been working with the Bank as a daily wager since 1991. He was once disengaged in the year 2000 and was reinstated under order of Hon'ble High Court in 2004, again disengaged arbitrarily in 2007, he requires to be reinstated with backwages and benefits.

There is force in the argument of management for the appointment of the workman was not through recruitment process, hence, not a regular appointment, a lump sum compensation quantified Rs. 1Lac/- in lieu of all his claims will meet the ends of justice which the workman is held entitled to be paid by the Bank within 30 days from the date of publication of the award, failing which interest @ 6% p.a. from the date of award till payment.

In light of above discussion and findings, the reference is answered as follows.-

AWARD

“Holding the action of the management in disengaging the workman Santosh Kumar Sahu from 07/10/2007, illegal and unjustified, he is held entitled to a lump sum amount of Rs. 1Lac/- to be paid by the Bank within 30 days from the date of publication award, failing which interest @ 6% p.a. from the date of award till payment, in lieu of all his claims.”

No order as to cost.

DATE:- 06-11-2025

P.K. SRIVASTAVA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 29 दिसम्बर, 2025

का.आ. 2248.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार भारतीय स्टेट बैंक के प्रबंधतंत्र, संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय नागपुर के पंचाट (03/2020-21) प्रकाशित करती है।

[सं. एल- 12025/01/2025-आईआर (बी-1)-148]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 29th December, 2025

S.O. 2248.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. 03/2020-21) of the *Cent.Govt.Indus.Tribunal-cum-Labour Court Nagpur* as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of State Bank of India their workmen.

[No. L-12025/01/2025- IR(B-I)-148]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

BEFORE SHRI SHIV SHANKER PRASAD PRESIDING OFFICER,

CGIT-CUM-LABOUR COURT, NAGPUR

Case No. CGIT/NGP/Appln./03/2020-21

Date: 07.11.2025.

Party No.1:

The State Bank of India & 17 others,
State Bank Bhawan, Madam Cama Road,
Mumbai - 400032

V/s.

Party No.2:

1. Vajrabodhi s/o Ramchandra Meshram,
17, Barse Nagar, Pancpaoli,
Nagpur – 440017

AWARD(Dated: 07th November, 2025)

In exercise of the powers conferred by Section (1) & (2) of Section 2-A of Industrial Disputes (Amendment) Act, 2010 ("the Act" in short), the applicant filed an industrial dispute between the employers, in relation to the management of State Bank of India the applicant Vajrabodhi s/o Ramchandra Meshram for adjudication vide case No. CGIT/NGP/APPL./03/2020-21 with the following issues framed: -

"Whether the action of the management/ SBI by giving punishment "be brought down to lower stage in the scale of pay up to one stage" is legal, fair and justified? If so, what relief the applicants are entitled to?"

2. Case is called out. Shri. Dadu Sachdev learned counsel for the management is present before the court but none is present on behalf of the petitioner. From perusal of record, it is apparent that petitioner is not responding and attending the court since 23.09.2021. Although, Statement of Claim and Written Statement have been filed by the parties respectively but the petitioner has not filed any evidence to prove his case. The petitioner is not coming to the court since long back. It appears that petitioner 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 applicants Vajrabodhi s/o Ramchandra is not entitled to any relief".

Justice (Retd.) SHIV SHANKER PRASAD, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 29 दिसम्बर, 2025

का.आ. 2249.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक के प्रबंधतंत्र, संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय नागपुर के पंचाट (02/2019-20) प्रकाशित करती है।

[सं. एल- 12025/01/2025-आईआर (बी-1)-147]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 29th December, 2025

S.O. 2249.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. 02/2019-20) of the *Cent.Govt.Indus.Tribunal-cum-Labour Court Nagpur* as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of Reserve Bank of India their workmen.

[No. L-12025/01/2025- IR(B-I)-147]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

BEFORE SHRI SHIV SHANKER PRASAD PRESIDING OFFICER,

CGIT-CUM-LABOUR COURT, NAGPUR

Case No. CGIT/NGP/Appln.02/2019-20

Date: 04.11.2025.

Party No.1:

1. The Regional Director,
Reserve Bank of India,
Samvidhan Square, Nagpur - 440001
2. M/s World Wide Security,
B-6, Vidya Nagar, Hosangabad road,
Bhopal MP- 462026.

V/s.

Party No.2:

The Secretary,
Nagpur General Workers Union,
NMCEU 502 Dugdh Vikas Karmachari
Gruh Nirman Sanstha, Civil Lines, GPO Square,
Nagpur - 440001

AWARD

(Dated: 04th November, 2025)

In exercise of the powers conferred by Section (1) & (2) of Section 2-A of Industrial Disputes (Amendment) Act, 2010 (“the Act” in short), the applicant filed an industrial dispute between the employers, in relation to the management of Reserve Bank of India and one other and the Union “Nagpur General Workers Union for adjudication with the following issues framed: -

“Whether the action of the management of Reserve Bank of India and M/s. World Wide Securities in terminating the services of the workman Shri. Mahipal Karia and 17 others is fair, just and proper? If not, to what relief the concerned workmen are entitled to?”

2. Case is called out. Mrs Sharanya S, Manager herself is present on behalf of the respondent/management today in the court. But none is present on behalf of petitioner. From perusal of record, it is apparent that petitioner is not responding and attending the court since 08/04/2022, although Statement of Claim and Written Statement have been filed by the parties respectively. The petitioner has also filed his affidavit as an evidence but petitioner has not come to the court to prove the contents of the Statement of Claim and the contents of the affidavit filed by him. No other evidence has been filed by the petitioner to prove his claim. Claim of the petitioner is not proved. So, it is closed.

Hence, it is ordered.

ORDER

“The action of the management of Reserve Bank of India and M/s. World Wide Securities in terminating the services of the workman Shri. Mahipal Karia and 17 others is fair, just and proper. The concerned workmen are not entitled to any relief”

Justice (Retd.) SHIV SHANKER PRASAD, Presiding Officer