रजिस्ट्री सं. डी.एल. (एन) 04/0007/2003—05 REGD. NO. D. L. (N) 04/0007/2003—05

भारत का राजपत्र
The Gazette of India

सी.जी.-डी.एल.-सा.-07092026-276027
CG-DL-W-07092026-276027

प्राधिकार से प्रकाशित
PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

साप्ताहिक
WEEKLY

सं. 30] नई दिल्ली, अगस्त 2—अगस्त 8, 2026, शनिवार/ श्रावण 11—श्रावण 17, 1948
No. 30] NEW DELHI, AUGUST 2—AUGUST 8, 2026, SATURDAY/ SHRAVAN 11— SHRAVAN 17, 1948

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

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

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

वित्त मंत्रालय

(राजस्व विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 3 अगस्त, 2026

का.आ. 1606.—केन्द्र 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 अप्रत्यक्ष कर एवं सीमा शुल्क बोर्ड के अधीन **आयुक्त का कार्यालय, केन्द्रीय वस्तु एवं सेवा कर तथा केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क,बेलगावी,** जिनके 80 प्रतिशत से अधिक अधिकारियों एवं कर्मचारियों ने हिन्दी का कार्यसाधक ज्ञान प्राप्त कर लिया है, को अधिसूचित करती है।

[फा. सं. ई-11017/3/2017- हिन्दी-2-अधिसूचना]

प्रीति सेलारे, उप निदेशक (रा.भा.)

MINISTRY OF FINANCE

(Department of Revenue)

New Delhi, the 3th August, 2026

S.O. 1606.—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, **Office of the Commissioner, Central Goods & Service Tax and Central Excise, Belgavi** under Central Board of Indirect Taxes and Customs, Department of Revenue where more than 80% staff has acquired the working knowledge of Hindi.

[F. No. E-11017/3/2017- Hindi-2-Notification]

PREETI SELLARE, Dy. Director (OL)

विदेश मंत्रालय

(सी.पी.वी. प्रभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 29 जुलाई, 2026

का.आ. 1607.—राजनयिक और कोंसुलीय अधिकारी (शपथ एवं फीस) के अधिनियम, 1948 की धारा 2 के खंड (क) के अनुसरण में वैधानिक आदेश।

एतद्द्वारा, केंद्र सरकार भारतीय दूतावास, रियाद में श्री राजेश कुमार, वरिष्ठ सचिवालय सहायक, को जुलाई 29, 2026 से सहायक कांसुलर अधिकारी के रूप में कांसुलर सेवाओं का निर्वहन करने के लिए अधिकृत करती है।

[फा. सं. टी.4330/01/2026(13)]

तरुण कुमार, अवर सचिव (सीपीवी-II)

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

(CPV Division)

New Delhi, the 29th July, 2026

S.O. 1607.—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 Shri Rajesh Kumar, Senior Secretariat Assistant, in the Embassy of India, Riyadh, as Assistant Consular Officer to perform Consular services with effect from July 29, 2026.

[F. No. T.4330/01/2026 (13)]

TARUN KUMAR, Under Secy.(CPV-II)

श्रम एवं रोजगार मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 31 जुलाई, 2026

का.आ. 1608.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार **इंस्टिट्यूट ऑफ़ हिमालयन बायोरिसोर्स टेक्नोलॉजी; राजीव सूद** के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और **श्री प्रीतम चंद** के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट **केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय-2, चंडीगढ़, पंचाट (रिफरेन्स न.- 160/2015)** को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 24.07.2026 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-42025/07/2026-216-आईआर(डीयू)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT

New Delhi, the 31st July, 2026

S.O. 1608.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award **(Reference No. 160/2015)** of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court-2, Chandigarh** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **Institute of Himalayan Bioresource Technology; Rajiv Sood** and **Shri Pritam Chand** which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 24.07.2026.

[No. L-42025/07/2026-216-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.160/2015

Pritam Chand S/o Dhogru Ram through R. K. Singh Parmar, General Secretary Punjab INTUC L-211 Brari PO Partap Nagar, Nangal, Tehsil Nangal, District Rupnagar (Punjab).

-------- Workman

Versus

1. Director Institute of Himalayan Bioresource Technology, (CSIR Complex) Palampur, District Kangra, Himachal Pradesh.
2. Rajiv Sood (Govt. Contractor) S/o Sh. Jyoti Ram R/o VPO Paprola Tehsil Baijnath District Kangra, Himachal Pradesh.

------Respondents

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

Sh. G S Sidhu, AR for respondent no.1.

Sh. K.B. Sharma, AR for respondent no.2.

Award :04.05.2026

1. Workman has filed the present petition/complaint under Section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter called the Act) against his termination by respondent no.1 & 2 on 28.11.2024.

2. The brief facts, related to the case are that the workman was employed with respondents since long and his services were terminated orally by respondents on 28.11.2014 during the pendency of the main reference bearing no.255 of 2013 contravening Section 33 of the Act. It is prayed that termination be set aside and appropriate order be passed.

3. Notice of complaint was given to the respondents.

4. Respondent no.1 filed reply thereof maintaining therein that the workman was never employed by respondent no.1 and no master and servant relation exist between respondent no.1 and the workman. Workman was deployed by respondent no.2 as a part of the man-force for executing the work in terms of the agreement dated 18.07.2013 which expired in July, 2014 and thereafter no further contract was awarded to respondent no.2 nor any man-force has been deployed. The respondent No.2 had been paid the bills submitted by him, in terms of the agreement with him. Termination of service of the workman is on the part of respondent No.2 i.e. contractor. In any case, since the workman was never employed in the service of respondent no.1, the question of violation of any service condition during the pendency of the reference No.255/2013 does not arise against respondent no.1. It is prayed that the application may be rejected against respondent no.1.

5. Respondent no.2 also filed reply, maintaining therein that the respondent made an agreement/contract with respondent no.1 for one year in November, 2013 and the respondent ceases to be contractor of respondent No.1 w.e.f. November, 2014. Since the contract expired w.e.f. November, 2014 and there was no work with the respondent, therefore, services of the workman were not required as there was no work or contract. It is prayed that the present petition against respondent no.2 may be dismissed.

Evidence of parties:-

6. In order to prove his case, workman examined himself as WW1 and tendered into evidence his affidavit Ex.WW1/A and has been cross examined by the AR for respondent no.1. AR for workman closed the evidence on 15.10.2019.

7. List of documents, original exhibited with ID No.85/2015 Bir Singh Vs IHBT, photocopy placed in file:-

Sl. No.	Document	Dated	Exhibit
1.	Bill	24.05.2013	Ex.W-1
2.	Bill	22.03.2021	Ex.W-2
3.	Bill	22.03.2021	Ex.W-3
4.	Bill	22.07.2010	Ex.W-4
5.	Bill	23.03.2007	Ex.W-5
6.	Bill	28.03.2007	Ex.W-6
7.	Bill	07.09.2010	Ex.W-7

8. Respondent no.1 has examined Sh. Virender Lamba, Administrative Officer, CSIR-IHBT, Palampur as RW1, who tendered into evidence his affidavit RW1/A along with documents RW-1/1 and RW-1/2 and has been cross examined by AR for workman. AR for respondent no.1 closed the evidence on 13.02.2025.

List of documents:-

Sl. No.	Agreement	Dated	Period
1.	Agreement with M/s Rajiv Sood Trading (Part of Ex.RW-1/1 Colly)	16.10.2008	16.10.2008 to 15.10.2009
2.	Agreement with M/s Rajiv Sood Trading (Part of Ex.RW-1/1 Colly)	16.10.2008	16.10.2008 to 15.10.2009
3.	Agreement with M/s Rajiv Sood Trading(Part of Ex.RW-1/1 Colly)	07.12.2010	07.12.2010 to 06.12.2012
4.	Letter(Part of Ex.RW-1/1 Colly)	01.12.2010	01.12.2010 to 30.11.2012
5.	Agreement with M/s Rajiv Sood Trading (Part of Ex.RW-1/1 Colly)	07.12.2010	07.12.2010 to 06.12.2012
6.	Letter (Part of Ex.RW-1/1 Colly)	01.12.2010	01.12.2010 to 30.11.2012
7.	Agreement with M/s Rajiv Sood Trading (Part of Ex.RW-1/1 Colly)	09.12.2012	09.12.2012 to 08.12.2014
8.	Letter (Part of Ex.RW-1/1 Colly)	04.12.2012	07.12.2012 to 06.12.2014
9.	Agreement with M/s Rajeev Sood Trading Kapoor (Ex.RW-1/2)	19.12.2012	19.12.2012 to 18.12.2014

9. Respondent no.2 has examined Sh. Rajeev Sood S/o Sh. Jyoti Ram Sood, who tendered into evidence his affidavit MW2/A along with documents MW2/1 to MW2/3 and has been cross examined by AR for workman as well as by AR for respondent no.1. AR for respondent no.2 closed the evidence on 03.03.2026.

List of documents:-

Sl. No.	Document	Date	Exhibit
1.	EPF slip		MW2/1
2.	Letter	07.10.2014	MW2/2
3.	Undertaking		MW2/3

Submissions of workman:-

10. While arguing the case, AR for workman contended that in this case, reference was pending before this Tribunal bearing ***ID No.255 of 2013 titled as The General Secretary, Institute of Himalayan Bio-Source Technology (CSIR) Shramik Sangh, Palampur, Distt. Kangra versus The Director, Himalayan Bio-source Technology (CSIR)*** regarding regularization of service and accepting all other demands raised

by union of workers, of which present workman is also a party. During the pendency of that reference, workman was removed from service orally on 28.11.2014 by respondent no.2 without seeking permission from this Court under Section 33(2)(b) of the Act, which is illegal. Workman would be deemed to be in the service of respondent no.1. He further contended that in this case, respondent no.2 was allotted contract by respondent no.1 for the period 19.12.2012 to 18.12.2014. However, the said period was reduced to 30.11.2014 as per Ex.MW2/2 and the workman was paid salary upto 28.11.2014 and on that date, his services were dispensed with. He thus contended that the workman is liable to be reinstated into service.

Submissions of respondent no.1:-

11. While arguing the case, AR for respondent no.1 contended that IHBT i.e. respondent no.1 being subsidiary of CSIR is not covered under the definition of Industry as defined under the Act. To support this view, he place reliance upon ***Central Institute of Medicinal and Aromatic Plants and others versus Sri Rishi Dev Mishra and other (Writ –C No.1005010 of 2006)***.

12. He further contended that there is no master and servant relation between respondent no.1 and the workman. To support this view, he placed reliance upon ***The Joint Secretary, Central Board of Secondary education and another versus Raj Kumar Mishra and another (SLP (C) No.22030 of 2023)***. He further placed reliance upon ***Kirlosker Brothers Ltd. Vs. Ramcharan and others (2022 INSC 1255).*** He further contended that CSIR Service Rules are not applicable to the workman. No appointment letter was given to the workman. He thus contended that the complaint be dismissed.

Submissions of respondent no.2:-

13. While arguing the case, AR for respondent no.2 contended that respondent no.2 has engaged workman and other workmen, who have already filed reference bearing ID No.255/2013 and during the pendency of the case, workman was removed from the service on the asking of respondent no.1 principal employer as per Ex.MW2/2. Further no permission from the competent authority was taken before terminating the services of the workman as it was not necessitated.

Findings:-

14. I have given due consideration to the arguments advanced by Sh. R P Rana (AR for workman), Sh. G S Sidhu (AR for respondent no.1) and Sh. K B Sharma (AR for respondent no.2).

15. First question which arise for consideration is whether the applicant is workman as defined under Section 2(s) of the Act. To my mind, the claimant is a workman within the definition of Section 2(s) of the Act. In this regard, reliance can be made to the decision in the case of ***Devinder Singh Vs. Municipal Council, Sanaur, AIR 2011 Supreme Court 2532***, wherein the Hon'ble Apex Court while interpreting the provisions of Section 2(s) of the Act which deals with the definition of "workman" has observed as under :

> *"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."*

It is clear from the perusal of aforesaid observations that even if a person is engaged on temporary, part time 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 in Section 2(s) of the Act. Thus, nature of appointment or source of appointment is not relevant to be a "workman" within the Act. Since, the workman was engaged on contract basis by respondent no.2 for the work of respondent no.1, thus it would be termed as workman under Section 2(s) of the Act.

16. Next question which arises for consideration is whether respondent no.1 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. Relevant part of judgment of ***Banglore Water Supply & Sewerage Board (supra)*** is reproduced as under:-

> *"Does research involve collaboration between employer and employee? It does. The employer is the institution, the employees are the scientists, para-scientists and other personnel. Is scientific research service? Undoubtedly it is. Its discoveries are valuable contributions to the wealth of the nation. Such discoveries may be sold for a heavy price in the industrial or other markets. Technology has to be plate for and technological inventions and innovations may be patented and sold. In our scientific and technological age nothing has more cash value, as intangible goods and invaluable services, than discoveries. For instance, the discoveries of Thomas Alva Edison made him fabulously rich. It has been said that his brain had the highest cash value in history for he made the world vibrate with the miraculous discovery of recorded, sound. Unlike most inventors, he did not have to wait to get his reward in heaven; he received, it munificently on this gratified and grateful earth, thanks to conversion of his inventions into, money a plenty. Research benefits industry. Even though a research institute may be a separate entity disconnected from the many industries which funded the institute itself, it can be regarded as an Organisation, propelled by systematic activity, modeled on co-operation between employer and employee and calculated to throw up discoveries and inventions and useful solutions which benefit individual industries and the nation in terms of goods and services and wealth. It follows that research institutes, albeit run without profit-motive, are industries."*

17. In the present case, respondent no.1 is doing research work and as per RW1 Sh. Virender Lamba, black tea, rose water, stevia plant, harar, amla and other medicinal plants are sold in the institute. He has also admitted that vide Ex.W1 to W7, various products of the institute have been sold to the customers. Thus, respondent no.1is engaged in systematic activity organized by cooperation between employer and employee (employee being workman in the present case) for the production or distribution of goods and services to calculated to satisfy human wants. In this regard, it is carrying out research. In addition to this, from the research work, benefits are being driven by respondent no.1 and as per observation of Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Banglore Water Supply & Sewerage Board (supra),*** respondent no.1 falls under the definition of 'industry' as defined under the Act.

18. So far as argument of AR for respondent no.1 that respondent no.1 being instrumentality of state does not fall under the definition of 'industry'. In this regard, 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 research and other allied works of selling of goods and earning from research 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. Thus, from every angle, respondent no.1 is an industry. Moreover, its employees are not governed by IHBT Rules or CCS Rules, thus it is an industry. In view of the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court titled as ***Banglore Water Supply & Sewerage Board (supra),*** decided by Hon'ble Supreme Court, the case law ***Central Institute of Medicinal and Aromatic Plants and others (supra)*** decided by Hon'ble High Court at Allahabad cited by AR for respondent no.1 is not attracted to the facts and circumstances of the present case.

20. It is also added here that as per definition of contractor as given in the Section 2(c) of the Contract Labour (Regulation and Abolition) Act, 1970 (hereinafter called as Contract Act), respondent no.2 was supplying contract labour to the respondent no.1. Thus, he would also fall under the definition of contractor. Section 2(c) of the Contract Act is reproduced as under:

> *"Contractor", in relation to an establishment, means a person who undertakes to produce a given result for the establishment, other than a mere supply of goods or articles of manufacture to such establishment, through contract labour or who supplies contract labour for any work of the establishment and includes a sub-contractor;*

21. The workman was doing work i.e. systematic activity for respondent no.1 at the asking of respondent no.2 and there was cooperation between the workman and respondent no.2, which involve substantial commercial element for rendering service to satisfy human wants. Thus, as per ***Banglore Water Supply (supra),*** respondent no.2 would be termed as industry.

22. Next question, which arises for consideration is whether there exists relationship of employer and employee between respondent no.1 and present workman. In this regard, it is pointed out that admittedly in this case, union of workmen has filed ***ID No.255 of 2013 titled as The General Secretary, Institute of Himalayan Bio-Source Technology (CSIR) (supra)***, wherein name of the worker appeared at Sr. No.88 of the list of enclosed by union as Annexure P-4. It is further pointed out that in order to prove relationship of employer and employee i.e. master and servant, the Hon'ble Supreme Court after analyzing the catena of cases has laid down in ***Balwant Raj Saluja Vs. Air India Limited in Civil Appeal No.10266 dated 25.08.2014,*** two well recognized tests to find out whether the labours are the contract employees of the principal employer are:-

(1) Whether the principal employer pays the salary instead of contractor and

(2) Whether the principal employer controls and supervise the work of the employees?

In this case, admittedly, as per statement of Sh. Rajeev Sood (MW2), wages were paid by respondent no.2, however, control was of the respondent no.1. This fact got proved in statement of MW2. Thus, under these circumstances, it is held that there exist relationship of master and servant between respondent no.1 and workman.

23. Further, in the present case, admittedly respondent no.1 is entering into different contract agreements with respondent no.2 (Ex.RW1/1 colly and Ex.RW2/2 as detailed above) by retaining same workmen and thus contracts are sham in view of the observation of Hon'ble Delhi High Court in similar

matter in ***Management of CPWD versus Anand Kumar Gautam and ors. (2024:DHC:2757)***which is as under:

> "*Contract labourers can be engaged for the work of contractor only and not for the work of any establishment. In the present case the work is of the establishment and not of the contractor. The term supply of labour by a contractor is against human dignity. No one can be a supplier of human labour to any establishment. It is the duty of State to give employment to citizen and not of the contractors. Contractors cannot supply labour to any establishment. In view of the above discussion it becomes quite obvious that the contractors workmen in the instant case have been retained all along and contractors have been changed. So the contractor is only a label of a bottle. This label is changed from time to time but the contents of the bottle always remain the same. The contractors have been changed and the workmen have been retained. Such a system is in-human. The contractors are the direct employees of the respondent/management.*
>
> *From the foregoing it becomes quite obvious that these two workmen have been working regularly and even without artificial breaks since 1995-96.* ***The contract is camouflage. There is direct relation of master and servant between the respondent and the workmen."***

24. Hon'ble Supreme Court in case titled as ***Bhilwara Dugdh Utpadak Sahakari S. Ltd. Versus Vinod Kumar Sharma dead by LRs and others (AIR 2011 Supreme Court 3546)*** has held as under:-

> *4. In order to avoid their liability under various labour statutes employers are very often resorting to subterfuge by trying to show that their employees are in fact, the employees of a contractor. It is high time that this subterfuge must come to an end.*
>
> *5. Labour statutes were meant to protect the employees/workmen because it was realized that the employers and the employees are not on an equal bargaining position. Hence, protection of employees was required so that they may not be exploited. However, this new technique of subterfuge has been adopted by some employers in recent years in order to deny the rights of the workmen under various labour statutes by showing that the concerned workmen are not their employees but are the employees/workmen of a contractor, or that they are merely daily wage or short term or casual employees when in fact they are doing the work of regular employees.*

25. Thus, from the above observation of Hon'ble Supreme Court, it is clear that respondent no.1 has resorted to subterfuge by trying to show that workman was employee of respondent no.2.

26. Moreover, respondent no.2 contractor while appearing in the witness box in his deposition has stated that in IHBT, there is practice that the contract for engagement of the employer/labour through contractors is for one year only and it changes on the basis of bid of the contractors every year. The contractor may change but the employees/labourers always remain same. The workman was already working with the management when the contract was tendered to the respondent no.2. Neither the workman was engaged by respondent no.2 nor the services of workman were terminated by respondent no.2. It is the respondent no.1 who uses to select/engage and terminate the labour/workman and respondent no.2 has no role in the same. Thus, it shows that the contract was just an eyewash. It is further submitted that contract was allotted to respondent no.2 by respondent no.1 on different years as per Ex.RW1/1 (colly) and Ex.RW2/2 and sometime to other contractors, meaning thereby the respondent no.1 is controlling authority of the workmen including their engagement, termination etc. and even the wages of workman were also decided by respondent no.1 only and respondent no.2 has no role to play in the same. So, there

exist relationship of employees/servant and employer/master between the workmen and respondent no.1. Thus, the judgment ***The Joint Secretary, Central Board of Secondary education and another (supra)*** cited by AR for respondent no.1 is not attracted to the present case as in this case, time and again, same workers were being engaged through contractor and in view of clear cut dictum of Hon'ble Delhi High Court in ***Management of CPWD (supra),*** the aforementioned case law is not attracted.

27. So far as ***Kirlosker Brothers Ltd. Vs. Ramcharan and others (supra)*** relied upon by the AR for respondent no.1 is concerned, facts and circumstances of this case are distinguishable. In the said ***Kirlosker Brothers Ltd. Vs. Ramcharan and others (supra),*** Court has held that that when there are no allegations or findings of sham and bogus contract then the contention of the reinstatement or the absorption of the workman cannot be sustained but the facts of the matter at hand is different from the facts of the case as in the instant case. In this case, workman was working since long and the work was of perennial nature. Thus, it tantamount to unfair labour practice.

28. It is added here that admittedly in this case, workman was discharged by the respondent no.1 & 2 and as per agreement Ex.RW1/2, contract was awarded to respondent no.2 by respondent no.1 for a period of two years i.e. from 19.12.2012 to 18.12.2014. However, workman was discharged prior to that on 28.11.2014 as per Ex.MW2/2, wherein it is stated by respondent no.1 as under :-

> *The contract for the related forms and field work, as per this institute's letter dated 04-12-2012, is scheduled to expire on November 30, 2014. Therefore, you are hereby informed that you must submit the fully completed EPF payment documents for all the workers employed under these contracts to the concerned EPF department, along with a copy to the institute, by October 2014, so that your final bill can be processed on time. Furthermore, please ensure that there are no outstanding financial dues of any kind for any worker; otherwise, these dues may be recovered from your security deposit.*

29. No prior permission was taken by respondent no.1 & 2 before the discharging the services of workman. Section 33(2)(b) of the Act is very material and the same is reproduced below:-

> *"(b) for any misconduct not connected with the dispute, or discharge or punish, whether by dismissal or otherwise, that workman:*
>
> *Provided that no such workman shall be discharged or dismissed, unless he has been paid wages for one month and an application has been made by the employer to the authority before which the proceeding is pending for approval of the action taken by the employer."*

30. As per aforesaid provision, the workman can be discharged or dismissed after paying one month wages and after getting approval of the competent authority. In this case, no wages for one month was paid nor any permission from competent authority was taken before discharging the workman and consequently, it would be considered that workman was in regular services of the workman. A ***Full Constitutional Bench of Hon'ble Supreme Court*** in case titled as ***Jaipur Zila Sahakari Bhoomi Vikas Bank Ltd. versus Ram Gopal Sharma and others (2002 SCC (L & S) 279)*** has held that failure to make application for approval of the order of discharge or dismissal or withdrawal of such application after making it, held, renders the order of discharge or dismissal void and inoperative.

31. The present application under Section 33A is well maintainable and purpose has also been defined by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Jaipur Zila Sahakari Bhoomi Vikas Bank Ltd. (supra)*** case, which read as follows:-

> *Section 33A is available to an employee and is intended to save his time and trouble in as much as he can straightway make a complaint before the very authority, where the industrial dispute is already pending between the parties, challenging the order of approval instead of making efforts to raise an industrial dispute, get a reference and thereafter adjudication. Section 31 speaks of penalty in respect of the offences stated therein. This provision is not intended to give any remedy to an aggrieved employee. It is only to punish the offender. Merely because penal provision is available or a workman has a further remedy under Section 33A to challenge the approval granted, it cannot be said that the order of discharge or dismissal does not become inoperative or invalid unless set aside under Section 33A.*

32. In view of the above discussion, the termination of workman on 28.11.2014 is bad in law and hence is set aside. In this case, both the respondents in connivance with each other have dispensed the services of the workman. Hence, both respondents are liable. The workman is entitled for reinstatement along with full back wages. It is ordered accordingly. The services of the workman would not be discharged/terminated during the pendency of the ID No.255 of 2013, wherein, they have claimed various demands vide charter of demands dated 09.05.2011. However, in case workman has attained the age of retirement, then he would be entitled for full back wages along with other consequential benefits instead of reinstatement in service.

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

Dated : 04.05.2026 KAMAL KANT, Presiding Officer

Chandigarh

नई दिल्ली, 29 जुलाई, 2026

का.आ. 1609.—औघोगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार **इंडियन बैंक** के प्रबंधतत्र, संबद्ध नियोजको और उनके **कर्मकार** के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औघोगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औघोगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, **हैदराबाद** के **पंचाट (75/2020)** प्रकाशित करती है।

[सं. एल-12025/01/2026-आईआर(बी-I)-152]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 29th July, 2026

S.O. 1609.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the **Award (Ref. 75/2020*)*** of the ***Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court Hyderabad*** as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of **Indian Bank** and **their workman.**

[No. L-12025/01/2026-IR(B-I)-152]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD

Present: Sri IRFAN QAMAR
Presiding Officer

Dated the 18th day of June, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. 75/2020

Between:

1. Tolichukka Yadagiri, Died LRs.
2. Smt. Shobha Rani, W/o Late T. Yadagiri
3. Smt. Swapna, D/o Late T. Yadagiri
4. Smt. Sandhya, D/o Late T. Yadagiri
5. Sri Sandeep Kumar, S/o Late T. Yadagiri

R/o H.No.2-3-761/8/B,

Laxmi Nagar, Golnaka, Hyderabad – 500013

Telangana State. ….. Petitioner(s)

AND

1. The General Manager,
   Indian Bank, Corporate Office,
   254-260, Acai Shanmugham Salai,
   Royapettah, CHENNAI – 600014,
   TAMIL NADU,

2. The Officer Incharge,
   Indian Bank, 3-6-150, Currency Chest,
   Himayath Nagar, Hyderabad – 500 029,
   Telangana State. …. Respondents

Appearances:

For the Petitioner : Sri Y. Ranjeeth Reddy, Advocate

For the Respondent: Sri K. Lakshminarayana & Mrs. Madhuri, Advocates (for R-2)

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. 7/38/2019-B1 dated 7th February, 2020 referred the following dispute under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for adjudication to this Tribunal between the management of Indian Bank and their workman. The reference is,

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Indian Bank, Hyderabad in dismissing the services of Shri T. Yadagiri (Late), Clerk of Himayathnagar, Currency Chest Branch, Hyderabad w.e.f. 25.7.2017 (though superannuated on 31.12.2016 is justified ? If not, what relief the concerned workman is entitled to ?"

The reference was numbered as I.D. No. 75/2020 and notices were issued to the parties concerned. In response of notice Petitioner has filed his claim statement and Respondent has filed counter.

2. **The averments made in the claim statement are as follows**:

As per averments of claim statement, Petitioner was appointed on 21st January, 1981 in Respondent Bank and worked up to 28th December 2016 without any complaints whatsoever in nature with entire satisfaction of his superiors. Respondent issued charge sheet to the Petitioner Sri Y. Yadagiri on 28th December, 2016 with the allegation that on 28th December, 2016 the Petitioner - removed 44 old currency notes of Rs.500/- denomination from the sections meant for shrink warping and kept in his pockets. The Respondent conducted an inquiry and Petitioner participated with the help of defense Assistant and it was submitted that Petitioner was not in a stable mind and not in a position to comprehend/understand the conduct committed by him. Therefore, a request was made to drop the charges levelled against him. Further, it is summitted that the Respondent inspite of Petitioner's request conducted an inquiry and issued the dismissal order dated 25th July, 2017 though he was superannuated on 31st December, 2016. The action of Respondent by issuing dismissal order at the fag end without considering his 35 years of service and without paying any superannuation's benefits is nothing but victimization and said order is illegal and against the principles of natural justice. Further, Petitioner submitted that due to non-payment of terminal benefits like pension and family pension and leave encashment etc., the legal heirs of the Petitioner are facing the financial problems. Therefore, prayed to set aside the dismissal order dated 25th May 2017 and to direct Respondent to pay terminal benefits like family pension and leave encashment etc., to the legal heirs of the Petitioner.

3. Per contra, Respondent in his counter has contended that the Petitioners admitted to pilfer the demonetize notes while on duty in currency chest with mischievous intention and he was caught red-handed and suspended and charge sheeted. As per order dated 25th July, 2017 of Disciplinary Authority it was observed that very act of trying to misappropriate cash of Bank indicates that Petitioner understood the importance of the value of the currency and Petitioner was dismissed from service under clause 6(a) of the Memorandum of settlement after taking Disciplinary Action under prescribed procedure for committing gross misconduct of doing act prejudice to the interest of the Bank. Further, it is contended that Petitioner misused his post in currency chest for his personal advantage and putting at risk/ exposing other officers/ staff of the Bank. Further, it is contended as the misconduct committed by the Petitioner is quite serious in nature and that was proved in properly conducted domestic enquiry, the Disciplinary Authority had found it appropriate unnecessary to impose the punishment of dismissal having lost confidence in his integrity as an employee of the Bank. Further, it is contended that the Petitioner is not entitled for pension/ family pension having been dismissed from service as per Regulation No.22 of Indian Bank (Employees') Pension Regulations, 1995 which provided, "in the case of resignation or dismissal or removal or termination of an employee from the service of the Bank shall entail forfeiture of his entire past service and consequently shall not qualify for pensionary benefits." Further, justifying the dismissal order imposed upon the Petitioner, Respondent has relied upon the decision of the **Supreme Court in the case of 2007 SCC page 15 therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have held :-**

"Once the employer has lost confidence in his employee and the Bonafide loss of confidence is affirmed, the order of punishment must be considered to be immune from challenge, for the reason that discharging the office of trust and conscience requires absolute integrity. A necessary implication which must be engrafted on the contract of service is that the servant must undertake to serve his master with good faith and fidelity. In a case of loss of confidence, reinstatement cannot be directed. Granting such an employee the relief of reinstatement would be an act of misplaced sympathy which can find no foundation in law or in equity."

Further, Respondent has also relied upon the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court therein it has been held such misconduct irrespective of the amount involved and other circumstances shall be dealt with iron hands. Further, Respondent contended that it is settle law that once the charges are to in a properly conducted departmental enquiry, it is exclusive domain of the disciplinary authority to impose the appropriate punishment and courts and Tribunals cannot re-assess the evidence to come a different conclusion even if such conclusions if possibly and intervene into the punishment imposed. Therefore, Respondent has prayed that the Petition be dismissed with costs.

4. Heard arguments of Learned Counsels for Petitioner as well as Respondent. Both parties have also filed their written submissions.

5. Ongoing pleadings of the both the parties following points emerge for determination in the present case:-

I. Whether the departmental enquiry held against the CSE workman is legal and valid?

II. Whether the action of Respondent management Indian Bank, Hyderabad in dismissing the services of Petitioner T. Yadagiri (Late) Clerck of Himayat Nagar, Currency Chest Brach, Hyderabad vid order dated 25th July, 2017 is legal and justified?

III. Whether the Petitioner is entitled for any relief if any?

FINDINGS :-

6. **Issue No.I:-**The validity and legality of the departmental enquiry has been held legal and valid by the Tribunal vide order dated 22nd November, 2024, since the Petitioner has filed memo for not pressing the issue.

Therefore, this issue is decided accordingly.

7. **Issue No.II**:- In the instant matter departmental enquiry held against Petitioner CSE has already been held legal and valid by this Court vide order dated 22nd November, 2024. The perusal of the enquiry proceeding's along with the enquiry report, reveals that there is no fault of any nature in the departmental proceedings. The Petitioner CSE was given fair opportunity of hearing at every stage of proceedings and charge sheet was served upon him by the Respondent Management and CSE has filed his explanation dated 29th December, 2016 and 28th December, 2016 wherein he has accepted his guilt. Further, all the documents filed and relied upon by the Respondent Management Bank in support of charge sheet were served to the CSE and witnesses were examined during the enquiry proceedings in the presence of CSE and as well as his defense representative. The CSE has attended the proceedings and participated at every stage in the enquiry proceedings. On conclusion of the enquiry proceedings Enquiry Officer upon appreciation of oral and documentary evidence, has submitted his findings with reasons holding the CSE guilty of the charges of mis-conduct of pocketing the 44 pieces of notes of Rs.500/- notes, amounting to Rs.22,000/- from packets, during his discharge of the duties. Further, the enquiry report was issued to the

CSE along with show case notice dated 27th June, 2017 issued by Disciplinary Authority to CSE and personal hearing held on 7.7.2017 but CSE did not prefer to submit any ground or shown any cause against the imposition of the proposed punishment during the personal hearing nor submitted any oral or written argument showing as to why punishment, can not be imposed against him. Therefore, the Disciplinary Authority on careful consideration of entire record of the case including CSE employee's explanation to charge sheet, enquiry proceeding and exhibits in the enquiry, the deposition of the witnesses and Presenting Officer's defense brief and finding of the Enquiry Officer, has concluded that charges levelled against CSE is found true and CSE is guilty of committing gross mis-conduct of under clause 5(j) of the memorandum of settlement of Disciplinary Action and procedure adopted there for dated 10th April, 2002 and Disciplinary Authority was pleased to pass following punishment order on the CSE:-

" Considering all the records and circumstances of the case and submissions of the DR/CSE, I confirm the proposed punishment and accordingly impose on the CSE the punishment of 'dismissal without notice' under clause 6-A of the Memorandum of settlement of disciplinary action and procedure There for dated 10th April, 2002 as amended from time to time."

Thus, in view of forgone discussion no case is made out to hold that domestic enquiry suffers from any procedure lapse or was conducted in violation of principles of natural justice. Once it is held that departmental enquiry is legal and proper, the next question arises for consideration is as to whether the punishment imposed on the workman is just and legal or it is disproportionate to the gravity of the charges. The Petitioner has been found guilty of committing gross mis-conduct as mentioned under 5(J) of the Memorandum Settlement of Disciplinary Action and Procedure, 2002. Disciplinary Authority has imposed the punishment of dismissal under clause 6(a) of the Memorandum of Settlement dated 10-04-2002. The clause 6 of Bipartite Settlement dated 10th April , 2002 between Indian Bank Association and AIDA-NP-IN-BEF Indian Banks' Association and AIBEA-NCBE-INBEF on Disciplinary Action & Procedure. Therefore, provides the different categories of punishments for an employee who found guilty of committing gross mis-conduct as mentioned here under:-

"An employee found guilty of gross misconduct may:

(a) be dis-missed without notice; or

(b) be removed from service with superannuation benefits i.e. Pensions and/or Provident Fund and Gratuity as would be due otherwise under the Rules and Regulations Prevailing at the relevant time and without disqualification from future employment; or

(c) be compulsory retired with superannuation benefits i.e. Pensions and/or Provident Fund and Gratuity as would be due otherwise under the Rules and Regulations Prevailing at the relevant time and without disqualification from future employment; or

(d) be discharged from service with superannuation benefits i.e i.e. Pensions and/or Provident Fund and Gratuity as would be due otherwise under the Rules and Regulations Prevailing at the relevant time and without disqualification from future employment; or

(e) be brought down to lower stage in the scale of pay up to a maximum of two stages; or

(f) have his special pay withdrawn ; or

(g) have his special pay withdrawn; or

(h) be warned or censured, or have an adverse remark entered against him; or

(i) be fined."

Thus, it manifest from the above provision contained under clause 6 that apart from dismissal without notice several other categories of punishment has been provided which could be imposed upon an employee found guilty of gross mis-conduct. In the instant matter Disciplinary Authority in its punishment order dated 25th July, 2017 has not assigned any reason why it has preferred to impose the punishment of dismissal without the notice to the CSE and did not consider the other category of punishment provided under clause 6 of the Bipartite Settlement which could have been imposed upon CSE.

As regard power of the Tribunal of interference in the order of imposition of punishment by Disciplinary Authority, Hon'ble Supreme Court in the following case has laid principle as mention here under :-

(a). In the case of B.C. Chaturvedi Vs. Union of India & Ors.3, again a Three Judge Bench of this Court has held:-

"that power of judicial review is not an appeal from a decision but a review of the manner in which the decision is made. Power of judicial review is meant to ensure that the individual receives fair treatment and not to ensure that the conclusion which the authority reaches is necessarily correct in the eyes of the court. The Court/Tribunal in its power of judicial review does not act as an appellate authority to reappreciate the evidence and to arrive at its own independent findings on the evidence. It was held as under:

"12. Judicial review is not an appeal from a decision but a review of the manner in which the decision is made.

Power of judicial review is meant to ensure that the individual receives fair treatment and not to ensure that the conclusion which the authority reaches is necessarily correct in the eye of the court. When an inquiry is conducted on charges of misconduct by a public servant, the Court/Tribunal is concerned to determine whether the inquiry was held by a competent officer or whether rules of natural justice are complied with. Whether the findings or conclusions are based on some evidence, the authority entrusted with the power to hold inquiry has jurisdiction, power and authority to reach a finding of fact or conclusion. But that finding must be based on some evidence. Neither the technical rules of Evidence Act nor of proof of fact or evidence as defined therein, apply to disciplinary proceeding. When the authority accepts that evidence and conclusion receives support therefrom, the disciplinary authority is 3 (1995) 6 SCC 749 entitled to hold that the delinquent officer is guilty of the charge. The Court/Tribunal in its power of judicial review does not act as appellate authority to reappreciate the evidence and to arrive at its own independent findings on the evidence. The Court/Tribunal may interfere where the authority held the proceedings against the delinquent officer in a manner inconsistent with the rules of natural justice or in violation of statutory rules prescribing the mode of inquiry or where the conclusion or finding reached by the disciplinary authority is based on no evidence. If the conclusion or finding be such as no reasonable person would have ever reached, the Court/Tribunal may interfere with the conclusion or the finding, and mould the relief so as to make it appropriate to the facts of each case."

(b). In State of U.P. v. Sheo Shanker Lal Srivastava and Others [(2006) 3 SCC 276], Hon'ble Apex Court have held:-

"The Industrial Courts or the High Courts would not normally interfere with the quantum of punishment imposed upon by the Respondent stating: "It is now well-settled that principles of law that the High Court

or the Tribunal in exercise of its power of judicial review would not normally interfere with the quantum of punishment. Doctrine of proportionality can be invoked only under certain situations. It is now well-settled that the High Court shall be very slow in interfering with the quantum of punishment unless it is found to be shocking to one's conscience."

(c) Further, in the case of **Maharashtra State Road Transport Corporation Vs. Dilip Uttam Jayabhay, the 2022 LLR page 126, wherein the Hon'ble Apex Court held:**

"Once the Enquiry finding is held to be fair and proper, industrial Tribunal or Labour Court lacks jurisdiction to interfere with the quantum of punishment unless the same is shockingly disproportionate to the gravity of conduct."

(d) Further, **in the case of State of Rajasthan Vs. Heem Singh, Civil Appeal No.3340/2020, (supra) Hon'ble Apex Court have held:-**

"33. In exercising judicial review in disciplinary matters, there are two ends of the spectrum. The first embodies a rule of restraint. The second defines when interference is permissible. The rule of restraint constricts the ambit of judicial review. This is for a valid reason. The determination of whether a misconduct has been committed lies primarily within the domain of the disciplinary authority. The judge does not assume the mantle of the disciplinary authority. Nor does the judge wear the hat of an employer. Deference to a finding of fact by the disciplinary authority is a recognition of the idea that it is the employer who is responsible for the efficient conduct of their service. Disciplinary enquiries have to abide by the rules of natural justice. But they are not governed by strict rules of evidence which apply to judicial proceedings. The standard of proof is hence not the strict standard which governs a criminal trial, of proof beyond reasonable doubt, but a civil standard governed by a preponderance of probabilities. Within the rule of preponderance, there are varying approaches based on context and subject……..That is to satisfy the conscience of the court that there is some evidence to support the charge of misconduct and to guard against perversity. But this does not allow the court to re-appreciate evidentiary findings in a disciplinary Enquiry or to substitute a view which appears to the judge to be more appropriate. To do so would offend the first principle which has been outlined above. The ultimate guide is the exercise of robust common sense without which the judges' craft is in vain."

In view of principle laid down by Hon'ble Supreme Court as discussed above, we have to examine in the instant matter whether order of punishment imposed on Petitioner CSE by Disciplinary Authority is of such nature shockingly disproportionate to the gravity of conduct which warrant interference in the order of punishment imposed by Disciplinary Authority. Ongoing order of Disciplinary Authority it manifest that authority failed to discuss the past history of the service of CSE and long duration of 35 years of unblemished service record of the CSE employee in the Respondent Bank. CSE employee has admitted his guilt vide letter dated 28th December, 2016. The alleged pilfered notes recovered from CSE were already demonetized. In the instant case the alleged mis-conduct was committed by the CSE employee on 28th December, 2016 whereas he was going to superannuated from his service just after 3 days i.e. 31st December, 2016. An employee after putting a long period of 35 years of his life into service might have some psychological pressure and confusion in his mind that might have provoke him to commit such mis-conduct at the fog end of his services. There is no past record of mis-conduct of the employee of any nature. Moreover, dismissal order has been passed by the Disciplinary Authority vide order dated 25th July, 2017. It has come on the record that the Petitioner T. Yadagiri died on 14th January, 2019 leaving behind his Widow Smt. Shobha Rani and 3 children. Therefore, keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case, the imposition of other categories of the punishment into clause 6 of Bipartite

settlement should have been considered by the Disciplinary Authority, so that the employee or his family members may not have sufferance of financial constraint after his retirement due to punishment of dismissal without notice.

8. In this context, the reference of decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **_Umesh Kumar Pahwa vs The Board of Directors, Uttarakhand,** Civil appeal no 796799 of 2022 decision dated 11th February, 2022 is relevant. Therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have Held :-

" *Even looking to the charges proved in the departmental proceedings we find that as such, there is no financial loss caused to the Bank and on the contrary a decision was taken by the appellant to reduce the loan amount from Rs.1,50,000/- to Rs.75,000/- in the case of Karamjeet Singh the complainant, which can be said to be the decision in the bank's interest. Moreover, the fact that the appellant had worked for 28 years and during those 28 years there are no allegations against him, in the facts and circumstances of the case, we are of the opinion that the punishment of removal for the charges proved and the misconduct established, is too harsh and disproportionate. However, considering the fact that it can be said to be a case of loss of confidence in the employee by the Bank, we deem it just and proper to substitute the punishment from that of removal of service to that of compulsory retirement."*

Similarly in other case, **Union of Indian and 4 Others vs Dharam Prakash Agarwal, 2025** ASE, page 15975 date of decision 5th February, 2025 Hon'ble High Court Division Bench of High of Judicature at Allahabad, in a similar nature of the case where the Respondent employee have served for 33 years about 34 years and punishment of removal was imposed on workmen was set aside, and order of imposition of punishment from dismissal to compulsory retirement was imposed.

Similarly, in the case of **Brijesh Chandra Dwivedi Vs Sanya Sahayak 2022 SSC** Page no. 819 Hon'ble Supreme Court have held punishment of dismissal imposed is harsh and directed to convert the penalty to compulsory retirement considering the 25 years of long service.

In the case of **Deputy Commissioner KVS & Ors. v. J. Hussain (2014)**, the Hon'ble Supreme Court explicitly outlined the factors that go into determining the proportionality of punishment. The Court stated that authorities must objectively 0consider the nature and gravity of the misconduct, the delinquent's past conduct, the nature of their duties, and any extenuating or mitigating circumstances.

Further, Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Ranjith Thakur vs. Union of India (1987) 4 SCC 611** emphasizing that "all powers have legal limits" invokes the aforesaid doctrine in the following words :-

"The question of the choice and quantum of punishment is within the jurisdiction and discretion of the court-martial. But the sentence has to suit the offence and the offender. It should not be vindictive or unduly harsh. It should not be so disproportionate to the offence as to shock the conscience and amount in itself to conclusive evidence of bias. The doctrine of proportionality a part of the concept of judicial review, would ensure that even on an aspect which is, otherwise within the exclusive province of the court-martial, if the decision of the court even as to sentence is an outrageous defiance of logic, then the sentence would not be immune from correction. Irrationality and perversity are recognized grounds of judicial review."

Therefore, on going discussion and keeping in view of the Law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court and High Court as discussed above, in the instant case Petitioner has put in more than 35 years of his life in long service of Respondent bank without any blemish. Therefore, this Court is of the view that punishment order of Petitioner be substituted from 'dismissal without notice' to 'compulsory retirement'

as provided under clause 6 sub clause (c) of the Bipartite Settlement dated 10th April , 2002 which reads as here under:-

" Be compulsorily retired with superannuation benefits i.e. Pensions and/or Provident Fund and Gratuity as would be due otherwise under the Rules and Regulations prevailing at the relevant time and without disqualification from future employment."

Thus, the claim statement filed by the Petitioner is deserved to be allowed partly.

This Issue No.II is answered according

AWARD

The action of the management of Indian Bank, Hyderabad in dismissing the services of Shri T. Yadagiri (Late), Clerk of Himayathnagar, Currency Chest Branch, Hyderabad w.e.f. 25.7.2017 (though superannuated on 31.12.2016 is not justified. The imposition of the punishment of dismissal without notice on the Petitioner by Disciplinary Authority vide order dated 25.07.2017 is substituted with the punishment provided under Clause 6 (c) of Bipartite settlement order dated 10.4.2002 for compulsory retirement with superannuation benefits i.e., pension, Provident Fund and all benefits as would be due otherwise, under the rules and regulations at the relevant time. The claim of the Petitioner is allowed partly. The reference is answered accordingly.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Dictated to Smt. K. Phani Gowri, Personal Assistant transcribed by her, corrected and signed by me on this the 18th day of June, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner	Witnesses examined for the Respondent
NIL	NIL

Documents marked for the Petitioner

NIL

Documents marked for Respondent

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 29 जुलाई, 2026

का.आ. 1610.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एससीसीएल के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजको और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में **केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण–सह–श्रम न्यायालय,** हैदराबाद के पंचाट (पहचान **संख्या 15/2023)** को प्रकाशित करती है,

[सं. एल-20012/14/2023-आई.आर (सी.एम-I)]

जयदीप यादव, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 29th July, 2026

S.O. 1610.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award **(ID. No. 15/2023)** of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, HYDERABAD** as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the Management of **SCCL,** and their workmen,

[No. L-20012/14/2023–IR (CM-I)]

JAIDEEP YADAV, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD

Present: - **Sri IRFAN QAMAR**

Presiding Officer

Dated the 13th day of July, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. 15/2023

Between:

The Singareni Miners and

Engineering Workers Union (HMS),

C-34, Sector-1, Godavarikhani,

Peddapalli District .....….Petitioner

AND

The General Manager,

M/s Singareni Collieries Co. Ltd,

Ramagundam - II Area,

Peddapalli District ..……Respondent

Appearances:

For the Petitioner : Party in person

For the Respondent: Sri Y. Ranjeeth Reddy, Advocate

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No.L- 20012/14/2023-IR(CM-I) dated 25.05.2023 referred the following dispute under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for adjudication to this Tribunal between the management of M/s Singareni Collieries Co. Ltd, Ramagundam Area-II and their workman. The reference is,

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of management of M/s Singareni Collieries Co. Ltd, Ramagundam Area-II in terminating the services of the workman Sri G. Satyanarayana, Electrician with effect from 22.01.2018 is legal and justified. If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled?"

The reference is numbered in this Tribunal as I.D. No 15/2023 and notices were issued to the parties concerned.

2. Case is fixed for claim statement. Despite service of notice sufficient opportunity, no Claim statement filed by the Petitioner. It seems Petitioner do not want to press the dispute. Therefore, No Claim award is passed.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, P.A., corrected and signed by me on this the 13th day of July, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner	Witnesses examined for the Respondent
NIL	NIL

Documents marked for the Petitioner

NIL

Documents marked for the Respondent

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 29 जुलाई, 2026

का.आ. 1611.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एससीसीएल के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजको और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में **केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण–सह–श्रम न्यायालय,** हैदराबाद के पंचाट (पहचान **संख्या 77/2020)** को प्रकाशित करती है,

[सं. एल-20012/41/2020-आई.आर (सी.एम-II)]

जयदीप यादव, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 29th July, 2026

S.O. 1611.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award **(ID. No. 77/2020)** of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, HYDERABAD** as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the Management of **SCCL,** and their workmen,

[No. L-20012/41/2020–IR (CM-II)]

JAIDEEP YADAV, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD

Present: - **Sri IRFAN QAMAR**

Presiding Officer

Dated the 13th day of July, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. 77/2020

Between:

Sri Sabbani Krishna,

State Genl. Secretary,

Singaren Ikhya Gani Karmika Sangh (AITUC),

MCPI (U), SIGKS Office,

Near Club School, (Welfare Centre),

Main Road, Komaram Bheem Asifabad Dist.,

Bellampalli (TS) – 504251. ....Petitioner

AND

The General Manager,

M/s. Singareni Collieries Co. Ltd,

Ramagundam-I Area Disst.,

Peddapalli – 516130. .…. Respondent

Appearances:

For the Petitioner: Sri K. Muralidhar, Advocate

For the Respondent: Sri Y. Ranjith Reddy, Advocate

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-22012/41/2020-(IR(CM-11)) dated 9.11.2020 referred the following dispute under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for adjudication to this Tribunal between the management of M/s. Singareni Collieries Co. Ltd, and their workman. The reference is,

SCHEDULE

"Whether the demand raised by union namely Singaren Ikhya Gani Karmika Sangh (AITUC), Bellampalli in respect if Sri A. Krishna Hari, Security Guard against the action of the management of M/s. Singareni Collieries Co. Ltd, in not allowing to join duty w.e.f. 16.03.2014 to him in spite of fitness certificate and harassing by issuing charge-sheet on the ground if absenteeism from duty and withholding wages w.e.f. 16.03.2014 is legal and justified. If yes, what relief the workman is entitled to?"

The reference is numbered in this Tribunal as I.D. No 77/2020 and notices were issued to the parties concerned.

2. Petitioner has filed his claim statement as well as Respondent has filed his counter. Despite sufficient opportunity Petitioner failed to adduce any evidence to substantiate his claim in the light of reference how the Respondent is not allowing to the Petitioner to join the duty and causing harassment to the workman. Therefore, in the absence of Petitioner evidence, the claim of the Petitioner is not substantiated by the evidence. Hence, 'No Claim Award' is passed.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, P.A., corrected and signed by me on this the 13th day of July, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner	Witnesses examined for the Respondent
NIL	NIL

Documents marked for the Petitioner

NIL

Documents marked for the Respondent

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 29 जुलाई, 2026

का.आ. 1612.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एफसीआई के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजको और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में **केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण–सह–श्रम न्यायालय,** हैदराबाद के पंचाट (पहचान **संख्या 17/2009)** को प्रकाशित करती है,

[सं. एल-22011/79/2008-आई.आर (सी.एम-II)]

जयदीप यादव, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 29th July, 2026

S.O. 1612.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award **(ID. No. 17/2009)** of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, HYDERABAD** as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the Management of **FCI,** and their workmen,

[No. L-22011/79/2008–IR (CM-II)]

JAIDEEP YADAV, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD

Present: **Sri IRFAN QAMAR**
Presiding Officer

Dated the 10th day of July, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No.17/2009

Between

Smt. G. Gannemma

represented by General Secretary,

F.C.I., Workers Union,

Amadalavalasa,

Srikakulam District. ….. Petitioner/Union

And

1. The Zonal Manager,
   Zonal Office (South),
   F.C.I., Chennai-6, Tamilnadu.
2. The General Manager (Formerly Senior regional manager),
   F.C.I., H.A.C.A.,
   Bhavan, Hyderabad.
3. The District Manager,
   F.C.I., District Office,
   Day and Night Junction,
   Srikakulam, Srikakulam District. ….Respondents

Appearances:

For the Petitioner : Sri K. Sudheer Reddy, Advocate

For the Respondent: M/s B.G. Ravinder Reddy & Y. Ranjeeth Reddy, Advocates

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by vide order No. L-22011/79/2008 (IR-CM-II)) dated 6th April, 2009 has referred the Industrial Dispute under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for adjudication to this Tribunal between the management of Food Corporation of India, and their workman, to the following effect :-

SCHEDULE

"Whether the demand of Food Corporation of India Workers Union Ammadalavalasa, Srikakulam District (A.P.) for regularization of services of Smt G. Gannamma sweeper cum Scavenger of FCI Godowns Ammadalavalasa by the management of Food Corporation of India is legal and justified? To, what relief is the workman is entitled to?"

The reference has been numbered as I.D. No. 17/2009 the notices were issued to the parties concerned.

2. The facts culled out from the record in brief are that, the Petitioner/workman Smt. G. Gannemma was appointed as a Sweeper to work at FSD., FCI., Aamdalavalasa on 5th December, 1979. She was sponsored by the employment exchange and was also required to work at FCI Badangi Godowns in the year 1976. Further, Petitioner averred that her services has been terminated wrongly by the Respondent. Further, it is averred that Industrial Dispute was raised by Workman and the same was referred for adjudication in I.D. No. 15/1992. The Industrial Tribunal after elaborated enquiry has passed an award dated 30.11.1993 directing the management to reinstate Workman into services with full back wages and with continuity of services and also to extend all attendant benefits. In the award the Court has observed that the Workman had worked from 7 A.M to 6 P.M. Further, it is found that Laxmi, Jayadurga, Sanyasamma and Annapurnamma are her juniors. The most juniors namely Neelamma, Ammanna, Adilaxmi, Malla Suramma, Thavitamma, Somamma and Chinnamma has been regularized as (Direct Payment System) Labour and getting Rs.6000/- per month. While, Workman Smt. G. Gannamma has been working since long and was required to perform the duties of Safaiwala cum Scavenger. The above mentioned juniors have been made permanent and their services has been regularized. Whereas the said persons were appointed much later than Smt. G. Gannamma. Further, it is submitted that the management is paying maximum salary per month of Rs.2000/- to her if she attends all the 26 days in a month. The persons who were working as sweepers in direct payment system are getting Rs.6000/- per month. The regularized sweepers are getting a monthly salary of Rs.15,000/- per month. Further, Workman averred that Hon'ble High Court directed Respondent to consider her case for regularization in W. P, No.13685/95 dated 29-12-03 but same was not considered on flimsy grounds, workwomen sent a notice to the Respondents on 2-8-2004, but Respondent did not any reply. Workman submitted that on 9-3-1990 the Zonal Office had issued proceedings to regularize the services of casual and part time sweepers of South Zone, her services has not been regularized. Further, Petitioner submitted that Smt. G. Gannemma filed a Writ Petition W.P.No.21696/2008 for payment of minimum scale of pay and the Hon'ble High Court of A.P., by its order in W.P.No.28321/2008 dated 30-9-2008 has passed an order directing the Respondents to consider payment of minimum scale of pay to her as applicable to the post of sweeper. The Respondent management has victimized Workman by not paying minimum scale of pay and by not regularizing her services. Therefore, Petitioner Union has prayed for direction to Respondent for regularize her service.

4. Per contra, Respondent filed counter, and therein it is contended that the claim statement filed by the Petitioner is neither maintainable in law nor on facts. The allegations made in the claim statement are not correct and are therefore denied. Further, Respondent contended that Workman was appointed as a part-time sweeper on 5-12-1979 on a consolidated payment of Rs. 25/- per month, vide office letter dated 13-12-1979 issued by the Assistant Manager (Depot) FSD, Amadalavalasa. When her services were dispensed with effect from 30-4-1986, Petitioner filed I.D. No. 15 of 1992 and the same was allowed by the Tribunal with a direction to reinstate the claimant into service with full back wages. The W.P.No. 22835/1994 filed by the Corporation was also dismissed. Consequently, Workman was reinstated into service and was paid the back wages also. Further, Respondent submitted that the allegation of Workman

that her juniors were regularized in service is not correct. M/s Laxmi, Jayadurga, Sanyasamma and Annapurnamma were all given appointment under the category of compassionate appointment, on the death of their husbands/fathers, etc. Workman cannot compare herself with the compassionate category employees. As they are in a different category, question of junior/senior does not arise. As regards the employees namely M/s Neelamma Ammanna, Adilaxmi, Malla Suramma, Thavitamma, Semmamma and Chinnammi, they were all working as H&T Labourers. Under the contract labour society, being the members of the said society, and pursuant to the introduction of D.P.S. system, they were inducted as D.P.S. workers. Whereas the claimant is a part time sweeper and therefore question of her induction into DPS System does not arise. Further, it is submitted that as per Staff Regulations, 1971, the Sweeper post is 100% direct recruitment and the aspiring person should be able to read and write any language. Whereas the claimant is neither able to read nor write and accordingly, she is not eligible for the post of sweeper in terms of the Staff Regulations, 1971. Further, it is submitted that Workman had worked as part time sweeper and she is not entitled to be regularized in service. Respondent deemed that junior of her has been regularized so far. In fact, Workman is not eligible for any regularization. Respondent contended that the dispute raised by the claimant is beyond the scope of Section 10 and is accordingly liable to be dismissed. Further, it is submitted that there is no merits in this case and claimant is not entitled to the relief claimed by her.

Further, Petitioner has also filed rejoinder against the counter and submitted that it is true that, the workman was appointed by an appointment letter dated 5.12.1979, as part time sweeper, but she has worked as a full time sweeper. The finding of the Industrial Tribunal in its award in I.D. No. 15/1992 that she worked as a full time sweeper is binding on Respondent. Further, it is submitted that alleged staff regularization 1971 is not applicable to her case as she was appointed in the year, 1979 and has been continuously working as sweeper. Further, it is submitted that question of ability to read and write does not arise as the first time management has come with such pleas. Therefore, Workman has prayed to direct the Respondent to regularize her service as sweeper.

5. In support of the claim statement Petitioner in her oral evidence has examined witness WW1-Smt. G. Gannemma, WW2- Sri Ponnanna Neelayya and WW3- Sri Reddy Yerrayya and Petitioner union has filed photocopies of documents Ex.W1 to Ex.W4. On the other hand, Respondent has examined witness MW1 Sankara Rao Boddu and also filed the documents Ex. M1 to M11.

6. Heard the arguments of either parties. On going the pleadings of both the parties, following issues emerge for determination in this dispute :-

I Whether the demand of Food Corporation of India workman for regularization of services of Smt G. Gannemma, Sweeper cum Scavenger of FCI is legal and justified?

II. To what relief the Petitioner is entitled if any?

Findings:-

7. **Issue No.I**: - This issue pertain to the question whether Petitioner Smt. G. Gannamma is entitled for regularization in the service of the Respondent. In support of averment of claim statement of Petitioner Union, Smt. G. Gannamma has filed chief statement affidavit and therein she has reinstated the averments made in claim statement. The witness WW1 has deposed, that she was appointed as sweeper to work at Food Storage Godown of Food Corporation of India on 5th December, 1979 and in her appointment order it is not mentioned that she was a part time sweeper. WW1 states that she was required to work as a full time sweeper and the Respondent has utilized her services on full time without any break. Further, WW1

states that every year she works more than 240 days and she was required to perform the duties of Safaiwala cum Scavenger. Further,WW1 states that she has been working continuously from 5th December, 1979 till today and having 34 years of continues service, but her services have not been regularized, Whereas her duties are perennial in nature. Further, witness states that the sweepers who were subsequently appointed i.e. Neelamma, Ammanna, Adilaxmi, Malla Suramma, Thavitamma, Somamma and Chinnamma are getting salary more than Workman under Direct Payment System while they are more juniors to the workman.

8. Per contra, Respondent has contended that Workman was appointed as part time sweeper on 5th December, 1979 on consolidated payment of Rs.25 per month vide letter dated 13th December, 1979 issued by Assistant Manager (Depot) FSD, Ammadalavalasa and her services were dispensed with effect from 30th April, 1986. In this context, the Respondent witness MW1 in his chief examination has reiterated the same version that Workman was appointed as a part time sweeper on 5th December 1979. In this context, the Respondent has also filed document the appointment letter dated 5th December, 1979 of the Workman Smt. G. Gannamma. The perusal of appointment letter goes to show that Smt. Gaddapu Gannama of Amadalavalasa was appointed as sweeper on part time basis at the FCI (Depot) Amadalavalasa with effect from 5th December, 1979 at the rate of Rs.25/- per month.

9. Thus, according to the document Ex.M1 manifest that she was appointed as part time sweeper to work in the Respondent office. The claim of the Workman that she was full time sweeper is incorrect and contrary to her appointment letter dated 5th December, 1979 Ex.M1 and not acceptable. Further, her termination letter dated 01.05.1986 also disclose that the Workman's services were terminated with effect from 30.4.1986 as her services was not required by the corporation and therein her designation has also mentioned as termination of Contingency Sweeper. Thus, it is established from document Ex.M1 that she has worked as a part time sweeper in the Respondent office. Thus, the claim of the Petitioner union that she has worked as a full time sweeper is not tenable.

10. Further, as regards the plea of the Workman that her junior namely, Neelamma, Ammanna, Adilaxmi, Malla Suramma, Thavitamma, Somamma and Chinnamma has been regularized in the service and Workman has been denied regularization in the service by the Respondent. In this context, the management witness MW1 has stated that as per Staff Regulation 1971, the sweeper post is 100% direct recruitment and aspiring person should be able to read and write in any language. Whereas the Workman is neither able to read nor write and accordingly she is not eligible for the post of sweeper in terms of Staff Regulation, 1971. Further, it is submitted that the Workman as a part time sweeper is not entitled for regularization. Further, witness MW1 states that no junior of her has been regularized so far.

11. As regard that plea of the Workman that M/s. Neelamma, Ammanna, Adilaxmi, Malla Suramma, Achanamma, her juniors has been regularized. Respondent witness has deposed that all of them are working as Labours under the Contract Labour Society being the member of said society and pursuant to introduction of direct payment system they have been inducted as DPS workers where as the claimant is a part time sweeper. Therefore, question of her induction in DPS system does not arise. However, witness MW1 was cross-examined by the Petitioner counsel, but nothing has been elicited in cross-examination of MW1 to discredit the testimony of the witness. Further, the document Ex.M6-M9 manifest that these are the photocopies of service record of the Jaya Durga, Annapurnamma, Sanyasamma,and K. Laxmi. The perusal of these documents goes to reveal that these employees has been appointed in the deceased quota. Therefore, the Workman cannot claim the parity of these employees for the purpose of her regularization in the service. Whereas the Workman had worked as a part time sweeper. Further, the perusal of copy of

Staff Service Regulation, 1971 Ex.M10 & Ex.M11 goes to reveal that post of the sweeper in the Respondent department are filled up 100% by direct recruitment and in the qualification of post it is specifically mentioned that the candidate should be able to read and write in any language. Whereas, the Petitioner witness WW1 in her testimony has specifically admitted that she cannot either read or write. Therefore, Workman does not fulfill the qualification eligibility for recruitment on the post of Safaiwala/sweeper in the Respondent office as per rules provided under Staff Regulation, 1971.

12. Further, witness WW1 was cross-examined by the Respondent Counsel and in her cross-examination she has stated:

> ***" It is not true to suggest that I was appointed as part time sweeper in 1979. [The Witness adds] I am full time sweeper. I was removed from service in the year 1986. I do not know whether I was given appointment letter stating that I was appointed as part time sweeper in 1979. I do not know whether Lakshmi, Jayadurga, Annapurnamma and Sanyasamma were given compassionate appointments. It is true to suggest that Neelamma, Adilakshmi Suramma, Tavitamma and Chinnammayi are working Labour Co-Operative Society and that they were extended the benefit of Direct Payment System introduced by FCI. I cannot either read or write. The Witness adds that others also illiterates. I do not know whether there is a rule that for a sweeper in FCI the person must know to read and write. It is not true to suggest that since I do not know either to read or write only I was not regularized in service."***

Thus, from the above statement of the Petitioner witness WW1 it is established that Lakshmi, Jayadurga, Annapurnamma and Sanyasamma were given compassionate appointments and she cannot claim parity of these workmen for regularization. This fact is also corroborated by the documents filed in evidence by the Respondent. Therefore, Workman cannot claim the parity of these workmen who have been appointed from the different source i.e. compassionate appointment and cooperative society. Therefore, plea of the Workman in this respect is untenable.

13. As regards the claim of the Workman for regularization in service, the reference of the decisions of the **Hon'ble High Court Himachal Pradesh, Shimla is relevant in the case of Krishna Devi Vs. The BBMB & Others date of decision dated 12th March, 2024**. Therein, Division Bench of Hon'ble High Court in the later patent Appeal have held :-

"10. So far as claim of the petitioner for regularization of her services is concerned, we make it clear that the petitioner cannot claim a fundamental right to be absorbed in service having been appointed on part time basis. The petitioner cannot be said to be holder of a post, since, a regular appointment could be made only by making appointments consistent with the requirements of Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution.

11. An identical issue came up for consideration before the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Secretary to Government School Education Department vs. R. Govindaswamy & others, 2014(4) SCC 769, wherein the respondents, who were part time sweepers and were working for more than 10 years, had come up with a plea for regularization of their services and their petition had been allowed by the High Court. However, the said judgment was set aside by the Hon'ble Supreme Court reiterating that mere continuation of services by a temporary/ad hoc or daily wage employee would not confer upon him/her any right to be absorbed in service. It was held that temporary, ad hoc or daily wage service for a long number of years will not entitle such employee to claim regularization, if he is not .

working against a sanctioned post. Lastly, it was held that sympathy and sentiment cannot be valid grounds for regularization of services in absence of a legal right. The judgment relied upon by the petitioner in Uma Devi's case (supra) was also considered and it was held as under:-

"5. The issue involved here remains restricted as to whether the services of the part-time sweepers could have been directed by the High Court to be regularized. The issue is no more res integra.

6. In State of Karnataka & Ors. v. Umadevi & Ors., AIR 2006 SC 1806, this Court held as under:

"48. .....There is no fundamental right in those who have been employed on daily wages or temporarily or on contractual basis, to claim that they have a right to be absorbed in service. As has been held by this Court, they cannot be said to be holders of a post, since, a regular appointment could be made only by making appointments consistent with the requirements of Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution. The right to be treated equally with the other employees employed on daily wages, cannot be extended to a claim for equal treatment with those who were regularly employed. That would be treating unequals as equals. It cannot also be relied on to claim a right to be absorbed in service even though they have never been selected in terms of the relevant recruitment rules."

7. In Union of India & Ors. v. A.S. Pillai & Ors., (2010) 13 SCC 448, this Court dealt with the issue of regularisation of part-time employees and the court refused the relief on the ground that part- timers are free to get themselves engaged elsewhere and they are not restrained from working elsewhere when they are not working for the authority/employer. Being the part-time employees, they are not subject to service rules or other regulations which govern and control the regularly appointed staff of the department. Therefore, the question of giving them equal .

pay for equal work or considering their case for regularisation would not arise.

8. This Court in State of Rajasthan & Ors. v. Daya Lal & Ors., AIR 2011 SC 1193, has considered the scope of regularisation of irregular or part-time appointments in all possible eventualities and laid down well-settled principles relating to regularisation and parity in pay relevant in the context of the issues involved therein. The same are as under:

"(i) The High Courts, in exercising power under Article 226 of the Constitution will not issue directions for regularisation, absorption or permanent continuance, unless the employees claiming regularisation had been appointed in pursuance of a regular recruitment in accordance with relevant rules in an open competitive process, against sanctioned vacant posts. The equality clause contained in Articles 14 and 16 should be scrupulously followed and Courts should not issue a direction for regularisation of services of an employee which would be violative of the constitutional scheme.

While something that is irregular for want of compliance with one of the elements in the process of selection which does not go to the root of the process, can be regularised, back door entries, appointments contrary to the constitutional scheme and/or appointment of ineligible candidates cannot be regularised.

(ii) Mere continuation of service by a temporary or ad hoc or daily-wage employee, under cover of some interim orders of the court, would not confer upon him any right to be absorbed into service, as such service would be "litigious employment". Even temporary, ad hoc or daily-wage service for a long number of years, let alone service for one or two years, will not entitle such employee to claim regularisation, if he is not working against a sanctioned post. Sympathy and sentiment cannot be grounds for passing any order of regularisation in the absence of a legal right.

(iii) Even where a scheme is formulated for regularisation with a cut-off date (that is a scheme providing that persons who had put in a specified number of years of service and continuing in employment as on the cut-off date), it is not possible to others who were appointed subsequent to the cut-off date, to claim or contend that the scheme should be applied to them by extending the cut-off date or seek a direction for framing of fresh schemes providing for successive cut-off dates.

(iv) Part-time employees are not entitled to seek regularisation as they are not working against any sanctioned posts. There cannot be a direction for absorption, regularisation or permanent continuance of part-time temporary employees.

(v) Part-time temporary employees in government-run institutions cannot claim parity in salary with regular employees of the Government on the principle of equal pay for equal work. Nor can employees in private employment, even if serving full time, seek parity in salary with government employees. The right to claim a particular salary against the State must arise under a contract or under a statute." (Emphasis supplied)"

Further, **Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of Union of India Vs. ILMo Devi, AIR 2021 Supreme Court 4855, Aironline 2021 SC 864, date of decision on 7th October, 2021**, have held :-

"The observations made in paragraph 9 are on surmises and conjunctures. Even the observations made that they have worked continuously and for the whole day are also without any basis and for which there is no supporting evidence. In any case, the fact remains that the respondents served as part-time employees and were contingent paid staff. As observed above, there are no sanctioned posts in the Post Office in which the respondents were working, therefore, the directions issued by the High Court in the impugned judgment and order are not permissible in the judicial review under Article 226 of the Constitution. The High Court cannot, in exercise of the power under Article 226, issue a Mandamus to direct the Department to sanction and create the posts. The High Court, in exercise of the powers under Article 226 of the Constitution, also cannot direct the Government and/or the Department to formulate a particular regularization policy. Framing of any scheme is no function of the Court and is the sole prerogative of the Government. Even the creation and/or sanction of the posts is also the sole prerogative of the Government and the High Court, in exercise of the power under Article 226 of the Constitution, cannot issue Mandamus and/or direct to create and sanction the posts.

8.5 Even the regularization policy to regularize the services of the employees working on temporary status and/or casual labourers is a policy decision and in judicial review the Court cannot issue Mandamus and/or issue mandatory directions to do so. In the case of R.S. Bhonde and Ors. (supra), it is observed and held by this Court that the status of permanency cannot be granted when there is no post. It is further observed that mere continuance every year of seasonal work during the period when work was available does not constitute a permanent status unless there exists a post and regularization is done."

Thus, in view of the foregone discussion and law laid down by Hon'ble High Court on going the evidence on record, the claim of the Workman for regularization is not tenable as she has worked as the part time employee and has not worked against any sanctioned post in the Respondent Management. Therefore, there cannot be a direction for absorption, regularization of part time temporary employees in government run institutions cannot claim parity in salary with regular employees of the Government on the principle of equal pay of equal work. Therefore, in view of foregone decision a law laid down by the Apex Court discussed, the claim of the Workman for regularization into service of Respondent is not maintainable.

14. Thus, in view of the foregone discussion the claim of the Workman is not tenable as she has worked as the part time employees and has not worked against any sanctioned post in the Respondent Management. Therefore, the claim of the Workman for regularization into service of Respondent is not maintainable, hence liable to be dismissed.

Thus, Issue No.I is decided against Petitioner/ workman.

15. **Issue No.II**:- In view of discussion and finding given at Issue No.I, the Petitioner/workman is not entitled for regularization in service of the Respondent. Therefore, she is not entitled to any relief and claim petition filed by the Petitioner sans merit, hence liable to be dismissed.

Thus, Issue No.II is decided accordingly.

AWARD

In view of the findings given at Issue Nos. I & II, the demand of Food Corporation of India Workers Union, Amadalavalasa, Srikaakulam Distt. for regularization of services of Smt G. Gannemma, Sweeper cum Scavenger of FCI is neither legal nor justified. The workman is not entitled for any relief. The reference is answered accordingly.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Dictated to Smt. K. Phani Gowri, Personal Assistant, transcribed by her, corrected and signed by me on this the 10th day of July, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner	Witnesses examined for the Respondent
WW1: Smt. G. Gannemma	MW1: Sri B. Sankara Rao
WW2: Sri Ponna Neelayya	
WW3: Sri Reddy Yerrayya	

Documents marked for the Petitioner

Ex.W1: Photostat copy of notice issued to union by Conciliation officer

Ex.W2: Photostat copy of minutes of conciliation proceedings

Ex.W3: Photostat copy of lr. of FCI HQtrs dt. 23.12.2010/4.2.2011 for implementation of EPF

Ex.W4: Photostat copy of FCI zonal office lr. dt. 16.2.1982

Documents marked for the Respondent

Ex.M1: Photostat copy of appointment lr. dt. 5.12.79

Ex.M2: Photostat copy of office order dt.1.5.86

Ex.M3: Photostat copy of award in ID 15/1992

Ex.M4: Photostat copy of order in WP 22835/1994

Ex.M5: Photostat copy of order passed in WP 13685/1995

Ex.M6: Photostat copy of service record of Smt. Jayadurga, Sweeper

Ex.M7: Photostat copy of service record of Smt.Annapurnamma, Sweeper

Ex.M8: Photostat copy of service record of Smt. Sayasamma, Sweeper

Ex.M9: Photostat copy of service record of Smt. K. Laxmi, Sweeper

Ex.M10: Photostat copy of office order dt. 25.9.1999

Ex.M11: Photostat copy of staff regulations

नई दिल्ली, 29 जुलाई, 2026

का.आ. 1613.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14)की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार भारतीय खाद्य निगम के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजको और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में **केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण–सह–श्रम न्यायालय,** भुवनेश्वर के पंचाट (सन्दर्भ संख्या **35/2023**) को प्रकाशित करती है,

[सं. एल-22013/01/2026-आई.आर (सी.एम-II)]

जयदीप यादव, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 29th July, 2026

S.O. 1613.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award **(Reference. I.D. No. 35/2023** of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court,Bhubaneswar** as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the Management of **Food Corporation of India** and their workmen,

[No. L-22013/01/2026–IR (CM-II)]

JAIDEEP YADAV, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, BHUBANESWAR

Present:

Sri Dinesh Kumar Singh,

Presiding Officer, C.G.I.T.-cum-Labour Court,

Bhubaneswar.

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE CASE NO. 35/2023

Date of Passing Order – 6th February, 2026

Between :-

Sri Bedvyas Meher,

S/o. Ganesh Meher, At. Malimunda, Jamadarpara,

P.O./P.S./Dist. Jharsuguda.

… Applicant-Workman.

(AND)

1. General Manager, (Regional Office),

Food Corporation of India,

At Satsang Vihar, Vani Vihar, Bhubaneswar.

2. The District Area Manager,

Food Corporation of India, Dist. Office, Sambalpur,

At./Po. Farm Road, (Khetrajpur), Dist. Sambalpur.

3. Managing Director, M/s. SIS India Ltd.,

2nd Floor, Patanjali Chikitsalaya,

Shanti Nagar, Sambalpur.

… Opp. Partes-Managements.

Appearances:

None. … For theO.Ps-Managements.

None. … For the Applicant-Workman.

ORDER

This is an application of applicant-workman filed under section 2-A(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act (herein-after referred as an act).

2. The case of the applicant-workman as per his statement of claim is that he was working as Security Staff at the depots of the Management of FCI at Balijhari under direct supervision and control of the Management No. 2 through contractors but he was disengaged from 16.11.2019 and such action of the management is an unfair labour practice. He approached labour machinery but no result was yielded. Hence he has filed the present claim petition.

The applicant-workman has prayed that his claim may be allowed and he may be reinstated in service with all consequential service benefits including back wages with the finding that his disengagement is in violation of the statutory provisions including violation of Section 33 of the I.D. Act, 1947.

3. The Managements have not appeared and have not filed any written statements.

4. Applicant-workman is asked to appear for hearing on the admission of the case. However, despite providing a number of opportunities, applicant-workman has not turned up to participate in the hearing on admission of the case. As the applicant-workman has not turned up for hearing on admission of his case, his claim stands dismissed.

5. Order is passed accordingly.

6. A copy of this order is sent to the appropriate government for notification as required under section 17 of the I.D. Act, 1947. File is consigned to record room.

Dictated & Corrected by me.

DINESH KUMAR SINGH, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 29 जुलाई, 2026

का.आ. 1614.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एससीसीएल के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजको और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में **केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण–सह–श्रम न्यायालय,** हैदराबाद के पंचाट (पहचान **संख्या 7/2023)** को प्रकाशित करती है,

[सं. एल-22012/14/2023-आई.आर (सी.एम-II)]

जयदीप यादव, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 29th July, 2026

S.O. 1614.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award **(ID. No. 7/2023*)*** of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, HYDERABAD** as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the Management of **SCCL,** and their workmen,

[No. L-22012/14/2023–IR (CM-II)]

JAIDEEP YADAV, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD

Present: - **Sri IRFAN QAMAR**

Presiding Officer

Dated the 13th day of July, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No.7/2023

Between:

The General Secretary,

Singareni Collieries Karmika Sangh,

Regd. No. E-12 (Affiliated to ABKMS-BMS),

H.No. 10-1-208, Opp IOB,

Near Singareni Head Office, Kotagudam,

Telangana – 507101. …..Petitioner

AND

The Chairman and Managing Director,

Singareni Collieries Company Limited,

KOTHAGUDAM – 507101 ….Respondent

Appearances:

For the Petitioner: M/s. G. Sai Prangen & P. Sudheer Rao, Advocates

For the Respondent: Sri Y. Ranjeeth Reddy, Advocate (For R1)

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-22012/14/2023-IR(CM-II) dated 21.02.2023 referred the following dispute under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for adjudication to this Tribunal between the management of Singareni Collieries Company Limited, and their workman. The reference is,

SCHEDULE

"Whether the demand of Union i.e. Singareni Coal Mines Karmika Sangh for payment of 38 days to Shri T. Narendra Babu, ex. Dy Superintendent (Rtd), EC No. 0153235 by adjusting the sick leaves, standing in his credit at the time of superannuation, for the period of absenteeism on account of alleged illegal transfer during the period from 11.1.2019 to 01.03.2019 is proper legal and justified? If yes, what relief the workman concerned is entitled to and what directions are necessary in this regard?"

The reference is numbered in this Tribunal as I.D. No 7/2023 and notices were issued to the parties concerned.

2. On the date fixed for Petitioner's evidence, Petitioner called absent. Despite providing sufficient opportunity Petitioner did not adduce any evidence to substantiate his claim. Therefore, a 'No claim' award is passed for want of evidence.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, P.A., corrected and signed by me on this the 13th day of July, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner	Witnesses examined for the Respondent
NIL	NIL

Documents marked for the Petitioner

NIL

Documents marked for the Respondent

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 28 जुलाई, 2026

का.आ. 1615.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एस बी आई भारत का के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजको और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में **केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण–सह–श्रम न्यायालय,** हैदराबाद के पंचाट **(सन्दर्भ संख्या 47/2002)** को प्रकाशित करती है,

[सं. एल-12012/251/2000-आई.आर (बी-I)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 28th July, 2026

S.O. 1615.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Reference.I.D.No. 47/2002) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Hyderabad as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the Management of SBI of India and their workmen,

[No. L-12012/251/2000–IR (B-I)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

In The Central Government Industrial Tribunal Cum Labour Court At Hyderabad

Present: **Sri IRFAN QAMAR**

Presiding Officer

Dated the 11th day of May, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. 47/2002

[Old ID No. 139/2000 of Industrial Tribunal No. I, Hyderabad]

Between:

Sri G. Anil Kumar,
S/o G. Surya Narayana,
R/o. 16-6-652, Osmanpura,
Chaderghat,
Hyderabad-500024. A.P. … Petitioner

And

The Assistant General Manager,
(Personnel & HRD Deptt.),
State Bank of India,
Local Head Office,
Bank street Koti,
Hyderabad – 500 095. …...Respondent

Appearances:

For the Petitioner : Sri Macherla Rangaiah, Advocate

For the Respondent: Sri Y. Ranjeeth Reddy, Advocate

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-12012/251/2000-IR(B.I) dated 16.10.2000 referred the following dispute under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 to Industrial Tribunal No. I, Hyderabad for adjudication and later the same has been transferred to this Tribunal bearing ID No.139/2000, as per orders of Central Government vide Lr.No.H-11026/1/2001-IR(C.II) dated 18.10.2001, requiring this forum to decide the question:

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of State Bank of India, Local Head Office, Hyderabad in terminating the services of Sri G. Anil Kumar, Temporary-Non Messenger, by way of oral orders w.e.f. 31.3.1997 is justified? If not, what relief the workman is entitled?"

After receipt of the reference, it was numbered as ID No. 47/2002 and notices were issued to both the Workman and the management.

2. Before unfolding the factual matrix of the instant industrial dispute it would be apposite to have a bird eye view of a chequered history of the instant industrial dispute. Earlier instant industrial dispute along with the batch cases was decided by this Tribunal vide common award dated 17.5.2005 and the reference was answered in favour of the Respondent and against the Workman. That said common award dated 17.5.2005 was challenged by the aggrieved Workmen in various Writ petition No.6470/2014 along with batch of writ petitions before the Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh and Hon'ble High Court vide its' judgement dated 23.6.2014 allowed all batch of writ petitions and set aside the common award dated 17.5.2005 passed in ID No.222 of 2001 and other batch of ID cases by Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad and the Respondent management of State Bank of India was directed to reengage the Writ Petitioners in position, which they have been occupying prior to their termination and further directed to consider their cases for regularization as and when the substantive vacancy arises. This judgement dated 23.6.2014 of Hon'ble High Court of AP, passed in WP No.6470/2014 and batch petitions was challenged by Respondent management before the Hon'ble High Court in Writ Appeal No. 1268 of 2014. The aforesaid Writ Appeals No.1268/2014 and other Writ Appeals were decided by Division Bench of High Court of Andhra Pradesh by a common judgement dated 20.3.2019. Hon'ble High Court in aforesaid Writ Appeal was pleased to pass the order which is extracted as below:-

" 7. Hearing the learned senior counsel for the SBI and the learned senior counsel for the contesting unofficial Respondents, we see that while the learned single Judge was justified in setting aside the award af the Tribunal, the proper course to be adopted was to remit all the cases to the Tribunal. This we say for reasons more than one. Firstly, in such matters, claims have to be decided on individual basis, as different persons have different claims as to the length of officiation or discharge of duties and functions; quality of engagement, drawings, accounting of the post for each one of them, who have worked etc. AIl these issues will not be the same in all the cases. Therefore, each case ought to have been directed to be decided by the Tribunal afresh on individual basis. The second and most important aspect is the learned single Judge has in one go ordered re-employment of all the workmen. This is not a relief that could have been granted without answering the individual issues; each issue relating to each case could not have been decided by the writ Court within the format of its adjudication procedures and scope. The adjudicating body, which has to do that activity, is the Industrial Tribunal. Therefore, we are of the view that while we would sustain the order of the learned singe Judge insofar as it interfered and sets aside the award of the Tribunal, the further findings and directions, issued through the impugned order have to go and the individual cases have to be sent back for consideration of the Tribunal. Such further procedure before the Tribunal will have to be carried forward with the materials already on record and also by affording an opportunity to the persons, who have claims as well as the management to place their rival contentions and further material before the Tribunal. The learned counsel appearing for the workmen are justified in pointing out that enormous delay has already happened and further action by the Tribunal in this line may be expedited.

9. In the result, these writ appeals are ordered;

(1) affirming the impugned common order of the learned single Judge to the extent it sets aside the common award dated 17.05.2005 of the Industrial Tribunal;

(2) the further findings and directions issued through the impugned common order are vacated:

(3) all the matters shall be remitted to the Industrial Tribunal with a direction to dispose of them within an outer limit of five (5) months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order; and,

(4) the parties to make appearance before the Tribunal on the given date."

Thus, in view of the above direction of Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh in W.A.No.1268 of 2014 and batch cases. This Tribunal has taken up the matter of industrial dispute for hearing and deciding it afresh in view of the aforesaid guidelines laid down by the Hon'ble High Court in Writ Appeal No.1268/2014 vide judgement dated 20.3.019.

3. The factual matrix of instant industrial dispute as narrated by the Workman in his claim statement are that, the he joined the service of the Respondent Bank at the workman joined in the services of the Management Institution as Non-Messenger on 1988 to 1997 and rendered unblemished service spreading over a period of about 10 years, and by dint of hard work till his services were terminated by oral orders with till his services where terminated by oral orders with effect from 1.04.1997. Further, it is submitted that the management of Respondent bank decided to give a chance to temporarily employed personnel "found suitable for permanent appointment" by wait- listing them by offering permanent appointment or waitlisting till such opportunity arises.

4. That on 17.11.1987 a settlement was reached between All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and the Management of State Bank of India - settlement one, under this settlement three categories of employees were listed. That is, A) those who have completed 240 days in 12 months or less after 1.7.1975. B) those who have completed 270 days in any continuous block of 36 calendar months after 1.7.1975. C) (i) those who have completed minimum of 30 days aggregate temporary service in any calendar year after 1.7.1975 or (ii) 70 days aggregate temporary service in continuous block of 36 months after 1.7.1975.

5. The persons who satisfied in all the above 4 categories were to be interviewed by a selection committee and the said selection committee would determine the suitability of the said candidate for permanent appointment. Therefore, the bank prescribed certain qualifications and from among the candidates satisfying the qualifications the suitable candidates were enlisted by a selection committee. The Clause 7 of the said agreement provided with the selected candidate would be wait listed in order of their respective categorization and the selected panel would be valid upto December, 1991. Clause 10 of the settlement specifically provided that henceforth. "there will be no temporary appointments in the subordinate cadre", except on a restrictive basis in the specified category, "from amongst empanelled candidates as per existing guidelines of the bank". The Workman further submits that consequent upon the said agreement and the draft, a notification was issued in the newspapers. The last date for responding to the advertisement was 30.8.1988. A written examination followed by viva-voce in May, 1989 was held. A selected panel was prepared, as per Clause 7 of the agreement, ie. Settlement No.1, the selected panel was to be valid upto December, 1991, the Workman submits that circular was issued on 26.4.91 by the said letter it is mentioned that the terms of the agreement dated 17.11.87 was modified vide second agreement dated 16.7.88 was entered into between the parties. In terms of the said agreement a chance was to be given, "to all eligible temporary employees for permanent appointments. The appointments were

against the vacancies likely to arise during the years 1995-96, circular made it clear that in view of the enormity of the problem an extension of the currency of the panel, eligible temporary employees who have been empanelled could not appear in the earlier interviews and have been pursuing their cases thereafter, "will be given another chance to appear for interview".

6. Workman submits that there were total five settlements. The settlement dated 17.11.87 is the 1st settlement (Ex M1), settlement dated 16.7.88 is 2nd settlement (Ex M2), settlement dated 27.10.88 is the 3rd settlement (Ex M3), then settlement dated 9.1.91 is 4th settlement and settlement dated 30.7.96 is 5th settlement (Ex M6). In between there is minutes of conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.95 marked as Ex M5. That due to all these settlements which were extended by subsequent settlements thereby created reasonable expectations in the list of the selected candidates arose with that it's a question of time their appointments or services would be regularized in the services of the bank. The Workman was working with the bank on temporary basis was under the bonafide hope that sooner his services will be regularized with the bank. He is thereby closed all his options elsewhere. It is needless to point out that employing person to whom hope of employment in substantial terms was made is a facet of Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

7. Further Workman submits that the Government of India issued Circular No. F-3/3/104/87-IR, dated 16.8.1990. Under said circular the chief Executives of all public sector banks including the Management herein were specifically instructed that until the problem of existing temporary employees is fully resolved, no bank is permitted to make any permanent appointments. That some of the persons similarly situated like this Workman aggrieved by the inaction on the part of the management of the bank is not regularizing their services from out of the selected panel and not clearly focusing the vacancy position, filed W.P. No. 4194/97 before Hon'ble High court of A.P.. It is specifically averred in the said writ petition that the Management of the bank had failed to implement the settlement and that it violates the various fundamental rights guaranteed under the constitution of India. The Hon'ble High court of A.P .. by order dated 5.3.97 directed the bank to implement the settlement as amended from time to time. It also directed the bank to carry out the terms of settlement before the expiry of March, 1997. The Hon'ble High Court also recorded finding that the Bank cannot escape its liability of enforcement of the Settlement. In view of the directions given by the High Court all candidates whose names appeared in the select panels prepared on the basis of the agreement entered into on 17.11.87 under which the panel was valid upto December, 1991, and on the basis of a settlement dated 27.10.1988 whereby the panels were made alive upto 31.3.1997 under which the panel was valid upto December, 1999. The other agreement dated 16.7.1988 under which the panel was valid upto 1992 and on the basis of the settlement dated 27.10.1998 whereby the panels were made alive upto 31.3.1997 were under the bonafide impression that their cases will be considered for regularization and were living on the basis of the said reasonable expectation. Unfortunately, contrary to the aforesaid directions given by the High Court and contrary to the settlements entered into between the parties, the bank issued proceedings dated 25.3.1997, dated 27.3.1997 and 31.3.1997 instructing the various authorities of the Management not to continue the temporary employees those who are in services of the bank from 1.4.97. The said order was followed by the Management. Aggrieved by the said action the Workman herein and similarly situated candidates have filed a writ petition before the Hon'ble High Court and by way of Writ Petition No.9206/97 seeking a declaration that the proceedings issued by the Deputy General Manager and the Assistant General Manager (Respondents 3,4 and 5 therein) on 25.3.97, 27.3.97 and 31.3.97 as illegal and also non-continuance of the Workmen therein in service by absorbing them in the services of the bank as violative of Section 2(p) and 18(1) read with Rule 58 of Central Rules and sought for specific direction to the bank to absorb them in service.

8. Further, Workman submits that in the counter affidavit filed in Writ Petition No.9206/97, the bank has submitted that it has about 805 branches in Andhra Pradesh alone. It has stated that due to exigencies of circumstances and on account of the urgent need in its banks, it employed temporary employees in subordinate cadre. It is pertinent to mention that it does not state the urgent or need or the nature of temporary employees that it had engaged. Enquiry into the same would reveal that the stand taken by the bank either on the ground of urgent need or of temporary employees is a façade to perpetuate unfair labour practice. It is designed to on the one hand, keep the employed in the erroneous zone of hope and on the other to ensure that benefits that a model employer will extend under various statutes to its employees is not required to be borne out by the bank. A reading of the counter affidavit would show that the bank would opines that being just fair and reasonable are which obviously is reprehensible and is a facet of unfair labour practice.

9. The Workman submits that the bank had referred in its counter affidavit to three settlements dated 17.11.87, 16.7.88 and 27.10.88. The bank in the guise of extending the benefits of the circular of Government dated 16.8.90 stated in its counter affidavit that as follows:

"Government of India, vide its letter dated 16.8.1990, issued guidelines to all the public sector banks with regard to recruitment and absorption of temporary employees in public sector banks. The said guidelines were issued to implement on the lines of the approach paper on the issue provided by a committee constituted in this regard. The Government of India guidelines made it clear that all the public sector banks may follow the provisions laid down in the approach paper.

The approach paper specified that the cases of temporary employees who had put in not less than 240 days of temporary service in 12 consecutive Months and who are entitled to benefit of Section 25-F may be decided by entering into a settlement with the representative union. In respect of temporary employees who had put in less than 240 days of service in 12 consecutive months or less, a settlement could be avoided and however if the Management so desired, they could enter into a conciliation settlement with the representative union. Para 6(h), it is mentioned that only those temporary employees who had put in temporary service of 90 or more days after 1.1 1982 would be eligible for considering under the scheme. Although the Government guidelines envisaged for a settlement in respect of employees who had put in temporary service of 90 or more days, the bank by way of further concession entered into settlements Even in respect of those who had put in less than 90 days. As such, it could be Seen that the settlements are more beneficial to the temporary employees concerned. The approach paper also specify at para 6(c) that the banks would provide one time opportunity to all the temporary employees and for that purpose temporary employees worked in the bank on or after 1.1.1982 could be considered for re-employment in terms of the scheme. The Respondents have gone further wherein even persons working after 1975 were also considered.

As could be seen from the above, there was a genuine effort on the part of the Respondent bank to provide permanent employment for as many as possible subject to availability of the vacancies.

It is further submitted that at para 6(k) of the approach paper, it was made clear that this would be one time exercise in full and final settlement of all the aims and disputes for the past period in respect of temporary workmen covered by the settlement. This would mean that the Government of India guidelines would cover only those persons who were temporarily employed for the period specified therein and not otherwise. As such, it is submitted that the Respondents have not only followed the Government of India guidelines but in fact covered cases of the employees who had worked for less than 90 days. As such, question of violation does not arise and in any case those were only broad guidelines and not directives".

10. The Workman submits that the bank also referred a subsequent settlement dated 9.1.1991 wherein there is a clause to the effect- that the panel of temporary employees and the panel of daily wage employees will be operated to a particular period. Therefore, their cases will not be considered. The Management herein relying upon this settlement in their impugned action. It is submitted that even the settlement dated 9.1.1991 will not empower the management to terminate the services of the temporary employees who are working in the bank services like the Workman herein as it does not specify the termination of the employees. In fact there are so many vacancies wherein the Management has engaged several new persons as temporary messengers/ attendars/ sweepers etc., even after the judgment of Hon'ble High Court without considering the cases of the similarly situated candidates like the Workman herein. It is submitted inspite of engaging fresh candidates as is now being done by the Management they would have continued the similarly situated candidates like the Workman herein in the services of the bank and consider their cases for absorption in view of the circulars issued by Central Government as well as the directions of this Hon'ble Court in Writ Petition No.4194/97, dated 5.3.97. In view of the circulars issued by the Central Government, the Management should not have relied upon the settlement dated 9.1.1991. Hence, the impugned action of the Management is illegal, unjust, violative of fundamental rights such as Articles 14,16 and 21 of the Constitution of India.

11. The Workman submits that in W.P. No.4194/97 filed by the union of temporary employees where in they have complained about the non- implementation of the settlements arrived between the parties and sought for absorption. Such employees in the bank services on permanent basis before the date fixed for carrying out the terms of settlement, the Court held that the members of the union had been empanelled in the list, they were not regularized and the time was going to run out to the near future and the Respondent bank and its officers cannot escape from the liability of enforcing the settlement which has been reached and therefore directed that the bank and the officers shall implement the settlement dated 17.11.87 as amended from time to time before the expiry of 31.3.97.

12. Further, it is submitted that in the clause of Settlement it is specifically mentioned that the workmen to be absorbed/appointed in the bank prohibiting any temporary appointments subsequent to the date of settlement even the authorities want to make temporary appointments that should be made only from among the empanelled can be appointed either for temporary vacancy or permanent vacancy except from among the empanelled candidates like the Workman and that should be continued till they are absorbed. The management committed unfair labour practices and terminated the services of the candidates with effect from 1.4.1997 which is arbitrary, discriminatory, contrary to their own guidelines and violative of the constitutional provisions which are guaranteed in Chapter-III of the Constitution of India.

13. The Workman submits that it is strange as to how the panels were allowed to lapse by a so-called Memorandum of Understanding dated 25.2.1997, that the action of terminating such employees like the Workman by virtue of an impugned oral proceedings without implementing the settlement would be illegal and unfair labour practice which cannot be allowed to be perpetuated. That the discontinuance of the Workman after 31.3.97 who had served in the bank in any capacity amounts to retrenchment. It could not have been done without any notice and it violates Sec.25FF of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and the said action is violative of principles of natural justice guaranteed under Chapter III of the Constitution of India. This amounts to retrenchment without one month's notice and taken in view of such notice. Thus, the main proceedings issued by the Respondent is without jurisdiction and is arbitrary, illegal and therefore liable to be quashed. That the alleged Memorandum of Understanding dated

27.2.97, Ex.M5 does not own any legal entity, as the said Memorandum of Understanding is not published anywhere to brought to the notice of the Workman whose rights are being affected. It is submitted that Management did not adhere to the procedure envisaged by the Central Government in its' instructions dated 16.8.90 in the year 1995. The same was not followed in the year 1997 despite there being vacancies. The management has followed the procedure of calling candidates through Employment exchange instead of giving chance to the empanelled candidates like the Workman here. It is pertinent to mention here that the Respondent Management sent letters to the all similarly situated candidates like the Workman in the month of June, 1997, subsequent to the passing of impugned termination orders. After knowing the facts that the candidates are litigating, the Management refused to engage these candidates. It is once again reiterated that the panels are meant for absorption but not for termination. It was the duty of the Management to engage the empanelled candidates like the Workman even in temporary vacancies till they are absorbed permanently in regular vacancies. Hence, the action of the Respondent Management terminating the services of the Workman by oral order dated 31.3.97 is unjust, illegal, violative of principles of natural justice and hence, the Management be directed to reinstate and absorb the Workman and to grant all incidental and consequential benefits.

14. Per contra, Respondent had filed counter and made a contentions that the reference is not tenable and contrary to the provisions of I.D. Act, 1947. Respondent submitted that to tide over severe sub-ordinate staff constraints which arose out of leave vacancies, exigencies, etc., and also owning to the restrictions imposed by the Government of India/Reserve Bank of India on intake of staff, the Respondent bank used to engage sub-ordinate staff like messengers, sweepers, sweeper cum water boys, etc., depending on the availability of work on purely temporary basis for the smooth and uninterrupted functioning of the branches. It is submitted that the All India State Bank of India Staff Federation which represents majority of the employees in the State Bank of India comprising about 98% of the work force as its' members espoused the cause of temporary employees who have put in less than 240 days of temporary service in 12 calendar months in the bank and who were ineligible for any protection under Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 to give a chance for being considered for absorption and permanent appointments.

15. Discussions were held and on 17.11.1987 an agreement was signed between the federation and the Management bank under Sec. 2(p) read with Sec 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules 1957. A copy of the said settlement dated 17.11.87 which may be herein after referred as first settlement is filed and 4 categories were made as it has already been mentioned in the claim statement above, it need not be repeated here. In the first settlement, it was agreed that the temporary employees as categorized would be given a chance for being considered for permanent appointment in the bank's service against the vacancies which are likely to arise during the period 1987 to 1991. On 16.7.88 second settlement was arrived between the Federation and the Bank whereby it was agreed to substitute the period of consideration of vacancies as 1987 to 1992 in place of 1987 to 1991 as contemplated under the first settlement dated 17.11.1987. This is the second settlement. A 3rd settlement was entered into on 27.10.88 and it was agreed that the bank's service against the vacancies likely to arise from 1988 to 1992 was to be considered. Government of India vide its letter dated 16.8.90 issued guidelines to all the public sector banks with regard to recruitment and absorption of temporary employees in public sector banks. The said guidelines were issued to implement on the lines of approach paper on the issue provided by a committee constituted in this regard. Government of India guidelines made it clear that all the public sector banks may follow the provisions laid down in the approach paper. The approach paper specified that the cases of temporary service in 12 consecutive months and who are entitled to benefit of Sec.25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 may be decided by entering into a settlement with the

representative union. In respect of temporary employees who had put in less than 240 days of service in 12 consecutive months or less, a settlement could be avoided and however if the Management so desired they could enter into a conciliation settlement with the representative union. In para. 6(h) it is mentioned that only those temporary employees who had put in temporary service of 90 days or more days after 1.1.82 would be eligible for considering under the scheme. Although the Government guidelines envisaged for a settlement in respect of employees who had put in temporary service of 90 days or more days, the bank by way of a further concession entered into settlements. Even in respect of those who had put in less than 90 days and also the bank went a step further and said those persons who are working after 1975 were also considered. Hence, there was a genuine effort on the part of the Respondent bank to provide as many as possible jobs subject to the availability of the vacancies. However, para 6 (k) of the approach paper made it clear that it is a one time, exercise in full and final, settlement of all the claims and disputes for the past period, in respect of temporary workmen covered by the settlement. Another settlement was entered on 9.1.91 herein after referred as 4th settlement and the time limit was extended upto 1994 and separate panel was prepared for temporary employees, casual/daily wagers. It was agreed that while vacancies arising between 1988 to 1994 in respect of temporary employees and in respect of casual/daily wagers, they can be considered for the vacancies arising between 1995-96 only.

16. It is submitted that the administrative set up of the Hyderabad Local Head Office comprises of four Zonal Offices (Zones) at Hyderabad, Vijayawada, Visakhapatnam and Tirupathi covering all the Districts of Andhra Pradesh. In terms of the settlement the Management after following the procedure laid down therein prepared the panels of qualified candidates of temporary employees denoted as 1989 panel and also panel of casual/daily wagers denoted as 1992 panel for giving a chance for being considered for permanent absorption. These panels were prepared zone-wise separately for messengers and non-messengers in the descending order of temporary service put in by the candidates during the stipulated period i.e., 1.7.1975 to 31.7.1988. That the Federation approached the Regional Labour Commissioner(C) for implementation of bi-partite settlement in respect of absorption of temporary employees. The Regional Labour Commissioner(C) conducted conciliation proceedings and an agreement was arrived between the Federation and the bank. It was agreed that it would be kept alive upto March, 1997. A copy of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.2.1995 signed by the parties is filed as material paper. A settlement was arrived at and an agreement was signed between the Federation and the Management bank on 30.7.1996 under Sec.2 (p) read with Sec.18(1) of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957, which is hereinafter called as 5th settlement. That on 27.2.1997 a Memorandum of understanding was also signed by the federation's affiliate and the bank Management recording the fact that the exercise of identifying the messengerial vacancies as on 31.12.1994 has since been completed by Central Office and thereby 403 messengerial vacancies were sanctioned . It was agreed that these vacancies may be filled from 1989 panel of temporary employees after effecting conversion from full time non-messengerial staff in the usual manner and the agreement was reached accordingly. It was agreed between the Federation's affiliate and the Management bank that in terms of the settlement dated 30.7.1996 both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees would lapse on 31.3.1997. That as agreed upon vacancies were filled from the panels. The Workman who has put in an aggregate temporary service of less than 240 days in a continuous block of 12 months period during 1.7.1975 to 31.7.1988 has no right to seek a direction to consider his candidature for absorption in the Management bank under any rule/law except under the settlement entered into thereon.

17. Respondent contended that, in fact, the case of the Workman can be considered under all the five settlements having got his case considered under provisions of these settlements. All the other provisions

and terms of the settlements are also binding on him/her. The Management bank has not violated any of the provisions of the terms of the said settlement. That the very preparation and maintenance of panel is in compliance of the terms agreed under these settlements. These settlements were time bound and they ceased to exist on 31.3.1997. That the bank has never promised that all the candidates in the panel will be absorbed. In the advertisement itself it was made clear that candidates will be considered for absorption in the vacancies that may arise upto 1992. Keeping alive the panels after 31.3.1997 is contrary to the settlements arrived between the State Bank of India Staff Federation and the Management bank. That the settlements are binding on the parties. The Workman is also bound under the terms of the said settlement. The settlement does not suffer from any ambiguity as their language is very clear. The right under the settlements is to give them a chance to be considered for future appointment in the bank's services against the vacancies likely to arise. The settlements were effected to balance the expectations of the temporary employees to be absorbed in permanent service as against the constitutional rights for all eligible persons to be considered for employment every time a vacancy arises. That the alleged dispute including the demand for reinstatement has to be decided in this context. It is submitted that the period of panel list got expired on 31.3.97 and it is an integral term of the settlement and cannot be modified in any proceedings under the law. These temporary employees who unfortunately could not be accommodated for want of vacancies have no further rights to be considered for regularization. That the Hon'ble High Court in WP No.12964/94, held as follows, "It is needless to state that the settlement arrived at between the All India State Bank of India Staff Federation which, is the majority union and the bank Management is binding on the Workmen also. It is not at all the case of the Workman that any of the terms of the settlement has been violated by the bank's Management. If the Workman had worked in the bank on part-time basis before 31.5.94, that itself would not vest in him a right to claim that his services should be regularized on permanent basis against a full time cadre post. The claim put forth by the Workman in the present petition is therefore misconceived and not tenable. However, it is open to the Workman to claim any right which flows from the settlement between the union and the bank Management. As already pointed out that it is not the grievance of the Workman that some right which has flown from the settlement in favour of the Workman has been denied by the bank Management. Therefore, I do not find any ground, let alone substantial ground, to grant the kind of relief sought for by the Workman. Writ Petition fails and is accordingly dismissed. No costs."

18. Further, it is contended that if the panels were not lapsed at the end of designated period and allowed to be continued it would result in making the contracts of temporary employment indirectly permanent through back door entry, which would not only be contrary to the settlements but also to Articles 14 and 16 of Constitution of India and deprive the chances of original claimants who would Come through proper recruitment procedure. As their rights have been crystallized by operation of the settlements. Hence, there is no question of any Legitimate expectation being violated.

19. Similarly placed ex-employees filed WP No.9206/1995 and the batch before the Hon'ble High Court of A.P. and the learned Single Judge allowed the Writ Petitions. Aggrieved by the same WA No.86/98 and the batch was filed and the Division Bench set aside the order of the Single Judge. Thereafter the ex-temporary employees filed Special Leave Petition No.11886-11888 of 1998 before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India also dismissed the SLP. Therefore, reference to the Judgement of the Learned Single Judge in WP No.9206/97 is of no consequences as the same has already been set aside. The observations made in the Judgements cannot be relied upon for any purpose what so ever. The question of operation of Sec.25F would not come into play. Further the issue is

covered by various Judgements of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India and various Hon'ble High Courts. Hence, the reference may be ordered that the Workman is not entitled for any relief.

20. In order to fortify his claim Workman has examined himself as WW1 and also filed documents in evidence which has been exhibited as Ex.W1 to W24. Further, the Workman has filed photocopies of documents in support of his claim which are discussed as under:-

Ex.W1 is the Service Certificate. Ex.W1A is the Service Certificate. Ex. W1B is the Service Certificate dated 21.07.1992. Ex. W2 is the Notification. Ex. W3 is the Interview call letter. Ex. W4 is the Service Certificate dated 12.04.1993. Ex. W5 is the Service Certificate dated 11.05.1993. Ex. W6 is the Service Certificate dated 11.06.1993. Ex. W7 is the Service Certificate dated 7.10.1993. Ex. W8 is the Service Certificate dated 7.12.1993. Ex. W9 is the Service Certificate dated 13.05.1994. Ex. W10 is the Service Certificate dated 18.05.1994. Ex. W11 is the Service Certificate dated2.02.1995. Ex. W12 is the Service Certificate dated 05.12.1994. Ex. W13 is the Service Certificate dated 21.03.1994. Ex. W14 is the Service Certificate dated 13.05.1994. Ex. W15 is the Service Certificate dated 08.01.1994. Ex. W16 is the Service Certificate dated 17.05.1995. Ex. W17 is the Service Certificate dated 02.02.1995. Ex. W18 is the Service Certificate dated 15.03.1996. Ex. W19 is the Service Certificate dated 08.10.1996. Ex. W20 is the Service Certificate dated 23.11.1999. Ex. W21 is the Service Certificate dated 08.11.1996. Ex. W22 is the Service Certificate dated 23.11.1999. Ex. W23 is the letter to Employment exchange by Respondent. Ex. W24 is the Circular letter dated 14.07.1999.

21. On the other hand, Respondent has examined witness MW1 Sri Aluru Rama Rao and this witness has exhibited 12 documents, marked as Ex.M1 to M12. The details of these documents are as follows:-

Ex.M.1 is the Settlement dated 17.11.1987. Ex.M2 is the Settlement dated 16.7.1988. Ex.M3 is the Settlement dated 27.10.1988. Ex.M4 is the Settlement dated 9.1.1991. Ex.M5 is the Minutes of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.1995. Ex.M6 is the Settlement dated 30.7.1996. Ex.M7 is the Memorandum of Understanding dt. 27.2.1997. Ex.M8 is the Particulars of 1989 Messengerial Panel. Ex.M9 is the Particulars of 1989 Non-Messengerial Panel. Ex.M10 is the Particulars of 1992 General Attendant Panel. Ex.M11 is the Judgment of Hon'ble High Court of A.P. in Writ Appeal No.86/98 dt.1.5.1998. Ex.M12 is the Judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in SLP No. 11886-11888 of 1998 dt.10.8.1998.

22. Apart from afore mentioned documents, Learned Counsel for Workman has also filed a long list of various judgements of Hon'ble Supreme Court as well as Hon'ble High Court, which we will discuss at appropriate place in this Award.

23. Heard the argument of Learned Counsel for Workman as well as for Respondent.

24. On the basis of rival pleadings of both the parties and submissions made by the Learned Counsel for both the parties, following points arise for determination in the industrial dispute :-

I. Whether the 1st settlement dated 17.11.1987, 2nd settlement dated 16.7.1988, 3rd settlement dated 27.10.1988, 4th settlement dated 9.1.1991 and 5th settlement dated 30.7.1996 entered into between State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and also Memorandum of Understanding are binding upon both the parties?

II. Whether the action of State Bank of India, Local Head Office, Hyderabad in terminating the services of Workman Sri G. Anil Kumar, a Messenger with effect from 31.3.1997 is justified?

III. Whether the Workman is entitled for absorption on permanent post in the Branch of Respondent management as per averments made by him in the claim statement?

IV. To what relief if any the Workman is entitled for?

Findings:-

25. Point No.I:- Undisputedly settlements dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988, 9.1.1991 and 30.7.1996, minutes of conciliation proceedings and memorandum of understanding dated 27.2.1997 were executed between the State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation under section 2(p) and 18 (1) of I.D. Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Disputes (Central Rules), 1957.

Section 2(p) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 as follows:-

(p) "settlement" means a settlement arrived at in the course of conciliation proceeding and includes a written agreement between the employer and workmen arrived at otherwise than in the course of conciliation proceeding where such agreement has been signed by the parties thereto in such manner as may be prescribed and a copy thereof has been sent to an officer authorised in this behalf by the appropriate Government and the conciliation officer;

Section 18(1) provides as follows:-

18. Persons on whom settlements and awards are binding.

- [(1) A settlement arrived at by agreement between the employer and Workman otherwise than in the course of conciliation proceeding shall be binding on the parties to the agreement.

Therefore, in view of the provision contained u/s.18 (1) I.D. Act, 1947, terms and conditions enumerated in the aforesaid settlements are binding on the parties to the agreement. The Learned Counsel for Workman has argued that the Workman after going through the selection procedure has successfully been listed in the panel for appointment on the permanent basis in the Respondent management and the empanelled list has to be valid till last person in the empanelled list is appointed on permanent basis. But the impugned order dated 25.3.97, 27.3.97 and 31.3.97, has been issued by Respondent management thereby the services of the Workman has been terminated and the said order is not in consonance of the terms of the agreement entered into between the parties. Further, Workman submits that the Respondent in the 5th settlement has mentioned the date i.e., 31.3.1997 for lapse of empanel list which is illegal and that is not binding upon the Workman. The condition of lapse of empanelment list on 31.3.97 incorporated in the aforesaid 5th settlement, is arbitrary and illegal.

26. The perusal of the impugned order dated 25.3.1997 goes to reveal that the Chief/Branch Manager, SBI Zonal Office has issued the letter to all the branches with regard to the subject not to make any temporary appointments in the Branch in messengerial category from 1.4.1997. The extract of the said letter is given below:-

"We have been advised by the Deputy General Manager, Zonal Office, Hyderabad that as both the panels of temporary employees of 1989 and daily wagers/casual labours of 1992 will lapse by 31.3.1997, it has been decided by Central Office not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial category from 1.4.1997."

Thus, from the contents of the aforesaid letter, it manifest that Head Office of State Bank of India vide letter dated 25.3.1997 has issued direction to all its branches not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial category from 1.4.1997 due to reason of lapse of both panels i.e., 1989 & 1992 on 31.3.1997

as per terms of settlements entered into by both parties. Further, the contents of the subsequent letter dated 27.3.1997 issued by Respondent Management is also direction to Branch Manager, State Bank of India not to make any temporary messengerial category appointment with effect from 1.4.1997 and it has also been communicated to all concerned that the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers maintained by Zonal offices stand lapsed from 31.1.1997. Further, office order dated 31.3.1997 has been issued by Respondent management that goes to reveal that the said office order has been issued to this effect that, "Consequent on absorption of temporary employees in permanent cadre, it has been decided by the competent authority that no one onwards, no further daily labour or temporary employees/appointments should be resorted to/engaged/employed." Therefore, it reflects from the contents of the aforesaid orders that the temporary appointment in messengerial category and daily labour has been stopped by the Respondent management with effect from 1.4.1997 because of the lapsed of panel of temporary workers and daily wagers by 31.3.1997. The agreement for lapse of both the panels on 31.3.1997 is contained in the 5th settlement which has been arrived at between the parties on dated 30.7.1996 with the consensus of both the parties. Therefore, Workman can not challenge the terms and conditions contained in settlement dated 30.7.1996 regarding lapse of panel on 31.3.1997 as agreed between State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation. As per provision contained u/s.18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 the said Agreement dated 30.7.1996 is binding on both the parties.

In the case of **Allied Sales Corporation Secunderabad vs.The Authority Under Andhra Pradesh..... 1990 II LLJ 510 AP para 414, Hon'ble Court have held:-**

"*4. There was a settlement between the Management and the workmen under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act on 25th April 1983 under which the age of superannuation of the workmen was fixed at 55 years. The settlement was to be in force upto 30th June 1986 and the next settlement, incorporating practically the same terms, was again entered into on 4th February 1987 under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act. There is no dispute that these settlements are under Section 18(1).*

14. Now the Authority constituted under Section 41(1) of the Act is an authority with very limited jurisdiction. It can only decide in the first appeal whether a termination by the management is valid or not and is within the parameters of Section 40 of the Act. The said Authority, in our view, has absolutely no jurisdiction to decide whether a settlement entered into under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act between the representatives of the Workmen and of the Management, is vitiated by undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion on the part of the Management. The Authority, namely, the Assistant Commissioner of Labour, was never intended by the A.P. Legislature to have jurisdiction to go into the question of the validity of a settlement arrived at under Section 18 of the Industrial Disputes Act by an Industrial Court. That Parliament has, in fact, constituted Industrial Courts under the Industrial Disputes Act, with extensive powers cannot be disputed. What we mean to say is that the Authority under Section 41(1) of the A.P. Act has no jurisdiction what-so-ever either to question or to decide about the validity of any such settlements. If parties to a settlement have a grievance about the validity of a settlement, it is for them to agitate the matter before the appropriate forum and they cannot ask an Authority constituted under Section 41(1) of the A.P. Shops and Establishments Act, 1966 with limited jurisdiction, to go into any such question and, that too, incidentally while deciding whether retirement as per the contract of employment, is legal or not."

It is not the case of Workman that aforesaid settlements are vitiated by undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion on the part of the management. If the Workman feeling aggrieved by any terms of settlement/ agreement on the aforementioned grounds then he can challenge of settlement before

a competent authority under the Act, 1947. But here in the instant matter it is not a case of Workman that aforementioned settlement has been entered into between the parties on the ground of undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion. Therefore, Workman is barred to raise any objection in respect of fixing the date of lapse of both panels on 31.3.1997 as agreed between both the parties and Workman can not challenge any terms of said Agreement.

Further in the case of **Herbertsons Limited Vs. Workmen of Herbertsons Limited and Ors, 1977 AIR 322,** Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

The Tribunal thought that the question of the quantum of membership of the 2nd Respondent did not call for a finding at all in view of 1his Court's order. As observed above that was not a correct assumption. On the other hand, we feel that this view of the Tribunal has led it to approach the matter in an entirely erroneous manner. The Tribunal is, rightly enough, conscious that under section 18 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act the settlement was binding on the company and the members of the 3rd Respondent union. Even so, the Tribunal devoted nearly half of its order in scanning the evidence given by the company and Respondent No. 3 to find out whether the terms of the settlement had been explained by the President of the union to the workmen or not and whether the workers voluntarily accepted the settlement knowing all the "consequences". This to our mind is again an entirely wrong approach.

"When a recognised union negotiates with an employer the workers as individuals do not come into the picture. It is not necessary that each individual worker should know the implications of the settlement since a recognised union, which is expected to protect the legitimate interests of labour, enters into a settlement in the best interests of labour. This would be the normal rule. We cannot altogether rule out exceptional cases where there may be allegations of mala fides, fraud or even corruption or other induce- ments. Nothing of that kind has been suggested against the President of the 3rd Respondent in this case. That being the position, prima facie, this is a settlement in the course of collective bargaining and, therefore, is entitled to due weight and consideration.

It is not possible to scan the settlement in bits and pieces and hold some parts good and acceptable and others bad. Unless it can be demonstrated that the objectionable portion is such that it completely outweighs all the other advantages gained the Court will be slow to hold a settle- ment as unfair and unjust. The settlement has to be accepted or rejected as a whole and we are unable to reject it as a whole as unfair or unjust. Even before this Court the 3rd Respondent representing admittedly the large majority of the workmen has stood by this settlement and that is a strong factor which it is difficult to ignore. As stated elsewhere in the judgment, we cannot also be oblivious of the fact that all workmen of the company have accepted the settlement. Besides, the period of settlement has since expired and we are informed that the employer and the 3rd Respondent are negotiating another settlement with further improvements. These factors, apart from what has been stated above, and the need for industrial peace and harmony when a union backed by a large majority of workmen has accepted a settlement in the course of collective bargaining have impelled us not to interfere with this settlement. That being the position, we unhold the settlement as fair and just and order that the award of the Tribunal shall be substituted by the settlement dated October 18, 1973. The said settlement shall be the substituted award. The appeal is disposed of accordingly. There will be no order as to costs."

Therefore, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above, the contention of the Workman that the date fixed for lapse of empanelled list on 31.3.1997 for appointment to the permanent post vide 5th Settlement dated 30.7.1996 is arbitrary, illegal is not untenable. The recognized union of Workmen has negotiated with the Respondent Bank Management representing large number of

Workmen and the Workman as individual do not come into picture. Workman in the instant case has work as temporary Workmen in the Respondent Branch and in response of Notification he had applied for inclusion of his name in the panel and he was selected for inclusion his name in the panel list to be utilized for absorption of such Workman to permanent post in order of their seniority in the list. The Settlement dated 30.7.1996 between State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation under Sec.2(p) and Sec.18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 has clearly provided as regard non-messengerial position and it is agreed that all such posts sanctioned fallen vacant upto 31.3.1997 shall be filled before empanel list is allowed to lapse. Thus, in view of law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, in the instant case, Agreement dated 30.7.1996 was entered into between both the parties in respect of lapsing of the both the panels on 31.3.1997 and absorption of the Workmen from panel list was subject to availability of vacancy of post likely to arise upto 31.3.1997, have a binding force on Workman as well as management of State Bank of India in view of provision contained under section 18 (1) of I.D. Act, 1947.

Thus, Point No.I is answered against the Workman and in favour of the Respondent.

27. **Point No.II**:- Firstly, it is submitted on behalf of the Workman that the Respondent has terminated his services by oral order on 31.3.1997 without issuing any notice or paying any salary or compensation in lieu thereof. Therefore, the termination order of the Workman from service is in violation of provision contained Under Section 25 F of I.D. Act, 1947. Therefore, the order is liable to be set aside.

28. On the other hand, Respondent counsel contended that Workman has not worked for 240 days in any preceding calendar year. Therefore, reference of the industrial dispute is not relevant. In this context, the Workman has examined himself as WW1 who has reiterated that Workman has been terminated from service by Respondent on 31.3.1997 without notice of salary or compensation in lieu thereof. Before examining the claim of the Workman on merit it would be apposite to reproduce the provision contained under section 25 F:-

Section 25F provides:-

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].

Compensation to workmen in case of transfer of undertakings.

Section 25B defines the term continuous service which provides

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 authorized

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;

In order to prove the fact of 240 days of service within 12 months of a calendar year just preceding from the date of termination, the initial burden of proof lies upon the Workman and the Workman has to prove this factum by adducing his oral as well as documentary evidence in support of his claim.

Further, how to calculate 240 days of service by the Workman in a calendar year. In this context the reference of decisions of Hon'ble Supreme Court is relevant and the same are discussed below:-

In Rajasthan State Ganganagar S. Mills Ltd. v. State of Rajasthan and Anr. (2004) Apex Court held:

"It was the case of the Workman that he had worked for more than 240 days in the year concerned. This claim was denied by the appellant. It was for the claimant to lead evidence to show that he had worked for 240 days in the year preceding the date of his termination. He has filed an affidavit. It is statement which is in his favor and that cannot be regarded as sufficient evidence for any Court or Tribunal to come to the conclusion that in fact the claimant had worked for 240 days in a year These aspects were highlighted in Range Forest Officer v. S.T. Hadimani (2002 (3) SCC 25. No proof of receipt of salary or wages for 240 days or order or record in that regard was produced. Mere non-production of the muster roll for a particular period was not sufficient for the Labour Court held that the Workman had worked for 240 days as claimed."

In Municipal Corporation, Faridabad v. Siri Niwas (2004 (8) SCC 195), held "*the burden was on the Workman to show that he was working for more than 240 days in the preceding one year prior to his alleged retrenchment." In M.P. Electricity Board v. Hariram (2004 (8) SCC 246) the position was again reiterated in paragraph 11 as follows: "The above burden having not been discharged and the Labour Court having held so, in our opinion, the Industrial Court and the High Court erred in basing an order of reinstatement solely on an adverse inference drawn erroneously ..*"

In the case of Manager, RBI, Bangalore vs. S Mani (2005) SCC Page 100, the 3 Judges Bench of the Apex Court held that "*the initial burden of proof was on the Workman to show that he had completed 240 days of service."*

Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of Mohan Lal vs Management BEL 1981 SCC page 225 has laid down the principle that how to count 240 days of service within one year it is held: *"Clause (2)(a) provides for a fiction to treat a Workman in continuous service for a period of one year despite the fact that he has not rendered uninterrupted service for a period of one year but he has rendered period of 240 days during the period of 12 calendar service for months counting backwards and just preceding the relevant date being the date of retrenchment. In other words, in order to invoke the fiction enacted in clause (2)(a) it is necessary to determine first the relevant date, ie the date of termination of service which*

is complained of as retrenchment. After that date is ascertained. move backward to a period of 12 months just preceding the date of retrenchment and then ascertain whether within the period of 12 months, the Workman has rendered service for a period of 240 days. If these three facts are affirmatively answered in favor of the Workman pursuant to the deeming fiction enacted in clause (2)(a) it will have to be assumed that the Workman is in continuous service for a period of one year and he will satisfy the eligibility qualification enacted in Section 25-F"

"14. We have already extracted section 25B since its amendment and the change in language is the legislative exposition of which note must be taken. In fact, we need not further dilate upon this aspect because in Surendra Kumar Verma and Ors. v. Central Government Industrial-cum-Labour Court, New Delhi and Anr., Chinnappa Reddy. J., after noticing the amendment and referring to the decision in Sur Enamel and Stamping Works (P) Ltd case, held as under:

"These changes brought about by Act 36 of 1964 appear to be clearly designed to provide that a Workman who has actually worked under the employer for not less than 240 days during a period of twelve months shall be deemed to have been in continuous service for a period of one year whether or not he has in fact been in such continuous service for a period of one year. It is enough that he has worked for 240 days in a period of 12 months, it is not necessary that he should have been in the service of the employer for one whole year."

In a concurring judgment Pathak J. agreed with this interpretation of section 25B(2). Therefore, both on principle and on precedent it must be held that section 25B(2) comprehends a situation where a Workman is not in employment for a period of 12 calendar months, but has rendered service for a period of 240 days within the period of 12 calendar months commencing and counting backwards from the relevant date, i.e. the date of retrenchment. If he has, he would be deemed to be in continuous service for a period of one year for the purpose of section 25B and Chapter VA."

Thus, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above the initial burden of proof lies upon the Workman to show that he has completed 240 days of the service with the Respondent just preceding from the date of his termination. Further, in respect of the employment of calculating the 240 days service provision contained Under Section 25-F read with Section 25-B of the I.D. Act, 1947.

29. Now, in view of the provision contained under Section 25 F and law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, we have to examine whether the Workman has discharged his initial burden of proof in respect of his claim of 240 days continuous service in a calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination i.e., 31.3.1997.

In this context, WW1 in his cross examination has stated that,

"I was not sponsored by any employment exchange did not undergo regular process of selection before my engagement as temporary Messenger in the branch.."

"It is true that I did not work for 240 days in any year, in my entire service in the bank in any branch."

Thus, it is clear from the testimony of WW1 that the Workman had not worked for 240 days continuously in any 12 months of a calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination in the Respondent bank. Therefore, Workman failed to establish his plea by his oral and documentary evidence that he had worked for 240 days continuously in calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination i.e., 31.3.1997. Thus, the claim of the Workman that he has been terminated by oral order without issuing notice or payment in lieu after termination, in contravention of Section 25 F of Industrial Disputes Act,

1947 is not tenable. However the documents filed by the Workman in support of his claim, number of days worked with the Respondent goes to reveal that the Workman had worked intermittently as daily wager depending upon availability of work in branch. Workman did not file any document of appointment letter or salary slips in support of his claim for appointment as a non-messenger in the Respondent branch on temporary basis.

30. Per contra, the Learned Counsel for Respondent has submitted the allegation of Workman that he was terminated from services is not correct. As the vacancies were filled up on regular basis in order of their respective seniority the non-engagement of the Workman does not amount to termination. Further, Respondent contended that no law provide that even though there is no work temporary employee should be continued in the bank work as the very engagement of Workman was subject to availability of work. Therefore, the allegation that the bank has indulged in unfair labour practice is incorrect.

31. Thus, in view of the fore gone discussion and contentions made by the Respondent, I find the force in the argument advanced by the Respondent that in the instant matter, Workman was not terminated from service by order dated 31.3.1997 rather he was disengaged in view of the non-availability of the work in the branch. Further, there was direction issued by the Head Office of the Respondent authority not to engage any daily wager Workman/ temporary Worker w.e.f. 1.4.1997. Thus, such disengagement of Workman does not amount to termination. Moreover, the Workman failed to prove his claim that he was terminated in contravention of provision of Sec.25F of the I.D. Act, 1947 as he failed to establish his plea by any oral or documentary evidence that he had worked for 240 days continuously in a twelve months of calendar year just preceding from date of termination i.e., 31.3.1997.

32. Further, perusal of the order dated 25.3.1997 goes to reveal that the Chief Branch Manager, State Bank of India has issued the letter to Zonal Office with direction to all its branches to this effect that they have been advised by the DGM, Zonal Office, Hyderabad that as both the panel of temporary employees of 1989 and daily wagers/casual labour of 1992 will lapse on 31.3.1997 it has been decided by central office not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial cadre from 1.4.1997, therefore it was directed to issue suitable instructions not to make temporary appointments from 1.4.1997. There is no mention in this order that the Workman herein has been terminated from service by this order.

33. Further, the circular dated 27.3.1997 was issued by DGM, SBI to all branches in commercial network in respect of the non-appointment of temporary employees in subordinate cadre and it has directed not to make any temporary employment in the subordinate cadre with effect from 1.4.97 and further, it has directed to ensure that no temporary/casual/daily basis appointment of the petty cash. Further, it is directed to all Branch Managers that any deviation in this regard will be viewed seriously. Thus, these circulars do not reflect that the Workman has been terminated from service by this order.

34. Similarly, office order dated 31.3.1997 is simply a direction to all branches of the Respondent bank by DGM that no further daily labour should be engaged or employed. Therefore, the plea of the Workman that he has been terminated by the aforesaid order dated 25.3.1997, 27.3.1997 and 31.3.1997 from the service by the Respondent is not acceptable. The evidence adduced by the Workman clearly goes to reveal that he had worked as a daily wager for which he has been paid wages according to number of working days. As there was an order for prohibition for engaging temporary workmen, in the bank, therefore, Workman could not be engaged by the Respondent for work from 1.4.1997 and there after. It is settled law that the daily wagers are engaged by the employer depending upon the availability of work and as the work was not available the Workman was not engaged further by the Respondent management. Therefore, the Workman on the ground of number of days he had worked in the Respondent bank cannot

claim any right to reinstate him into the employment. As the Workman failed to prove the mandatory condition of 240 days of continuous service as required under Sec.25F of I.D. Act, 1947. Therefore, the disengagement of Workman from work can not be termed in contravention of provision contained under Sec.25F and 25 B of the I.D. Act, 1947.

Thus, this point is answered against the Workman and in favour of Respondent.

35. Point No.III:- In this context, the Workman has contended that the management failed to implement the selected panels during its valid tenure. The management adopted the back door methods contrary to the settlements and filled up the vacancies. The same is evident from the proceedings dated 18.11.1993 a copy of the same is filed in the material papers and the same may be read as part of the claim statement. Further, it is submitted that management has to adhere the procedure issued by the Central Government, the instructions dated 16.8.1990 in the year 1995, but same was not followed in the year 1997 despite there being vacancies. The management has followed the procedure of calling candidates through employment exchange instead of giving chance to the empanelled candidates like the Workman herein. The management sent call letters to the similarly situated candidates like the Workman in the month of June 1997 subsequent to issuance of impugned termination orders. After knowing the fact that they are litigating the issue by way of dispute, the management has refused to engage those candidates, the copies of call letters issued are filed herein along with claim petition. The Workman herein reiterates that the panels are meant for absorption but not for termination. In view of the same a duty is cast upon the Respondent management to engage the empanelled candidates like the Workman herein even in temporary vacancies till they are absorbed permanently in regular vacancies.

36. On the other hand, Respondent has contended that the Federation approached Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) for implementation of bipartite settlement in respect of the absorption of temporary employees. The Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) conducted conciliation proceedings and agreement was arrived at between the Federation and the Management bank. It is submitted that it was agreed between the Federation and the Management that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers /casual labour would be kept alive upto March, 1997 and the vacancies as agreed to under the afore set out settlements will be filled from both the lists concurrently. A copy of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.1995 signed by the parties to the dispute is filed as a material paper. Further, it is submitted that the settlement was arrived at and an agreement was signed between the Federation and the Management bank on 30.7.1996 under Section 2(p) read with Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules 1957 which is binding on the parties. A copy of this agreement which hereinafter may be referred to as 5th settlement for brevity, is also filed as a material paper. The 5th settlement dated 30.7.1996 whereunder the earlier four settlements dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988 and 9.1.1991 were also referred, it was agreed to, by the Federation and the Management bank that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees will be kept alive upto March, 1997 for filling the vacancies existing/arrived at as on 31.12.1994 as per the norms agreed to between the bank and Federation and that thereafter the said panels would lapse. It was also agreed that within the framework of the above settlements the modalities about drawing names from either the panel of temporary employees or the panel of daily wagers and casual labour would be decided administratively on circle to circle basis depending upon the local requirements in consultation with the Federation's affiliate by the Circle management. It was further agreed that all messenger real vacancies/positions in the subordinate cadre including part-time attendants specifically provided as leave reserve will be filled by the end of 31.3.1997. Further, Respondent contended that on 27.2.1997 a memorandum of understanding was also signed between the

Federation's affiliate and the bank management regarding the fact that the exercise of identifying the messengerial vacancies as on 31.12.1994 has since been completed by central office and thereby 403 messengerial vacancies were sanctioned to the circle of the Management bank and it was agreed that these vacancies may be filled from 1989 panel of temporary employees after effecting conversion from full time non-messengerial staff in the usual manner and the agreement was reached upon. Further, it was agreed between the Federations affiliate and the management bank that in terms of the settlement dated 30.7.1996 both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers /casual employees would lapse on 31.3.1997.

37. The Workman has contended that the empanelled list prepared by the Respondent management for appointment of temporary and daily wage Workers to the permanent post cannot lapse unless until it is exhausted by appointing all the empanelled persons and it should continue even after 31.3.1997, i.e., the date fixed for the lapse of panel. It is undisputed that the date of lapse of empanelled list of Workmen has been fixed to 31.3.1997 as mentioned in the settlement dated 30.7.1996, and agreed between the parties. It is settled law that and once the life of panel list lapses on the date as agreed between the parties it cannot be extended beyond that date. In the instant case the panel list of the workmen was valid upto 31.3.1997 in view of the terms and conditions enumerated in the 5th Settlement entered into between the parties. As the lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997 has been agreed by State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation through 5th Settlement, the Workman is not competent to challenge the same.

In this context I would like to take reference of the decision of the apex court in the case of **Syndicate Bank and Ors vs. Shankar Paul and Ors , AIR 1997 SC 3091, therein the Hon'ble Apex Court** have held:-

"Till 1982, the branches of the appellant Bank in Calcutta region were recruiting persons locally to work as temporary attenders in leave vacancies. In view of the revised procedure prescribed by the Government of India in respect of such temporary appointments, the Calcutta regional office of the appellant Bank issued a circular to all of its branches on 14.8.1982, instructing all the branches under it to discontinue the old practice from 1.6.1982 and appoint only empanelled candidates. The regional office was to prepare a panel of eligible candidates, after calling names from the local/district employment exchange, and split it up branch-wise. Following that new procedure yearly panels were prepared thereafter. Names of the Respondents were for the first time included in the panel prepared for the period 7.2.1987 to 6.2.1988. By its letter dated 7.2.1987 the Bank had informed the Respondents that the panel was valid for one year only and that inclusion of their names in the panel was not to confer on them any right to seek permanent appointment in the service of the bank. Considering the object with which the panel was prepared and the fact that it was an yearly panel expiring on 6.2.1988, we are of the opinion that the Respondents did not get any right, because of inclusion of their names in the said panel, for permanent absorption in the service of the Bank. Whatever conditional right they had came to an end with the expiry of the panel. The claim of the Respondents, as contained in the writ petition was thus misconceived and therefore the learned single Judge and the Division Bench, when it first decided the appeal, were right in dismissing the writ petition and the appeal respectively."

Thus, in view of the above law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court and in view of the terms and conditions of the 5th Settlement the contention of the Workman that empanelled list should continue even after 31.3.1997 till the last Workman in the panel is absorbed is not tenable. The contention of the Workman is baseless in view of recital in the settlement. Therefore, in view of the fore gone discussion and finding given at Point No. I regarding binding nature of Settlements and terms and conditions enumerated therein, in view of the provision contained u/s.18(1) of the I.D. Act, 1947, I am of the

considered view that life of panels lapsed on 31.3.1997 in view of terms of settlement dated 30.7.1996 and plea of Workman that the panel shall continue even after 31.3.1997 till last man absorbed has no legal force and same is untenable.

38. Undisputedly, settlement agreement dated 30.7.1996 was executed between the State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation and in that settlement it was agreed that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/ casual employees will be used for filling vacancies existing as on 31.12.1994 as per the norms agreed between the bank and the Federation. These empanelled workmen were to be given a chance for permanent appointment in the bank against vacancies arising up to December 1994 whereas the daily wagers/ casual employees were to be considered against the vacancies arise from January 1995 to December 1996, whereby the said panel would lapse. It was agreed that the vacancies falls upto 31.3.1997 shall be filled before the empanelled list is allowed to lapse. Thus, the claim of the Workman to the post of permanent non-messenger in the Respondent management was subject to the availability of the sanctioned post and vacancies arising upto 31.3.1997. The workmen given chance to the permanent post were seniors in number of working days in panel list and Workman herein was junior to those workmen. Therefore, Workman could not be given absorption to permanent post being junior to other workmen in the panel list.

39. In this context the Workman witness WW1 was cross examined by the Respondent counsel and in the cross examination the witness WW1 states:-

"I applied for appointment as Messenger, in response to the advertisement issued by the bank and the union in the year 1991….. Further, witness states*, " The panel was prepared basing upon the number of days of service, put in by the temporary employees. Some of the temporary employees whose names were included in the panel were given regular appointment in the bank order of their seniority in the panel….* Further witness states*, "It is true that I am not having any documents to show that any of my juniors are continuing in service in the bank."*

Thus, from the above statement of the Workman witness WW1 it is clear that the panel was prepared in terms of various settlements entered into between Staff Federation of State Bank of India and State Bank of India and it was prepared on the basis of number of days of work put in by the temporary employees. Further, the Workman himself admitted that some of the temporary employees whose names were included in the panel were given regular appointment in the bank in order of their seniority in the panel and he is not having any document to show that any person who worked for less number of days than the Workman was given appointment in the bank. Therefore, the allegation of the Workman that the regular appointment has been made by the bank from the panel list in breach of the terms of the settlement and violation of seniority of panel list is not proved by this evidence of WW1. Thus, there is no evidence on record that bank has given the appointment to the temporary employees as well as daily wagers from the panel list 1989 and 1992 in breach of seniority of the temporary employees in the list. There is no evidence of jumbling in the panel list to make appointment of any permanent Workman in breach of the seniority. Therefore, I am constrained to hold that the Respondent Management has appointed the workmen from panel list in order of seniority and there is no jumbling of workmen in the panel list before it got lapsed on 31.3.1997.

40. However, Workman has taken the plea that the panels of Workmen for absorption in the employment of the Respondent banks (panels of temporary employees and daily wagers) has been lapsed on 31.3.1997 in contravention of terms of settlement as the object of preparing the entire empanelment of temporary and daily wagers was to provide them permanent employment and till the both the panel lists

exhausted the panel list cannot be lapsed on 31.3.1997 and the date of lapsing of the panel on 31.3.1997 has been fixed by the Respondent arbitrarily without any authority.

41. In this context, the perusal of Settlement dated 30.7.1996 reveals that the 5th Settlement dated 30.7.1996 was entered under Section 2(p) and 18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Dispute (Central) Rules 1957. This settlement has been entered into by the competent parties and in this settlement parties thereto agreed that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees will lapse on 31.3.1997. Thus the date of lapse of panel was fixed by both the parties with consensus under the settlement dated 30.7.1996 and same is binding upon the Workman under the provision of Section 18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947. Moreover, this issue of binding force of the settlement dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988 and 9.1.1991 has already been discussed, decided at finding in Point No.I of this award. However, the legality and validity of the aforementioned settlement has not been challenged by the Workman before any competent forum. Thus, claim of Workman that the date of lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997 has been fixed arbitrarily by the Respondent bank is untenable. As regard the claim of Workman for his absorption to the permanent post it is settled law that the Workman can not claim his regularization to permanent post merely on the basis of number of working days.

42. In this context the reference of the decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Oil and Natural Gas Corporation vs Krishan Gopal 2020(3) SCALE 272, date of decision 7.2.2020** is relevant therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have has laid down principle regarding regularization of the Workman on permanent posts. Hon'ble Supreme Court have laid down the prepositions of regularization of the workmen to permanent post is as under:-

"*(i) Wide as they are, the powers of the Labour Court and the Industrial Court cannot extend to a direction to order regularisation, where such a direction would in the context of public employment offend the provisions contained in Article 14 of the Constitution;*

(ii) The statutory power of the Labour Court or Industrial Court to grant relief to workmen including the status of permanency continues to exist in circumstances where the employer has indulged in an unfair labour practice by not filling up permanent posts even though such posts are available and by continuing to employ workmen as temporary or daily wage employees despite their performing the same work as regular workmen on lower wages;

(iii) The power to create permanent or sanctioned posts lies outside the judicial domain and where no posts are available, a direction to grant regularisation would be impermissible merely on the basis of the number of years of service;

(iv) Where an employer has regularised similarly situated workmen either in a scheme or otherwise, it would be open to workmen who have been deprived of the same benefit at par with the workmen who have been regularised to make a complaint before the Labour or Industrial Court, since the deprivation of the benefit would amount to a violation of Article 14; and

(v) In order to constitute an unfair labour practice under Section 2(ra) read with Item 10 of the Vth Schedule of the ID Act, the employer should be engaging workmen as badlis, temporaries or casuals, and continuing them for years, with the object of depriving them of the benefits payable to permanent workmen.

Thus, in view of the principles laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court as discussed above, in the instant matter the Workman utterly failed to prove his claim by adducing any documentary or oral evidence that the employer has indulged in unfair labour practice by not filling the permanent posts even though such

posts are available and by continuing to employ workmen as temporary or daily wage employees despite their performance was the same work, as regular workmen on lower wages.

43. Respondent has contended that all the vacancies exist and arise upto 31.3.1997 has been filled up from the panel list in order of seniority and no vacancy exists or arises as on 31.3.1997 remained unfilled. Further, it is contended that as per terms of settlement the life of panel lists has been lapsed on 31.3.1997, hence, there is no occasion to extend the life of panel lists beyond 31.3.1997. However, the workman failed to prove contrary by any evidence to the aforesaid contention of the Respondent that the vacancies were existing as on 31.3.1997 and the workman was not given absorption to the permanent post in order of his seniority. It is settled law that the power to create permanent or sanctioned post lies outside the judicial domain and where no posts are available, a direction to grant regularization would be impermissible merely on the basis of the number of years of service. Therefore, the claim of the workman on this ground also not acceptable.

44. Further, as per the of settlement, panel was prepared for absorption of the workmen on the permanent posts has already been lapsed on 31.3.1997 and the vacancies existing and arising upto 31.12.1994 and upto 31.3.1997 as settlement dated 30.7.1996 has been filled up from the panel by appointing the workmen as per seniority in the panel list. Workman witness WW1 in his cross examination has himself admitted this fact that, some of the temporary employees whose names were included in the panel were given regular appointment in the bank in order of their seniority in the panel. The Workman failed to show that there was any breach of terms of settlement has been committed by the Respondent in appointment to permanent post from aforesaid panel list.

45. As discussed in preceding paragraph of this Award, the life of the panel has not been extended beyond 31.3.1997, by any further settlement hence, the panel list in which name of the Workman was included got expired on 31.3.1997. It is not the case of the Workman that Respondent has regularized similarly situated workmen either in the scheme or otherwise and the Workman has been deprived of same benefit on par with those workmen or the vacancies remained unfilled on the date of lapse of panels i.e., 31.3.1997, Industrial Tribunal has no jurisdiction to extend the date of lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997. This Tribunal can not order for regularization of workmen to the permanent post in contravention of the provision of Article 14 of the Constitution of India.

In the case of **Mahboob Deepak vs. Nagar Panchayat Gajraula & Anr, Civil Appeal No.5875/2007 date of judgement 13.12.2007,** Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

"8. Respondent is a Local Authority. The terms and conditions of employment of the employees are governed by a statute and statutory rules. No appointment can be made by a Local Authority without following the provisions of the recruitment rules. Any appointment made in violation of the said rules as also the constitutional scheme of equality as contained in Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India would be a nullity.

9. Due to some exigency of work, although recruitment on daily wages or on an ad hoc basis was permissible, but by reason thereof an employee cannot claim any right to be permanently absorbed in service or made permanent in absence of any statute or statutory rules. Merely because an employee has completed 240 days of work in a year preceding the date of retrenchment, the same would not mean that his services were liable to be regularized."

Therefore, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, the claim of the Workman for absorption merely on the basis of number of day of work in the Respondent bank Branch is not acceptable.

As regard plea of the Workman that the Workman should have been given employment even after 31.3.1997 as temporary Workman, it is the discretion of Respondent to engage the Workman depending upon availability of work and this Tribunal can not direct the Respondent to engage the Workman in the absent of such rule/scheme.

46. In view of principle laid down by Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above, in the instant matter Workman utterly failed to establish the fact of rendering continuous service for a period of 240 days of service within a period of 12 calendar months commencing and coming backward from relevant date i.e., the date of retrenchment, if has he would be denied to be in continuous service for a period of one year. Therefore, the provision contained under Sec.25F of retrenchment is not applicable to Workman.

Counsel for Workman has relied upon number of decisions of Hon'ble High Court and Hon'ble Supreme Court and few of them are discussed herein:-

In the case of **F.C.I., vs. Kamdhenu Cattle Feed Industries 1993 (1) SCC 71,** therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

"7. In contractual sphere as in all other State actions, the State and all its instrumentalities have to conform to Article 14 of the Constitution of which non-arbitrariness is a significant facet. There is no unfettered discretion in public law: A public authority possesses powers only to use them for public good. This impose the duty to act fairly and to adopt a procedure which is `fairplay in action'. Due observance of this obligation as a part of good administration raises a reasonable or legitimate expectation in every citizen to be treated fairly in his interaction with the State and its instrumentalities, with this element forming a necessary component of the decision making process in all State actions. To satisfy this requirement of non- arbitrariness in a State action, it is, therefore, necessary to consider and give due weight to the reasonable or legitimate expectations of the persons likely lo be affected by the decision or else that unfairness in the exercise of the power may amount to an abuse or excess of power apart from affecting the bona fides of the decision in a given case. The decision so made would be exposed to challenge on the ground of arbitrariness. Rule of law does not completely eliminate discretion in the exercise of power, as it is unrealistic, but providers for control of its exercise by judicial review."

In the case of **State Bank of India, R.O., Vijayawada vs. Industrial Tribunal, Hyderabad WP No.193/1997,** therein Hon'ble High Court have held,

"*Sri Krovvidi Narasimham, the learned counsel for the 2nd respondent contends, supporting the award that it was a permanent vacancy and even though the 2nd respondent was appointed on temporary basis, his services were not liable to be terminated and he was to be regularised into service on permanent basis. Shastry award warrants that no temporary appointment can be made to a permanent post. But the matter is now covered by two division bench judgements dated 28.11.1986 in W.A. No.791 of 1986 and 25.8.1987 in W.A. No.270 of 1982. The ratio decided in the two judgements is to the effect that there cannot be any mandate to appoint employees on permanent basis when the requirement was for appointment on temporary basis. But it is held in the said judgements that when a temporary appointee is ousted from service and not for misconduct and, if again temporary appointment is to be made, then, the case of such temporary appointee who was ousted, has got to be considered in accordance with Sec. 25-H of the Act."*

In the case of **State of Haryana and others vs. Piara Singh and others. 1992 (4) SCC 118,** therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

"49. If for any reason an adhoc or temporary employee is continued for a fairly long spell, the authorities must consider his case for regularization provided he is eligible and qualified according to the rules and his service record is satisfactory and his appointment does not run counter to the reservation policy of the state."

In the above cited judgements by the Workman the facts of the case are different hence do not apply to instant case of Workman.

47. On the other hand, in support of his contention Respondent has examined witness MW1 and MW1 in chief examination states that, Settlements i.e., on 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988, 9.1.1991 were entered into between the SBI and SBI Staff Federation for filling up of the vacancies that arise up to 1994 for those temporary employees who has worked on scale wages. Further, MW1 states that two different panels for messengers and non-messengers as per the eligibility criteria prescribed by the bank. There are four modules in Andhra Pradesh and they are Hyderabad, Tirupathi, Vijayawada and Visakhapatnam. MW1 states that the temporary employees so empanelled were given permanent absorption depending upon the vacancies so arise strictly in terms of the settlement. MW1 states that on 9.6.1995 conciliation proceeding was held before the RLC(C), Hyderabad and in said proceedings it was decided that the panels will be kept live up to 31.3.1997 and vacancies will be filled from both the lists concurrently. A copy of the said minutes of proceedings is Ex.M5. Further, MW1 states that on 30.7.1996 another settlement was entered between the SBI and All India SBI Staff Federation providing for filling up of the vacancies arising up to December 1994 in respect of subordinate cadre and daily wage /casual wage employees out of panel so prepared were to be considered against vacancies arising from January 1995 to December 1996, thereafter the said panels lapse. MW1 states that it was also agreed that all the non- messenger positions in subordinate cadre including part time attendants specially provided as leave reserve will be filled before 31.3.1997 and as regards to non-messengerial positions it is agreed that all such posts sanctioned and fallen vacant up to 31.3.1997 shall be filled before the empanelled list is allowed to lapse. Thus in both the cases empanelled list were lapsed on 1.4.1997. Ex.M6 is the copy of the settlement dated 30.7.1996. Further, witness states that on 27.2.1997 a memorandum of understanding was reached between the SBI and SBI Staff Federation providing that both the panels above mentioned will lapse on 31.3.1997. Ex.M7 is the copy of the memorandum of understanding and Ex.M8 is the copy of the statements giving the particulars of 1989 non-messenger panel, Ex.M9 is the copy of the statement of 1989 non- messenger panel, Ex.M10 is the copy of statement of 1992 panel. Further, witness states that petitioner was included in the 1989 panel. As the existing vacancies at that time were exhausted and his turn did not come he could not be given permanent employment in the bank as per the agreements. All the appointments were made strictly in accordance with the settlements reached from time to time between SBI and SBI staff federation and as per seniority, number of days of temporary service put in by them in the bank in the given period. Further, MW1 states petitioner was not sponsored by any employment exchange he did not undergo the regular process of selection required for appointment as a regular non-messenger the petitioner has not worked for 240 days in any year in his entire temporary service in the bank. The petitioner and other temporary employees were terminated from service by the bank. Further, MW1 states that the vacancies were filled up on regular basis with the temporary employees from the panels and these panels were expired in terms of the settlements so reached and there were no vacancies to absorb such employees. Thus, witness MW1 has proved the documents Ex.M1 to Ex.M12 and also contentions made in the counter. However, MW1 was cross examined by the Petitioner Counsel. But nothing has been elicited in his cross examination so as to discredit the testimony of the witness MW1 as regards the date of lapse of both the panels on 31.3.1997 and reasons assigned for non-absorption of the Petitioner from the

panel list to the permanent post. Moreover the witness MW1 was re-examined by the Respondent and the witness MW1 states that panels were expired in terms of the settlement send absorptions to the extent of the available vacancies were made. There was no termination of any temporary messenger as such but their services were not utilized after the cut off date as the available vacancies were already filled up and most of these Petitioners were not in the service of the bank as on the date of the expiry date of the panels. Therefore, in view of the aforesaid testimony of the MW1 in re-examination in the absence of cross examination remained uncontraverted, the claim of the Workman that he was entitled for absorption in permanent post in the branch of Respondent Management on the basis of panel list is found not established.

This point is answered against the Workman.

48. **Point No.IV**:- In view of the discussion and finding given at Point Nos. I, II and III, the Workman is not entitled for any relief and claim statement of Workman sans merit and liable to be dismissed.

This Point is answered accordingly.

AWARD

In view of the fore gone discussion, it is held that the action of the Respondent bank in terminating the services of Sri G. Anil Kumar, Ex. Messenger by way of oral orders w.e.f. 31.3.1997 is justified. Hence, the Petitioner is not entitled for any relief as prayed for. The claim statement filed by Workman sans merit, hence, dismissed. Reference is answered accordingly.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, Personal Assistant, transcribed by her, corrected and signed by me on this the 11th day of May, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner	Witnesses examined for the Respondent
WW1: Sri G. Anil Kumar	MW1: Sri Aluru Rama Rao

Documents marked for the Petitioner

Ex.W1:	Photocopy of Service Certificate
Ex.W1A:	Photocopy of Service Certificate
Ex.W1B:	Photocopy of Service Certificate dated 21.07.1992
Ex.W2:	Photocopy of Notification
Ex.W3:	Photocopy of Call letter for interview
Ex.W4:	Photocopy of Service Certificate dated 12.04.1993
Ex.W5:	Photocopy of Service Certificate dated 11.05.1993
Ex.W6:	Photocopy of Service Certificate dated 11.06.1993
Ex.W7:	Photocopy of Service Certificate dated 7.10.1993
Ex.W8:	Photocopy of Service Certificate dated 7.12.1993

Ex.W9: Photocopy of Service Certificate dated 13.05.1994

Ex.W10: Photocopy of Service Certificate dated 18.05.1994

Ex.W11: Photocopy of Service Certificate dated2.02.1995

Ex.W12: Photocopy of Service Certificate dated 05.12.1994

Ex.W13: Photocopy of Service Certificate dated 21.03.1994

Ex.W14: Photocopy of Service Certificate dated 13.05.1994

Ex.W15: Photocopy of Service Certificate dated 08.01.1994

Ex.W16: Photocopy of Service Certificate dated 17.05.1995

Ex.W17: Photocopy of Service Certificate dated 02.02.1995

Ex.W18: Photocopy of Service Certificate dated 15.03.1996

Ex.W19: Photocopy of Service Certificate dated 08.10.1996

Ex.W20: Photocopy of Service Certificate dated 23.11.1999

Ex.W21: Photocopy of Service Certificate dated 08.11.1996

Ex.W22: Photocopy of Service Certificate dated 23.11.1999

Ex.W23: Photocopy of letter to employment Exchange by the Respondent

Ex.W24: Photocopy of Circular letter dated 14.07.1999

Documents marked for the Respondent

Ex.M1: Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.17.11.87

Ex.M2: Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.16.7.88

Ex.M3: Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.27.10.1988

Ex.M4: Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.9.1.1991

Ex.M5: Photocopy of conciliation proceedings before the Regional Labour Commissioner(C) dt.9.6.1995

Ex.M6: Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.30.7.1996

Ex.M7: Photocopy of Memorandum of understanding dt. 27.1.1997

Ex.M8: Photocopy of statements giving the particulars of 1989 messenger panel.

Ex.M9: Photocopy of statement of 1989 Non-messenger panel

Ex.M10: Photocopy of statement of 1992 panel

Ex.M11: Photocopy of order of Hon'ble High Court in WA No.86/98 dt. 1.5.98

Ex.M12: Photocopy of order in SLP No.11886-11888 of 1998 dated 10.8.98

नई दिल्ली, 28 जुलाई, 2026

का.आ. 1616.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एस बी आई भारत का के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजको और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में **केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण–सह–श्रम न्यायालय,** हैदराबाद के पंचाट **(सन्दर्भ संख्या 93/2002)** को प्रकाशित करती है,

[सं. एल-12012/121/2000-आई.आर (बी-I)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 28th July, 2026

S.O. 1616.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Reference. I. D. No. 93/2002) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Hyderabad as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the Management of SBI of India and their workmen,

[No. L-12012/121/2000–IR (B-I)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

In The Central Government Industrial Tribunal Cum Labour Court At Hyderabad

Present: **Sri IRFAN QAMAR**

Presiding Officer

Dated the 7th day of May, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. 93/2002

[Old ID No.81/2000 of Industrial Tribunal No.I, Hyderabad]

Between:

Sri P. Mallikarjuna,
S/o Jalaiah,
Ulavapadu(P.O.) &(M),
Prakasham Dist.-523292. … Petitioner

And

The Asst. General Manager,
State Bank of India,
Zonal Office,
Region-II,
Tirupathi-517501. …..Respondent

Appearances:

For the Petitioner : Sri Macherla Rangaiah, Advocate

For the Respondent: Sri Y. Ranjeeth Reddy, Advocate

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-12012/121/2000-IR(B.I) dated 20.07.2000 referred the following dispute under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 to Industrial Tribunal No.I, Hyderabad for adjudication and later the same has been transferred to this Tribunal bearing ID No.81/2000, as per orders of Central Government vide Lr.No.H-11026/1/2001-IR(C.II) dated 18.10.2001, requiring this forum to decide the question:

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of State Bank of India, in terminating Sri P. Mallikarjuna, Ex-Temporary Messenger, Nellore Branch, by way of oral orders with effect from 31.3.1997 is justified? If not, what relief he is entitled?"

After receipt of the reference, it was numbered as ID No. 93/2002 and notices were issued to both the Workman and the management.

2. Before unfolding the factual matrix of the instant industrial dispute it would be apposite to have a bird eye view of a chequered history of the instant industrial dispute. Earlier instant industrial dispute along with the batch cases was decided by this Tribunal vide common award dated 17.5.2005 and the reference was answered in favour of the Respondent and against the Workman. That said common award dated 17.5.2005 was challenged by the aggrieved Workmen in various Writ petition No.6470/2014 along with batch of writ petitions before the Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh and Hon'ble High Court vide its' judgement dated 23.6.2014 allowed all batch of writ petitions and set aside the common award dated 17.5.2005 passed in ID No.222 of 2001 and other batch of ID cases by Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad and the Respondent management of State Bank of India was directed to reengage the Writ Petitioners in position, which they have been occupying prior to their termination and further directed to consider their cases for regularization as and when the substantive vacancy arises. This judgement dated 23.6.2014 of Hon'ble High Court of AP, passed in WP No.6470/2014 and batch petitions was challenged by Respondent management before the Hon'ble High Court in Writ Appeal No. 1268 of 2014. The aforesaid Writ Appeals No.1268/2014 and other Writ Appeals were decided by Division Bench of High Court of Andhra Pradesh by a common judgement dated 20.3.2019. Hon'ble High Court in aforesaid Writ Appeal was pleased to pass the order which is extracted as below:-

" 7. Hearing the learned senior counsel for the SBI and the learned senior counsel for the contesting unofficial Respondents, we see that while the learned single Judge was justified in setting aside the award af the Tribunal, the proper course to be adopted was to remit all the cases to the Tribunal. This we say for reasons more than one. Firstly, in such matters, claims have to be decided on individual basis, as different persons have different claims as to the length of officiation or discharge of duties and functions; quality of engagement, drawings, accounting of the post for each one of them, who have worked etc. All these issues will not be the same in all the cases. Therefore, each case ought to have been directed to be decided by the Tribunal afresh on individual basis. The second and most important aspect is the learned single Judge has in one go ordered re-employment of all the workmen. This is not a relief that could have been granted without answering the individual issues; each issue relating to each case could not have been decided by the writ Court within the format of its adjudication procedures and scope. The adjudicating body, which has to do that activity, is the Industrial Tribunal. Therefore, we are of the view that while we would sustain the order of the learned singe Judge insofar as it interfered and sets aside the award of the Tribunal, the

further findings and directions, issued through the impugned order have to go and the individual cases have to be sent back for consideration of the Tribunal. Such further procedure before the Tribunal will have to be carried forward with the materials already on record and also by affording an opportunity to the persons, who have claims as well as the management to place their rival contentions and further material before the Tribunal. The learned counsel appearing for the workmen are justified in pointing out that enormous delay has already happened and further action by the Tribunal in this line may be expedited.

9. In the result, these writ appeals are ordered;

(1) affirming the impugned common order of the learned single Judge to the extent it sets aside the common award dated 17.05.2005 of the Industrial Tribunal;

(2) the further findings and directions issued through the impugned common order are vacated:

(3) all the matters shall be remitted to the Industrial Tribunal with a direction to dispose of them within an outer limit of five (5) months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order; and,

(4) the parties to make appearance before the Tribunal on the given date."

Thus, in view of the above direction of Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh in W.A.No.1268 of 2014 and batch cases. This Tribunal has taken up the matter of industrial dispute for hearing and deciding it afresh in view of the aforesaid guidelines laid down by the Hon'ble High Court in Writ Appeal No.1268/2014 vide judgement dated 20.3.019.

3. The factual matrix of instant industrial dispute as narrated by the Workman in his claim statement are that, the Workman joined in the service of the management institution as Messenger from 1982 to 1995, and has rendered unblemished service spreading over a period of about 15 years. The Respondent has terminated services of Workman by oral orders with effect from 1.4.1997. Further, it is submitted that the management of Respondent bank decided to give a chance to temporarily employed personnel "found suitable for permanent appointment" by wait- listing them by offering permanent appointment or waitlisting till such opportunity arises.

4. That on 17.11.1987 a settlement was reached between All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and the Management of State Bank of India - settlement one, under this settlement three categories of employees were listed. That is, A) those who have completed 240 days in 12 months or less after 1.7.1975. B) those who have completed 270 days in any continuous block of 36 calendar months after 1.7.1975. C) (i) those who have completed minimum of 30 days aggregate temporary service in any calendar year after 1.7.1975 or (ii) 70 days aggregate temporary service in continuous block of 36 months after 1.7.1975.

5. The persons who satisfied in all the above 4 categories were to be interviewed by a selection committee and the said selection committee would determine the suitability of the said candidate for permanent appointment. Therefore, the bank prescribed certain qualifications and from among the candidates satisfying the qualifications the suitable candidates were enlisted by a selection committee. The Clause 7 of the said agreement provided with the selected candidate would be wait listed in order of their respective categorization and the selected panel would be valid upto December, 1991. Clause 10 of the settlement specifically provided that henceforth. "there will be no temporary appointments in the subordinate cadre", except on a restrictive basis in the specified category, "from amongst empanelled candidates as per existing guidelines of the bank". The Workman further submits that consequent upon

the said agreement and the draft, a notification was issued in the newspapers. The last date for responding to the advertisement was 30.8.1988. A written examination followed by viva-voce in May, 1989 was held. A selected panel was prepared, as per Clause 7 of the agreement, ie. Settlement No.1, the selected panel was to be valid upto December, 1991, the Workman submits that circular was issued on 26.4.91 by the said letter it is mentioned that the terms of the agreement dated 17.11.87 was modified vide second agreement dated 16.7.88 was entered into between the parties. In terms of the said agreement a chance was to be given, "to all eligible temporary employees for permanent appointments. The appointments were against the vacancies likely to arise during the years 1995-96, circular made it clear that in view of the enormity of the problem an extension of the currency of the panel, eligible temporary employees who have been empanelled could not appear in the earlier interviews and have been pursuing their cases thereafter, "will be given another chance to appear for interview".

6. Workman submits that there were total five settlements. The settlement dated 17.11.87 is the 1st settlement (Ex M1), settlement dated 16.7.88 is 2nd settlement (Ex M2), settlement dated 27.10.88 is the 3rd settlement (Ex M3), then settlement dated 9.1.91 is 4th settlement and settlement dated 30.7.96 is 5th settlement (Ex M6). In between there is minutes of conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.95 marked as Ex M5. That due to all these settlements which were extended by subsequent settlements thereby created reasonable expectations in the list of the selected candidates arose with that it's a question of time their appointments or services would be regularized in the services of the bank. The Workman was working with the bank on temporary basis was under the bonafide hope that sooner his services will be regularized with the bank. He is thereby closed all his options elsewhere. It is needless to point out that employing person to whom hope of employment in substantial terms was made is a facet of Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

7. Further Workman submits that the Government of India issued Circular No. F-3/3/104/87-IR, dated 16.8.1990. Under said circular the chief Executives of all public sector banks including the Management herein were specifically instructed that until the problem of existing temporary employees is fully resolved, no bank is permitted to make any permanent appointments. That some of the persons similarly situated like this Workman aggrieved by the inaction on the part of the management of the bank is not regularizing their services from out of the selected panel and not clearly focusing the vacancy position, filed W.P. No. 4194/97 before Hon'ble High court of A.P.. It is specifically averred in the said writ petition that the Management of the bank had failed to implement the settlement and that it violates the various fundamental rights guaranteed under the constitution of India. The Hon'ble High court of A.P .. by order dated 5.3.97 directed the bank to implement the settlement as amended from time to time. It also directed the bank to carry out the terms of settlement before the expiry of March, 1997. The Hon'ble High Court also recorded finding that the Bank cannot escape its liability of enforcement of the Settlement. In view of the directions given by the High Court all candidates whose names appeared in the select panels prepared on the basis of the agreement entered into on 17.11.87 under which the panel was valid upto December, 1991, and on the basis of a settlement dated 27.10.1988 whereby the panels were made alive upto 31.3.1997 under which the panel was valid upto December, 1999. The other agreement dated 16.7.1988 under which the panel was valid upto 1992 and on the basis of the settlement dated 27.10.1998 whereby the panels were made alive upto 31.3.1997 were under the bonafide impression that their cases will be considered for regularization and were living on the basis of the said reasonable expectation. Unfortunately, contrary to the aforesaid directions given by the High Court and contrary to the settlements entered into between the parties, the bank issued proceedings dated 25.3.1997, dated 27.3.1997 and 31.3.1997 instructing the various authorities of the Management not to continue the temporary employees

those who are in services of the bank from 1.4.97. The said order was followed by the Management. Aggrieved by the said action the Workman herein and similarly situated candidates have filed a writ petition before the Hon'ble High Court and by way of Writ Petition No.9206/97 seeking a declaration that the proceedings issued by the Deputy General Manager and the Assistant General Manager (Respondents 3,4 and 5 therein) on 25.3.97, 27.3.97 and 31.3.97 as illegal and also non-continuance of the Workmen therein in service by absorbing them in the services of the bank as violative of Section 2(p) and 18(1) read with Rule 58 of Central Rules and sought for specific direction to the bank to absorb them in service.

8. Further, Workman submits that in the counter affidavit filed in Writ Petition No.9206/97, the bank has submitted that it has about 805 branches in Andhra Pradesh alone. It has stated that due to exigencies of circumstances and on account of the urgent need in its banks, it employed temporary employees in subordinate cadre. It is pertinent to mention that it does not state the urgent or need or the nature of temporary employees that it had engaged. Enquiry into the same would reveal that the stand taken by the bank either on the ground of urgent need or of temporary employees is a façade to perpetuate unfair labour practice. It is designed to on the one hand, keep the employed in the erroneous zone of hope and on the other to ensure that benefits that a model employer will extend under various statutes to its employees is not required to be borne out by the bank. A reading of the counter affidavit would show that the bank would opines that being just fair and reasonable are which obviously is reprehensible and is a facet of unfair labour practice.

9. The Workman submits that the bank had referred in its counter affidavit to three settlements dated 17.11.87, 16.7.88 and 27.10.88. The bank in the guise of extending the benefits of the circular of Government dated 16.8.90 stated in its counter affidavit that as follows:

"Government of India, vide its letter dated 16.8.1990, issued guidelines to all the public sector banks with regard to recruitment and absorption of temporary employees in public sector banks. The said guidelines were issued to implement on the lines of the approach paper on the issue provided by a committee constituted in this regard. The Government of India guidelines made it clear that all the public sector banks may follow the provisions laid down in the approach paper.

The approach paper specified that the cases of temporary employees who had put in not less than 240 days of temporary service in 12 consecutive Months and who are entitled to benefit of Section 25-F may be decided by entering into a settlement with the representative union. In respect of temporary employees who had put in less than 240 days of service in 12 consecutive months or less, a settlement could be avoided and however if the Management so desired, they could enter into a conciliation settlement with the representative union. Para 6(h), it is mentioned that only those temporary employees who had put in temporary service of 90 or more days after 1.1 1982 would be eligible for considering under the scheme. Although the Government guidelines envisaged for a settlement in respect of employees who had put in temporary service of 90 or more days, the bank by way of further concession entered into settlements Even in respect of those who had put in less than 90 days. As such, it could be Seen that the settlements are more beneficial to the temporary employees concerned. The approach paper also specify at para 6(c) that the banks would provide one time opportunity to all the temporary employees and for that purpose temporary employees worked in the bank on or after 1.1.1982 could be considered for re-employment in terms of the scheme. The Respondents have gone further wherein even persons working after 1975 were also considered.

As could be seen from the above, there was a genuine effort on the part of the Respondent bank to provide permanent employment for as many as possible subject to availability of the vacancies.

It is further submitted that at para 6(k) of the approach paper, it was made clear that this would be one time exercise in full and final settlement of all the aims and disputes for the past period in respect of temporary workmen covered by the settlement. This would mean that the Government of India guidelines would cover only those persons who were temporarily employed for the period specified therein and not otherwise. As such, it is submitted that the Respondents have not only followed the Government of India guidelines but in fact covered cases of the employees who had worked for less than 90 days. As such, question of violation does not arise and in any case those were only broad guidelines and not directives".

10. The Workman submits that the bank also referred a subsequent settlement dated 9.1.1991 wherein there is a clause to the effect- that the panel of temporary employees and the panel of daily wage employees will be operated to a particular period. Therefore, their cases will not be considered. The Management herein relying upon this settlement in their impugned action. It is submitted that even the settlement dated 9.1.1991 will not empower the management to terminate the services of the temporary employees who are working in the bank services like the Workman herein as it does not specify the termination of the employees. In fact there are so many vacancies wherein the Management has engaged several new persons as temporary messengers/ attendars/ sweepers etc., even after the judgment of Hon'ble High Court without considering the cases of the similarly situated candidates like the Workman herein. It is submitted inspite of engaging fresh candidates as is now being done by the Management they would have continued the similarly situated candidates like the Workman herein in the services of the bank and consider their cases for absorption in view of the circulars issued by Central Government as well as the directions of this Hon'ble Court in Writ Petition No.4194/97, dated 5.3.97. In view of the circulars issued by the Central Government, the Management should not have relied upon the settlement dated 9.1.1991. Hence, the impugned action of the Management is illegal, unjust, violative of fundamental rights such as Articles 14,16 and 21 of the Constitution of India.

11. The Workman submits that in W.P. No.4194/97 filed by the union of temporary employees where in they have complained about the non- implementation of the settlements arrived between the parties and sought for absorption. Such employees in the bank services on permanent basis before the date fixed for carrying out the terms of settlement, the Court held that the members of the union had been empanelled in the list, they were not regularized and the time was going to run out to the near future and the Respondent bank and its officers cannot escape from the liability of enforcing the settlement which has been reached and therefore directed that the bank and the officers shall implement the settlement dated 17.11.87 as amended from time to time before the expiry of 31.3.97.

12. Further, it is submitted that in the clause of Settlement it is specifically mentioned that the workmen to be absorbed/appointed in the bank prohibiting any temporary appointments subsequent to the date of settlement even the authorities want to make temporary appointments that should be made only from among the empanelled can be appointed either for temporary vacancy or permanent vacancy except from among the empanelled candidates like the Workman and that should be continued till they are absorbed. The management committed unfair labour practices and terminated the services of the candidates with effect from 1.4.1997 which is arbitrary, discriminatory, contrary to their own guidelines and violative of the constitutional provisions which are guaranteed in Chapter-III of the Constitution of India.

13. The Workman submits that it is strange as to how the panels were allowed to lapse by a so-called Memorandum of Understanding dated 25.2.1997, that the action of terminating such employees like the Workman by virtue of an impugned oral proceedings without implementing the

settlement would be illegal and unfair labour practice which cannot be allowed to be perpetuated. That the discontinuance of the Workman after 31.3.97 who had served in the bank in any capacity amounts to retrenchment. It could not have been done without any notice and it violates Sec.25FF of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and the said action is violative of principles of natural justice guaranteed under Chapter III of the Constitution of India. This amounts to retrenchment without one month's notice and taken in view of such notice. Thus, the main proceedings issued by the Respondent is without jurisdiction and is arbitrary, illegal and therefore liable to be quashed. That the alleged Memorandum of Understanding dated 27.2.97, Ex.M5 does not own any legal entity, as the said Memorandum of Understanding is not published anywhere to brought to the notice of the Workman whose rights are being affected. It is submitted that Management did not adhere to the procedure envisaged by the Central Government in its' instructions dated 16.8.90 in the year 1995. The same was not followed in the year 1997 despite there being vacancies. The management has followed the procedure of calling candidates through Employment exchange instead of giving chance to the empanelled candidates like the Workman here. It is pertinent to mention here that the Respondent Management sent letters to the all similarly situated candidates like the Workman in the month of June, 1997, subsequent to the passing of impugned termination orders. After knowing the facts that the candidates are litigating, the Management refused to engage these candidates. It is once again reiterated that the panels are meant for absorption but not for termination. It was the duty of the Management to engage the empanelled candidates like the Workman even in temporary vacancies till they are absorbed permanently in regular vacancies. Hence, the action of the Respondent Management terminating the services of the Workman by oral order dated 31.3.97 is unjust, illegal, violative of principles of natural justice and hence, the Management be directed to reinstate and absorb the Workman and to grant all incidental and consequential benefits.

14. Per contra, Respondent had filed counter and made a contentions that the reference is not tenable and contrary to the provisions of I.D. Act, 1947. Respondent submitted that to tide over severe sub-ordinate staff constraints which arose out of leave vacancies, exigencies, etc., and also owning to the restrictions imposed by the Government of India/Reserve Bank of India on intake of staff, the Respondent bank used to engage sub-ordinate staff like messengers, sweepers, sweeper cum water boys, etc., depending on the availability of work on purely temporary basis for the smooth and uninterrupted functioning of the branches. It is submitted that the All India State Bank of India Staff Federation which represents majority of the employees in the State Bank of India comprising about 98% of the work force as its' members espoused the cause of temporary employees who have put in less than 240 days of temporary service in 12 calendar months in the bank and who were ineligible for any protection under Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 to give a chance for being considered for absorption and permanent appointments.

15. Discussions were held and on 17.11.1987 an agreement was signed between the federation and the Management bank under Sec. 2(p) read with Sec 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules 1957. A copy of the said settlement dated 17.11.87 which may be herein after referred as first settlement is filed and 4 categories were made as it has already been mentioned in the claim statement above, it need not be repeated here. In the first settlement, it was agreed that the temporary employees as categorized would be given a chance for being considered for permanent appointment in the bank's service against the vacancies which are likely to arise during the period 1987 to 1991. On 16.7.88 second settlement was arrived between the Federation and the Bank whereby it was agreed to substitute the period of consideration of vacancies as 1987 to 1992 in place of 1987 to 1991 as contemplated under the first settlement dated 17.11.1987. This is the second settlement. A 3rd settlement was entered into on 27.10.88 and it was agreed that the bank's service against the vacancies likely to arise

from 1988 to 1992 was to be considered. Government of India vide its letter dated 16.8.90 issued guidelines to all the public sector banks with regard to recruitment and absorption of temporary employees in public sector banks. The said guidelines were issued to implement on the lines of approach paper on the issue provided by a committee constituted in this regard. Government of India guidelines made it clear that all the public sector banks may follow the provisions laid down in the approach paper. The approach paper specified that the cases of temporary service in 12 consecutive months and who are entitled to benefit of Sec.25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 may be decided by entering into a settlement with the representative union. In respect of temporary employees who had put in less than 240 days of service in 12 consecutive months or less, a settlement could be avoided and however if the Management so desired they could enter into a conciliation settlement with the representative union. In para. 6(h) it is mentioned that only those temporary employees who had put in temporary service of 90 days or more days after 1.1.82 would be eligible for considering under the scheme. Although the Government guidelines envisaged for a settlement in respect of employees who had put in temporary service of 90 days or more days, the bank by way of a further concession entered into settlements. Even in respect of those who had put in less than 90 days and also the bank went a step further and said those persons who are working after 1975 were also considered. Hence, there was a genuine effort on the part of the Respondent bank to provide as many as possible jobs subject to the availability of the vacancies. However, para 6 (k) of the approach paper made it clear that it is a one time, exercise in full and final, settlement of all the claims and disputes for the past period, in respect of temporary workmen covered by the settlement. Another settlement was entered on 9.1.91 herein after referred as 4th settlement and the time limit was extended upto 1994 and separate panel was prepared for temporary employees, casual/daily wagers. It was agreed that while vacancies arising between 1988 to 1994 in respect of temporary employees and in respect of casual/daily wagers, they can be considered for the vacancies arising between 1995-96 only.

16. It is submitted that the administrative set up of the Hyderabad Local Head Office comprises of four Zonal Offices (Zones) at Hyderabad, Vijayawada, Visakhapatnam and Tirupathi covering all the Districts of Andhra Pradesh. In terms of the settlement the Management after following the procedure laid down therein prepared the panels of qualified candidates of temporary employees denoted as 1989 panel and also panel of casual/daily wagers denoted as 1992 panel for giving a chance for being considered for permanent absorption. These panels were prepared zone-wise separately for messengers and non-messengers in the descending order of temporary service put in by the candidates during the stipulated period i.e., 1.7.1975 to 31.7.1988. That the Federation approached the Regional Labour Commissioner(C) for implementation of bi-partite settlement in respect of absorption of temporary employees. The Regional Labour Commissioner(C) conducted conciliation proceedings and an agreement was arrived between the Federation and the bank. It was agreed that it would be kept alive upto March, 1997. A copy of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.2.1995 signed by the parties is filed as material paper. A settlement was arrived at and an agreement was signed between the Federation and the Management bank on 30.7.1996 under Sec.2 (p) read with Sec.18(1) of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957, which is hereinafter called as 5th settlement. That on 27.2.1997 a Memorandum of understanding was also signed by the federation's affiliate and the bank Management recording the fact that the exercise of identifying the messengerial vacancies as on 31.12.1994 has since been completed by Central Office and thereby 403 messengerial vacancies were sanctioned . It was agreed that these vacancies may be filled from 1989 panel of temporary employees after effecting conversion from full time non-messengerial staff in the usual manner and the agreement was reached accordingly. It was agreed between the Federation's affiliate and the Management bank that in terms of the settlement dated 30.7.1996 both the panels of temporary

employees and daily wagers/casual employees would lapse on 31.3.1997. That as agreed upon vacancies were filled from the panels. The Workman who has put in an aggregate temporary service of less than 240 days in a continuous block of 12 months period during 1.7.1975 to 31.7.1988 has no right to seek a direction to consider his candidature for absorption in the Management bank under any rule/law except under the settlement entered into thereon.

17. Respondent contended that, in fact, the case of the Workman can be considered under all the five settlements having got his case considered under provisions of these settlements. All the other provisions and terms of the settlements are also binding on him/her. The Management bank has not violated any of the provisions of the terms of the said settlement. That the very preparation and maintenance of panel is in compliance of the terms agreed under these settlements. These settlements were time bound and they ceased to exist on 31.3.1997. That the bank has never promised that all the candidates in the panel will be absorbed. In the advertisement itself it was made clear that candidates will be considered for absorption in the vacancies that may arise upto 1992. Keeping alive the panels after 31.3.1997 is contrary to the settlements arrived between the State Bank of India Staff Federation and the Management bank. That the settlements are binding on the parties. The Workman is also bound under the terms of the said settlement. The settlement does not suffer from any ambiguity as their language is very clear. The right under the settlements is to give them a chance to be considered for future appointment in the bank's services against the vacancies likely to arise. The settlements were effected to balance the expectations of the temporary employees to be absorbed in permanent service as against the constitutional rights for all eligible persons to be considered for employment every time a vacancy arises. That the alleged dispute including the demand for reinstatement has to be decided in this context. It is submitted that the period of panel list got expired on 31.3.97 and it is an integral term of the settlement and cannot be modified in any proceedings under the law. These temporary employees who unfortunately could not be accommodated for want of vacancies have no further rights to be considered for regularization. That the Hon'ble High Court in WP No.12964/94, held as follows, "It is needless to state that the settlement arrived at between the All India State Bank of India Staff Federation which, is the majority union and the bank Management is binding on the Workmen also. It is not at all the case of the Workman that any of the terms of the settlement has been violated by the bank's Management. If the Workman had worked in the bank on part-time basis before 31.5.94, that itself would not vest in him a right to claim that his services should be regularized on permanent basis against a full time cadre post. The claim put forth by the Workman in the present petition is therefore misconceived and not tenable. However, it is open to the Workman to claim any right which flows from the settlement between the union and the bank Management. As already pointed out that it is not the grievance of the Workman that some right which has flown from the settlement in favour of the Workman has been denied by the bank Management. Therefore, I do not find any ground, let alone substantial ground, to grant the kind of relief sought for by the Workman. Writ Petition fails and is accordingly dismissed. No costs."

18. Further, it is contended that if the panels were not lapsed at the end of designated period and allowed to be continued it would result in making the contracts of temporary employment indirectly permanent through back door entry, which would not only be contrary to the settlements but also to Articles 14 and 16 of Constitution of India and deprive the chances of original claimants who would Come through proper recruitment procedure. As their rights have been crystallized by operation of the settlements. Hence, there is no question of any Legitimate expectation being violated.

19. Similarly placed ex-employees filed WP No.9206/1995 and the batch before the Hon'ble High Court of A.P. and the learned Single Judge allowed the Writ Petitions. Aggrieved by the same WA No.86/98 and the batch was filed and the Division Bench set aside the order of the Single Judge. Thereafter the ex-temporary employees filed Special Leave Petition No.11886-11888 of 1998 before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India also dismissed the SLP. Therefore, reference to the Judgement of the Learned Single Judge in WP No.9206/97 is of no consequences as the same has already been set aside. The observations made in the Judgements cannot be relied upon for any purpose what so ever. The question of operation of Sec.25F would not come into play. Further the issue is covered by various Judgements of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India and various Hon'ble High Courts. Hence, the reference may be ordered that the Workman is not entitled for any relief.

20. In order to fortify his claim Workman has examined himself as WW1 and also filed documents in evidence which has been exhibited as Ex.W1 to W11. Further, the Workman has filed photocopies of documents in support of his claim which are discussed as under:-

Ex.W1 is the notification. Ex.W2 is the interview call letter. Ex.W3 is the panel list. Ex.W4 is the service certificate. Ex.W5 is the service certificate. Ex.W6 is the service certificate. Ex. W7 is the Service Certificate. Ex. W8 is the Service Certificate. Ex. W9 is the Service Certificate. Ex. W10 is the letter to employment exchange by the Respondent. Ex. W11 is the circular letter dated 14.07.1999.

21. On the other hand, Respondent has examined witness MW1 Sri K. Bala Kotaiah and this witness has exhibited 12 documents, marked as Ex.M1 to M12. The details of these documents are as follows:-

Ex.M.1 is the Settlement dated 17.11.1987. Ex.M2 is the Settlement dated 16.7.1988. Ex.M3 is the Settlement dated 27.10.1988. Ex.M4 is the Settlement dated 9.1.1991. Ex.M5 is the Minutes of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.1995. Ex.M6 is the Settlement dated 30.7.1996. Ex.M7 is the Memorandum of Understanding dt. 27.2.1997. Ex.M8 is the Particulars of 1989 Messengerial Panel. Ex.M9 is the Particulars of 1989 Non-Messengerial Panel. Ex.M10 is the Particulars of 1992 General Attendant Panel. Ex.M11 is the Judgment of Hon'ble High Court of A.P. in Writ Appeal No.86/98 dt.1.5.1998. Ex.M12 is the Judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in SLP No. 11886-11888 of 1998 dt.10.8.1998.

22. Apart from afore mentioned documents, Learned Counsel for Workman has also filed a long list of various judgements of Hon'ble Supreme Court as well as Hon'ble High Court, which we will discuss at appropriate place in this Award.

23. Heard the argument of Learned Counsel for Workman as well as for Respondent.

24. On the basis of rival pleadings of both the parties and submissions made by the Learned Counsel for both the parties, following points arise for determination in the industrial dispute :-

I. Whether the 1st settlement dated 17.11.1987, 2nd settlement dated 16.7.1988, 3rd settlement dated 27.10.1988, 4th settlement dated 9.1.1991 and 5th settlement dated 30.7.1996 entered into between State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and also Memorandum of Understanding are binding upon both the parties?

II. Whether the action of State Bank of India, Ulavapadu branch in terminating the services of Workman Sri P. Mallikarjuna, a Messenger with effect from 31.3.1997 is justified?

III. Whether the Workman is entitled for absorption on permanent post in the Branch of Respondent management as per averments made by him in the claim statement?

IV. To what relief if any the Workman is entitled for?

Findings:-

25. **Point No.I**:- Undisputedly settlements dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988, 9.1.1991 and 30.7.1996, minutes of conciliation proceedings and memorandum of understanding dated 27.2.1997 were executed between the State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation under section 2(p) and 18 (1) of I.D. Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Disputes (Central Rules), 1957.

Section 2(p) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 as follows:-

(p) "settlement" means a settlement arrived at in the course of conciliation proceeding and includes a written agreement between the employer and workmen arrived at otherwise than in the course of conciliation proceeding where such agreement has been signed by the parties thereto in such manner as may be prescribed and a copy thereof has been sent to an officer authorised in this behalf by the appropriate Government and the conciliation officer;

Section 18(1) provides as follows:-

18. Persons on whom settlements and awards are binding.

- [(1) A settlement arrived at by agreement between the employer and Workman otherwise than in the course of conciliation proceeding shall be binding on the parties to the agreement.

Therefore, in view of the provision contained u/s.18 (1) I.D. Act, 1947, terms and conditions enumerated in the aforesaid settlements are binding on the parties to the agreement. The Learned Counsel for Workman has argued that the Workman after going through the selection procedure has successfully been listed in the panel for appointment on the permanent basis in the Respondent management and the empanelled list has to be valid till last person in the empanelled list is appointed on permanent basis. But the impugned order dated 25.3.97, 27.3.97 and 31.3.97, has been issued by Respondent management thereby the services of the Workman has been terminated and the said order is not in consonance of the terms of the agreement entered into between the parties. Further, Workman submits that the Respondent in the 5th settlement has mentioned the date i.e., 31.3.1997 for lapse of empanel list which is illegal and that is not binding upon the Workman. The condition of lapse of empanelment list on 31.3.97 incorporated in the aforesaid 5th settlement, is arbitrary and illegal.

26. The perusal of the impugned order dated 25.3.1997 goes to reveal that the Chief/Branch Manager, SBI Zonal Office has issued the letter to all the branches with regard to the subject not to make any temporary appointments in the Branch in messengerial category from 1.4.1997. The extract of the said letter is given below:-

"We have been advised by the Deputy General Manager, Zonal Office, Hyderabad that as both the panels of temporary employees of 1989 and daily wagers/casual labours of 1992 will lapse by 31.3.1997, it has been decided by Central Office not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial category from 1.4.1997."

Thus, from the contents of the aforesaid letter, it manifest that Head Office of State Bank of India vide letter dated 25.3.1997 has issued direction to all its branches not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial category from 1.4.1997 due to reason of lapse of both panels i.e., 1989 & 1992 on 31.3.1997 as per terms of settlements entered into by both parties. Further, the contents of the subsequent letter dated 27.3.1997 issued by Respondent Management is also direction to Branch Manager, State Bank of India not to make any temporary messengerial category appointment with effect from 1.4.1997 and it has also been communicated to all concerned that the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers maintained by

Zonal offices stand lapsed from 31.1.1997. Further, office order dated 31.3.1997 has been issued by Respondent management that goes to reveal that the said office order has been issued to this effect that, "Consequent on absorption of temporary employees in permanent cadre, it has been decided by the competent authority that no one onwards, no further daily labour or temporary employees/appointments should be resorted to/engaged/employed." Therefore, it reflects from the contents of the aforesaid orders that the temporary appointment in messengerial category and daily labour has been stopped by the Respondent management with effect from 1.4.1997 because of the lapsed of panel of temporary workers and daily wagers by 31.3.1997. The agreement for lapse of both the panels on 31.3.1997 is contained in the 5th settlement which has been arrived at between the parties on dated 30.7.1996 with the consensus of both the parties. Therefore, Workman can not challenge the terms and conditions contained in settlement dated 30.7.1996 regarding lapse of panel on 31.3.1997 as agreed between State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation. As per provision contained u/s.18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 the said Agreement dated 30.7.1996 is binding on both the parties.

In the case of **Allied Sales Corporation Secunderabad vs.The Authority Under Andhra Pradesh..... 1990 II LLJ 510 AP para 414, Hon'ble Court have held:-**

"*4. There was a settlement between the Management and the workmen under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act on 25th April 1983 under which the age of superannuation of the workmen was fixed at 55 years. The settlement was to be in force upto 30th June 1986 and the next settlement, incorporating practically the same terms, was again entered into on 4th February 1987 under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act. There is no dispute that these settlements are under Section 18(1).*

14. Now the Authority constituted under Section 41(1) of the Act is an authority with very limited jurisdiction. It can only decide in the first appeal whether a termination by the management is valid or not and is within the parameters of Section 40 of the Act. The said Authority, in our view, has absolutely no jurisdiction to decide whether a settlement entered into under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act between the representatives of the Workmen and of the Management, is vitiated by undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion on the part of the Management. The Authority, namely, the Assistant Commissioner of Labour, was never intended by the A.P. Legislature to have jurisdiction to go into the question of the validity of a settlement arrived at under Section 18 of the Industrial Disputes Act by an Industrial Court. That Parliament has, in fact, constituted Industrial Courts under the Industrial Disputes Act, with extensive powers cannot be disputed. What we mean to say is that the Authority under Section 41(1) of the A.P. Act has no jurisdiction what-so-ever either to question or to decide about the validity of any such settlements. If parties to a settlement have a grievance about the validity of a settlement, it is for them to agitate the matter before the appropriate forum and they cannot ask an Authority constituted under Section 41(1) of the A.P. Shops and Establishments Act, 1966 with limited jurisdiction, to go into any such question and, that too, incidentally while deciding whether retirement as per the contract of employment, is legal or not."

It is not the case of Workman that aforesaid settlements are vitiated by undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion on the part of the management. If the Workman feeling aggrieved by any terms of settlement/ agreement on the aforementioned grounds then he can challenge of settlement before a competent authority under the Act, 1947. But here in the instant matter it is not a case of Workman that aforementioned settlement has been entered into between the parties on the ground of undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion. Therefore, Workman is barred to raise any objection in respect of fixing

the date of lapse of both panels on 31.3.1997 as agreed between both the parties and Workman can not challenge any terms of said Agreement.

Further in the case of **Herbertsons Limited Vs. Workmen of Herbertsons Limited and Ors, 1977 AIR 322,** Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

The Tribunal thought that the question of the quantum of membership of the 2nd Respondent did not call for a finding at all in view of 1his Court's order. As observed above that was not a correct assumption. On the other hand, we feel that this view of the Tribunal has led it to approach the matter in an entirely erroneous manner. The Tribunal is, rightly enough, conscious that under section 18 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act the settlement was binding on the company and the members of the 3rd Respondent union. Even so, the Tribunal devoted nearly half of its order in scanning the evidence given by the company and Respondent No. 3 to find out whether the terms of the settlement had been explained by the President of the union to the workmen or not and whether the workers voluntarily accepted the settlement knowing all the "consequences". This to our mind is again an entirely wrong approach.

"When a recognised union negotiates with an employer the workers as individuals do not come into the picture. It is not necessary that each individual worker should know the implications of the settlement since a recognised union, which is expected to protect the legitimate interests of labour, enters into a settlement in the best interests of labour. This would be the normal rule. We cannot altogether rule out exceptional cases where there may be allegations of mala fides, fraud or even corruption or other induce- ments. Nothing of that kind has been suggested against the President of the 3rd Respondent in this case. That being the position, prima facie, this is a settlement in the course of collective bargaining and, therefore, is entitled to due weight and consideration.

It is not possible to scan the settlement in bits and pieces and hold some parts good and acceptable and others bad. Unless it can be demonstrated that the objectionable portion is such that it completely outweighs all the other advantages gained the Court will be slow to hold a settle- ment as unfair and unjust. The settlement has to be accepted or rejected as a whole and we are unable to reject it as a whole as unfair or unjust. Even before this Court the 3rd Respondent representing admittedly the large majority of the workmen has stood by this settlement and that is a strong factor which it is difficult to ignore. As stated elsewhere in the judgment, we cannot also be oblivious of the fact that all workmen of the company have accepted the settlement. Besides, the period of settlement has since expired and we are informed that the employer and the 3rd Respondent are negotiating another settlement with further improvements. These factors, apart from what has been stated above, and the need for industrial peace and harmony when a union backed by a large majority of workmen has accepted a settlement in the course of collective bargaining have impelled us not to interfere with this settlement. That being the position, we unhold the settlement as fair and just and order that the award of the Tribunal shall be substituted by the settlement dated October 18, 1973. The said settlement shall be the substituted award. The appeal is disposed of accordingly. There will be no order as to costs."

Therefore, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above, the contention of the Workman that the date fixed for lapse of empanelled list on 31.3.1997 for appointment to the permanent post vide 5th Settlement dated 30.7.1996 is arbitrary, illegal is not untenable. The recognized union of Workmen has negotiated with the Respondent Bank Management representing large number of Workmen and the Workman as individual do not come into picture. Workman in the instant case has work as temporary Workmen in the Respondent Branch and in response of Notification he had applied for inclusion of his name in the panel and he was selected for inclusion his name in the panel list to be

utilized for absorption of such Workman to permanent post in order of their seniority in the list. The Settlement dated 30.7.1996 between State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation under Sec.2(p) and Sec.18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 has clearly provided as regard non-messengerial position and it is agreed that all such posts sanctioned fallen vacant upto 31.3.1997 shall be filled before empanel list is allowed to lapse. Thus, in view of law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, in the instant case, Agreement dated 30.7.1996 was entered into between both the parties in respect of lapsing of the both the panels on 31.3.1997 and absorption of the Workmen from panel list was subject to availability of vacancy of post likely to arise upto 31.3.1997, have a binding force on Workman as well as management of State Bank of India in view of provision contained under section 18 (1) of I.D. Act, 1947.

Thus, Point No.I is answered against the Workman and in favour of the Respondent.

27. **Point No.II**:- Firstly, it is submitted on behalf of the Workman that the Respondent has terminated his services by oral order on 31.3.1997 without issuing any notice or paying any salary or compensation in lieu thereof. Therefore, the termination order of the Workman from service is in violation of provision contained Under Section 25 F of I.D. Act, 1947. Therefore, the order is liable to be set aside.

28. On the other hand, Respondent counsel contended that Workman has not worked for 240 days in any preceding calendar year. Therefore, reference of the industrial dispute is not relevant. In this context, the Workman has examined himself as WW1 who has reiterated that Workman has been terminated from service by Respondent on 31.3.1997 without notice of salary or compensation in lieu thereof. Before examining the claim of the Workman on merit it would be apposite to reproduce the provision contained under section 25 F:-

Section 25F provides:-

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].

Compensation to workmen in case of transfer of undertakings.

Section 25B defines the term continuous service which provides

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 authorized 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;

In order to prove the fact of 240 days of service within 12 months of a calendar year just preceding from the date of termination, the initial burden of proof lies upon the Workman and the Workman has to prove this factum by adducing his oral as well as documentary evidence in support of his claim.

Further, how to calculate 240 days of service by the Workman in a calendar year. In this context the reference of decisions of Hon'ble Supreme Court is relevant and the same are discussed below:-

In Rajasthan State Ganganagar S. Mills Ltd. v. State of Rajasthan and Anr. (2004) Apex Court held:

"It was the case of the Workman that he had worked for more than 240 days in the year concerned. This claim was denied by the appellant. It was for the claimant to lead evidence to show that he had worked for 240 days in the year preceding the date of his termination. He has filed an affidavit. It is statement which is in his favor and that cannot be regarded as sufficient evidence for any Court or Tribunal to come to the conclusion that in fact the claimant had worked for 240 days in a year These aspects were highlighted in Range Forest Officer v. S.T. Hadimani (2002 (3) SCC 25. No proof of receipt of salary or wages for 240 days or order or record in that regard was produced. Mere non-production of the muster roll for a particular period was not sufficient for the Labour Court held that the Workman had worked for 240 days as claimed."

In Municipal Corporation, Faridabad v. Siri Niwas (2004 (8) SCC 195), held "*the burden was on the Workman to show that he was working for more than 240 days in the preceding one year prior to his alleged retrenchment." In M.P. Electricity Board v. Hariram (2004 (8) SCC 246) the position was again reiterated in paragraph 11 as follows: "The above burden having not been discharged and the Labour Court having held so, in our opinion, the Industrial Court and the High Court erred in basing an order of reinstatement solely on an adverse inference drawn erroneously ..*"

In the case of Manager, RBI, Bangalore vs. S Mani (2005) SCC Page 100, the 3 Judges Bench of the Apex Court held that "*the initial burden of proof was on the Workman to show that he had completed 240 days of service."*

Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of Mohan Lal vs Management BEL 1981 SCC page 225 has laid down the principle that how to count 240 days of service within one year it is held: *"Clause (2)(a) provides for a fiction to treat a Workman in continuous service for a period of one year despite the fact that he has not rendered uninterrupted service for a period of one year but he has rendered period of 240 days during the period of 12 calendar service for months counting backwards and just preceding the relevant date being the date of retrenchment. In other words, in order to invoke the fiction enacted in clause (2)(a) it is necessary to determine first the relevant date, ie the date of termination of service which is complained of as retrenchment. After that date is ascertained. move backward to a period of 12 months just preceding the date of retrenchment and then ascertain whether within the period of 12 months, the Workman has rendered service for a period of 240 days. If these three facts are affirmatively answered in*

favor of the Workman pursuant to the deeming fiction enacted in clause (2)(a) it will have to be assumed that the Workman is in continuous service for a period of one year and he will satisfy the eligibility qualification enacted in Section 25-F"

"14. We have already extracted section 25B since its amendment and the change in language is the legislative exposition of which note must be taken. In fact, we need not further dilate upon this aspect because in Surendra Kumar Verma and Ors. v. Central Government Industrial-cum-Labour Court, New Delhi and Anr., Chinnappa Reddy. J., after noticing the amendment and referring to the decision in Sur Enamel and Stamping Works (P) Ltd case, held as under:

"These changes brought about by Act 36 of 1964 appear to be clearly designed to provide that a Workman who has actually worked under the employer for not less than 240 days during a period of twelve months shall be deemed to have been in continuous service for a period of one year whether or not he has in fact been in such continuous service for a period of one year. It is enough that he has worked for 240 days in a period of 12 months, it is not necessary that he should have been in the service of the employer for one whole year."

In a concurring judgment Pathak J. agreed with this interpretation of section 25B(2). Therefore, both on principle and on precedent it must be held that section 25B(2) comprehends a situation where a Workman is not in employment for a period of 12 calendar months, but has rendered service for a period of 240 days within the period of 12 calendar months commencing and counting backwards from the relevant date, i.e. the date of retrenchment. If he has, he would be deemed to be in continuous service for a period of one year for the purpose of section 25B and Chapter VA."

Thus, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above the initial burden of proof lies upon the Workman to show that he has completed 240 days of the service with the Respondent just preceding from the date of his termination. Further, in respect of the employment of calculating the 240 days service provision contained under Section 25-F read with Section 25-B of the I.D. Act, 1947.

29. Now, in view of the provision contained under Section 25 F and law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, we have to examine whether the Workman has discharged his initial burden of proof in respect of his claim of 240 days continuous service in a calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination i.e., 31.3.1997.

In this context, WW1 in his cross examination has stated that,

"I was not sponsored by any employment exchange. I did not undergo the regular selection process required for appointment as a temporary attender.."

"I did not work for 240 days in any year in my entire service in the bank."

Thus, it is clear from the testimony of WW1 that the Workman had not worked for 240 days continuously in any 12 months of a calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination in the Respondent bank. Therefore, Workman failed to establish his plea by his oral and documentary evidence that he had worked for 240 days continuously in calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination i.e., 31.3.1997. Thus, the claim of the Workman that he has been terminated by oral order without issuing notice or payment in lieu after termination, in contravention of Section 25 F of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is not tenable. However the documents filed by the Workman in support of his claim, number of days worked with the Respondent goes to reveal that the Workman had worked intermittently as daily wager depending upon availability of work in branch. Workman did not file any document of

appointment letter or salary slips in support of his claim for appointment as a non-messenger in the Respondent branch on temporary basis.

30. Per contra, the Learned Counsel for Respondent has submitted the allegation of Workman that he was terminated from services is not correct. As the vacancies were filled up on regular basis in order of their respective seniority the non-engagement of the Workman does not amount to termination. Further, Respondent contended that no law provide that even though there is no work temporary employee should be continued in the bank work as the very engagement of Workman was subject to availability of work. Therefore, the allegation that the bank has indulged in unfair labour practice is incorrect.

31. Thus, in view of the fore gone discussion and contentions made by the Respondent, I find the force in the argument advanced by the Respondent that in the instant matter, Workman was not terminated from service by order dated 31.3.1997 rather he was disengaged in view of the non-availability of the work in the branch. Further, there was direction issued by the Head Office of the Respondent authority not to engage any daily wager Workman/ temporary Worker w.e.f. 1.4.1997. Thus, such disengagement of Workman does not amount to termination. Moreover, the Workman failed to prove his claim that he was terminated in contravention of provision of Sec.25F of the I.D. Act, 1947 as he failed to establish his plea by any oral or documentary evidence that he had worked for 240 days continuously in a twelve months of calendar year just preceding from date of termination i.e., 31.3.1997.

32. Further, perusal of the order dated 25.3.1997 goes to reveal that the Chief Branch Manager, State Bank of India has issued the letter to Zonal Office with direction to all its branches to this effect that they have been advised by the DGM, Zonal Office, Hyderabad that as both the panel of temporary employees of 1989 and daily wagers/casual labour of 1992 will lapse on 31.3.1997 it has been decided by central office not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial cadre from 1.4.1997, therefore it was directed to issue suitable instructions not to make temporary appointments from 1.4.1997. There is no mention in this order that the Workman herein has been terminated from service by this order.

33. Further, the circular dated 27.3.1997 was issued by DGM, SBI to all branches in commercial network in respect of the non-appointment of temporary employees in subordinate cadre and it has directed not to make any temporary employment in the subordinate cadre with effect from 1.4.97 and further, it has directed to ensure that no temporary/casual/daily basis appointment of the petty cash. Further, it is directed to all Branch Managers that any deviation in this regard will be viewed seriously. Thus, these circulars do not reflect that the Workman has been terminated from service by this order.

34. Similarly, office order dated 31.3.1997 is simply a direction to all branches of the Respondent bank by DGM that no further daily labour should be engaged or employed. Therefore, the plea of the Workman that he has been terminated by the aforesaid order dated 25.3.1997, 27.3.1997 and 31.3.1997 from the service by the Respondent is not acceptable. The evidence adduced by the Workman clearly goes to reveal that he had worked as a daily wager for which he has been paid wages according to number of working days. As there was an order for prohibition for engaging temporary workmen, in the bank, therefore, Workman could not be engaged by the Respondent for work from 1.4.1997 and there after. It is settled law that the daily wagers are engaged by the employer depending upon the availability of work and as the work was not available the Workman was not engaged further by the Respondent management. Therefore, the Workman on the ground of number of days he had worked in the Respondent bank cannot claim any right to reinstate him into the employment. As the Workman failed to prove the mandatory condition of 240 days of continuous service as required under Sec.25F of I.D. Act, 1947. Therefore, the

disengagement of Workman from work can not be termed in contravention of provision contained under Sec.25F and 25 B of the I.D. Act, 1947.

Thus, this point is answered against the Workman and in favour of Respondent.

35. Point No.III:- In this context, the Workman has contended that the management failed to implement the selected panels during its valid tenure. The management adopted the back door methods contrary to the settlements and filled up the vacancies. The same is evident from the proceedings dated 18.11.1993 a copy of the same is filed in the material papers and the same may be read as part of the claim statement. Further, it is submitted that management has to adhere the procedure issued by the Central Government, the instructions dated 16.8.1990 in the year 1995, but same was not followed in the year 1997 despite there being vacancies. The management has followed the procedure of calling candidates through employment exchange instead of giving chance to the empanelled candidates like the Workman herein. The management sent call letters to the similarly situated candidates like the Workman in the month of June 1997 subsequent to issuance of impugned termination orders. After knowing the fact that they are litigating the issue by way of dispute, the management has refused to engage those candidates, the copies of call letters issued are filed herein along with claim petition. The Workman herein reiterates that the panels are meant for absorption but not for termination. In view of the same a duty is cast upon the Respondent management to engage the empanelled candidates like the Workman herein even in temporary vacancies till they are absorbed permanently in regular vacancies.

36. On the other hand, Respondent has contended that the Federation approached Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) for implementation of bipartite settlement in respect of the absorption of temporary employees. The Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) conducted conciliation proceedings and agreement was arrived at between the Federation and the Management bank. It is submitted that it was agreed between the Federation and the Management that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers /casual labour would be kept alive upto March, 1997 and the vacancies as agreed to under the afore set out settlements will be filled from both the lists concurrently. A copy of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.1995 signed by the parties to the dispute is filed as a material paper. Further, it is submitted that the settlement was arrived at and an agreement was signed between the Federation and the Management bank on 30.7.1996 under Section 2(p) read with Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules 1957 which is binding on the parties. A copy of this agreement which hereinafter may be referred to as 5th settlement for brevity, is also filed as a material paper. The 5th settlement dated 30.7.1996 whereunder the earlier four settlements dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988 and 9.1.1991 were also referred, it was agreed to, by the Federation and the Management bank that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees will be kept alive upto March, 1997 for filling the vacancies existing/arrived at as on 31.12.1994 as per the norms agreed to between the bank and Federation and that thereafter the said panels would lapse. It was also agreed that within the framework of the above settlements the modalities about drawing names from either the panel of temporary employees or the panel of daily wagers and casual labour would be decided administratively on circle to circle basis depending upon the local requirements in consultation with the Federation's affiliate by the Circle management. It was further agreed that all messenger real vacancies/positions in the subordinate cadre including part-time attendants specifically provided as leave reserve will be filled by the end of 31.3.1997. Further, Respondent contended that on 27.2.1997 a memorandum of understanding was also signed between the Federation's affiliate and the bank management regarding the fact that the exercise of identifying the messengerial vacancies as on 31.12.1994 has since been completed by central office and thereby 403

messengerial vacancies were sanctioned to the circle of the Management bank and it was agreed that these vacancies may be filled from 1989 panel of temporary employees after effecting conversion from full time non-messengerial staff in the usual manner and the agreement was reached upon. Further, it was agreed between the Federations affiliate and the management bank that in terms of the settlement dated 30.7.1996 both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers /casual employees would lapse on 31.3.1997.

37. The Workman has contended that the empanelled list prepared by the Respondent management for appointment of temporary and daily wage Workers to the permanent post cannot lapse unless until it is exhausted by appointing all the empanelled persons and it should continue even after 31.3.1997, i.e., the date fixed for the lapse of panel. It is undisputed that the date of lapse of empanelled list of Workmen has been fixed to 31.3.1997 as mentioned in the settlement dated 30.7.1996, and agreed between the parties. It is settled law that and once the life of panel list lapses on the date as agreed between the parties it cannot be extended beyond that date. In the instant case the panel list of the workmen was valid upto 31.3.1997 in view of the terms and conditions enumerated in the 5th Settlement entered into between the parties. As the lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997 has been agreed by State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation through 5th Settlement, the Workman is not competent to challenge the same.

In this context I would like to take reference of the decision of the apex court in the case of **Syndicate Bank and Ors vs. Shankar Paul and Ors , AIR 1997 SC 3091, therein the Hon'ble Apex Court** have held:-

"Till 1982, the branches of the appellant Bank in Calcutta region were recruiting persons locally to work as temporary attenders in leave vacancies. In view of the revised procedure prescribed by the Government of India in respect of such temporary appointments, the Calcutta regional office of the appellant Bank issued a circular to all of its branches on 14.8.1982, instructing all the branches under it to discontinue the old practice from 1.6.1982 and appoint only empanelled candidates. The regional office was to prepare a panel of eligible candidates, after calling names from the local/district employment exchange, and split it up branch-wise. Following that new procedure yearly panels were prepared thereafter. Names of the Respondents were for the first time included in the panel prepared for the period 7.2.1987 to 6.2.1988. By its letter dated 7.2.1987 the Bank had informed the Respondents that the panel was valid for one year only and that inclusion of their names in the panel was not to confer on them any right to seek permanent appointment in the service of the bank. Considering the object with which the panel was prepared and the fact that it was an yearly panel expiring on 6.2.1988, we are of the opinion that the Respondents did not get any right, because of inclusion of their names in the said panel, for permanent absorption in the service of the Bank. Whatever conditional right they had came to an end with the expiry of the panel. The claim of the Respondents, as contained in the writ petition was thus misconceived and therefore the learned single Judge and the Division Bench, when it first decided the appeal, were right in dismissing the writ petition and the appeal respectively."

Thus, in view of the above law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court and in view of the terms and conditions of the 5th Settlement the contention of the Workman that empanelled list should continue even after 31.3.1997 till the last Workman in the panel is absorbed is not tenable. The contention of the Workman is baseless in view of recital in the settlement. Therefore, in view of the fore gone discussion and finding given at Point No. I regarding binding nature of Settlements and terms and conditions enumerated therein, in view of the provision contained u/s.18(1) of the I.D. Act, 1947, I am of the considered view that life of panels lapsed on 31.3.1997 in view of terms of settlement dated 30.7.1996 and

plea of Workman that the panel shall continue even after 31.3.1997 till last man absorbed has no legal force and same is untenable.

38. Undisputedly, settlement agreement dated 30.7.1996 was executed between the State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation and in that settlement it was agreed that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/ casual employees will be used for filling vacancies existing as on 31.12.1994 as per the norms agreed between the bank and the Federation. These empanelled workmen were to be given a chance for permanent appointment in the bank against vacancies arising up to December 1994 whereas the daily wagers/ casual employees were to be considered against the vacancies arise from January 1995 to December 1996, whereby the said panel would lapse. It was agreed that the vacancies falls upto 31.3.1997 shall be filled before the empanelled list is allowed to lapse. Thus, the claim of the Workman to the post of permanent non-messenger in the Respondent management was subject to the availability of the sanctioned post and vacancies arising upto 31.3.1997. The workmen given chance to the permanent post were seniors in number of working days in panel list and Workman herein was junior to those workmen. Therefore, Workman could not be given absorption to permanent post being junior to other workmen in the panel list.

39. In this context the Workman witness WW1 was cross examined by the Respondent counsel and in the cross examination the witness WW1 states:-

"I applied in response to an advertisement issued by the bank as per the settlements entered between the bank and the union. Further, witness states, *The panel was prepared depending upon the number of days of service put in by the temporary employees. Some of the employees were given regular appointment as per the settlements in order of their seniority….* Further witness states, *'I am not having any documents to show that any of my juniors are continuing in the service."*

Thus, from the above statement of the Workman witness WW1 it is clear that the panel was prepared in terms of various settlements entered into between Staff Federation of State Bank of India and State Bank of India and it was prepared on the basis of number of days of work put in by the temporary employees. Further, the Workman himself admitted that some of the temporary employees whose names were included in the panel were given regular appointment in the bank in order of their seniority in the panel and he is not having any document to show that any person who worked for less number of days than the Workman was given appointment in the bank. Therefore, the allegation of the Workman that the regular appointment has been made by the bank from the panel list in breach of the terms of the settlement and violation of seniority of panel list is not proved by this evidence of WW1. Thus, there is no evidence on record that bank has given the appointment to the temporary employees as well as daily wagers from the panel list 1989 and 1992 in breach of seniority of the temporary employees in the list. There is no evidence of jumbling in the panel list to make appointment of any permanent Workman in breach of the seniority. Therefore, I am constrained to hold that the Respondent Management has appointed the workmen from panel list in order of seniority and there is no jumbling of workmen in the panel list before it got lapsed on 31.3.1997.

40. However, Workman has taken the plea that the panels of Workmen for absorption in the employment of the Respondent banks (panels of temporary employees and daily wagers) has been lapsed on 31.3.1997 in contravention of terms of settlement as the object of preparing the entire empanelment of temporary and daily wagers was to provide them permanent employment and till the both the panel lists exhausted the panel list cannot be lapsed on 31.3.1997 and the date of lapsing of the panel on 31.3.1997 has been fixed by the Respondent arbitrarily without any authority.

41. In this context, the perusal of Settlement dated 30.7.1996 reveals that the 5th Settlement dated 30.7.1996 was entered under Section 2(p) and 18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Dispute (Central) Rules 1957. This settlement has been entered into by the competent parties and in this settlement parties thereto agreed that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees will lapse on 31.3.1997. Thus the date of lapse of panel was fixed by both the parties with consensus under the settlement dated 30.7.1996 and same is binding upon the Workman under the provision of Section 18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947. Moreover, this issue of binding force of the settlement dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988 and 9.1.1991 has already been discussed, decided at finding in Point No.I of this award. However, the legality and validity of the aforementioned settlement has not been challenged by the Workman before any competent forum. Thus, claim of Workman that the date of lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997 has been fixed arbitrarily by the Respondent bank is untenable. As regard the claim of Workman for his absorption to the permanent post it is settled law that the Workman can not claim his regularization to permanent post merely on the basis of number of working days.

42. In this context the reference of the decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Oil and Natural Gas Corporation vs Krishan Gopal 2020(3) SCALE 272, date of decision 7.2.2020** is relevant therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have has laid down principle regarding regularization of the Workman on permanent posts. Hon'ble Supreme Court have laid down the prepositions of regularization of the workmen to permanent post is as under:-

"*(i) Wide as they are, the powers of the Labour Court and the Industrial Court cannot extend to a direction to order regularisation, where such a direction would in the context of public employment offend the provisions contained in Article 14 of the Constitution;*

(ii) The statutory power of the Labour Court or Industrial Court to grant relief to workmen including the status of permanency continues to exist in circumstances where the employer has indulged in an unfair labour practice by not filling up permanent posts even though such posts are available and by continuing to employ workmen as temporary or daily wage employees despite their performing the same work as regular workmen on lower wages;

(iii) The power to create permanent or sanctioned posts lies outside the judicial domain and where no posts are available, a direction to grant regularisation would be impermissible merely on the basis of the number of years of service;

(iv) Where an employer has regularised similarly situated workmen either in a scheme or otherwise, it would be open to workmen who have been deprived of the same benefit at par with the workmen who have been regularised to make a complaint before the Labour or Industrial Court, since the deprivation of the benefit would amount to a violation of Article 14; and

(v) In order to constitute an unfair labour practice under Section 2(ra) read with Item 10 of the Vth Schedule of the ID Act, the employer should be engaging workmen as badlis, temporaries or casuals, and continuing them for years, with the object of depriving them of the benefits payable to permanent workmen.

Thus, in view of the principles laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court as discussed above, in the instant matter the Workman utterly failed to prove his claim by adducing any documentary or oral evidence that the employer has indulged in unfair labour practice by not filling the permanent posts even though such posts are available and by continuing to employ workmen as temporary or daily wage employees despite their performance was the same work, as regular workmen on lower wages.

43. Respondent has contended that all the vacancies exist and arise upto 31.3.1997 has been filled up from the panel list in order of seniority and no vacancy exists or arises as on 31.3.1997 remained unfilled. Further, it is contended that as per terms of settlement the life of panel lists has been lapsed on 31.3.1997, hence, there is no occasion to extend the life of panel lists beyond 31.3.1997. However, the workman failed to prove contrary by any evidence to the aforesaid contention of the Respondent that the vacancies were existing as on 31.3.1997 and the workman was not given absorption to the permanent post in order of his seniority. It is settled law that the power to create permanent or sanctioned post lies outside the judicial domain and where no posts are available, a direction to grant regularization would be impermissible merely on the basis of the number of years of service. Therefore, the claim of the workman on this ground also not acceptable.

44. Further, as per the of settlement, panel was prepared for absorption of the workmen on the permanent posts has already been lapsed on 31.3.1997 and the vacancies existing and arising upto 31.12.1994 and upto 31.3.1997 as settlement dated 30.7.1996 has been filled up from the panel by appointing the workmen as per seniority in the panel list. Workman witness WW1 in his cross examination has himself admitted this fact that, some of the temporary employees whose names were included in the panel were given regular appointment in the bank in order of their seniority in the panel. The Workman failed to show that there was any breach of terms of settlement has been committed by the Respondent in appointment to permanent post from aforesaid panel list.

45. As discussed in preceding paragraph of this Award, the life of the panel has not been extended beyond 31.3.1997, by any further settlement hence, the panel list in which name of the Workman was included got expired on 31.3.1997. It is not the case of the Workman that Respondent has regularized similarly situated workmen either in the scheme or otherwise and the Workman has been deprived of same benefit on par with those workmen or the vacancies remained unfilled on the date of lapse of panels i.e., 31.3.1997, Industrial Tribunal has no jurisdiction to extend the date of lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997. This Tribunal can not order for regularization of workmen to the permanent post in contravention of the provision of Article 14 of the Constitution of India.

In the case of **Mahboob Deepak vs. Nagar Panchayat Gajraula & Anr, Civil Appeal No.5875/2007 date of judgement 13.12.2007,** Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

"8. Respondent is a Local Authority. The terms and conditions of employment of the employees are governed by a statute and statutory rules. No appointment can be made by a Local Authority without following the provisions of the recruitment rules. Any appointment made in violation of the said rules as also the constitutional scheme of equality as contained in Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India would be a nullity.

9. Due to some exigency of work, although recruitment on daily wages or on an ad hoc basis was permissible, but by reason thereof an employee cannot claim any right to be permanently absorbed in service or made permanent in absence of any statute or statutory rules. Merely because an employee has completed 240 days of work in a year preceding the date of retrenchment, the same would not mean that his services were liable to be regularized."

Therefore, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, the claim of the Workman for absorption merely on the basis of number of day of work in the Respondent bank Branch is not acceptable. As regard plea of the Workman that the Workman should have been given employment even after 31.3.1997 as temporary Workman, it is the discretion of Respondent to engage the Workman depending

upon availability of work and this Tribunal can not direct the Respondent to engage the Workman in the absent of such rule/scheme.

46. In view of principle laid down by Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above, in the instant matter Workman utterly failed to establish the fact of rendering continuous service for a period of 240 days of service within a period of 12 calendar months commencing and coming backward from relevant date i.e., the date of retrenchment, if has he would be denied to be in continuous service for a period of one year. Therefore, the provision contained under Sec.25F of retrenchment is not applicable to Workman.

Counsel for Workman has relied upon number of decisions of Hon'ble High Court and Hon'ble Supreme Court and few of them are discussed herein:-

In the case of **F.C.I., vs. Kamdhenu Cattle Feed Industries 1993 (1) SCC 71,** therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

"7. In contractual sphere as in all other State actions, the State and all its instrumentalities have to conform to Article 14 of the Constitution of which non-arbitrariness is a significant facet. There is no unfettered discretion in public law: A public authority possesses powers only to use them for public good. This impose the duty to act fairly and to adopt a procedure which is `fairplay in action'. Due observance of this obligation as a part of good administration raises a reasonable or legitimate expectation in every citizen to be treated fairly in his interaction with the State and its instrumentalities, with this element forming a necessary component of the decision making process in all State actions. To satisfy this requirement of non- arbitrariness in a State action, it is, therefore, necessary to consider and give due weight to the reasonable or legitimate expectations of the persons likely lo be affected by the decision or else that unfairness in the exercise of the power may amount to an abuse or excess of power apart from affecting the bona fides of the decision in a given case. The decision so made would be exposed to challenge on the ground of arbitrariness. Rule of law does not completely eliminate discretion in the exercise of power, as it is unrealistic, but providers for control of its exercise by judicial review."

In the case of **State Bank of India, R.O., Vijayawada vs. Industrial Tribunal, Hyderabad WP No.193/1997,** therein Hon'ble High Court have held,

"*Sri Krovvidi Narasimham, the learned counsel for the 2nd respondent contends, supporting the award that it was a permanent vacancy and even though the 2nd respondent was appointed on temporary basis, his services were not liable to be terminated and he was to be regularised into service on permanent basis. Shastry award warrants that no temporary appointment can be made to a permanent post. But the matter is now covered by two division bench judgements dated 28.11.1986 in W.A. No.791 of 1986 and 25.8.1987 in W.A. No.270 of 1982. The ratio decided in the two judgements is to the effect that there cannot be any mandate to appoint employees on permanent basis when the requirement was for appointment on temporary basis. But it is held in the said judgements that when a temporary appointee is ousted from service and not for misconduct and, if again temporary appointment is to be made, then, the case of such temporary appointee who was ousted, has got to be considered in accordance with Sec. 25-H of the Act."*

In the case of **State of Haryana and others vs. Piara Singh and others. 1992 (4) SCC 118,** therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

" 49. If for any reason an adhoc or temporary employee is continued for a fairly long spell, the authorities must consider his case for regularization provided he is eligible and qualified according to the

rules and his service record is satisfactory and his appointment does not run counter to the reservation policy of the state."

In the above cited judgements by the Workman the facts of the case are different hence do not apply to instant case of Workman.

47. On the other hand, in support of his contention Respondent has examined witness MW1 and MW1 in chief examination states that, Settlements i.e., on 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988, 9.1.1991 were entered into between the SBI and SBI Staff Federation for filling up of the vacancies that arise up to 1994 for those temporary employees who has worked on scale wages. Further, MW1 states that two different panels for messengers and non-messengers as per the eligibility criteria prescribed by the bank. There are four modules in Andhra Pradesh and they are Hyderabad, Tirupathi, Vijayawada and Visakhapatnam. MW1 states that the temporary employees so empanelled were given permanent absorption depending upon the vacancies so arise strictly in terms of the settlement. MW1 states that on 9.6.1995 conciliation proceeding was held before the RLC(C), Hyderabad and in said proceedings it was decided that the panels will be kept live up to 31.3.1997 and vacancies will be filled from both the lists concurrently. A copy of the said minutes of proceedings is Ex.M5. Further, MW1 states that on 30.7.1996 another settlement was entered between the SBI and All India SBI Staff Federation providing for filling up of the vacancies arising up to December 1994 in respect of subordinate cadre and daily wage /casual wage employees out of panel so prepared were to be considered against vacancies arising from January 1995 to December 1996, thereafter the said panels lapse. MW1 states that it was also agreed that all the non- messenger positions in subordinate cadre including part time attendants specially provided as leave reserve will be filled before 31.3.1997 and as regards to non-messengerial positions it is agreed that all such posts sanctioned and fallen vacant up to 31.3.1997 shall be filled before the empanelled list is allowed to lapse. Thus in both the cases empanelled list were lapsed on 1.4.1997. Ex.M6 is the copy of the settlement dated 30.7.1996. Further, witness states that on 27.2.1997 a memorandum of understanding was reached between the SBI and SBI Staff Federation providing that both the panels above mentioned will lapse on 31.3.1997. Ex.M7 is the copy of the memorandum of understanding and Ex.M8 is the copy of the statements giving the particulars of 1989 non-messenger panel, Ex.M9 is the copy of the statement of 1989 non- messenger panel, Ex.M10 is the copy of statement of 1992 panel. Further, witness states that petitioner was included in the 1989 panel. As the existing vacancies at that time were exhausted and his turn did not come he could not be given permanent employment in the bank as per the agreements. All the appointments were made strictly in accordance with the settlements reached from time to time between SBI and SBI staff federation and as per seniority, number of days of temporary service put in by them in the bank in the given period. Further, MW1 states petitioner was not sponsored by any employment exchange he did not undergo the regular process of selection required for appointment as a regular non-messenger the petitioner has not worked for 240 days in any year in his entire temporary service in the bank. The petitioner and other temporary employees were terminated from service by the bank. Further, MW1 states that the vacancies were filled up on regular basis with the temporary employees from the panels and these panels were expired in terms of the settlements so reached and there were no vacancies to absorb such employees. Thus, witness MW1 has proved the documents Ex.M1 to Ex.M12 and also contentions made in the counter. However, MW1 was cross examined by the Petitioner Counsel. But nothing has been elicited in his cross examination so as to discredit the testimony of the witness MW1 as regards the date of lapse of both the panels on 31.3.1997 and reasons assigned for non-absorption of the Petitioner from the panel list to the permanent post. Moreover the witness MW1 was re-examined by the Respondent and the witness MW1 states that panels were expired in terms of the settlement send absorptions to the extent of

the available vacancies were made. There was no termination of any temporary messenger as such but their services were not utilized after the cut off date as the available vacancies were already filled up and most of these Petitioners were not in the service of the bank as on the date of the expiry date of the panels. Therefore, in view of the aforesaid testimony of the MW1 in re-examination in the absence of cross examination remained uncontraverted, the claim of the Workman that he was entitled for absorption in permanent post in the branch of Respondent Management on the basis of panel list is found not established.

This point is answered against the Workman.

48. **Point No.IV**:- In view of the discussion and finding given at Point Nos. I, II and III, the Workman is not entitled for any relief and claim statement of Workman sans merit and liable to be dismissed.

This Point is answered accordingly.

AWARD

In view of the fore gone discussion, it is held that the action of the Respondent bank in terminating the services of Sri P. Mallikarjuna, Ex. Messenger by way of oral orders w.e.f. 31.3.1997 is justified. Hence, the Petitioner is not entitled for any relief as prayed for. The claim statement filed by Workman sans merit, hence, dismissed. Reference is answered accordingly.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, Personal Assistant, transcribed by her, corrected and signed by me on this the 7th day of May, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner	Witnesses examined for the Respondent
WW1: Sri P. Mallikarjuna	MW1: Sri K. Bala Kotaiah

Documents marked for the Petitioner

Ex.W1:	Photocopy of notification
Ex.W2:	Photocopy of interview call letter
Ex.W3:	Photocopy of Panel list
Ex.W4:	Photocopy of Service Certificate
Ex.W5:	Photocopy of Service certificate
Ex.W6:	Photocopy of service certificate
Ex.W7:	Photocopy of Service certificate
Ex.W8:	Photocopy of service certificate
Ex.W9:	Photocopy of Service certificate
Ex.W10:	Photocopy of lr. to employment exchange by the Respondent
Ex.W11:	Photocopy of circular letter dated 14.07.1999

Documents marked for the Respondent

Ex.M1: Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.17.11.87

Ex.M2: Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.16.7.88

Ex.M3: Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.27.10.1988

Ex.M4: Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.9.1.1991

Ex.M5: Photocopy of conciliation proceedings before the Regional Labour Commissioner(C) dt.9.6.1995

Ex.M6: Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.30.7.1996

Ex.M7: Photocopy of Memorandum of understanding dt. 27.1.1997

Ex.M8: Photocopy of statements giving the particulars of 1989 messenger panel.

Ex.M9: Photocopy of statement of 1989 Non-messenger panel

Ex.M10: Photocopy of statement of 1992 panel

Ex.M11: Photocopy of order of Hon'ble High Court in WA No.86/98 dt. 1.5.98

Ex.M12: Photocopy of order in SLP No.11886-11888 of 1998 dated 10.8.98

नई दिल्ली, 27 जुलाई, 2026

का.आ. 1617.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार दक्षिण भारत गेटवे टर्मिनल प्राइवेट लिमिटेड के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजको और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में **केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण–सह–श्रम न्यायालय,** चेन्नई के पंचाट **(सन्दर्भ संख्या 97/2017)** को प्रकाशित करती है,

[सं. एल- 44012/01/2017-आई.आर (बी-II)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 27th July, 2026

S.O. 1617.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Reference. I.D. No. 97/2017) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, CHANNAI as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the Management of Dakshin Bharat gateway Terminal Pvt,Ltd. of India and their workmen,

[No. L-44012/01/2017–IR (B-II)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL- CUM - LABOUR COURT, CHENNAI

Date: 19-05-2026

Present: SUSHIL KUMAR-II**,**

PRESIDING OFFICER

I.D. No.97/2017

BETWEEN

Shri S.Saravanan,

No.4/407/4, Muthammal Colony,

II Street, Extension,

Tuticorin Dist-628 002. : Petitioner

AND

The Chief Executive Officer,

Dakshin Bharat Gateway Terminal Pvt. Ltd

Berth No.8, V.O.C. Port Trust,

Tuticorin Dist. 628 004. : Respondent

Appearance:

For the Petitioner : M/s. Kanimozhi Mathi, Advocates

For the Respondent : M/s. P.Nehru, Advocates

****

The Central Government, Ministry of Labour & Employment, New Delhi vide its order No. L-44012/01/2017-IR(B-II) dated 25.10.2017 referred the following Industrial Dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication:-

> *"Whether the action of the management of M/s. Dakshin Bharat Gateway Terminal Pvt.Ltd., Tuticorin in terminating the service of Shri S.Saravanan, an ex-Senior Executive (Operations) w.e.f. 20.04.2016 is just, legal and fair? If not, to what extent the workman is entitled for relief?*

2. As per the claim statement, the Petitioner has joined the respondent as Senior Executive (operations) during November, 2013 and the Respondent/Management has terminated his services w.e.f. 20.04.2016. the Petitioner has issued legal notice dated 26.04.2016 demanding revocation of the termination order, but received no reply from the Respondent/Management.

3. It is further stated that the Petitioner has raised an industrial dispute u/s.2A and escalated the matter to the RLC, Madurai initiating conciliation proceedings. On failure of conciliation proceedings, the Labour Commissioner submitted a failure report to the Central Govt. based on the report which has

referred the matter for adjudication to this Tribunal. The Petitioner seeks reinstatement into service with continuity of service and other attendant benefits with full back wages.

4. The Respondent in its reply stated that the Petitioner is not a workman. The Petitioner was working in managerial position. He was the authority competent to grant leave to the employees. He was vested with the power of supervising entire all loading and unloading work in the vessel and gate entry and exist and approximately 25 workmen are working under him. The Petitioner being Senior Executive (operations) was vested with the duties of assigning the work of persons working under him, supervising, allocating of jobs, make recommendation regarding grant of leave to the workmen and to supervise all the workmen.

5. It is further stated that the Petitioner was authorized to deal outside agencies on behalf of the company. He used to send e-mails outside the company seeking CHA license, copy of same for registration purpose and he was authorized to communicate on behalf of the outside company. He was not performing highly skilled technical work but perform the duties of uploading work etc. It is also stated that he is gainfully employed and thus the ID is not maintainable on this very ground alone.

6. The Respondent further stated that the termination being contractual was justified by post facto allegation of misconduct u/s.11A of the Act.

Witnesses Examined:

For the First Party Petitioner : WW1 Shri S.Saravanan, Petitioner

For the 2nd Party/Management : NIL

Documents Marked:

On the Petitioner's side:

Ex.No.	Date	Description
Ex.W1	03.09.2013	Letter of Offer
Ex.W2	04.11.2013	Appointment order of the p-
Ex.W3	20.04;2016	Termination order
Ex.W4	24.04/2016	Legal notice sent by petitioner to Respondent
Ex.W5	08.0-9.2016	Conciliation letter sent by RLC Madurai to the petitioner
Ex.W6	16.09.2016	Reply given by Respondent to RLC Madurai
Ex.W7	07.10.2016	Reply given by petitioner to RLC Madurai
Ex.W8	07.10.2016	Letter issued by Respondent to RLC
Ex.W9	07.12.2016	Letter issued by RLC to Petitioner
Ex.W10	11.01.2017	Letter issued sent by RLC to Petitioner
Ex.W11	13.03.2018	Reply sent by Respondent to RLC

Ex.W12	31.03.2017	Letter of RLC to Ministry of labour New Delhi
Ex.W13	25.10.2017	Order in L44012/01/2017

Documents Marked:

On the Respondent side:

Ex.No.	Date	Description
Ex.M1	_`	Resume of the Petitioner
Ex.M2	--	Leave card of the Petitioner
Ex.M3	-	Leave card of Nithya M
Ex.M4	-	Delivery report of SSI Gujarat
Ex.M5	-	Shift report dated 19.04.2015
Ex.M6	-	Report of Ameer Atham regad yard checker not reporting properly.
Ex.,M7	-	CHA License copy
Ex.M8	-	Report regarding vessel crane requirement
Ex.M9	-	Notification form
Ex.M10	-	Dossier of S.Saravanan

6. Heard the learned counsel appearing on either side and perused the material available on record.

7. The following points arise for adjudication:-

The first point that arises for consideration is whether the Petitioner is a workman as defined u/s 2(s) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947?

8. The essential conditions provided u/s 2(s) of the Act are as under:-

(i) The person must be employed in any industry.

(ii) He must do / perform any of the following kinds of work:

(a) Manual work;

(b) Skilled work

(c) Unskilled work

(d) Technical work

(e) Operational work

(f) Clerical work &

(g) Supervisory work

9. As per definition of section 2(s) the following persons are not considered as a workman:

(a) Managerial or administrative capacity,

(b) supervisory capacity drawing wages above the statutory limit and performing managerial functions.

10. It is argued by the Petitioner that the Respondent attempts to exclude the Petitioner from the definition of workman solely on the basis of his designation as Senior Executive and his salary. While, the real test is dominant nature of duties test. The Petitioner in his proof of affidavit has stated that the work involved was co-ordination of vessel and gate operations during loading and unloading of containers. He further stated that the nature of work is clerical/ operational and clearly falls under the purview of section 2(s) of the Act.

11. It is argued on behalf of the Respondent that Petitioner himself has admitted in his cross examination that he was vested with the powers of approving leave application of his subordinates. He admitted that he has sanctioned the leave of one Nithya.M. It is also admitted that he has approved leave of another workman namely S.Saravanan. Thus, the person who has vested with the powers of granting approval of leave cannot be considered as clerical cadre.

12. Now, the Tribunal has to ascertain the following points:-

a. Whether the workman was authorized to sanction leave and performed his duties during his employment?

b. Whether he had control over the staff?

c. Whether he has enjoyed the powers of independent decision making authority?

d. What was the nature of related duties?

e. Whether the work of the Petitioner was supervisory / clerical / technical?

13. The Petitioner in his cross examination admitted that his qualification is B.Com and MBA and he is having experience of 14 years in handling of operation in capacity of supervision. He further stated that he was supervising the work of loading and unloading in the vessel and attend the work of gate entry & exist. He further submitted that approximately 25 persons were working under his control. Regarding the sanction of leave applications of workmen, he stated as under:-

" I have approved leave application of Nithya .M, which is marked as Ex.M3."

With regard to making contact with other persons on behalf of Respondent he replied as under:-

"I have sent a mail to one Mr.Maheshwaran and Others"

14. He also admitted that he has approved leave to other employees. He contacted other parties and sent e-mail to maheswaran@srs.co.in, who is the vessel agent. Although, he stated that on behalf of the management only, the sent the e-mail, which is marked as ExM10. He further stated that Ex.M5 document was sent by him on behalf of his senior. He further stated that EX.M7 was sent by him to Southern Trading company to furnish copy of CHA license.(Custom House Agent). Copy of Ex.M8 was sent by him to M/s.MBK Logistics intimating that vessel arrived at their terminal. Copy of Ex.9 was sent by him to a vessel operator on behalf of the Respondent with regard to delay in unloading the container due to some technical problem. He further admitted that Ex.M9 was sent by him in the capacity of Senior Executive (Operations). He admitted that at the time of appointment, he received salary of Rs.45,000/- and at the time of termination, it was Rs.48,000/-. Thus, workman himself admitted that he was working in a supervisory capacity and was drawing Rs.48,000/- . He admitted that he approved leave applications of another workmen / employee, he contacted another parties and sent e-mail on behalf of Respondent. Although he admitted that he sent e-mail on behalf of the Respondent it is true that he sent e-mail on behalf of the Respondent But only the person who is holding managerial capacity can only send e-mail.

Every employee perform the work on behalf of the Respondent. It is not a fact that originally wage ceiling was Rs.16,000/- per month and by one month or present the wage is Rs.10,000/- per month. Thus, a supervisor who is drawing wags exceeding Rs.10,000 per month may be excluded from the definition of workman. It is true that salary is not decisive to decide the nature of work. This Tribunal has to decide the dominant nature of duties.

15. As I discussed above, the Petitioner has approved the leave application of another employee and sent e-mail to third parties on behalf of Respondent.

16. In the case of Bennett Colemann & Company Ltd, Vs, Yadeshwar Kumar 2007 (1) LLN 535, the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi held that if the employee was working in supervisory capacity and was responsible for sanction of leave for the persons working under him, and drawing salary above the prescribed limit, then such person cannot be considered to be a workman. This case law relied on by the learned counsel for the Respondent is squarely applicable to the facts of the present case on hand. At least 25 workmen were working under the Petitioner, who sanctioned their leave and contacted the third parties and has sent and received e-mails from third parties.

17. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the Appellant relied on the judgement of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Arkal Govind Raj Rao Vs CIBA Ceigy of India Ltd. (1985) 3 SCC 371. In this case, section 2(s) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 was interpreted and held that if a person is mainly performing clerical work and incidentally performing supervisory work is a workman. The Hon'ble Court further held that it was a primary, basic or dominant nature of duties for which a person whose status is under enquiry to be settled by the Court. In this case, the Hon'ble Court further held that the work distribution of clerical nature would not seize to be clerical work and further held that work of preparation of bank reconciliation cannot be said to be supervisory in nature.

18. The Petitioner in the present case on hand, during cross examination has admitted that he has sanctioned leave of employees, who worked under him approximately 25 numbers of workmen and further on behalf of the Respondent/Management he contacted outside agencies / companies and sent e-mail in connection with official work of the Respondent.

19. As per discussion above, this fact is established that the Petitioner does not fall under the definition of workman as defined u/s.2(s) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. The Petitioner was working in supervisory category and getting salary of Rs.48,000/- per month is more than the statutory ceiling limit . Therefore, the point is decided against the Petitioner.

20. Since the Petitioner in this case is not a workman, this Industrial Dispute raised by the Petitioner is not maintainable and therefore, there is no need to discuss the case on merits.

AWARD

The Industrial Dispute raised by the Petitioner is dismissed as not maintainable for the reasons indicated above.

The reference is answered accordingly.

Record be consigned to the record room.

Place : Chennai SUSHIL KUMAR-II, Presiding Officer

Date : 19.05.2026

नई दिल्ली, 28 जुलाई, 2026

का.आ. 1618.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एस बी आई भारत का के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजको और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में **केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण–सह–श्रम न्यायालय,** हैदराबाद के पंचाट **(सन्दर्भ संख्या 45/2002)** को प्रकाशित करती है,

[सं. एल-12012/235/2000-आई.आर (बी-I)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 28th July, 2026

S.O. 1618.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Reference. I.D. No. 45/2002) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Hyderabad as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the Management of SBI of India and their workmen,

[No. L-12012/235/2000–IR (B-I)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

In The Central Government Industrial Tribunal Cum Labour Court At Hyderabad

Present: **Sri IRFAN QAMAR**

Presiding Officer

Dated the 11th day of May, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. 45/2002

[Old ID No. 136/2000 of Industrial Tribunal No.I, Hyderabad]

Between:

Sri B. Rama Krishna,

Venkatapuram (V & P.O.),

Bukkarayasamudram (M),

Dist. Anatpur (A.P.) – 515 001. … Petitioner

And

The Dy. General Manager,

State Bank of India,

Zonal Office,

Renigunta Road,

Tirupathi.

Appearances:

For the Petitioner : Sri Macherla Rangaiah, Advocate

For the Respondent: Sri Y. Ranjeeth Reddy, Advocate

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-12012/235/2000-IR(B.I) dated 29.9.2000 referred the following dispute under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 to Industrial Tribunal No.I, Hyderabad for adjudication and later the same has been transferred to this Tribunal bearing ID No. 136/2000, as per orders of Central Government vide Lr.No.H-11026/1/2001-IR(C.II) dated 18.10.2001, requiring this forum to decide the question:

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of State Bank of India, Main branch, Anantapur is justified in terminating the services of Sri B. Rama Krishna, from the services of the Bank? If not, what relief the workman is entitled?"

After receipt of the reference, it was numbered as ID No. 45/2002 and notices were issued to both the Workman and the management.

2. Before unfolding the factual matrix of the instant industrial dispute it would be apposite to have a bird eye view of a chequered history of the instant industrial dispute. Earlier instant industrial dispute along with the batch cases was decided by this Tribunal vide common award dated 17.5.2005 and the reference was answered in favour of the Respondent and against the Workman. That said common award dated 17.5.2005 was challenged by the aggrieved Workmen in various Writ petition No.6470/2014 along with batch of writ petitions before the Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh and Hon'ble High Court vide its' judgement dated 23.6.2014 allowed all batch of writ petitions and set aside the common award dated 17.5.2005 passed in ID No.222 of 2001 and other batch of ID cases by Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad and the Respondent management of State Bank of India was directed to reengage the Writ Petitioners in position, which they have been occupying prior to their termination and further directed to consider their cases for regularization as and when the substantive vacancy arises. This judgement dated 23.6.2014 of Hon'ble High Court of AP, passed in WP No.6470/2014 and batch petitions was challenged by Respondent management before the Hon'ble High Court in Writ Appeal No. 1268 of 2014. The aforesaid Writ Appeals No.1268/2014 and other Writ Appeals were decided by Division Bench of High Court of Andhra Pradesh by a common judgement dated 20.3.2019. Hon'ble High Court in aforesaid Writ Appeal was pleased to pass the order which is extracted as below:-

" 7. Hearing the learned senior counsel for the SBI and the learned senior counsel for the contesting unofficial Respondents, we see that while the learned single Judge was justified in setting aside the award af the Tribunal, the proper course to be adopted was to remit all the cases to the Tribunal. This we say for reasons more than one. Firstly, in such matters, claims have to be decided on individual basis, as different persons have different claims as to the length of officiation or discharge of duties and functions; quality of engagement, drawings, accounting of the post for each one of them, who have worked etc. All these issues will not be the same in all the cases. Therefore, each case ought to have been directed to be decided by the Tribunal afresh on individual basis. The second and most important aspect is the learned single Judge has in one go ordered re-employment of all the workmen. This is not a relief that could have been granted without answering the individual issues; each issue relating to each case could not have been decided by the writ Court within the format of its adjudication procedures and scope. The adjudicating body, which has to do that activity, is the Industrial Tribunal. Therefore, we are of the view that while we would sustain the order of the learned singe Judge insofar as it interfered and sets aside the award of the Tribunal, the

further findings and directions, issued through the impugned order have to go and the individual cases have to be sent back for consideration of the Tribunal. Such further procedure before the Tribunal will have to be carried forward with the materials already on record and also by affording an opportunity to the persons, who have claims as well as the management to place their rival contentions and further material before the Tribunal. The learned counsel appearing for the workmen are justified in pointing out that enormous delay has already happened and further action by the Tribunal in this line may be expedited.

9. In the result, these writ appeals are ordered;

(1) affirming the impugned common order of the learned single Judge to the extent it sets aside the common award dated 17.05.2005 of the Industrial Tribunal;

(2) the further findings and directions issued through the impugned common order are vacated:

(3) all the matters shall be remitted to the Industrial Tribunal with a direction to dispose of them within an outer limit of five (5) months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order; and,

(4) the parties to make appearance before the Tribunal on the given date."

Thus, in view of the above direction of Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh in W.A.No.1268 of 2014 and batch cases. This Tribunal has taken up the matter of industrial dispute for hearing and deciding it afresh in view of the aforesaid guidelines laid down by the Hon'ble High Court in Writ Appeal No.1268/2014 vide judgement dated 20.3.019.

3. The factual matrix of instant industrial dispute as narrated by the Workman in his claim statement are that, the Workman joined in the service of the management institution as Messenger from 1.1.86 to 31.12.86 and has rendered unblemished service spreading over a period of about one year. The Respondent has terminated services of Workman by oral orders with effect from 1.4.1997. Further, it is submitted that the management of Respondent bank decided to give a chance to temporarily employed personnel "found suitable for permanent appointment" by wait- listing them by offering permanent appointment or waitlisting till such opportunity arises.

4. That on 17.11.1987 a settlement was reached between All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and the Management of State Bank of India - settlement one, under this settlement three categories of employees were listed. That is, A) those who have completed 240 days in 12 months or less after 1.7.1975. B) those who have completed 270 days in any continuous block of 36 calendar months after 1.7.1975. C) (i) those who have completed minimum of 30 days aggregate temporary service in any calendar year after 1.7.1975 or (ii) 70 days aggregate temporary service in continuous block of 36 months after 1.7.1975.

5. The persons who satisfied in all the above 4 categories were to be interviewed by a selection committee and the said selection committee would determine the suitability of the said candidate for permanent appointment. Therefore, the bank prescribed certain qualifications and from among the candidates satisfying the qualifications the suitable candidates were enlisted by a selection committee. The Clause 7 of the said agreement provided with the selected candidate would be wait listed in order of their respective categorization and the selected panel would be valid upto December, 1991. Clause 10 of the settlement specifically provided that henceforth. "there will be no temporary appointments in the subordinate cadre", except on a restrictive basis in the specified category, "from amongst empanelled candidates as per existing guidelines of the bank". The Workman further submits that consequent upon the

said agreement and the draft, a notification was issued in the newspapers. The last date for responding to the advertisement was 30.8.1988. A written examination followed by viva-voce in May, 1989 was held. A selected panel was prepared, as per Clause 7 of the agreement, ie. Settlement No.1, the selected panel was to be valid upto December, 1991, the Workman submits that circular was issued on 26.4.91 by the said letter it is mentioned that the terms of the agreement dated 17.11.87 was modified vide second agreement dated 16.7.88 was entered into between the parties. In terms of the said agreement a chance was to be given, "to all eligible temporary employees for permanent appointments. The appointments were against the vacancies likely to arise during the years 1995-96, circular made it clear that in view of the enormity of the problem an extension of the currency of the panel, eligible temporary employees who have been empanelled could not appear in the earlier interviews and have been pursuing their cases thereafter, "will be given another chance to appear for interview".

6. Workman submits that there were total five settlements. The settlement dated 17.11.87 is the 1st settlement (Ex M1), settlement dated 16.7.88 is 2nd settlement (Ex M2), settlement dated 27.10.88 is the 3rd settlement (Ex M3), then settlement dated 9.1.91 is 4th settlement and settlement dated 30.7.96 is 5th settlement (Ex M6). In between there is minutes of conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.95 marked as Ex M5. That due to all these settlements which were extended by subsequent settlements thereby created reasonable expectations in the list of the selected candidates arose with that it's a question of time their appointments or services would be regularized in the services of the bank. The Workman was working with the bank on temporary basis was under the bonafide hope that sooner his services will be regularized with the bank. He is thereby closed all his options elsewhere. It is needless to point out that employing person to whom hope of employment in substantial terms was made is a facet of Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

7. Further Workman submits that the Government of India issued Circular No. F-3/3/104/87-IR, dated 16.8.1990. Under said circular the chief Executives of all public sector banks including the Management herein were specifically instructed that until the problem of existing temporary employees is fully resolved, no bank is permitted to make any permanent appointments. That some of the persons similarly situated like this Workman aggrieved by the inaction on the part of the management of the bank is not regularizing their services from out of the selected panel and not clearly focusing the vacancy position, filed W.P. No. 4194/97 before Hon'ble High court of A.P.. It is specifically averred in the said writ petition that the Management of the bank had failed to implement the settlement and that it violates the various fundamental rights guaranteed under the constitution of India. The Hon'ble High court of A.P .. by order dated 5.3.97 directed the bank to implement the settlement as amended from time to time. It also directed the bank to carry out the terms of settlement before the expiry of March, 1997. The Hon'ble High Court also recorded finding that the Bank cannot escape its liability of enforcement of the Settlement. In view of the directions given by the High Court all candidates whose names appeared in the select panels prepared on the basis of the agreement entered into on 17.11.87 under which the panel was valid upto December, 1991, and on the basis of a settlement dated 27.10.1988 whereby the panels were made alive upto 31.3.1997 under which the panel was valid upto December, 1999. The other agreement dated 16.7.1988 under which the panel was valid upto 1992 and on the basis of the settlement dated 27.10.1998 whereby the panels were made alive upto 31.3.1997 were under the bonafide impression that their cases will be considered for regularization and were living on the basis of the said reasonable expectation. Unfortunately, contrary to the aforesaid directions given by the High Court and contrary to the settlements entered into between the parties, the bank issued proceedings dated 25.3.1997, dated 27.3.1997 and 31.3.1997 instructing the various authorities of the Management not to continue the temporary employees

those who are in services of the bank from 1.4.97. The said order was followed by the Management. Aggrieved by the said action the Workman herein and similarly situated candidates have filed a writ petition before the Hon'ble High Court and by way of Writ Petition No.9206/97 seeking a declaration that the proceedings issued by the Deputy General Manager and the Assistant General Manager (Respondents 3,4 and 5 therein) on 25.3.97, 27.3.97 and 31.3.97 as illegal and also non-continuance of the Workmen therein in service by absorbing them in the services of the bank as violative of Section 2(p) and 18(1) read with Rule 58 of Central Rules and sought for specific direction to the bank to absorb them in service.

8. Further, Workman submits that in the counter affidavit filed in Writ Petition No.9206/97, the bank has submitted that it has about 805 branches in Andhra Pradesh alone. It has stated that due to exigencies of circumstances and on account of the urgent need in its banks, it employed temporary employees in subordinate cadre. It is pertinent to mention that it does not state the urgent or need or the nature of temporary employees that it had engaged. Enquiry into the same would reveal that the stand taken by the bank either on the ground of urgent need or of temporary employees is a façade to perpetuate unfair labour practice. It is designed to on the one hand, keep the employed in the erroneous zone of hope and on the other to ensure that benefits that a model employer will extend under various statutes to its employees is not required to be borne out by the bank. A reading of the counter affidavit would show that the bank would opines that being just fair and reasonable are which obviously is reprehensible and is a facet of unfair labour practice.

9. The Workman submits that the bank had referred in its counter affidavit to three settlements dated 17.11.87, 16.7.88 and 27.10.88. The bank in the guise of extending the benefits of the circular of Government dated 16.8.90 stated in its counter affidavit that as follows:

"Government of India, vide its letter dated 16.8.1990, issued guidelines to all the public sector banks with regard to recruitment and absorption of temporary employees in public sector banks. The said guidelines were issued to implement on the lines of the approach paper on the issue provided by a committee constituted in this regard. The Government of India guidelines made it clear that all the public sector banks may follow the provisions laid down in the approach paper.

The approach paper specified that the cases of temporary employees who had put in not less than 240 days of temporary service in 12 consecutive Months and who are entitled to benefit of Section 25-F may be decided by entering into a settlement with the representative union. In respect of temporary employees who had put in less than 240 days of service in 12 consecutive months or less, a settlement could be avoided and however if the Management so desired, they could enter into a conciliation settlement with the representative union. Para 6(h), it is mentioned that only those temporary employees who had put in temporary service of 90 or more days after 1.1 1982 would be eligible for considering under the scheme. Although the Government guidelines envisaged for a settlement in respect of employees who had put in temporary service of 90 or more days, the bank by way of further concession entered into settlements Even in respect of those who had put in less than 90 days. As such, it could be Seen that the settlements are more beneficial to the temporary employees concerned. The approach paper also specify at para 6(c) that the banks would provide one time opportunity to all the temporary employees and for that purpose temporary employees worked in the bank on or after 1.1.1982 could be considered for re-employment in terms of the scheme. The Respondents have gone further wherein even persons working after 1975 were also considered.

As could be seen from the above, there was a genuine effort on the part of the Respondent bank to provide permanent employment for as many as possible subject to availability of the vacancies.

It is further submitted that at para 6(k) of the approach paper, it was made clear that this would be one time exercise in full and final settlement of all the aims and disputes for the past period in respect of temporary workmen covered by the settlement. This would mean that the Government of India guidelines would cover only those persons who were temporarily employed for the period specified therein and not otherwise. As such, it is submitted that the Respondents have not only followed the Government of India guidelines but in fact covered cases of the employees who had worked for less than 90 days. As such, question of violation does not arise and in any case those were only broad guidelines and not directives".

10. The Workman submits that the bank also referred a subsequent settlement dated 9.1.1991 wherein there is a clause to the effect- that the panel of temporary employees and the panel of daily wage employees will be operated to a particular period. Therefore, their cases will not be considered. The Management herein relying upon this settlement in their impugned action. It is submitted that even the settlement dated 9.1.1991 will not empower the management to terminate the services of the temporary employees who are working in the bank services like the Workman herein as it does not specify the termination of the employees. In fact there are so many vacancies wherein the Management has engaged several new persons as temporary messengers/ attendars/ sweepers etc., even after the judgment of Hon'ble High Court without considering the cases of the similarly situated candidates like the Workman herein. It is submitted inspite of engaging fresh candidates as is now being done by the Management they would have continued the similarly situated candidates like the Workman herein in the services of the bank and consider their cases for absorption in view of the circulars issued by Central Government as well as the directions of this Hon'ble Court in Writ Petition No.4194/97, dated 5.3.97. In view of the circulars issued by the Central Government, the Management should not have relied upon the settlement dated 9.1.1991. Hence, the impugned action of the Management is illegal, unjust, violative of fundamental rights such as Articles 14,16 and 21 of the Constitution of India.

11. The Workman submits that in W.P. No.4194/97 filed by the union of temporary employees where in they have complained about the non- implementation of the settlements arrived between the parties and sought for absorption. Such employees in the bank services on permanent basis before the date fixed for carrying out the terms of settlement, the Court held that the members of the union had been empanelled in the list, they were not regularized and the time was going to run out to the near future and the Respondent bank and its officers cannot escape from the liability of enforcing the settlement which has been reached and therefore directed that the bank and the officers shall implement the settlement dated 17.11.87 as amended from time to time before the expiry of 31.3.97.

12. Further, it is submitted that in the clause of Settlement it is specifically mentioned that the workmen to be absorbed/appointed in the bank prohibiting any temporary appointments subsequent to the date of settlement even the authorities want to make temporary appointments that should be made only from among the empanelled can be appointed either for temporary vacancy or permanent vacancy except from among the empanelled candidates like the Workman and that should be continued till they are absorbed. The management committed unfair labour practices and terminated the services of the candidates with effect from 1.4.1997 which is arbitrary, discriminatory, contrary to their own guidelines and violative of the constitutional provisions which are guaranteed in Chapter-III of the Constitution of India.

13. The Workman submits that it is strange as to how the panels were allowed to lapse by a so-called Memorandum of Understanding dated 25.2.1997, that the action of terminating such employees like the Workman by virtue of an impugned oral proceedings without implementing the settlement would be illegal and unfair labour practice which cannot be allowed to be perpetuated. That the discontinuance of the Workman after 31.3.97 who had served in the bank in any capacity amounts to retrenchment. It could not have been done without any notice and it violates Sec.25FF of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and the said action is violative of principles of natural justice guaranteed under Chapter III of the Constitution of India. This amounts to retrenchment without one month's notice and taken in view of such notice. Thus, the main proceedings issued by the Respondent is without jurisdiction and is arbitrary, illegal and therefore liable to be quashed. That the alleged Memorandum of Understanding dated 27.2.97, Ex.M5 does not own any legal entity, as the said Memorandum of Understanding is not published anywhere to brought to the notice of the Workman whose rights are being affected. It is submitted that Management did not adhere to the procedure envisaged by the Central Government in its' instructions dated 16.8.90 in the year 1995. The same was not followed in the year 1997 despite there being vacancies. The management has followed the procedure of calling candidates through Employment exchange instead of giving chance to the empanelled candidates like the Workman here. It is pertinent to mention here that the Respondent Management sent letters to the all similarly situated candidates like the Workman in the month of June, 1997, subsequent to the passing of impugned termination orders. After knowing the facts that the candidates are litigating, the Management refused to engage these candidates. It is once again reiterated that the panels are meant for absorption but not for termination. It was the duty of the Management to engage the empanelled candidates like the Workman even in temporary vacancies till they are absorbed permanently in regular vacancies. Hence, the action of the Respondent Management terminating the services of the Workman by oral order dated 31.3.97 is unjust, illegal, violative of principles of natural justice and hence, the Management be directed to reinstate and absorb the Workman and to grant all incidental and consequential benefits.

14. Per contra, Respondent had filed counter and made a contentions that the reference is not tenable and contrary to the provisions of I.D. Act, 1947. Respondent submitted that to tide over severe sub-ordinate staff constraints which arose out of leave vacancies, exigencies, etc., and also owning to the restrictions imposed by the Government of India/Reserve Bank of India on intake of staff, the Respondent bank used to engage sub-ordinate staff like messengers, sweepers, sweeper cum water boys, etc., depending on the availability of work on purely temporary basis for the smooth and uninterrupted functioning of the branches. It is submitted that the All India State Bank of India Staff Federation which represents majority of the employees in the State Bank of India comprising about 98% of the work force as its' members espoused the cause of temporary employees who have put in less than 240 days of temporary service in 12 calendar months in the bank and who were ineligible for any protection under Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 to give a chance for being considered for absorption and permanent appointments.

15. Discussions were held and on 17.11.1987 an agreement was signed between the federation and the Management bank under Sec. 2(p) read with Sec 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules 1957. A copy of the said settlement dated 17.11.87 which may be herein after referred as first settlement is filed and 4 categories were made as it has already been mentioned in the claim statement above, it need not be repeated here. In the first settlement, it was agreed that the temporary employees as categorized would be given a chance for being considered for permanent appointment in the bank's service against the vacancies which are likely to arise during the period 1987 to 1991. On 16.7.88 second settlement was arrived between the Federation and the Bank whereby it was

agreed to substitute the period of consideration of vacancies as 1987 to 1992 in place of 1987 to 1991 as contemplated under the first settlement dated 17.11.1987. This is the second settlement. A 3rd settlement was entered into on 27.10.88 and it was agreed that the bank's service against the vacancies likely to arise from 1988 to 1992 was to be considered. Government of India vide its letter dated 16.8.90 issued guidelines to all the public sector banks with regard to recruitment and absorption of temporary employees in public sector banks. The said guidelines were issued to implement on the lines of approach paper on the issue provided by a committee constituted in this regard. Government of India guidelines made it clear that all the public sector banks may follow the provisions laid down in the approach paper. The approach paper specified that the cases of temporary service in 12 consecutive months and who are entitled to benefit of Sec.25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 may be decided by entering into a settlement with the representative union. In respect of temporary employees who had put in less than 240 days of service in 12 consecutive months or less, a settlement could be avoided and however if the Management so desired they could enter into a conciliation settlement with the representative union. In para. 6(h) it is mentioned that only those temporary employees who had put in temporary service of 90 days or more days after 1.1.82 would be eligible for considering under the scheme. Although the Government guidelines envisaged for a settlement in respect of employees who had put in temporary service of 90 days or more days, the bank by way of a further concession entered into settlements. Even in respect of those who had put in less than 90 days and also the bank went a step further and said those persons who are working after 1975 were also considered. Hence, there was a genuine effort on the part of the Respondent bank to provide as many as possible jobs subject to the availability of the vacancies. However, para 6 (k) of the approach paper made it clear that it is a one time, exercise in full and final, settlement of all the claims and disputes for the past period, in respect of temporary workmen covered by the settlement. Another settlement was entered on 9.1.91 herein after referred as 4th settlement and the time limit was extended upto 1994 and separate panel was prepared for temporary employees, casual/daily wagers. It was agreed that while vacancies arising between 1988 to 1994 in respect of temporary employees and in respect of casual/daily wagers, they can be considered for the vacancies arising between 1995-96 only.

16. It is submitted that the administrative set up of the Hyderabad Local Head Office comprises of four Zonal Offices (Zones) at Hyderabad, Vijayawada, Visakhapatnam and Tirupathi covering all the Districts of Andhra Pradesh. In terms of the settlement the Management after following the procedure laid down therein prepared the panels of qualified candidates of temporary employees denoted as 1989 panel and also panel of casual/daily wagers denoted as 1992 panel for giving a chance for being considered for permanent absorption. These panels were prepared zone-wise separately for messengers and non-messengers in the descending order of temporary service put in by the candidates during the stipulated period i.e., 1.7.1975 to 31.7.1988. That the Federation approached the Regional Labour Commissioner(C) for implementation of bi-partite settlement in respect of absorption of temporary employees. The Regional Labour Commissioner(C) conducted conciliation proceedings and an agreement was arrived between the Federation and the bank. It was agreed that it would be kept alive upto March, 1997. A copy of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.2.1995 signed by the parties is filed as material paper. A settlement was arrived at and an agreement was signed between the Federation and the Management bank on 30.7.1996 under Sec.2 (p) read with Sec.18(1) of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957, which is hereinafter called as 5th settlement. That on 27.2.1997 a Memorandum of understanding was also signed by the federation's affiliate and the bank Management recording the fact that the exercise of identifying the messengerial vacancies as on 31.12.1994 has since been completed by Central Office and thereby 403 messengerial vacancies were sanctioned . It was agreed that these vacancies may be filled from 1989 panel

of temporary employees after effecting conversion from full time non-messengerial staff in the usual manner and the agreement was reached accordingly. It was agreed between the Federation's affiliate and the Management bank that in terms of the settlement dated 30.7.1996 both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees would lapse on 31.3.1997. That as agreed upon vacancies were filled from the panels. The Workman who has put in an aggregate temporary service of less than 240 days in a continuous block of 12 months period during 1.7.1975 to 31.7.1988 has no right to seek a direction to consider his candidature for absorption in the Management bank under any rule/law except under the settlement entered into thereon.

17. Respondent contended that, in fact, the case of the Workman can be considered under all the five settlements having got his case considered under provisions of these settlements. All the other provisions and terms of the settlements are also binding on him/her. The Management bank has not violated any of the provisions of the terms of the said settlement. That the very preparation and maintenance of panel is in compliance of the terms agreed under these settlements. These settlements were time bound and they ceased to exist on 31.3.1997. That the bank has never promised that all the candidates in the panel will be absorbed. In the advertisement itself it was made clear that candidates will be considered for absorption in the vacancies that may arise upto 1992. Keeping alive the panels after 31.3.1997 is contrary to the settlements arrived between the State Bank of India Staff Federation and the Management bank. That the settlements are binding on the parties. The Workman is also bound under the terms of the said settlement. The settlement does not suffer from any ambiguity as their language is very clear. The right under the settlements is to give them a chance to be considered for future appointment in the bank's services against the vacancies likely to arise. The settlements were effected to balance the expectations of the temporary employees to be absorbed in permanent service as against the constitutional rights for all eligible persons to be considered for employment every time a vacancy arises. That the alleged dispute including the demand for reinstatement has to be decided in this context. It is submitted that the period of panel list got expired on 31.3.97 and it is an integral term of the settlement and cannot be modified in any proceedings under the law. These temporary employees who unfortunately could not be accommodated for want of vacancies have no further rights to be considered for regularization. That the Hon'ble High Court in WP No.12964/94, held as follows, "It is needless to state that the settlement arrived at between the All India State Bank of India Staff Federation which, is the majority union and the bank Management is binding on the Workmen also. It is not at all the case of the Workman that any of the terms of the settlement has been violated by the bank's Management. If the Workman had worked in the bank on part-time basis before 31.5.94, that itself would not vest in him a right to claim that his services should be regularized on permanent basis against a full time cadre post. The claim put forth by the Workman in the present petition is therefore misconceived and not tenable. However, it is open to the Workman to claim any right which flows from the settlement between the union and the bank Management. As already pointed out that it is not the grievance of the Workman that some right which has flown from the settlement in favour of the Workman has been denied by the bank Management. Therefore, I do not find any ground, let alone substantial ground, to grant the kind of relief sought for by the Workman. Writ Petition fails and is accordingly dismissed. No costs."

18. Further, it is contended that if the panels were not lapsed at the end of designated period and allowed to be continued it would result in making the contracts of temporary employment indirectly permanent through back door entry, which would not only be contrary to the settlements but also to Articles 14 and 16 of Constitution of India and deprive the chances of original claimants who would Come

through proper recruitment procedure. As their rights have been crystallized by operation of the settlements. Hence, there is no question of any Legitimate expectation being violated.

19. Similarly placed ex-employees filed WP No.9206/1995 and the batch before the Hon'ble High Court of A.P. and the learned Single Judge allowed the Writ Petitions. Aggrieved by the same WA No.86/98 and the batch was filed and the Division Bench set aside the order of the Single Judge. Thereafter the ex-temporary employees filed Special Leave Petition No.11886-11888 of 1998 before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India also dismissed the SLP. Therefore, reference to the Judgement of the Learned Single Judge in WP No.9206/97 is of no consequences as the same has already been set aside. The observations made in the Judgements cannot be relied upon for any purpose what so ever. The question of operation of Sec.25F would not come into play. Further the issue is covered by various Judgements of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India and various Hon'ble High Courts. Hence, the reference may be ordered that the Workman is not entitled for any relief.

20. In order to fortify his claim Workman has examined himself as WW1 and also filed documents in evidence which has been exhibited as Ex.W1 to W6. Further, the Workman has filed photocopies of documents in support of his claim which are discussed as under:-

Ex.W1 is the notification. Ex.W2 is the interview call letter. Ex.W3 is the panel list. Ex.W4 is the service certificate.

21. On the other hand, Respondent has examined witness MW1 Sri K. Bala Kotaiah and this witness has exhibited 12 documents, marked as Ex.M1 to M12. The details of these documents are as follows:-

Ex.M.1 is the Settlement dated 17.11.1987. Ex.M2 is the Settlement dated 16.7.1988. Ex.M3 is the Settlement dated 27.10.1988. Ex.M4 is the Settlement dated 9.1.1991. Ex.M5 is the Minutes of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.1995. Ex.M6 is the Settlement dated 30.7.1996. Ex.M7 is the Memorandum of Understanding dt. 27.2.1997. Ex.M8 is the Particulars of 1989 Messengerial Panel. Ex.M9 is the Particulars of 1989 Non-Messengerial Panel. Ex.M10 is the Particulars of 1992 General Attendant Panel. Ex.M11 is the Judgment of Hon'ble High Court of A.P. in Writ Appeal No.86/98 dt.1.5.1998. Ex.M12 is the Judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in SLP No. 11886-11888 of 1998 dt.10.8.1998.

22. Apart from afore mentioned documents, Learned Counsel for Workman has also filed a long list of various judgements of Hon'ble Supreme Court as well as Hon'ble High Court, which we will discuss at appropriate place in this Award.

23. Heard the argument of Learned Counsel for Workman as well as for Respondent.

24. On the basis of rival pleadings of both the parties and submissions made by the Learned Counsel for both the parties, following points arise for determination in the industrial dispute :-

I. Whether the 1st settlement dated 17.11.1987, 2nd settlement dated 16.7.1988, 3rd settlement dated 27.10.1988, 4th settlement dated 9.1.1991 and 5th settlement dated 30.7.1996 entered into between State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and also Memorandum of Understanding are binding upon both the parties?

II. Whether the action of State Bank of India, branch in terminating the services of Workman Sri B. Rama Krishna, a Messenger with effect from 31.3.1997 is justified?

III. Whether the Workman is entitled for absorption on permanent post in the Branch of Respondent management as per averments made by him in the claim statement?

IV. To what relief if any the Workman is entitled for?

Findings:-

25. **Point No.I**:- Undisputedly settlements dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988, 9.1.1991 and 30.7.1996, minutes of conciliation proceedings and memorandum of understanding dated 27.2.1997 were executed between the State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation under section 2(p) and 18 (1) of I.D. Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Disputes (Central Rules), 1957.

Section 2(p) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 as follows:-

(p) "settlement" means a settlement arrived at in the course of conciliation proceeding and includes a written agreement between the employer and workmen arrived at otherwise than in the course of conciliation proceeding where such agreement has been signed by the parties thereto in such manner as may be prescribed and a copy thereof has been sent to an officer authorised in this behalf by the appropriate Government and the conciliation officer;

Section 18(1) provides as follows:-

18. Persons on whom settlements and awards are binding.

- [(1) A settlement arrived at by agreement between the employer and Workman otherwise than in the course of conciliation proceeding shall be binding on the parties to the agreement.

Therefore, in view of the provision contained u/s.18 (1) I.D. Act, 1947, terms and conditions enumerated in the aforesaid settlements are binding on the parties to the agreement. The Learned Counsel for Workman has argued that the Workman after going through the selection procedure has successfully been listed in the panel for appointment on the permanent basis in the Respondent management and the empanelled list has to be valid till last person in the empanelled list is appointed on permanent basis. But the impugned order dated 25.3.97, 27.3.97 and 31.3.97, has been issued by Respondent management thereby the services of the Workman has been terminated and the said order is not in consonance of the terms of the agreement entered into between the parties. Further, Workman submits that the Respondent in the 5th settlement has mentioned the date i.e., 31.3.1997 for lapse of empanel list which is illegal and that is not binding upon the Workman. The condition of lapse of empanelment list on 31.3.97 incorporated in the aforesaid 5th settlement, is arbitrary and illegal.

26. The perusal of the impugned order dated 25.3.1997 goes to reveal that the Chief/Branch Manager, SBI Zonal Office has issued the letter to all the branches with regard to the subject not to make any temporary appointments in the Branch in messengerial category from 1.4.1997. The extract of the said letter is given below:-

"We have been advised by the Deputy General Manager, Zonal Office, Hyderabad that as both the panels of temporary employees of 1989 and daily wagers/casual labours of 1992 will lapse by 31.3.1997, it has been decided by Central Office not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial category from 1.4.1997."

Thus, from the contents of the aforesaid letter, it manifest that Head Office of State Bank of India vide letter dated 25.3.1997 has issued direction to all its branches not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial category from 1.4.1997 due to reason of lapse of both panels i.e., 1989 & 1992 on 31.3.1997

as per terms of settlements entered into by both parties. Further, the contents of the subsequent letter dated 27.3.1997 issued by Respondent Management is also direction to Branch Manager, State Bank of India not to make any temporary messengerial category appointment with effect from 1.4.1997 and it has also been communicated to all concerned that the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers maintained by Zonal offices stand lapsed from 31.1.1997. Further, office order dated 31.3.1997 has been issued by Respondent management that goes to reveal that the said office order has been issued to this effect that, "Consequent on absorption of temporary employees in permanent cadre, it has been decided by the competent authority that no one onwards, no further daily labour or temporary employees/appointments should be resorted to/engaged/employed." Therefore, it reflects from the contents of the aforesaid orders that the temporary appointment in messengerial category and daily labour has been stopped by the Respondent management with effect from 1.4.1997 because of the lapsed of panel of temporary workers and daily wagers by 31.3.1997. The agreement for lapse of both the panels on 31.3.1997 is contained in the 5th settlement which has been arrived at between the parties on dated 30.7.1996 with the consensus of both the parties. Therefore, Workman can not challenge the terms and conditions contained in settlement dated 30.7.1996 regarding lapse of panel on 31.3.1997 as agreed between State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation. As per provision contained u/s.18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 the said Agreement dated 30.7.1996 is binding on both the parties.

In the case of **Allied Sales Corporation Secunderabad vs.The Authority Under Andhra Pradesh..... 1990 II LLJ 510 AP para 414, Hon'ble Court have held:-**

"*4. There was a settlement between the Management and the workmen under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act on 25th April 1983 under which the age of superannuation of the workmen was fixed at 55 years. The settlement was to be in force upto 30th June 1986 and the next settlement, incorporating practically the same terms, was again entered into on 4th February 1987 under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act. There is no dispute that these settlements are under Section 18(1).*

14. Now the Authority constituted under Section 41(1) of the Act is an authority with very limited jurisdiction. It can only decide in the first appeal whether a termination by the management is valid or not and is within the parameters of Section 40 of the Act. The said Authority, in our view, has absolutely no jurisdiction to decide whether a settlement entered into under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act between the representatives of the Workmen and of the Management, is vitiated by undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion on the part of the Management. The Authority, namely, the Assistant Commissioner of Labour, was never intended by the A.P. Legislature to have jurisdiction to go into the question of the validity of a settlement arrived at under Section 18 of the Industrial Disputes Act by an Industrial Court. That Parliament has, in fact, constituted Industrial Courts under the Industrial Disputes Act, with extensive powers cannot be disputed. What we mean to say is that the Authority under Section 41(1) of the A.P. Act has no jurisdiction what-so-ever either to question or to decide about the validity of any such settlements. If parties to a settlement have a grievance about the validity of a settlement, it is for them to agitate the matter before the appropriate forum and they cannot ask an Authority constituted under Section 41(1) of the A.P. Shops and Establishments Act, 1966 with limited jurisdiction, to go into any such question and, that too, incidentally while deciding whether retirement as per the contract of employment, is legal or not."

It is not the case of Workman that aforesaid settlements are vitiated by undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion on the part of the management. If the Workman feeling aggrieved by any terms of settlement/ agreement on the aforementioned grounds then he can challenge of settlement before

a competent authority under the Act, 1947. But here in the instant matter it is not a case of Workman that aforementioned settlement has been entered into between the parties on the ground of undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion. Therefore, Workman is barred to raise any objection in respect of fixing the date of lapse of both panels on 31.3.1997 as agreed between both the parties and Workman can not challenge any terms of said Agreement.

Further in the case of **Herbertsons Limited Vs. Workmen of Herbertsons Limited and Ors, 1977 AIR 322,** Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

The Tribunal thought that the question of the quantum of membership of the 2nd Respondent did not call for a finding at all in view of 1his Court's order. As observed above that was not a correct assumption. On the other hand, we feel that this view of the Tribunal has led it to approach the matter in an entirely erroneous manner. The Tribunal is, rightly enough, conscious that under section 18 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act the settlement was binding on the company and the members of the 3rd Respondent union. Even so, the Tribunal devoted nearly half of its order in scanning the evidence given by the company and Respondent No. 3 to find out whether the terms of the settlement had been explained by the President of the union to the workmen or not and whether the workers voluntarily accepted the settlement knowing all the "consequences". This to our mind is again an entirely wrong approach.

"When a recognised union negotiates with an employer the workers as individuals do not come into the picture. It is not necessary that each individual worker should know the implications of the settlement since a recognised union, which is expected to protect the legitimate interests of labour, enters into a settlement in the best interests of labour. This would be the normal rule. We cannot altogether rule out exceptional cases where there may be allegations of mala fides, fraud or even corruption or other induce- ments. Nothing of that kind has been suggested against the President of the 3rd Respondent in this case. That being the position, prima facie, this is a settlement in the course of collective bargaining and, therefore, is entitled to due weight and consideration.

It is not possible to scan the settlement in bits and pieces and hold some parts good and acceptable and others bad. Unless it can be demonstrated that the objectionable portion is such that it completely outweighs all the other advantages gained the Court will be slow to hold a settle- ment as unfair and unjust. The settlement has to be accepted or rejected as a whole and we are unable to reject it as a whole as unfair or unjust. Even before this Court the 3rd Respondent representing admittedly the large majority of the workmen has stood by this settlement and that is a strong factor which it is difficult to ignore. As stated elsewhere in the judgment, we cannot also be oblivious of the fact that all workmen of the company have accepted the settlement. Besides, the period of settlement has since expired and we are informed that the employer and the 3rd Respondent are negotiating another settlement with further improvements. These factors, apart from what has been stated above, and the need for industrial peace and harmony when a union backed by a large majority of workmen has accepted a settlement in the course of collective bargaining have impelled us not to interfere with this settlement. That being the position, we unhold the settlement as fair and just and order that the award of the Tribunal shall be substituted by the settlement dated October 18, 1973. The said settlement shall be the substituted award. The appeal is disposed of accordingly. There will be no order as to costs."

Therefore, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above, the contention of the Workman that the date fixed for lapse of empanelled list on 31.3.1997 for appointment to the permanent post vide 5th Settlement dated 30.7.1996 is arbitrary, illegal is not untenable. The recognized union of Workmen has negotiated with the Respondent Bank Management representing large number of

Workmen and the Workman as individual do not come into picture. Workman in the instant case has work as temporary Workmen in the Respondent Branch and in response of Notification he had applied for inclusion of his name in the panel and he was selected for inclusion his name in the panel list to be utilized for absorption of such Workman to permanent post in order of their seniority in the list. The Settlement dated 30.7.1996 between State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation under Sec.2(p) and Sec.18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 has clearly provided as regard non-messengerial position and it is agreed that all such posts sanctioned fallen vacant upto 31.3.1997 shall be filled before empanel list is allowed to lapse. Thus, in view of law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, in the instant case, Agreement dated 30.7.1996 was entered into between both the parties in respect of lapsing of the both the panels on 31.3.1997 and absorption of the Workmen from panel list was subject to availability of vacancy of post likely to arise upto 31.3.1997, have a binding force on Workman as well as management of State Bank of India in view of provision contained under section 18 (1) of I.D. Act, 1947.

Thus, Point No.I is answered against the Workman and in favour of the Respondent.

27. **Point No.II**:- Firstly, it is submitted on behalf of the Workman that the Respondent has terminated his services by oral order on 31.3.1997 without issuing any notice or paying any salary or compensation in lieu thereof. Therefore, the termination order of the Workman from service is in violation of provision contained Under Section 25 F of I.D. Act, 1947. Therefore, the order is liable to be set aside.

28. On the other hand, Respondent counsel contended that Workman has not worked for 240 days in any preceding calendar year. Therefore, reference of the industrial dispute is not relevant. In this context, the Workman has examined himself as WW1 who has reiterated that Workman has been terminated from service by Respondent on 31.3.1997 without notice of salary or compensation in lieu thereof. Before examining the claim of the Workman on merit it would be apposite to reproduce the provision contained under section 25 F:-

Section 25F provides:-

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].

Compensation to workmen in case of transfer of undertakings.

Section 25B defines the term continuous service which provides

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 authorized 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;

In order to prove the fact of 240 days of service within 12 months of a calendar year just preceding from the date of termination, the initial burden of proof lies upon the Workman and the Workman has to prove this factum by adducing his oral as well as documentary evidence in support of his claim.

Further, how to calculate 240 days of service by the Workman in a calendar year. In this context the reference of decisions of Hon'ble Supreme Court is relevant and the same are discussed below:-

In Rajasthan State Ganganagar S. Mills Ltd. v. State of Rajasthan and Anr. (2004) Apex Court held:

"It was the case of the Workman that he had worked for more than 240 days in the year concerned. This claim was denied by the appellant. It was for the claimant to lead evidence to show that he had worked for 240 days in the year preceding the date of his termination. He has filed an affidavit. It is statement which is in his favor and that cannot be regarded as sufficient evidence for any Court or Tribunal to come to the conclusion that in fact the claimant had worked for 240 days in a year These aspects were highlighted in Range Forest Officer v. S.T. Hadimani (2002 (3) SCC 25. No proof of receipt of salary or wages for 240 days or order or record in that regard was produced. Mere non-production of the muster roll for a particular period was not sufficient for the Labour Court held that the Workman had worked for 240 days as claimed."

In Municipal Corporation, Faridabad v. Siri Niwas (2004 (8) SCC 195), held "*the burden was on the Workman to show that he was working for more than 240 days in the preceding one year prior to his alleged retrenchment." In M.P. Electricity Board v. Hariram (2004 (8) SCC 246) the position was again reiterated in paragraph 11 as follows: "The above burden having not been discharged and the Labour Court having held so, in our opinion, the Industrial Court and the High Court erred in basing an order of reinstatement solely on an adverse inference drawn erroneously ..*"

In the case of Manager, RBI, Bangalore vs. S Mani (2005) SCC Page 100, the 3 Judges Bench of the Apex Court held that "*the initial burden of proof was on the Workman to show that he had completed 240 days of service."*

Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of Mohan Lal vs Management BEL 1981 SCC page 225 has laid down the principle that how to count 240 days of service within one year it is held: *"Clause (2)(a) provides for a fiction to treat a Workman in continuous service for a period of one year despite the fact that he has not rendered uninterrupted service for a period of one year but he has rendered period of 240 days during the period of 12 calendar service for months counting backwards and just preceding the*

relevant date being the date of retrenchment. In other words, in order to invoke the fiction enacted in clause (2)(a) it is necessary to determine first the relevant date, ie the date of termination of service which is complained of as retrenchment. After that date is ascertained. move backward to a period of 12 months just preceding the date of retrenchment and then ascertain whether within the period of 12 months, the Workman has rendered service for a period of 240 days. If these three facts are affirmatively answered in favor of the Workman pursuant to the deeming fiction enacted in clause (2)(a) it will have to be assumed that the Workman is in continuous service for a period of one year and he will satisfy the eligibility qualification enacted in Section 25-F"

"14. We have already extracted section 25B since its amendment and the change in language is the legislative exposition of which note must be taken. In fact, we need not further dilate upon this aspect because in Surendra Kumar Verma and Ors. v. Central Government Industrial-cum-Labour Court, New Delhi and Anr., Chinnappa Reddy. J., after noticing the amendment and referring to the decision in Sur Enamel and Stamping Works (P) Ltd case, held as under:

"These changes brought about by Act 36 of 1964 appear to be clearly designed to provide that a Workman who has actually worked under the employer for not less than 240 days during a period of twelve months shall be deemed to have been in continuous service for a period of one year whether or not he has in fact been in such continuous service for a period of one year. It is enough that he has worked for 240 days in a period of 12 months, it is not necessary that he should have been in the service of the employer for one whole year."

In a concurring judgment Pathak J. agreed with this interpretation of section 25B(2). Therefore, both on principle and on precedent it must be held that section 25B(2) comprehends a situation where a Workman is not in employment for a period of 12 calendar months, but has rendered service for a period of 240 days within the period of 12 calendar months commencing and counting backwards from the relevant date, i.e. the date of retrenchment. If he has, he would be deemed to be in continuous service for a period of one year for the purpose of section 25B and Chapter VA."

Thus, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above the initial burden of proof lies upon the Workman to show that he has completed 240 days of the service with the Respondent just preceding from the date of his termination. Further, in respect of the employment of calculating the 240 days service in view of the contents of Section 25-F read with Section 25-B of the I.D. Act, 1947.

29. Now, in view of the provision contained under Section 25 F and law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, we have to examine whether the Workman has discharged his initial burden of proof in respect of his claim of 240 days continuous service in a calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination i.e., 31.3.1997.

In this context, WW1 in his cross examination has stated that,

"I was not sponsored by any employment exchange for appointment in the bank. I did not undergo the regular process of selection required for appointment in the bank. I did not work for 240 days in a year in the bank."

Thus, it is clear from the testimony of WW1 that the Workman had not worked for 240 days continuously in any 12 months of a calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination in the Respondent bank. Therefore, Workman failed to establish his plea by his oral and documentary evidence that he had worked for 240 days continuously in calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination i.e., 31.3.1997. Thus, the claim of the Workman that he has been terminated by oral order without issuing

notice or payment in lieu after termination, in contravention of Section 25 F of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is not tenable. However the documents filed by the Workman in support of his claim, number of days worked with the Respondent goes to reveal that the Workman had worked intermittently as daily wager depending upon availability of work in branch. Workman did not file any document of appointment letter or salary slips in support of his claim for appointment as a non-messenger in the Respondent branch on temporary basis.

30. Per contra, the Learned Counsel for Respondent has submitted the allegation of Workman that he was terminated from services is not correct. As the vacancies were filled up on regular basis in order of their respective seniority the non-engagement of the Workman does not amount to termination. Further, Respondent contended that no law provide that even though there is no work temporary employee should be continued in the bank work as the very engagement of Workman was subject to availability of work. Therefore, the allegation that the bank has indulged in unfair labour practice is incorrect.

31. Thus, in view of the fore gone discussion and contentions made by the Respondent, I find the force in the argument advanced by the Respondent that in the instant matter, Workman was not terminated from service by order dated 31.3.1997 rather he was disengaged in view of the non-availability of the work in the branch. Further, there was direction issued by the Head Office of the Respondent authority not to engage any daily wager Workman/ temporary Worker w.e.f. 1.4.1997. Thus, such disengagement of Workman does not amount to termination. Moreover, the Workman failed to prove his claim that he was terminated in contravention of provision of Sec.25F of the I.D. Act, 1947 as he failed to establish his plea by any oral or documentary evidence that he had worked for 240 days continuously in a twelve months of calendar year just preceding from date of termination i.e., 31.3.1997.

32. Further, perusal of the order dated 25.3.1997 goes to reveal that the Chief Branch Manager, State Bank of India has issued the letter to Zonal Office with direction to all its branches to this effect that they have been advised by the DGM, Zonal Office, Hyderabad that as both the panel of temporary employees of 1989 and daily wagers/casual labour of 1992 will lapse on 31.3.1997 it has been decided by central office not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial cadre from 1.4.1997, therefore it was directed to issue suitable instructions not to make temporary appointments from 1.4.1997. There is no mention in this order that the Workman herein has been terminated from service by this order.

33. Further, the circular dated 27.3.1997 was issued by DGM, SBI to all branches in commercial network in respect of the non-appointment of temporary employees in subordinate cadre and it has directed not to make any temporary employment in the subordinate cadre with effect from 1.4.97 and further, it has directed to ensure that no temporary/casual/daily basis appointment of the petty cash. Further, it is directed to all Branch Managers that any deviation in this regard will be viewed seriously. Thus, these circulars do not reflect that the Workman has been terminated from service by this order.

34. Similarly, office order dated 31.3.1997 is simply a direction to all branches of the Respondent bank by DGM that no further daily labour should be engaged or employed. Therefore, the plea of the Workman that he has been terminated by the aforesaid order dated 25.3.1997, 27.3.1997 and 31.3.1997 from the service by the Respondent is not acceptable. The evidence adduced by the Workman clearly goes to reveal that he had worked as a daily wager for which he has been paid wages according to number of working days. As there was an order for prohibition for engaging temporary workmen, in the bank, therefore, Workman could not be engaged by the Respondent for work from 1.4.1997 and there after. It is settled law that the daily wagers are engaged by the employer depending upon the availability of work and as the work was not available the Workman was not engaged further by the Respondent management.

Therefore, the Workman on the ground of number of days he had worked in the Respondent bank cannot claim any right to reinstate him into the employment. As the Workman failed to prove the mandatory condition of 240 days of continuous service as required under Sec.25F of I.D. Act, 1947. Therefore, the disengagement of Workman from work can not be termed in contravention of provision contained under Sec.25F and 25 B of the I.D. Act, 1947.

Thus, this point is answered against the Workman and in favour of Respondent.

35. **Point No.III**:- In this context, the Workman has contended that the management failed to implement the selected panels during its valid tenure. The management adopted the back door methods contrary to the settlements and filled up the vacancies. The same is evident from the proceedings dated 18.11.1993 a copy of the same is filed in the material papers and the same may be read as part of the claim statement. Further, it is submitted that management has to adhere the procedure issued by the Central Government, the instructions dated 16.8.1990 in the year 1995, but same was not followed in the year 1997 despite there being vacancies. The management has followed the procedure of calling candidates through employment exchange instead of giving chance to the empanelled candidates like the Workman herein. The management sent call letters to the similarly situated candidates like the Workman in the month of June 1997 subsequent to issuance of impugned termination orders. After knowing the fact that they are litigating the issue by way of dispute, the management has refused to engage those candidates, the copies of call letters issued are filed herein along with claim petition. The Workman herein reiterates that the panels are meant for absorption but not for termination. In view of the same a duty is cast upon the Respondent management to engage the empanelled candidates like the Workman herein even in temporary vacancies till they are absorbed permanently in regular vacancies.

36. On the other hand, Respondent has contended that the Federation approached Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) for implementation of bipartite settlement in respect of the absorption of temporary employees. The Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) conducted conciliation proceedings and agreement was arrived at between the Federation and the Management bank. It is submitted that it was agreed between the Federation and the Management that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers /casual labour would be kept alive upto March, 1997 and the vacancies as agreed to under the afore set out settlements will be filled from both the lists concurrently. A copy of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.1995 signed by the parties to the dispute is filed as a material paper. Further, it is submitted that the settlement was arrived at and an agreement was signed between the Federation and the Management bank on 30.7.1996 under Section 2(p) read with Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules 1957 which is binding on the parties. A copy of this agreement which hereinafter may be referred to as 5th settlement for brevity, is also filed as a material paper. The 5th settlement dated 30.7.1996 whereunder the earlier four settlements dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988 and 9.1.1991 were also referred, it was agreed to, by the Federation and the Management bank that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees will be kept alive upto March, 1997 for filling the vacancies existing/arrived at as on 31.12.1994 as per the norms agreed to between the bank and Federation and that thereafter the said panels would lapse. It was also agreed that within the framework of the above settlements the modalities about drawing names from either the panel of temporary employees or the panel of daily wagers and casual labour would be decided administratively on circle to circle basis depending upon the local requirements in consultation with the Federation's affiliate by the Circle management. It was further agreed that all messenger real vacancies/positions in the subordinate cadre including part-time attendants specifically provided as leave reserve will be filled by the end of 31.3.1997. Further,

Respondent contended that on 27.2.1997 a memorandum of understanding was also signed between the Federation's affiliate and the bank management regarding the fact that the exercise of identifying the messengerial vacancies as on 31.12.1994 has since been completed by central office and thereby 403 messengerial vacancies were sanctioned to the circle of the Management bank and it was agreed that these vacancies may be filled from 1989 panel of temporary employees after effecting conversion from full time non-messengerial staff in the usual manner and the agreement was reached upon. Further, it was agreed between the Federations affiliate and the management bank that in terms of the settlement dated 30.7.1996 both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers /casual employees would lapse on 31.3.1997.

37. The Workman has contended that the empanelled list prepared by the Respondent management for appointment of temporary and daily wage Workers to the permanent post cannot lapse unless until it is exhausted by appointing all the empanelled persons and it should continue even after 31.3.1997, i.e., the date fixed for the lapse of panel. It is undisputed that the date of lapse of empanelled list of Workmen has been fixed to 31.3.1997 as mentioned in the settlement dated 30.7.1996, and agreed between the parties. It is settled law that and once the life of panel list lapses on the date as agreed between the parties it cannot be extended beyond that date. In the instant case the panel list of the workmen was valid upto 31.3.1997 in view of the terms and conditions enumerated in the 5th Settlement entered into between the parties. As the lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997 has been agreed by State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation through 5th Settlement, the Workman is not competent to challenge the same.

In this context I would like to take reference of the decision of the apex court in the case of **Syndicate Bank and Ors vs. Shankar Paul and Ors , AIR 1997 SC 3091, therein the Hon'ble Apex Court** have held:-

"Till 1982, the branches of the appellant Bank in Calcutta region were recruiting persons locally to work as temporary attenders in leave vacancies. In view of the revised procedure prescribed by the Government of India in respect of such temporary appointments, the Calcutta regional office of the appellant Bank issued a circular to all of its branches on 14.8.1982, instructing all the branches under it to discontinue the old practice from 1.6.1982 and appoint only empanelled candidates. The regional office was to prepare a panel of eligible candidates, after calling names from the local/district employment exchange, and split it up branch-wise. Following that new procedure yearly panels were prepared thereafter. Names of the Respondents were for the first time included in the panel prepared for the period 7.2.1987 to 6.2.1988. By its letter dated 7.2.1987 the Bank had informed the Respondents that the panel was valid for one year only and that inclusion of their names in the panel was not to confer on them any right to seek permanent appointment in the service of the bank. Considering the object with which the panel was prepared and the fact that it was an yearly panel expiring on 6.2.1988, we are of the opinion that the Respondents did not get any right, because of inclusion of their names in the said panel, for permanent absorption in the service of the Bank. Whatever conditional right they had came to an end with the expiry of the panel. The claim of the Respondents, as contained in the writ petition was thus misconceived and therefore the learned single Judge and the Division Bench, when it first decided the appeal, were right in dismissing the writ petition and the appeal respectively."

Thus, in view of the above law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court and in view of the terms and conditions of the 5th Settlement the contention of the Workman that empanelled list should continue even after 31.3.1997 till the last Workman in the panel is absorbed is not tenable. The contention of the Workman is baseless in view of recital in the settlement. Therefore, in view of the fore gone discussion and finding given at Point No. I regarding binding nature of Settlements and terms and conditions

enumerated therein, in view of the provision contained u/s.18(1) of the I.D. Act, 1947, I am of the considered view that life of panels lapsed on 31.3.1997 in view of terms of settlement dated 30.7.1996 and plea of Workman that the panel shall continue even after 31.3.1997 till last man absorbed has no legal force and same is untenable.

38. Undisputedly, settlement agreement dated 30.7.1996 was executed between the State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation and in that settlement it was agreed that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/ casual employees will be used for filling vacancies existing as on 31.12.1994 as per the norms agreed between the bank and the Federation. These empanelled workmen were to be given a chance for permanent appointment in the bank against vacancies arising up to December 1994 whereas the daily wagers/ casual employees were to be considered against the vacancies arise from January 1995 to December 1996, whereby the said panel would lapse. It was agreed that the vacancies falls upto 31.3.1997 shall be filled before the empanelled list is allowed to lapse. Thus, the claim of the Workman to the post of permanent non-messenger in the Respondent management was subject to the availability of the sanctioned post and vacancies arising upto 31.3.1997. The workmen given chance to the permanent post were seniors in number of working days in panel list and Workman herein was junior to those workmen. Therefore, Workman could not be given absorption to permanent post being junior to other workmen in the panel list.

39. In this context the Workman witness WW1 was cross examined by the Respondent counsel and in the cross examination the witness WW1 states:-

"I applied in response to an advertisement issued by the bank and my name was included in the panel in the year 1992…. Further, witness states, *The panels were prepared as per the number of days of service of the temporary employees and they were given regular appointment in terms of the settlement as per the bank seniority of the employees in the panel….* Further witness states, *I am not having any papers to show that any of my juniors were continuing in service."*

Thus, from the above statement of the Workman witness WW1 it is clear that the panel was prepared in terms of various settlements entered into between Staff Federation of State Bank of India and State Bank of India and it was prepared on the basis of number of days of work put in by the temporary employees. Further, the Workman himself admitted that some of the temporary employees whose names were included in the panel were given regular appointment in the bank in order of their seniority in the panel and he is not having any document to show that any person who worked for less number of days than the Workman was given appointment in the bank. Therefore, the allegation of the Workman that the regular appointment has been made by the bank from the panel list in breach of the terms of the settlement and violation of seniority of panel list is not proved by this evidence of WW1. Thus, there is no evidence on record that bank has given the appointment to the temporary employees as well as daily wagers from the panel list 1989 and 1992 in breach of seniority of the temporary employees in the list. There is no evidence of jumbling in the panel list to make appointment of any permanent Workman in breach of the seniority. Therefore, I am constrained to hold that the Respondent Management has appointed the workmen from panel list in order of seniority and there is no jumbling of workmen in the panel list before it got lapsed on 31.3.1997.

40. However, Workman has taken the plea that the panels of Workmen for absorption in the employment of the Respondent banks (panels of temporary employees and daily wagers) has been lapsed on 31.3.1997 in contravention of terms of settlement as the object of preparing the entire empanelment of temporary and daily wagers was to provide them permanent employment and till the both the panel lists

exhausted the panel list cannot be lapsed on 31.3.1997 and the date of lapsing of the panel on 31.3.1997 has been fixed by the Respondent arbitrarily without any authority.

41. In this context, the perusal of Settlement dated 30.7.1996 reveals that the 5th Settlement dated 30.7.1996 was entered under Section 2(p) and 18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Dispute (Central) Rules 1957. This settlement has been entered into by the competent parties and in this settlement parties thereto agreed that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees will lapse on 31.3.1997. Thus the date of lapse of panel was fixed by both the parties with consensus under the settlement dated 30.7.1996 and same is binding upon the Workman under the provision of Section 18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947. Moreover, this issue of binding force of the settlement dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988 and 9.1.1991 has already been discussed, decided at finding in Point No.I of this award. However, the legality and validity of the aforementioned settlement has not been challenged by the Workman before any competent forum. Thus, claim of Workman that the date of lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997 has been fixed arbitrarily by the Respondent bank is untenable. As regard the claim of Workman for his absorption to the permanent post it is settled law that the Workman can not claim his regularization to permanent post merely on the basis of number of working days.

42. In this context the reference of the decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Oil and Natural Gas Corporation vs Krishan Gopal 2020(3) SCALE 272, date of decision 7.2.2020** is relevant therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have has laid down principle regarding regularization of the Workman on permanent posts. Hon'ble Supreme Court have laid down the prepositions of regularization of the workmen to permanent post is as under:-

"*(i) Wide as they are, the powers of the Labour Court and the Industrial Court cannot extend to a direction to order regularisation, where such a direction would in the context of public employment offend the provisions contained in Article 14 of the Constitution;*

(ii) The statutory power of the Labour Court or Industrial Court to grant relief to workmen including the status of permanency continues to exist in circumstances where the employer has indulged in an unfair labour practice by not filling up permanent posts even though such posts are available and by continuing to employ workmen as temporary or daily wage employees despite their performing the same work as regular workmen on lower wages;

(iii) The power to create permanent or sanctioned posts lies outside the judicial domain and where no posts are available, a direction to grant regularisation would be impermissible merely on the basis of the number of years of service;

(iv) Where an employer has regularised similarly situated workmen either in a scheme or otherwise, it would be open to workmen who have been deprived of the same benefit at par with the workmen who have been regularised to make a complaint before the Labour or Industrial Court, since the deprivation of the benefit would amount to a violation of Article 14; and

(v) In order to constitute an unfair labour practice under Section 2(ra) read with Item 10 of the Vth Schedule of the ID Act, the employer should be engaging workmen as badlis, temporaries or casuals, and continuing them for years, with the object of depriving them of the benefits payable to permanent workmen.

Thus, in view of the principles laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court as discussed above, in the instant matter the Workman utterly failed to prove his claim by adducing any documentary or oral evidence that the employer has indulged in unfair labour practice by not filling the permanent posts even though such

posts are available and by continuing to employ workmen as temporary or daily wage employees despite their performance was the same work, as regular workmen on lower wages.

43. Respondent has contended that all the vacancies exist and arise upto 31.3.1997 has been filled up from the panel list in order of seniority and no vacancy exists or arises as on 31.3.1997 remained unfilled. Further, it is contended that as per terms of settlement the life of panel lists has been lapsed on 31.3.1997, hence, there is no occasion to extend the life of panel lists beyond 31.3.1997. However, the workman failed to prove contrary by any evidence to the aforesaid contention of the Respondent that the vacancies were existing as on 31.3.1997 and the workman was not given absorption to the permanent post in order of his seniority. It is settled law that the power to create permanent or sanctioned post lies outside the judicial domain and where no posts are available, a direction to grant regularization would be impermissible merely on the basis of the number of years of service. Therefore, the claim of the workman on this ground also not acceptable.

44. Further, as per the of settlement, panel was prepared for absorption of the workmen on the permanent posts has already been lapsed on 31.3.1997 and the vacancies existing and arising upto 31.12.1994 and upto 31.3.1997 as settlement dated 30.7.1996 has been filled up from the panel by appointing the workmen as per seniority in the panel list. Workman witness WW1 in his cross examination has himself admitted this fact that, some of the temporary employees whose names were included in the panel were given regular appointment in the bank in order of their seniority in the panel. The Workman failed to show that there was any breach of terms of settlement has been committed by the Respondent in appointment to permanent post from aforesaid panel list.

45. As discussed in preceding paragraph of this Award, the life of the panel has not been extended beyond 31.3.1997, by any further settlement hence, the panel list in which name of the Workman was included got expired on 31.3.1997. It is not the case of the Workman that Respondent has regularized similarly situated workmen either in the scheme or otherwise and the Workman has been deprived of same benefit on par with those workmen or the vacancies remained unfilled on the date of lapse of panels i.e., 31.3.1997, Industrial Tribunal has no jurisdiction to extend the date of lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997. This Tribunal can not order for regularization of workmen to the permanent post in contravention of the provision of Article 14 of the Constitution of India.

In the case of **Mahboob Deepak vs. Nagar Panchayat Gajraula & Anr, Civil Appeal No.5875/2007 date of judgement 13.12.2007,** Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

"8. Respondent is a Local Authority. The terms and conditions of employment of the employees are governed by a statute and statutory rules. No appointment can be made by a Local Authority without following the provisions of the recruitment rules. Any appointment made in violation of the said rules as also the constitutional scheme of equality as contained in Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India would be a nullity.

9. Due to some exigency of work, although recruitment on daily wages or on an ad hoc basis was permissible, but by reason thereof an employee cannot claim any right to be permanently absorbed in service or made permanent in absence of any statute or statutory rules. Merely because an employee has completed 240 days of work in a year preceding the date of retrenchment, the same would not mean that his services were liable to be regularized."

Therefore, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, the claim of the Workman for absorption merely on the basis of number of day of work in the Respondent bank Branch is not acceptable.

As regard plea of the Workman that the Workman should have been given employment even after 31.3.1997 as temporary Workman, it is the discretion of Respondent to engage the Workman depending upon availability of work and this Tribunal can not direct the Respondent to engage the Workman in the absent of such rule/scheme.

46. In view of principle laid down by Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above, in the instant matter Workman utterly failed to establish the fact of rendering continuous service for a period of 240 days of service within a period of 12 calendar months commencing and coming backward from relevant date i.e., the date of retrenchment, if has he would be denied to be in continuous service for a period of one year. Therefore, the provision contained under Sec.25F of retrenchment is not applicable to Workman.

Counsel for Workman has relied upon number of decisions of Hon'ble High Court and Hon'ble Supreme Court and few of them are discussed herein:-

In the case of **F.C.I., vs. Kamdhenu Cattle Feed Industries 1993 (1) SCC 71,** therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

"7. In contractual sphere as in all other State actions, the State and all its instrumentalities have to conform to Article 14 of the Constitution of which non-arbitrariness is a significant facet. There is no unfettered discretion in public law: A public authority possesses powers only to use them for public good. This impose the duty to act fairly and to adopt a procedure which is `fairplay in action'. Due observance of this obligation as a part of good administration raises a reasonable or legitimate expectation in every citizen to be treated fairly in his interaction with the State and its instrumentalities, with this element forming a necessary component of the decision making process in all State actions. To satisfy this requirement of non- arbitrariness in a State action, it is, therefore, necessary to consider and give due weight to the reasonable or legitimate expectations of the persons likely lo be affected by the decision or else that unfairness in the exercise of the power may amount to an abuse or excess of power apart from affecting the bona fides of the decision in a given case. The decision so made would be exposed to challenge on the ground of arbitrariness. Rule of law does not completely eliminate discretion in the exercise of power, as it is unrealistic, but providers for control of its exercise by judicial review."

In the case of **State Bank of India, R.O., Vijayawada vs. Industrial Tribunal, Hyderabad WP No.193/1997,** therein Hon'ble High Court have held,

"*Sri Krovvidi Narasimham, the learned counsel for the 2nd respondent contends, supporting the award that it was a permanent vacancy and even though the 2nd respondent was appointed on temporary basis, his services were not liable to be terminated and he was to be regularised into service on permanent basis. Shastry award warrants that no temporary appointment can be made to a permanent post. But the matter is now covered by two division bench judgements dated 28.11.1986 in W.A. No.791 of 1986 and 25.8.1987 in W.A. No.270 of 1982. The ratio decided in the two judgements is to the effect that there cannot be any mandate to appoint employees on permanent basis when the requirement was for appointment on temporary basis. But it is held in the said judgements that when a temporary appointee is ousted from service and not for misconduct and, if again temporary appointment is to be made, then, the case of such temporary appointee who was ousted, has got to be considered in accordance with Sec. 25-H of the Act."*

In the case of **State of Haryana and others vs. Piara Singh and others. 1992 (4) SCC 118,** therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

" 49. If for any reason an adhoc or temporary employee is continued for a fairly long spell, the authorities must consider his case for regularization provided he is eligible and qualified according to the rules and his service record is satisfactory and his appointment does not run counter to the reservation policy of the state."

In the above cited judgements by the Workman the facts of the case are different hence do not apply to instant case of Workman.

47. On the other hand, in support of his contention Respondent has examined witness MW1 and MW1 in chief examination states that, Settlements i.e., on 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988, 9.1.1991 were entered into between the SBI and SBI Staff Federation for filling up of the vacancies that arise up to 1994 for those temporary employees who has worked on scale wages. Further, MW1 states that two different panels for messengers and non-messengers as per the eligibility criteria prescribed by the bank. There are four modules in Andhra Pradesh and they are Hyderabad, Tirupathi, Vijayawada and Visakhapatnam. MW1 states that the temporary employees so empanelled were given permanent absorption depending upon the vacancies so arise strictly in terms of the settlement. MW1 states that on 9.6.1995 conciliation proceeding was held before the RLC(C), Hyderabad and in said proceedings it was decided that the panels will be kept live up to 31.3.1997 and vacancies will be filled from both the lists concurrently. A copy of the said minutes of proceedings is Ex.M5. Further, MW1 states that on 30.7.1996 another settlement was entered between the SBI and All India SBI Staff Federation providing for filling up of the vacancies arising up to December 1994 in respect of subordinate cadre and daily wage /casual wage employees out of panel so prepared were to be considered against vacancies arising from January 1995 to December 1996, thereafter the said panels lapse. MW1 states that it was also agreed that all the non- messenger positions in subordinate cadre including part time attendants specially provided as leave reserve will be filled before 31.3.1997 and as regards to non-messengerial positions it is agreed that all such posts sanctioned and fallen vacant up to 31.3.1997 shall be filled before the empanelled list is allowed to lapse. Thus in both the cases empanelled list were lapsed on 1.4.1997. Ex.M6 is the copy of the settlement dated 30.7.1996. Further, witness states that on 27.2.1997 a memorandum of understanding was reached between the SBI and SBI Staff Federation providing that both the panels above mentioned will lapse on 31.3.1997. Ex.M7 is the copy of the memorandum of understanding and Ex.M8 is the copy of the statements giving the particulars of 1989 non-messenger panel, Ex.M9 is the copy of the statement of 1989 non- messenger panel, Ex.M10 is the copy of statement of 1992 panel. Further, witness states that petitioner was included in the 1989 panel. As the existing vacancies at that time were exhausted and his turn did not come he could not be given permanent employment in the bank as per the agreements. All the appointments were made strictly in accordance with the settlements reached from time to time between SBI and SBI staff federation and as per seniority, number of days of temporary service put in by them in the bank in the given period. Further, MW1 states petitioner was not sponsored by any employment exchange he did not undergo the regular process of selection required for appointment as a regular non-messenger the petitioner has not worked for 240 days in any year in his entire temporary service in the bank. The petitioner and other temporary employees were terminated from service by the bank. Further, MW1 states that the vacancies were filled up on regular basis with the temporary employees from the panels and these panels were expired in terms of the settlements so reached and there were no vacancies to absorb such employees. Thus, witness MW1 has proved the documents Ex.M1 to Ex.M12 and also contentions made in the counter. However, MW1 was cross examined by the Petitioner Counsel. But nothing has been elicited in his cross examination so as to discredit the testimony of the witness MW1 as regards the date of lapse of both the panels on 31.3.1997 and reasons assigned for non-absorption of the Petitioner from the panel list to the permanent post. Moreover the witness MW1 was re-examined by the Respondent and the witness MW1 states that panels were expired in terms of the settlement send absorptions to the extent of

the available vacancies were made. There was no termination of any temporary messenger as such but their services were not utilized after the cut off date as the available vacancies were already filled up and most of these Petitioners were not in the service of the bank as on the date of the expiry date of the panels. Therefore, in view of the aforesaid testimony of the MW1 in re-examination in the absence of cross examination remained uncontraverted, the claim of the Workman that he was entitled for absorption in permanent post in the branch of Respondent Management on the basis of panel list is found not established.

This point is answered against the Workman.

48. **Point No.IV**:- In view of the discussion and finding given at Point Nos. I, II and III, the Workman is not entitled for any relief and claim statement of Workman sans merit and liable to be dismissed.

This Point is answered accordingly.

AWARD

In view of the fore gone discussion, it is held that the action of the Respondent bank in terminating the services of Sri B. Rama Krishna, Ex. Messenger by way of oral orders w.e.f. 31.3.1997 is justified. Hence, the Petitioner is not entitled for any relief as prayed for. The claim statement filed by Workman sans merit, hence, dismissed. Reference is answered accordingly.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, Personal Assistant, transcribed by her, corrected and signed by me on this the 11th day of May, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner	Witnesses examined for the Respondent
WW1: Sri B. Rama Krishna	MW1: Sri K. Bala Kotaiah

Documents marked for the Petitioner

Ex.W1: Photocopy of notification

Ex.W2: Photocopy of interview call letter

Ex.W3: Photocopy of Panel list

Ex.W4: Photocopy of Service certificate

Documents marked for the Respondent

Ex.M1: Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.17.11.87

Ex.M2: Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.16.7.88

Ex.M3: Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.27.10.1988

Ex.M4: Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.9.1.1991

Ex.M5: Photocopy of conciliation proceedings before the Regional Labour Commissioner(C) dt.9.6.1995

Ex.M6: Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.30.7.1996

Ex.M7: Photocopy of Memorandum of understanding dt. 27.1.1997

Ex.M8: Photocopy of statements giving the particulars of 1989 messenger panel.

Ex.M9: Photocopy of statement of 1989 Non-messenger panel

Ex.M10: Photocopy of statement of 1992 panel

Ex.M11: Photocopy of order of Hon'ble High Court in WA No.86/98 dt. 1.5.98

Ex.M12: Photocopy of order in SLP No.11886-11888 of 1998 dated 10.8.98

नई दिल्ली, 29 जुलाई, 2026

का.आ. 1619.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एस बी आई भारत का के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजको और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में **केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण–सह–श्रम न्यायालय,** हैदराबाद के पंचाट (**सन्दर्भ संख्या 39/2002**) को प्रकाशित करती है,

[सं. एल-12012/100/2000-आई.आर (बी-I)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 29th July, 2026

S.O. 1619.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Reference. I.D. No. 39/2002) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Hyderabad as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the Management of SBI of India and their workmen,

[No. L-12012/100/2000–IR (B-I)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

In The Central Government Industrial Tribunal Cum Labour Court At Hyderabad

Present: **Sri IRFAN QAMAR**

Presiding Officer

Dated the 11th day of May, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. 39/2002

[Old ID No. 65/2000 of Industrial Tribunal No.I, Hyderabad]

Between:

Sri C. Raju,

27/475, Ambedkar Nagar,

Anatapur,

Distt. Anantapur (A.P.) … Petitioner

And

The Dy. General Manager,
State Bank of India,
Zonal Office,
Renigunta Road,
Tirupathi. …..Respondent

Appearances:

For the Petitioner : Sri Macherla Rangaiah, Advocate

For the Respondent: Sri Y. Ranjeeth Reddy, Advocate

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-12012/100/2000-IR(B.I) dated 13.7.2000 referred the following dispute under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 to Industrial Tribunal No.I, Hyderabad for adjudication and later the same has been transferred to this Tribunal bearing ID No. 65/2000, as per orders of Central Government vide Lr.No.H-11026/1/2001-IR(C.II) dated 18.10.2001, requiring this forum to decide the question:

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of State Bank of India, Anantapur main branch in terminating the services of Sri C. Raju, Messenger, from the services of the Bank by way of oral orders with effect from 31.3.1997 is justified? If not, what relief he is entitled?"

After receipt of the reference, it was numbered as ID No. 39/2002 and notices were issued to both the Workman and the management.

2. Before unfolding the factual matrix of the instant industrial dispute it would be apposite to have a bird eye view of a chequered history of the instant industrial dispute. Earlier instant industrial dispute along with the batch cases was decided by this Tribunal vide common award dated 17.5.2005 and the reference was answered in favour of the Respondent and against the Workman. That said common award dated 17.5.2005 was challenged by the aggrieved Workmen in various Writ petition No.6470/2014 along with batch of writ petitions before the Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh and Hon'ble High Court vide its' judgement dated 23.6.2014 allowed all batch of writ petitions and set aside the common award dated 17.5.2005 passed in ID No.222 of 2001 and other batch of ID cases by Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad and the Respondent management of State Bank of India was directed to reengage the Writ Petitioners in position, which they have been occupying prior to their termination and further directed to consider their cases for regularization as and when the substantive vacancy arises. This judgement dated 23.6.2014 of Hon'ble High Court of AP, passed in WP No.6470/2014 and batch petitions was challenged by Respondent management before the Hon'ble High Court in Writ Appeal No. 1268 of 2014. The aforesaid Writ Appeals No.1268/2014 and other Writ Appeals were decided by Division Bench of High Court of Andhra Pradesh by a common judgement dated 20.3.2019. Hon'ble High Court in aforesaid Writ Appeal was pleased to pass the order which is extracted as below:-

" 7. Hearing the learned senior counsel for the SBI and the learned senior counsel for the contesting unofficial Respondents, we see that while the learned single Judge was justified in setting aside the award

af the Tribunal, the proper course to be adopted was to remit all the cases to the Tribunal. This we say for reasons more than one. Firstly, in such matters, claims have to be decided on individual basis, as different persons have different claims as to the length of officiation or discharge of duties and functions; quality of engagement, drawings, accounting of the post for each one of them, who have worked etc. All these issues will not be the same in all the cases. Therefore, each case ought to have been directed to be decided by the Tribunal afresh on individual basis. The second and most important aspect is the learned single Judge has in one go ordered re-employment of all the workmen. This is not a relief that could have been granted without answering the individual issues; each issue relating to each case could not have been decided by the writ Court within the format of its adjudication procedures and scope. The adjudicating body, which has to do that activity, is the Industrial Tribunal. Therefore, we are of the view that while we would sustain the order of the learned singe Judge insofar as it interfered and sets aside the award of the Tribunal, the further findings and directions, issued through the impugned order have to go and the individual cases have to be sent back for consideration of the Tribunal. Such further procedure before the Tribunal will have to be carried forward with the materials already on record and also by affording an opportunity to the persons, who have claims as well as the management to place their rival contentions and further material before the Tribunal. The learned counsel appearing for the workmen are justified in pointing out that enormous delay has already happened and further action by the Tribunal in this line may be expedited.

9. In the result, these writ appeals are ordered;

(1) affirming the impugned common order of the learned single Judge to the extent it sets aside the common award dated 17.05.2005 of the Industrial Tribunal;

(2) the further findings and directions issued through the impugned common order are vacated:

(3) all the matters shall be remitted to the Industrial Tribunal with a direction to dispose of them within an outer limit of five (5) months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order; and,

(4) the parties to make appearance before the Tribunal on the given date."

Thus, in view of the above direction of Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh in W.A.No.1268 of 2014 and batch cases. This Tribunal has taken up the matter of industrial dispute for hearing and deciding it afresh in view of the aforesaid guidelines laid down by the Hon'ble High Court in Writ Appeal No.1268/2014 vide judgement dated 20.3.019.

3. The factual matrix of instant industrial dispute as narrated by the Workman in his claim statement are that, the Workman joined in the service of the management institution as Messenger from 1990 to 1996, and has rendered unblemished service spreading over a period of about 7 years. The Respondent has terminated services of Workman by oral orders with effect from 1.4.1997. Further, it is submitted that the management of Respondent bank decided to give a chance to temporarily employed personnel "found suitable for permanent appointment" by wait- listing them by offering permanent appointment or waitlisting till such opportunity arises.

4. That on 17.11.1987 a settlement was reached between All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and the Management of State Bank of India - settlement one, under this settlement three categories of employees were listed. That is, A) those who have completed 240 days in 12 months or less after 1.7.1975. B) those who have completed 270 days in any continuous block of 36 calendar months after 1.7.1975. C) (i) those who have completed minimum of 30 days aggregate temporary service in any

calendar year after 1.7.1975 or (ii) 70 days aggregate temporary service in continuous block of 36 months after 1.7.1975.

5. The persons who satisfied in all the above 4 categories were to be interviewed by a selection committee and the said selection committee would determine the suitability of the said candidate for permanent appointment. Therefore, the bank prescribed certain qualifications and from among the candidates satisfying the qualifications the suitable candidates were enlisted by a selection committee. The Clause 7 of the said agreement provided with the selected candidate would be wait listed in order of their respective categorization and the selected panel would be valid upto December, 1991. Clause 10 of the settlement specifically provided that henceforth. "there will be no temporary appointments in the subordinate cadre", except on a restrictive basis in the specified category, "from amongst empanelled candidates as per existing guidelines of the bank". The Workman further submits that consequent upon the said agreement and the draft, a notification was issued in the newspapers. The last date for responding to the advertisement was 30.8.1988. A written examination followed by viva-voce in May, 1989 was held. A selected panel was prepared, as per Clause 7 of the agreement, ie. Settlement No.1, the selected panel was to be valid upto December, 1991, the Workman submits that circular was issued on 26.4.91 by the said letter it is mentioned that the terms of the agreement dated 17.11.87 was modified vide second agreement dated 16.7.88 was entered into between the parties. In terms of the said agreement a chance was to be given, "to all eligible temporary employees for permanent appointments. The appointments were against the vacancies likely to arise during the years 1995-96, circular made it clear that in view of the enormity of the problem an extension of the currency of the panel, eligible temporary employees who have been empanelled could not appear in the earlier interviews and have been pursuing their cases thereafter, "will be given another chance to appear for interview".

6. Workman submits that there were total five settlements. The settlement dated 17.11.87 is the 1st settlement (Ex M1), settlement dated 16.7.88 is 2nd settlement (Ex M2), settlement dated 27.10.88 is the 3rd settlement (Ex M3), then settlement dated 9.1.91 is 4th settlement and settlement dated 30.7.96 is 5th settlement (Ex M6). In between there is minutes of conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.95 marked as Ex M5. That due to all these settlements which were extended by subsequent settlements thereby created reasonable expectations in the list of the selected candidates arose with that it's a question of time their appointments or services would be regularized in the services of the bank. The Workman was working with the bank on temporary basis was under the bonafide hope that sooner his services will be regularized with the bank. He is thereby closed all his options elsewhere. It is needless to point out that employing person to whom hope of employment in substantial terms was made is a facet of Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

7. Further Workman submits that the Government of India issued Circular No. F-3/3/104/87-IR, dated 16.8.1990. Under said circular the chief Executives of all public sector banks including the Management herein were specifically instructed that until the problem of existing temporary employees is fully resolved, no bank is permitted to make any permanent appointments. That some of the persons similarly situated like this Workman aggrieved by the inaction on the part of the management of the bank is not regularizing their services from out of the selected panel and not clearly focusing the vacancy position, filed W.P. No. 4194/97 before Hon'ble High court of A.P.. It is specifically averred in the said writ petition that the Management of the bank had failed to implement the settlement and that it violates the various fundamental rights guaranteed under the constitution of India. The Hon'ble High court of A.P .. by order dated 5.3.97 directed the bank to implement the settlement as amended from time to time. It also

directed the bank to carry out the terms of settlement before the expiry of March, 1997. The Hon'ble High Court also recorded finding that the Bank cannot escape its liability of enforcement of the Settlement. In view of the directions given by the High Court all candidates whose names appeared in the select panels prepared on the basis of the agreement entered into on 17.11.87 under which the panel was valid upto December, 1991, and on the basis of a settlement dated 27.10.1988 whereby the panels were made alive upto 31.3.1997 under which the panel was valid upto December, 1999. The other agreement dated 16.7.1988 under which the panel was valid upto 1992 and on the basis of the settlement dated 27.10.1998 whereby the panels were made alive upto 31.3.1997 were under the bonafide impression that their cases will be considered for regularization and were living on the basis of the said reasonable expectation. Unfortunately, contrary to the aforesaid directions given by the High Court and contrary to the settlements entered into between the parties, the bank issued proceedings dated 25.3.1997, dated 27.3.1997 and 31.3.1997 instructing the various authorities of the Management not to continue the temporary employees those who are in services of the bank from 1.4.97. The said order was followed by the Management. Aggrieved by the said action the Workman herein and similarly situated candidates have filed a writ petition before the Hon'ble High Court and by way of Writ Petition No.9206/97 seeking a declaration that the proceedings issued by the Deputy General Manager and the Assistant General Manager (Respondents 3,4 and 5 therein) on 25.3.97, 27.3.97 and 31.3.97 as illegal and also non-continuance of the Workmen therein in service by absorbing them in the services of the bank as violative of Section 2(p) and 18(1) read with Rule 58 of Central Rules and sought for specific direction to the bank to absorb them in service.

8. Further, Workman submits that in the counter affidavit filed in Writ Petition No.9206/97, the bank has submitted that it has about 805 branches in Andhra Pradesh alone. It has stated that due to exigencies of circumstances and on account of the urgent need in its banks, it employed temporary employees in subordinate cadre. It is pertinent to mention that it does not state the urgent or need or the nature of temporary employees that it had engaged. Enquiry into the same would reveal that the stand taken by the bank either on the ground of urgent need or of temporary employees is a façade to perpetuate unfair labour practice. It is designed to on the one hand, keep the employed in the erroneous zone of hope and on the other to ensure that benefits that a model employer will extend under various statutes to its employees is not required to be borne out by the bank. A reading of the counter affidavit would show that the bank would opines that being just fair and reasonable are which obviously is reprehensible and is a facet of unfair labour practice.

9. The Workman submits that the bank had referred in its counter affidavit to three settlements dated 17.11.87, 16.7.88 and 27.10.88. The bank in the guise of extending the benefits of the circular of Government dated 16.8.90 stated in its counter affidavit that as follows:

"Government of India, vide its letter dated 16.8.1990, issued guidelines to all the public sector banks with regard to recruitment and absorption of temporary employees in public sector banks. The said guidelines were issued to implement on the lines of the approach paper on the issue provided by a committee constituted in this regard. The Government of India guidelines made it clear that all the public sector banks may follow the provisions laid down in the approach paper.

The approach paper specified that the cases of temporary employees who had put in not less than 240 days of temporary service in 12 consecutive Months and who are entitled to benefit of Section 25-F may be decided by entering into a settlement with the representative union. In respect of temporary employees who had put in less than 240 days of service in 12 consecutive months or less, a settlement could be avoided and however if the Management so desired, they could enter into a conciliation settlement

with the representative union. Para 6(h), it is mentioned that only those temporary employees who had put in temporary service of 90 or more days after 1.1 1982 would be eligible for considering under the scheme. Although the Government guidelines envisaged for a settlement in respect of employees who had put in temporary service of 90 or more days, the bank by way of further concession entered into settlements Even in respect of those who had put in less than 90 days. As such, it could be Seen that the settlements are more beneficial to the temporary employees concerned. The approach paper also specify at para 6(c) that the banks would provide one time opportunity to all the temporary employees and for that purpose temporary employees worked in the bank on or after 1.1.1982 could be considered for re-employment in terms of the scheme. The Respondents have gone further wherein even persons working after 1975 were also considered.

As could be seen from the above, there was a genuine effort on the part of the Respondent bank to provide permanent employment for as many as possible subject to availability of the vacancies.

It is further submitted that at para 6(k) of the approach paper, it was made clear that this would be one time exercise in full and final settlement of all the aims and disputes for the past period in respect of temporary workmen covered by the settlement. This would mean that the Government of India guidelines would cover only those persons who were temporarily employed for the period specified therein and not otherwise. As such, it is submitted that the Respondents have not only followed the Government of India guidelines but in fact covered cases of the employees who had worked for less than 90 days. As such, question of violation does not arise and in any case those were only broad guidelines and not directives".

10. The Workman submits that the bank also referred a subsequent settlement dated 9.1.1991 wherein there is a clause to the effect- that the panel of temporary employees and the panel of daily wage employees will be operated to a particular period. Therefore, their cases will not be considered. The Management herein relying upon this settlement in their impugned action. It is submitted that even the settlement dated 9.1.1991 will not empower the management to terminate the services of the temporary employees who are working in the bank services like the Workman herein as it does not specify the termination of the employees. In fact there are so many vacancies wherein the Management has engaged several new persons as temporary messengers/ attendars/ sweepers etc., even after the judgment of Hon’ble High Court without considering the cases of the similarly situated candidates like the Workman herein. It is submitted inspite of engaging fresh candidates as is now being done by the Management they would have continued the similarly situated candidates like the Workman herein in the services of the bank and consider their cases for absorption in view of the circulars issued by Central Government as well as the directions of this Hon'ble Court in Writ Petition No.4194/97, dated 5.3.97. In view of the circulars issued by the Central Government, the Management should not have relied upon the settlement dated 9.1.1991. Hence, the impugned action of the Management is illegal, unjust, violative of fundamental rights such as Articles 14,16 and 21 of the Constitution of India.

11. The Workman submits that in W.P. No.4194/97 filed by the union of temporary employees where in they have complained about the non- implementation of the settlements arrived between the parties and sought for absorption. Such employees in the bank services on permanent basis before the date fixed for carrying out the terms of settlement, the Court held that the members of the union had been empanelled in the list, they were not regularized and the time was going to run out to the near future and the Respondent bank and its officers cannot escape from the liability of enforcing the settlement which has been reached and therefore directed that the bank and the officers shall implement the settlement dated 17.11.87 as amended from time to time before the expiry of 31.3.97.

12. Further, it is submitted that in the clause of Settlement it is specifically mentioned that the workmen to be absorbed/appointed in the bank prohibiting any temporary appointments subsequent to the date of settlement even the authorities want to make temporary appointments that should be made only from among the empanelled can be appointed either for temporary vacancy or permanent vacancy except from among the empanelled candidates like the Workman and that should be continued till they are absorbed. The management committed unfair labour practices and terminated the services of the candidates with effect from 1.4.1997 which is arbitrary, discriminatory, contrary to their own guidelines and violative of the constitutional provisions which are guaranteed in Chapter-III of the Constitution of India.

13. The Workman submits that it is strange as to how the panels were allowed to lapse by a so-called Memorandum of Understanding dated 25.2.1997, that the action of terminating such employees like the Workman by virtue of an impugned oral proceedings without implementing the settlement would be illegal and unfair labour practice which cannot be allowed to be perpetuated. That the discontinuance of the Workman after 31.3.97 who had served in the bank in any capacity amounts to retrenchment. It could not have been done without any notice and it violates Sec.25FF of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and the said action is violative of principles of natural justice guaranteed under Chapter III of the Constitution of India. This amounts to retrenchment without one month's notice and taken in view of such notice. Thus, the main proceedings issued by the Respondent is without jurisdiction and is arbitrary, illegal and therefore liable to be quashed. That the alleged Memorandum of Understanding dated 27.2.97, Ex.M5 does not own any legal entity, as the said Memorandum of Understanding is not published anywhere to brought to the notice of the Workman whose rights are being affected. It is submitted that Management did not adhere to the procedure envisaged by the Central Government in its' instructions dated 16.8.90 in the year 1995. The same was not followed in the year 1997 despite there being vacancies. The management has followed the procedure of calling candidates through Employment exchange instead of giving chance to the empanelled candidates like the Workman here. It is pertinent to mention here that the Respondent Management sent letters to the all similarly situated candidates like the Workman in the month of June, 1997, subsequent to the passing of impugned termination orders. After knowing the facts that the candidates are litigating, the Management refused to engage these candidates. It is once again reiterated that the panels are meant for absorption but not for termination. It was the duty of the Management to engage the empanelled candidates like the Workman even in temporary vacancies till they are absorbed permanently in regular vacancies. Hence, the action of the Respondent Management terminating the services of the Workman by oral order dated 31.3.97 is unjust, illegal, violative of principles of natural justice and hence, the Management be directed to reinstate and absorb the Workman and to grant all incidental and consequential benefits.

14. Per contra, Respondent had filed counter and made a contentions that the reference is not tenable and contrary to the provisions of I.D. Act, 1947. Respondent submitted that to tide over severe sub-ordinate staff constraints which arose out of leave vacancies, exigencies, etc., and also owning to the restrictions imposed by the Government of India/Reserve Bank of India on intake of staff, the Respondent bank used to engage sub-ordinate staff like messengers, sweepers, sweeper cum water boys, etc., depending on the availability of work on purely temporary basis for the smooth and uninterrupted functioning of the branches. It is submitted that the All India State Bank of India Staff Federation which represents majority of the employees in the State Bank of India comprising about 98% of the work force as its' members espoused the cause of temporary employees who have put in less than 240 days of temporary

service in 12 calendar months in the bank and who were ineligible for any protection under Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 to give a chance for being considered for absorption and permanent appointments.

15. Discussions were held and on 17.11.1987 an agreement was signed between the federation and the Management bank under Sec. 2(p) read with Sec 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules 1957. A copy of the said settlement dated 17.11.87 which may be herein after referred as first settlement is filed and 4 categories were made as it has already been mentioned in the claim statement above, it need not be repeated here. In the first settlement, it was agreed that the temporary employees as categorized would be given a chance for being considered for permanent appointment in the bank's service against the vacancies which are likely to arise during the period 1987 to 1991. On 16.7.88 second settlement was arrived between the Federation and the Bank whereby it was agreed to substitute the period of consideration of vacancies as 1987 to 1992 in place of 1987 to 1991 as contemplated under the first settlement dated 17.11.1987. This is the second settlement. A 3rd settlement was entered into on 27.10.88 and it was agreed that the bank's service against the vacancies likely to arise from 1988 to 1992 was to be considered. Government of India vide its letter dated 16.8.90 issued guidelines to all the public sector banks with regard to recruitment and absorption of temporary employees in public sector banks. The said guidelines were issued to implement on the lines of approach paper on the issue provided by a committee constituted in this regard. Government of India guidelines made it clear that all the public sector banks may follow the provisions laid down in the approach paper. The approach paper specified that the cases of temporary service in 12 consecutive months and who are entitled to benefit of Sec.25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 may be decided by entering into a settlement with the representative union. In respect of temporary employees who had put in less than 240 days of service in 12 consecutive months or less, a settlement could be avoided and however if the Management so desired they could enter into a conciliation settlement with the representative union. In para. 6(h) it is mentioned that only those temporary employees who had put in temporary service of 90 days or more days after 1.1.82 would be eligible for considering under the scheme. Although the Government guidelines envisaged for a settlement in respect of employees who had put in temporary service of 90 days or more days, the bank by way of a further concession entered into settlements. Even in respect of those who had put in less than 90 days and also the bank went a step further and said those persons who are working after 1975 were also considered. Hence, there was a genuine effort on the part of the Respondent bank to provide as many as possible jobs subject to the availability of the vacancies. However, para 6 (k) of the approach paper made it clear that it is a one time, exercise in full and final, settlement of all the claims and disputes for the past period, in respect of temporary workmen covered by the settlement. Another settlement was entered on 9.1.91 herein after referred as 4th settlement and the time limit was extended upto 1994 and separate panel was prepared for temporary employees, casual/daily wagers. It was agreed that while vacancies arising between 1988 to 1994 in respect of temporary employees and in respect of casual/daily wagers, they can be considered for the vacancies arising between 1995-96 only.

16. It is submitted that the administrative set up of the Hyderabad Local Head Office comprises of four Zonal Offices (Zones) at Hyderabad, Vijayawada, Visakhapatnam and Tirupathi covering all the Districts of Andhra Pradesh. In terms of the settlement the Management after following the procedure laid down therein prepared the panels of qualified candidates of temporary employees denoted as 1989 panel and also panel of casual/daily wagers denoted as 1992 panel for giving a chance for being considered for permanent absorption. These panels were prepared zone-wise separately for messengers and non-messengers in the descending order of temporary service put in by the candidates during the stipulated period i.e., 1.7.1975 to 31.7.1988. That the Federation approached the Regional Labour Commissioner(C) for implementation of

bi-partite settlement in respect of absorption of temporary employees. The Regional Labour Commissioner(C) conducted conciliation proceedings and an agreement was arrived between the Federation and the bank. It was agreed that it would be kept alive upto March, 1997. A copy of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.2.1995 signed by the parties is filed as material paper. A settlement was arrived at and an agreement was signed between the Federation and the Management bank on 30.7.1996 under Sec.2 (p) read with Sec.18(1) of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957, which is hereinafter called as 5th settlement. That on 27.2.1997 a Memorandum of understanding was also signed by the federation's affiliate and the bank Management recording the fact that the exercise of identifying the messengerial vacancies as on 31.12.1994 has since been completed by Central Office and thereby 403 messengerial vacancies were sanctioned . It was agreed that these vacancies may be filled from 1989 panel of temporary employees after effecting conversion from full time non-messengerial staff in the usual manner and the agreement was reached accordingly. It was agreed between the Federation's affiliate and the Management bank that in terms of the settlement dated 30.7.1996 both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees would lapse on 31.3.1997. That as agreed upon vacancies were filled from the panels. The Workman who has put in an aggregate temporary service of less than 240 days in a continuous block of 12 months period during 1.7.1975 to 31.7.1988 has no right to seek a direction to consider his candidature for absorption in the Management bank under any rule/law except under the settlement entered into thereon.

17. Respondent contended that, in fact, the case of the Workman can be considered under all the five settlements having got his case considered under provisions of these settlements. All the other provisions and terms of the settlements are also binding on him/her. The Management bank has not violated any of the provisions of the terms of the said settlement. That the very preparation and maintenance of panel is in compliance of the terms agreed under these settlements. These settlements were time bound and they ceased to exist on 31.3.1997. That the bank has never promised that all the candidates in the panel will be absorbed. In the advertisement itself it was made clear that candidates will be considered for absorption in the vacancies that may arise upto 1992. Keeping alive the panels after 31.3.1997 is contrary to the settlements arrived between the State Bank of India Staff Federation and the Management bank. That the settlements are binding on the parties. The Workman is also bound under the terms of the said settlement. The settlement does not suffer from any ambiguity as their language is very clear. The right under the settlements is to give them a chance to be considered for future appointment in the bank's services against the vacancies likely to arise. The settlements were effected to balance the expectations of the temporary employees to be absorbed in permanent service as against the constitutional rights for all eligible persons to be considered for employment every time a vacancy arises. That the alleged dispute including the demand for reinstatement has to be decided in this context. It is submitted that the period of panel list got expired on 31.3.97 and it is an integral term of the settlement and cannot be modified in any proceedings under the law. These temporary employees who unfortunately could not be accommodated for want of vacancies have no further rights to be considered for regularization. That the Hon'ble High Court in WP No.12964/94, held as follows, "It is needless to state that the settlement arrived at between the All India State Bank of India Staff Federation which, is the majority union and the bank Management is binding on the Workmen also. It is not at all the case of the Workman that any of the terms of the settlement has been violated by the bank's Management. If the Workman had worked in the bank on part-time basis before 31.5.94, that itself would not vest in him a right to claim that his services should be regularized on permanent basis against a full time cadre post. The claim put forth by the Workman in the present petition is therefore misconceived and not tenable. However, it is open to the Workman to claim any right which

flows from the settlement between the union and the bank Management. As already pointed out that it is not the grievance of the Workman that some right which has flown from the settlement in favour of the Workman has been denied by the bank Management. Therefore, I do not find any ground, let alone substantial ground, to grant the kind of relief sought for by the Workman. Writ Petition fails and is accordingly dismissed. No costs."

18. Further, it is contended that if the panels were not lapsed at the end of designated period and allowed to be continued it would result in making the contracts of temporary employment indirectly permanent through back door entry, which would not only be contrary to the settlements but also to Articles 14 and 16 of Constitution of India and deprive the chances of original claimants who would Come through proper recruitment procedure. As their rights have been crystallized by operation of the settlements. Hence, there is no question of any Legitimate expectation being violated.

19. Similarly placed ex-employees filed WP No.9206/1995 and the batch before the Hon'ble High Court of A.P. and the learned Single Judge allowed the Writ Petitions. Aggrieved by the same WA No.86/98 and the batch was filed and the Division Bench set aside the order of the Single Judge. Thereafter the ex-temporary employees filed Special Leave Petition No.11886-11888 of 1998 before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India also dismissed the SLP. Therefore, reference to the Judgement of the Learned Single Judge in WP No.9206/97 is of no consequences as the same has already been set aside. The observations made in the Judgements cannot be relied upon for any purpose what so ever. The question of operation of Sec.25F would not come into play. Further the issue is covered by various Judgements of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India and various Hon'ble High Courts. Hence, the reference may be ordered that the Workman is not entitled for any relief.

20. In order to fortify his claim Workman has examined himself as WW1 and also filed documents in evidence which has been exhibited as Ex.W1 to W2. Further, the Workman has filed photocopies of documents in support of his claim which are discussed as under:-

Ex.W1 is the service certificate. Ex.W2 is the panel list.

21. On the other hand, Respondent has examined witness MW1 Sri K. Bala Kotaiah and this witness has exhibited 12 documents, marked as Ex.M1 to M12. The details of these documents are as follows:-

Ex.M.1 is the Settlement dated 17.11.1987. Ex.M2 is the Settlement dated 16.7.1988. Ex.M3 is the Settlement dated 27.10.1988. Ex.M4 is the Settlement dated 9.1.1991. Ex.M5 is the Minutes of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.1995. Ex.M6 is the Settlement dated 30.7.1996. Ex.M7 is the Memorandum of Understanding dt. 27.2.1997. Ex.M8 is the Particulars of 1989 Messengerial Panel. Ex.M9 is the Particulars of 1989 Non-Messengerial Panel. Ex.M10 is the Particulars of 1992 General Attendant Panel. Ex.M11 is the Judgment of Hon’ble High Court of A.P. in Writ Appeal No.86/98 dt.1.5.1998. Ex.M12 is the Judgment of Hon’ble Supreme Court of India in SLP No. 11886-11888 of 1998 dt.10.8.1998.

22. Apart from afore mentioned documents, Learned Counsel for Workman has also filed a long list of various judgements of Hon’ble Supreme Court as well as Hon’ble High Court, which we will discuss at appropriate place in this Award.

23. Heard the argument of Learned Counsel for Workman as well as for Respondent.

24. On the basis of rival pleadings of both the parties and submissions made by the Learned Counsel for both the parties, following points arise for determination in the industrial dispute :-

I. Whether the 1st settlement dated 17.11.1987, 2nd settlement dated 16.7.1988, 3rd settlement dated 27.10.1988, 4th settlement dated 9.1.1991 and 5th settlement dated 30.7.1996 entered into between State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and also Memorandum of Understanding are binding upon both the parties?

II. Whether the action of State Bank of India, branch in terminating the services of Workman Sri C. Raju, a Messenger with effect from 31.3.1997 is justified?

III. Whether the Workman is entitled for absorption on permanent post in the Branch of Respondent management as per averments made by him in the claim statement?

IV. To what relief if any the Workman is entitled for?

Findings:-

25. Point No.I:- Undisputedly settlements dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988, 9.1.1991 and 30.7.1996, minutes of conciliation proceedings and memorandum of understanding dated 27.2.1997 were executed between the State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation under section 2(p) and 18 (1) of I.D. Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Disputes (Central Rules), 1957.

Section 2(p) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 as follows:-

(p) "settlement" means a settlement arrived at in the course of conciliation proceeding and includes a written agreement between the employer and workmen arrived at otherwise than in the course of conciliation proceeding where such agreement has been signed by the parties thereto in such manner as may be prescribed and a copy thereof has been sent to an officer authorised in this behalf by the appropriate Government and the conciliation officer;

Section 18(1) provides as follows:-

18. Persons on whom settlements and awards are binding.

- [(1) A settlement arrived at by agreement between the employer and Workman otherwise than in the course of conciliation proceeding shall be binding on the parties to the agreement.

Therefore, in view of the provision contained u/s.18 (1) I.D. Act, 1947, terms and conditions enumerated in the aforesaid settlements are binding on the parties to the agreement. The Learned Counsel for Workman has argued that the Workman after going through the selection procedure has successfully been listed in the panel for appointment on the permanent basis in the Respondent management and the empanelled list has to be valid till last person in the empanelled list is appointed on permanent basis. But the impugned order dated 25.3.97, 27.3.97 and 31.3.97, has been issued by Respondent management thereby the services of the Workman has been terminated and the said order is not in consonance of the terms of the agreement entered into between the parties. Further, Workman submits that the Respondent in the 5th settlement has mentioned the date i.e., 31.3.1997 for lapse of empanel list which is illegal and that is not binding upon the Workman. The condition of lapse of empanelment list on 31.3.97 incorporated in the aforesaid 5th settlement, is arbitrary and illegal.

26. The perusal of the impugned order dated 25.3.1997 goes to reveal that the Chief/Branch Manager, SBI Zonal Office has issued the letter to all the branches with regard to the subject not to make any temporary appointments in the Branch in messengerial category from 1.4.1997. The extract of the said letter is given below:-

"We have been advised by the Deputy General Manager, Zonal Office, Hyderabad that as both the panels of temporary employees of 1989 and daily wagers/casual labours of 1992 will lapse by 31.3.1997, it has been decided by Central Office not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial category from 1.4.1997."

Thus, from the contents of the aforesaid letter, it manifest that Head Office of State Bank of India vide letter dated 25.3.1997 has issued direction to all its branches not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial category from 1.4.1997 due to reason of lapse of both panels i.e., 1989 & 1992 on 31.3.1997 as per terms of settlements entered into by both parties. Further, the contents of the subsequent letter dated 27.3.1997 issued by Respondent Management is also direction to Branch Manager, State Bank of India not to make any temporary messengerial category appointment with effect from 1.4.1997 and it has also been communicated to all concerned that the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers maintained by Zonal offices stand lapsed from 31.1.1997. Further, office order dated 31.3.1997 has been issued by Respondent management that goes to reveal that the said office order has been issued to this effect that, "Consequent on absorption of temporary employees in permanent cadre, it has been decided by the competent authority that no one onwards, no further daily labour or temporary employees/appointments should be resorted to/engaged/employed." Therefore, it reflects from the contents of the aforesaid orders that the temporary appointment in messengerial category and daily labour has been stopped by the Respondent management with effect from 1.4.1997 because of the lapsed of panel of temporary workers and daily wagers by 31.3.1997. The agreement for lapse of both the panels on 31.3.1997 is contained in the 5th settlement which has been arrived at between the parties on dated 30.7.1996 with the consensus of both the parties. Therefore, Workman can not challenge the terms and conditions contained in settlement dated 30.7.1996 regarding lapse of panel on 31.3.1997 as agreed between State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation. As per provision contained u/s.18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 the said Agreement dated 30.7.1996 is binding on both the parties.

In the case of **Allied Sales Corporation Secunderabad vs.The Authority Under Andhra Pradesh..... 1990 II LLJ 510 AP para 414, Hon'ble Court have held:-**

"*4. There was a settlement between the Management and the workmen under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act on 25th April 1983 under which the age of superannuation of the workmen was fixed at 55 years. The settlement was to be in force upto 30th June 1986 and the next settlement, incorporating practically the same terms, was again entered into on 4th February 1987 under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act. There is no dispute that these settlements are under Section 18(1).*

14. Now the Authority constituted under Section 41(1) of the Act is an authority with very limited jurisdiction. It can only decide in the first appeal whether a termination by the management is valid or not and is within the parameters of Section 40 of the Act. The said Authority, in our view, has absolutely no jurisdiction to decide whether a settlement entered into under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act between the representatives of the Workmen and of the Management, is vitiated by undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion on the part of the Management. The Authority, namely, the Assistant Commissioner of Labour, was never intended by the A.P. Legislature to have jurisdiction to go into the question of the validity of a settlement arrived at under Section 18 of the Industrial Disputes Act by an Industrial Court. That Parliament has, in fact, constituted Industrial Courts under the Industrial Disputes Act, with extensive powers cannot be disputed. What we mean to say is that the Authority under Section 41(1) of the A.P. Act has no jurisdiction what-so-ever either to question or to decide about the validity of any such settlements. If parties to a settlement have a grievance about the validity of a settlement, it is for

them to agitate the matter before the appropriate forum and they cannot ask an Authority constituted under Section 41(1) of the A.P. Shops and Establishments Act, 1966 with limited jurisdiction, to go into any such question and, that too, incidentally while deciding whether retirement as per the contract of employment, is legal or not."

It is not the case of Workman that aforesaid settlements are vitiated by undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion on the part of the management. If the Workman feeling aggrieved by any terms of settlement/ agreement on the aforementioned grounds then he can challenge of settlement before a competent authority under the Act, 1947. But here in the instant matter it is not a case of Workman that aforementioned settlement has been entered into between the parties on the ground of undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion. Therefore, Workman is barred to raise any objection in respect of fixing the date of lapse of both panels on 31.3.1997 as agreed between both the parties and Workman can not challenge any terms of said Agreement.

Further in the case of **Herbertsons Limited Vs. Workmen of Herbertsons Limited and Ors, 1977 AIR 322,** Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

The Tribunal thought that the question of the quantum of membership of the 2nd Respondent did not call for a finding at all in view of 1his Court's order. As observed above that was not a correct assumption. On the other hand, we feel that this view of the Tribunal has led it to approach the matter in an entirely erroneous manner. The Tribunal is, rightly enough, conscious that under section 18 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act the settlement was binding on the company and the members of the 3rd Respondent union. Even so, the Tribunal devoted nearly half of its order in scanning the evidence given by the company and Respondent No. 3 to find out whether the terms of the settlement had been explained by the President of the union to the workmen or not and whether the workers voluntarily accepted the settlement knowing all the "consequences". This to our mind is again an entirely wrong approach.

"When a recognised union negotiates with an employer the workers as individuals do not come into the picture. It is not necessary that each individual worker should know the implications of the settlement since a recognised union, which is expected to protect the legitimate interests of labour, enters into a settlement in the best interests of labour. This would be the normal rule. We cannot altogether rule out exceptional cases where there may be allegations of mala fides, fraud or even corruption or other induce- ments. Nothing of that kind has been suggested against the President of the 3rd Respondent in this case. That being the position, prima facie, this is a settlement in the course of collective bargaining and, therefore, is entitled to due weight and consideration.

It is not possible to scan the settlement in bits and pieces and hold some parts good and acceptable and others bad. Unless it can be demonstrated that the objectionable portion is such that it completely outweighs all the other advantages gained the Court will be slow to hold a settle- ment as unfair and unjust. The settlement has to be accepted or rejected as a whole and we are unable to reject it as a whole as unfair or unjust. Even before this Court the 3rd Respondent representing admittedly the large majority of the workmen has stood by this settlement and that is a strong factor which it is difficult to ignore. As stated elsewhere in the judgment, we cannot also be oblivious of the fact that all workmen of the company have accepted the settlement. Besides, the period of settlement has since expired and we are informed that the employer and the 3rd Respondent are negotiating another settlement with further improvements. These factors, apart from what has been stated above, and the need for industrial peace and harmony when a union backed by a large majority of workmen has accepted a settlement in the course of collective bargaining have impelled us not to interfere with this settlement. That being the position, we unhold the

settlement as fair and just and order that the award of the Tribunal shall be substituted by the settlement dated October 18, 1973. The said settlement shall be the substituted award. The appeal is disposed of accordingly. There will be no order as to costs."

Therefore, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above, the contention of the Workman that the date fixed for lapse of empanelled list on 31.3.1997 for appointment to the permanent post vide 5th Settlement dated 30.7.1996 is arbitrary, illegal is not untenable. The recognized union of Workmen has negotiated with the Respondent Bank Management representing large number of Workmen and the Workman as individual do not come into picture. Workman in the instant case has work as temporary Workmen in the Respondent Branch and in response of Notification he had applied for inclusion of his name in the panel and he was selected for inclusion his name in the panel list to be utilized for absorption of such Workman to permanent post in order of their seniority in the list. The Settlement dated 30.7.1996 between State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation under Sec.2(p) and Sec.18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 has clearly provided as regard non-messengerial position and it is agreed that all such posts sanctioned fallen vacant upto 31.3.1997 shall be filled before empanel list is allowed to lapse. Thus, in view of law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, in the instant case, Agreement dated 30.7.1996 was entered into between both the parties in respect of lapsing of the both the panels on 31.3.1997 and absorption of the Workmen from panel list was subject to availability of vacancy of post likely to arise upto 31.3.1997, have a binding force on Workman as well as management of State Bank of India in view of provision contained under section 18 (1) of I.D. Act, 1947.

Thus, Point No.I is answered against the Workman and in favour of the Respondent.

27. **Point No.II**:- Firstly, it is submitted on behalf of the Workman that the Respondent has terminated his services by oral order on 31.3.1997 without issuing any notice or paying any salary or compensation in lieu thereof. Therefore, the termination order of the Workman from service is in violation of provision contained Under Section 25 F of I.D. Act, 1947. Therefore, the order is liable to be set aside.

28. On the other hand, Respondent counsel contended that Workman has not worked for 240 days in any preceding calendar year. Therefore, reference of the industrial dispute is not relevant. In this context, the Workman has examined himself as WW1 who has reiterated that Workman has been terminated from service by Respondent on 31.3.1997 without notice of salary or compensation in lieu thereof. Before examining the claim of the Workman on merit it would be apposite to reproduce the provision contained under section 25 F:-

Section 25F provides:-

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].

Compensation to workmen in case of transfer of undertakings.

Section 25B defines the term continuous service which provides

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 authorized 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;

In order to prove the fact of 240 days of service within 12 months of a calendar year just preceding from the date of termination, the initial burden of proof lies upon the Workman and the Workman has to prove this factum by adducing his oral as well as documentary evidence in support of his claim.

Further, how to calculate 240 days of service by the Workman in a calendar year. In this context the reference of decisions of Hon'ble Supreme Court is relevant and the same are discussed below:-

In Rajasthan State Ganganagar S. Mills Ltd. v. State of Rajasthan and Anr. (2004) Apex Court held:

"It was the case of the Workman that he had worked for more than 240 days in the year concerned. This claim was denied by the appellant. It was for the claimant to lead evidence to show that he had worked for 240 days in the year preceding the date of his termination. He has filed an affidavit. It is statement which is in his favor and that cannot be regarded as sufficient evidence for any Court or Tribunal to come to the conclusion that in fact the claimant had worked for 240 days in a year These aspects were highlighted in Range Forest Officer v. S.T. Hadimani (2002 (3) SCC 25. No proof of receipt of salary or wages for 240 days or order or record in that regard was produced. Mere non-production of the muster roll for a particular period was not sufficient for the Labour Court held that the Workman had worked for 240 days as claimed."

In Municipal Corporation, Faridabad v. Siri Niwas (2004 (8) SCC 195), held "*the burden was on the Workman to show that he was working for more than 240 days in the preceding one year prior to his alleged retrenchment." In M.P. Electricity Board v. Hariram (2004 (8) SCC 246) the position was again reiterated in paragraph 11 as follows: "The above burden having not been discharged and the Labour Court having held so, in our opinion, the Industrial Court and the High Court erred in basing an order of reinstatement solely on an adverse inference drawn erroneously ..*"

In the case of Manager, RBI, Bangalore vs. S Mani (2005) SCC Page 100, the 3 Judges Bench of the Apex Court held that "*the initial burden of proof was on the Workman to show that he had completed 240 days of service."*

Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of Mohan Lal vs Management BEL 1981 SCC page 225 has laid down the principle that how to count 240 days of service within one year it is held: *"Clause (2)(a) provides for a fiction to treat a Workman in continuous service for a period of one year despite the fact that he has not rendered uninterrupted service for a period of one year but he has rendered period of 240 days during the period of 12 calendar service for months counting backwards and just preceding the relevant date being the date of retrenchment. In other words, in order to invoke the fiction enacted in clause (2)(a) it is necessary to determine first the relevant date, ie the date of termination of service which is complained of as retrenchment. After that date is ascertained. move backward to a period of 12 months just preceding the date of retrenchment and then ascertain whether within the period of 12 months, the Workman has rendered service for a period of 240 days. If these three facts are affirmatively answered in favor of the Workman pursuant to the deeming fiction enacted in clause (2)(a) it will have to be assumed that the Workman is in continuous service for a period of one year and he will satisfy the eligibility qualification enacted in Section 25-F"*

"14. We have already extracted section 25B since its amendment and the change in language is the legislative exposition of which note must be taken. In fact, we need not further dilate upon this aspect because in Surendra Kumar Verma and Ors. v. Central Government Industrial-cum-Labour Court, New Delhi and Anr., Chinnappa Reddy. J., after noticing the amendment and referring to the decision in Sur Enamel and Stamping Works (P) Ltd case, held as under:

"These changes brought about by Act 36 of 1964 appear to be clearly designed to provide that a Workman who has actually worked under the employer for not less than 240 days during a period of twelve months shall be deemed to have been in continuous service for a period of one year whether or not he has in fact been in such continuous service for a period of one year. It is enough that he has worked for 240 days in a period of 12 months, it is not necessary that he should have been in the service of the employer for one whole year."

In a concurring judgment Pathak J. agreed with this interpretation of section 25B(2). Therefore, both on principle and on precedent it must be held that section 25B(2) comprehends a situation where a Workman is not in employment for a period of 12 calendar months, but has rendered service for a period of 240 days within the period of 12 calendar months commencing and counting backwards from the relevant date, i.e. the date of retrenchment. If he has, he would be deemed to be in continuous service for a period of one year for the purpose of section 25B and Chapter VA."

Thus, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above the initial burden of proof lies upon the Workman to show that he has completed 240 days of the service with the Respondent just preceding from the date of his termination. Further, in respect of the employment of calculating the 240 days service in view of the contents of Section 25-F read with Section 25-B of the I.D. Act, 1947.

29. Now, in view of the provision contained under Section 25 F and law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, we have to examine whether the Workman has discharged his initial burden of proof in

respect of his claim of 240 days continuous service in a calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination i.e., 31.3.1997.

In this context, WW1 in his cross examination has stated that,

"I was not sponsored by any employment exchange. I did not undergo the regular selection process required for appointment in the bank."

"I did not work for 240 days in any year in my entire service."

Thus, it is clear from the testimony of WW1 that the Workman had not worked for 240 days continuously in any 12 months of a calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination in the Respondent bank. Therefore, Workman failed to establish his plea by his oral and documentary evidence that he had worked for 240 days continuously in calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination i.e., 31.3.1997. Thus, the claim of the Workman that he has been terminated by oral order without issuing notice or payment in lieu after termination, in contravention of Section 25 F of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is not tenable. However the documents filed by the Workman in support of his claim, number of days worked with the Respondent goes to reveal that the Workman had worked intermittently as daily wager depending upon availability of work in branch. Workman did not file any document of appointment letter or salary slips in support of his claim for appointment as a non-messenger in the Respondent branch on temporary basis.

30. Per contra, the Learned Counsel for Respondent has submitted the allegation of Workman that he was terminated from services is not correct. As the vacancies were filled up on regular basis in order of their respective seniority the non-engagement of the Workman does not amount to termination. Further, Respondent contended that no law provide that even though there is no work temporary employee should be continued in the bank work as the very engagement of Workman was subject to availability of work. Therefore, the allegation that the bank has indulged in unfair labour practice is incorrect.

31. Thus, in view of the fore gone discussion and contentions made by the Respondent, I find the force in the argument advanced by the Respondent that in the instant matter, Workman was not terminated from service by order dated 31.3.1997 rather he was disengaged in view of the non-availability of the work in the branch. Further, there was direction issued by the Head Office of the Respondent authority not to engage any daily wager Workman/ temporary Worker w.e.f. 1.4.1997. Thus, such disengagement of Workman does not amount to termination. Moreover, the Workman failed to prove his claim that he was terminated in contravention of provision of Sec.25F of the I.D. Act, 1947 as he failed to establish his plea by any oral or documentary evidence that he had worked for 240 days continuously in a twelve months of calendar year just preceding from date of termination i.e., 31.3.1997.

32. Further, perusal of the order dated 25.3.1997 goes to reveal that the Chief Branch Manager, State Bank of India has issued the letter to Zonal Office with direction to all its branches to this effect that they have been advised by the DGM, Zonal Office, Hyderabad that as both the panel of temporary employees of 1989 and daily wagers/casual labour of 1992 will lapse on 31.3.1997 it has been decided by central office not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial cadre from 1.4.1997, therefore it was directed to issue suitable instructions not to make temporary appointments from 1.4.1997. There is no mention in this order that the Workman herein has been terminated from service by this order.

33. Further, the circular dated 27.3.1997 was issued by DGM, SBI to all branches in commercial network in respect of the non-appointment of temporary employees in subordinate cadre and it has directed

not to make any temporary employment in the subordinate cadre with effect from 1.4.97 and further, it has directed to ensure that no temporary/casual/daily basis appointment of the petty cash. Further, it is directed to all Branch Managers that any deviation in this regard will be viewed seriously. Thus, these circulars do not reflect that the Workman has been terminated from service by this order.

34. Similarly, office order dated 31.3.1997 is simply a direction to all branches of the Respondent bank by DGM that no further daily labour should be engaged or employed. Therefore, the plea of the Workman that he has been terminated by the aforesaid order dated 25.3.1997, 27.3.1997 and 31.3.1997 from the service by the Respondent is not acceptable. The evidence adduced by the Workman clearly goes to reveal that he had worked as a daily wager for which he has been paid wages according to number of working days. As there was an order for prohibition for engaging temporary workmen, in the bank, therefore, Workman could not be engaged by the Respondent for work from 1.4.1997 and there after. It is settled law that the daily wagers are engaged by the employer depending upon the availability of work and as the work was not available the Workman was not engaged further by the Respondent management. Therefore, the Workman on the ground of number of days he had worked in the Respondent bank cannot claim any right to reinstate him into the employment. As the Workman failed to prove the mandatory condition of 240 days of continuous service as required under Sec.25F of I.D. Act, 1947. Therefore, the disengagement of Workman from work can not be termed in contravention of provision contained under Sec.25F and 25 B of the I.D. Act, 1947.

Thus, this point is answered against the Workman and in favour of Respondent.

35. **Point No.III**:- In this context, the Workman has contended that the management failed to implement the selected panels during its valid tenure. The management adopted the back door methods contrary to the settlements and filled up the vacancies. The same is evident from the proceedings dated 18.11.1993 a copy of the same is filed in the material papers and the same may be read as part of the claim statement. Further, it is submitted that management has to adhere the procedure issued by the Central Government, the instructions dated 16.8.1990 in the year 1995, but same was not followed in the year 1997 despite there being vacancies. The management has followed the procedure of calling candidates through employment exchange instead of giving chance to the empanelled candidates like the Workman herein. The management sent call letters to the similarly situated candidates like the Workman in the month of June 1997 subsequent to issuance of impugned termination orders. After knowing the fact that they are litigating the issue by way of dispute, the management has refused to engage those candidates, the copies of call letters issued are filed herein along with claim petition. The Workman herein reiterates that the panels are meant for absorption but not for termination. In view of the same a duty is cast upon the Respondent management to engage the empanelled candidates like the Workman herein even in temporary vacancies till they are absorbed permanently in regular vacancies.

36. On the other hand, Respondent has contended that the Federation approached Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) for implementation of bipartite settlement in respect of the absorption of temporary employees. The Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) conducted conciliation proceedings and agreement was arrived at between the Federation and the Management bank. It is submitted that it was agreed between the Federation and the Management that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers /casual labour would be kept alive upto March, 1997 and the vacancies as agreed to under the afore set out settlements will be filled from both the lists concurrently. A copy of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.1995 signed by the parties to the dispute is filed as a material paper. Further, it is submitted that the settlement was arrived at and an agreement was signed between the Federation and the Management

bank on 30.7.1996 under Section 2(p) read with Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules 1957 which is binding on the parties. A copy of this agreement which hereinafter may be referred to as 5th settlement for brevity, is also filed as a material paper. The 5th settlement dated 30.7.1996 whereunder the earlier four settlements dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988 and 9.1.1991 were also referred, it was agreed to, by the Federation and the Management bank that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees will be kept alive upto March, 1997 for filling the vacancies existing/arrived at as on 31.12.1994 as per the norms agreed to between the bank and Federation and that thereafter the said panels would lapse. It was also agreed that within the framework of the above settlements the modalities about drawing names from either the panel of temporary employees or the panel of daily wagers and casual labour would be decided administratively on circle to circle basis depending upon the local requirements in consultation with the Federation's affiliate by the Circle management. It was further agreed that all messenger real vacancies/positions in the subordinate cadre including part-time attendants specifically provided as leave reserve will be filled by the end of 31.3.1997. Further, Respondent contended that on 27.2.1997 a memorandum of understanding was also signed between the Federation's affiliate and the bank management regarding the fact that the exercise of identifying the messengerial vacancies as on 31.12.1994 has since been completed by central office and thereby 403 messengerial vacancies were sanctioned to the circle of the Management bank and it was agreed that these vacancies may be filled from 1989 panel of temporary employees after effecting conversion from full time non-messengerial staff in the usual manner and the agreement was reached upon. Further, it was agreed between the Federations affiliate and the management bank that in terms of the settlement dated 30.7.1996 both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers /casual employees would lapse on 31.3.1997.

37. The Workman has contended that the empanelled list prepared by the Respondent management for appointment of temporary and daily wage Workers to the permanent post cannot lapse unless until it is exhausted by appointing all the empanelled persons and it should continue even after 31.3.1997, i.e., the date fixed for the lapse of panel. It is undisputed that the date of lapse of empanelled list of Workmen has been fixed to 31.3.1997 as mentioned in the settlement dated 30.7.1996, and agreed between the parties. It is settled law that and once the life of panel list lapses on the date as agreed between the parties it cannot be extended beyond that date. In the instant case the panel list of the workmen was valid upto 31.3.1997 in view of the terms and conditions enumerated in the 5th Settlement entered into between the parties. As the lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997 has been agreed by State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation through 5th Settlement, the Workman is not competent to challenge the same.

In this context I would like to take reference of the decision of the apex court in the case of **Syndicate Bank and Ors vs. Shankar Paul and Ors , AIR 1997 SC 3091, therein the Hon'ble Apex Court** have held:-

"Till 1982, the branches of the appellant Bank in Calcutta region were recruiting persons locally to work as temporary attenders in leave vacancies. In view of the revised procedure prescribed by the Government of India in respect of such temporary appointments, the Calcutta regional office of the appellant Bank issued a circular to all of its branches on 14.8.1982, instructing all the branches under it to discontinue the old practice from 1.6.1982 and appoint only empanelled candidates. The regional office was to prepare a panel of eligible candidates, after calling names from the local/district employment exchange, and split it up branch-wise. Following that new procedure yearly panels were prepared thereafter. Names of the Respondents were for the first time included in the panel prepared for the period 7.2.1987 to 6.2.1988. By its letter dated 7.2.1987 the Bank had informed the Respondents that the panel was valid for one year only

and that inclusion of their names in the panel was not to confer on them any right to seek permanent appointment in the service of the bank. Considering the object with which the panel was prepared and the fact that it was an yearly panel expiring on 6.2.1988, we are of the opinion that the Respondents did not get any right, because of inclusion of their names in the said panel, for permanent absorption in the service of the Bank. Whatever conditional right they had came to an end with the expiry of the panel. The claim of the Respondents, as contained in the writ petition was thus misconceived and therefore the learned single Judge and the Division Bench, when it first decided the appeal, were right in dismissing the writ petition and the appeal respectively."

Thus, in view of the above law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court and in view of the terms and conditions of the 5th Settlement the contention of the Workman that empanelled list should continue even after 31.3.1997 till the last Workman in the panel is absorbed is not tenable. The contention of the Workman is baseless in view of recital in the settlement. Therefore, in view of the fore gone discussion and finding given at Point No. I regarding binding nature of Settlements and terms and conditions enumerated therein, in view of the provision contained u/s.18(1) of the I.D. Act, 1947, I am of the considered view that life of panels lapsed on 31.3.1997 in view of terms of settlement dated 30.7.1996 and plea of Workman that the panel shall continue even after 31.3.1997 till last man absorbed has no legal force and same is untenable.

38. Undisputedly, settlement agreement dated 30.7.1996 was executed between the State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation and in that settlement it was agreed that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/ casual employees will be used for filling vacancies existing as on 31.12.1994 as per the norms agreed between the bank and the Federation. These empanelled workmen were to be given a chance for permanent appointment in the bank against vacancies arising up to December 1994 whereas the daily wagers/ casual employees were to be considered against the vacancies arise from January 1995 to December 1996, whereby the said panel would lapse. It was agreed that the vacancies falls upto 31.3.1997 shall be filled before the empanelled list is allowed to lapse. Thus, the claim of the Workman to the post of permanent non-messenger in the Respondent management was subject to the availability of the sanctioned post and vacancies arising upto 31.3.1997. The workmen given chance to the permanent post were seniors in number of working days in panel list and Workman herein was junior to those workmen. Therefore, Workman could not be given absorption to permanent post being junior to other workmen in the panel list.

39. In this context the Workman witness WW1 was cross examined by the Respondent counsel and in the cross examination the witness WW1 states:-

"I applied in response to the notification issued by the bank as per the settlements….. Further, witness states*, "It is true that some of persons whose names were included in the panel were given regular appointment as per the settlements in the order of their seniority in number of days….* Further witness states*, I am not having any documents to show that any person who had worked for less number of days than me was given regular appointment in the bank."*

Thus, from the above statement of the Workman witness WW1 it is clear that the panel was prepared in terms of various settlements entered into between Staff Federation of State Bank of India and State Bank of India and it was prepared on the basis of number of days of work put in by the temporary employees. Further, the Workman himself admitted that some of the temporary employees whose names were included in the panel were given regular appointment in the bank in order of their seniority in the panel and he is not having any document to show that any person who worked for less number of days than the

Workman was given appointment in the bank. Therefore, the allegation of the Workman that the regular appointment has been made by the bank from the panel list in breach of the terms of the settlement and violation of seniority of panel list is not proved by this evidence of WW1. Thus, there is no evidence on record that bank has given the appointment to the temporary employees as well as daily wagers from the panel list 1989 and 1992 in breach of seniority of the temporary employees in the list. There is no evidence of jumbling in the panel list to make appointment of any permanent Workman in breach of the seniority. Therefore, I am constrained to hold that the Respondent Management has appointed the workmen from panel list in order of seniority and there is no jumbling of workmen in the panel list before it got lapsed on 31.3.1997.

40. However, Workman has taken the plea that the panels of Workmen for absorption in the employment of the Respondent banks (panels of temporary employees and daily wagers) has been lapsed on 31.3.1997 in contravention of terms of settlement as the object of preparing the entire empanelment of temporary and daily wagers was to provide them permanent employment and till the both the panel lists exhausted the panel list cannot be lapsed on 31.3.1997 and the date of lapsing of the panel on 31.3.1997 has been fixed by the Respondent arbitrarily without any authority.

41. In this context, the perusal of Settlement dated 30.7.1996 reveals that the 5th Settlement dated 30.7.1996 was entered under Section 2(p) and 18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Dispute (Central) Rules 1957. This settlement has been entered into by the competent parties and in this settlement parties thereto agreed that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees will lapse on 31.3.1997. Thus the date of lapse of panel was fixed by both the parties with consensus under the settlement dated 30.7.1996 and same is binding upon the Workman under the provision of Section 18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947. Moreover, this issue of binding force of the settlement dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988 and 9.1.1991 has already been discussed, decided at finding in Point No.I of this award. However, the legality and validity of the aforementioned settlement has not been challenged by the Workman before any competent forum. Thus, claim of Workman that the date of lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997 has been fixed arbitrarily by the Respondent bank is untenable. As regard the claim of Workman for his absorption to the permanent post it is settled law that the Workman can not claim his regularization to permanent post merely on the basis of number of working days.

42. In this context the reference of the decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Oil and Natural Gas Corporation vs Krishan Gopal 2020(3) SCALE 272, date of decision 7.2.2020** is relevant therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have has laid down principle regarding regularization of the Workman on permanent posts. Hon'ble Supreme Court have laid down the prepositions of regularization of the workmen to permanent post is as under:-

"*(i) Wide as they are, the powers of the Labour Court and the Industrial Court cannot extend to a direction to order regularisation, where such a direction would in the context of public employment offend the provisions contained in Article 14 of the Constitution;*

(ii) The statutory power of the Labour Court or Industrial Court to grant relief to workmen including the status of permanency continues to exist in circumstances where the employer has indulged in an unfair labour practice by not filling up permanent posts even though such posts are available and by continuing to employ workmen as temporary or daily wage employees despite their performing the same work as regular workmen on lower wages;

(iii) The power to create permanent or sanctioned posts lies outside the judicial domain and where no posts are available, a direction to grant regularisation would be impermissible merely on the basis of the number of years of service;

(iv) Where an employer has regularised similarly situated workmen either in a scheme or otherwise, it would be open to workmen who have been deprived of the same benefit at par with the workmen who have been regularised to make a complaint before the Labour or Industrial Court, since the deprivation of the benefit would amount to a violation of Article 14; and

(v) In order to constitute an unfair labour practice under Section 2(ra) read with Item 10 of the Vth Schedule of the ID Act, the employer should be engaging workmen as badlis, temporaries or casuals, and continuing them for years, with the object of depriving them of the benefits payable to permanent workmen.

Thus, in view of the principles laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court as discussed above, in the instant matter the Workman utterly failed to prove his claim by adducing any documentary or oral evidence that the employer has indulged in unfair labour practice by not filling the permanent posts even though such posts are available and by continuing to employ workmen as temporary or daily wage employees despite their performance was the same work, as regular workmen on lower wages.

43. Respondent has contended that all the vacancies exist and arise upto 31.3.1997 has been filled up from the panel list in order of seniority and no vacancy exists or arises as on 31.3.1997 remained unfilled. Further, it is contended that as per terms of settlement the life of panel lists has been lapsed on 31.3.1997, hence, there is no occasion to extend the life of panel lists beyond 31.3.1997. However, the workman failed to prove contrary by any evidence to the aforesaid contention of the Respondent that the vacancies were existing as on 31.3.1997 and the workman was not given absorption to the permanent post in order of his seniority. It is settled law that the power to create permanent or sanctioned post lies outside the judicial domain and where no posts are available, a direction to grant regularization would be impermissible merely on the basis of the number of years of service. Therefore, the claim of the workman on this ground also not acceptable.

44. Further, as per the of settlement, panel was prepared for absorption of the workmen on the permanent posts has already been lapsed on 31.3.1997 and the vacancies existing and arising upto 31.12.1994 and upto 31.3.1997 as settlement dated 30.7.1996 has been filled up from the panel by appointing the workmen as per seniority in the panel list. Workman witness WW1 in his cross examination has himself admitted this fact that, some of the temporary employees whose names were included in the panel were given regular appointment in the bank in order of their seniority in the panel. The Workman failed to show that there was any breach of terms of settlement has been committed by the Respondent in appointment to permanent post from aforesaid panel list.

45. As discussed in preceding paragraph of this Award, the life of the panel has not been extended beyond 31.3.1997, by any further settlement hence, the panel list in which name of the Workman was included got expired on 31.3.1997. It is not the case of the Workman that Respondent has regularized similarly situated workmen either in the scheme or otherwise and the Workman has been deprived of same benefit on par with those workmen or the vacancies remained unfilled on the date of lapse of panels i.e., 31.3.1997, Industrial Tribunal has no jurisdiction to extend the date of lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997. This Tribunal can not order for regularization of workmen to the permanent post in contravention of the provision of Article 14 of the Constitution of India.

In the case of **Mahboob Deepak vs. Nagar Panchayat Gajraula & Anr, Civil Appeal No.5875/2007 date of judgement 13.12.2007,** Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

"8. Respondent is a Local Authority. The terms and conditions of employment of the employees are governed by a statute and statutory rules. No appointment can be made by a Local Authority without following the provisions of the recruitment rules. Any appointment made in violation of the said rules as also the constitutional scheme of equality as contained in Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India would be a nullity.

9. Due to some exigency of work, although recruitment on daily wages or on an ad hoc basis was permissible, but by reason thereof an employee cannot claim any right to be permanently absorbed in service or made permanent in absence of any statute or statutory rules. Merely because an employee has completed 240 days of work in a year preceding the date of retrenchment, the same would not mean that his services were liable to be regularized."

Therefore, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, the claim of the Workman for absorption merely on the basis of number of day of work in the Respondent bank Branch is not acceptable. As regard plea of the Workman that the Workman should have been given employment even after 31.3.1997 as temporary Workman, it is the discretion of Respondent to engage the Workman depending upon availability of work and this Tribunal can not direct the Respondent to engage the Workman in the absent of such rule/scheme.

46. In view of principle laid down by Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above, in the instant matter Workman utterly failed to establish the fact of rendering continuous service for a period of 240 days of service within a period of 12 calendar months commencing and coming backward from relevant date i.e., the date of retrenchment, if has he would be denied to be in continuous service for a period of one year. Therefore, the provision contained under Sec.25F of retrenchment is not applicable to Workman.

Counsel for Workman has relied upon number of decisions of Hon'ble High Court and Hon'ble Supreme Court and few of them are discussed herein:-

In the case of **F.C.I., vs. Kamdhenu Cattle Feed Industries 1993 (1) SCC 71,** therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

"7. In contractual sphere as in all other State actions, the State and all its instrumentalities have to conform to Article 14 of the Constitution of which non-arbitrariness is a significant facet. There is no unfettered discretion in public law: A public authority possesses powers only to use them for public good. This impose the duty to act fairly and to adopt a procedure which is `fairplay in action'. Due observance of this obligation as a part of good administration raises a reasonable or legitimate expectation in every citizen to be treated fairly in his interaction with the State and its instrumentalities, with this element forming a necessary component of the decision making process in all State actions. To satisfy this requirement of non- arbitrariness in a State action, it is, therefore, necessary to consider and give due weight to the reasonable or legitimate expectations of the persons likely lo be affected by the decision or else that unfairness in the exercise of the power may amount to an abuse or excess of power apart from affecting the bona fides of the decision in a given case. The decision so made would be exposed to challenge on the ground of arbitrariness. Rule of law does not completely eliminate discretion in the exercise of power, as it is unrealistic, but providers for control of its exercise by judicial review."

In the case of **State Bank of India, R.O., Vijayawada vs. Industrial Tribunal, Hyderabad WP No.193/1997,** therein Hon'ble High Court have held,

"*Sri Krovvidi Narasimham, the learned counsel for the 2nd respondent contends, supporting the award that it was a permanent vacancy and even though the 2nd respondent was appointed on temporary basis, his services were not liable to be terminated and he was to be regularised into service on permanent basis. Shastry award warrants that no temporary appointment can be made to a permanent post. But the matter is now covered by two division bench judgements dated 28.11.1986 in W.A. No.791 of 1986 and 25.8.1987 in W.A. No.270 of 1982. The ratio decided in the two judgements is to the effect that there cannot be any mandate to appoint employees on permanent basis when the requirement was for appointment on temporary basis. But it is held in the said judgements that when a temporary appointee is ousted from service and not for misconduct and, if again temporary appointment is to be made, then, the case of such temporary appointee who was ousted, has got to be considered in accordance with Sec. 25-H of the Act."*

In the case of **State of Haryana and others vs. Piara Singh and others. 1992 (4) SCC 118,** therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

" 49. If for any reason an adhoc or temporary employee is continued for a fairly long spell, the authorities must consider his case for regularization provided he is eligible and qualified according to the rules and his service record is satisfactory and his appointment does not run counter to the reservation policy of the state."

In the above cited judgements by the Workman the facts of the case are different hence do not apply to instant case of Workman.

47. On the other hand, in support of his contention Respondent has examined witness MW1 and MW1 in chief examination states that, Settlements i.e., on 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988, 9.1.1991 were entered into between the SBI and SBI Staff Federation for filling up of the vacancies that arise up to 1994 for those temporary employees who has worked on scale wages. Further, MW1 states that two different panels for messengers and non-messengers as per the eligibility criteria prescribed by the bank. There are four modules in Andhra Pradesh and they are Hyderabad, Tirupathi, Vijayawada and Visakhapatnam. MW1 states that the temporary employees so empanelled were given permanent absorption depending upon the vacancies so arise strictly in terms of the settlement. MW1 states that on 9.6.1995 conciliation proceeding was held before the RLC(C), Hyderabad and in said proceedings it was decided that the panels will be kept live up to 31.3.1997 and vacancies will be filled from both the lists concurrently. A copy of the said minutes of proceedings is Ex.M5. Further, MW1 states that on 30.7.1996 another settlement was entered between the SBI and All India SBI Staff Federation providing for filling up of the vacancies arising up to December 1994 in respect of subordinate cadre and daily wage /casual wage employees out of panel so prepared were to be considered against vacancies arising from January 1995 to December 1996, thereafter the said panels lapse. MW1 states that it was also agreed that all the non- messenger positions in subordinate cadre including part time attendants specially provided as leave reserve will be filled before 31.3.1997 and as regards to non-messengerial positions it is agreed that all such posts sanctioned and fallen vacant up to 31.3.1997 shall be filled before the empanelled list is allowed to lapse. Thus in both the cases empanelled list were lapsed on 1.4.1997. Ex.M6 is the copy of the settlement dated 30.7.1996. Further, witness states that on 27.2.1997 a memorandum of understanding

was reached between the SBI and SBI Staff Federation providing that both the panels above mentioned will lapse on 31.3.1997. Ex.M7 is the copy of the memorandum of understanding and Ex.M8 is the copy of the statements giving the particulars of 1989 non-messenger panel, Ex.M9 is the copy of the statement of 1989 non- messenger panel, Ex.M10 is the copy of statement of 1992 panel. Further, witness states that petitioner was included in the 1989 panel. As the existing vacancies at that time were exhausted and his turn did not come he could not be given permanent employment in the bank as per the agreements. All the appointments were made strictly in accordance with the settlements reached from time to time between SBI and SBI staff federation and as per seniority, number of days of temporary service put in by them in the bank in the given period. Further, MW1 states petitioner was not sponsored by any employment exchange he did not undergo the regular process of selection required for appointment as a regular non-messenger the petitioner has not worked for 240 days in any year in his entire temporary service in the bank. The petitioner and other temporary employees were terminated from service by the bank. Further, MW1 states that the vacancies were filled up on regular basis with the temporary employees from the panels and these panels were expired in terms of the settlements so reached and there were no vacancies to absorb such employees. Thus, witness MW1 has proved the documents Ex.M1 to Ex.M12 and also contentions made in the counter. However, MW1 was cross examined by the Petitioner Counsel. But nothing has been elicited in his cross examination so as to discredit the testimony of the witness MW1 as regards the date of lapse of both the panels on 31.3.1997 and reasons assigned for non-absorption of the Petitioner from the panel list to the permanent post. Moreover the witness MW1 was re-examined by the Respondent and the witness MW1 states that panels were expired in terms of the settlement send absorptions to the extent of the available vacancies were made. There was no termination of any temporary messenger as such but their services were not utilized after the cut off date as the available vacancies were already filled up and most of these Petitioners were not in the service of the bank as on the date of the expiry date of the panels. Therefore, in view of the aforesaid testimony of the MW1 in re-examination in the absence of cross examination remained uncontraverted, the claim of the Workman that he was entitled for absorption in permanent post in the branch of Respondent Management on the basis of panel list is found not established.

This point is answered against the Workman.

48. **Point No.IV**:- In view of the discussion and finding given at Point Nos. I, II and III, the Workman is not entitled for any relief and claim statement of Workman sans merit and liable to be dismissed.

This Point is answered accordingly.

AWARD

In view of the fore gone discussion, it is held that the action of the Respondent bank in terminating the services of Sri C. Raju, Ex. Messenger by way of oral orders w.e.f. 31.3.1997 is justified. Hence, the Petitioner is not entitled for any relief as prayed for. The claim statement filed by Workman sans merit, hence, dismissed. Reference is answered accordingly.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, Personal Assistant, transcribed by her, corrected and signed by me on this the 11th day of May, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner	Witnesses examined for the Respondent
WW1: Sri C. Raju	MW1: Sri K. Bala Kotaiah

Documents marked for the Petitioner

Ex.W1: Photocopy of service certificate

Ex.W2: Photocopy of Panel list

Documents marked for the Respondent

Ex.M1: Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.17.11.87

Ex.M2: Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.16.7.88

Ex.M3: Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.27.10.1988

Ex.M4: Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.9.1.1991

Ex.M5: Photocopy of conciliation proceedings before the Regional Labour Commissioner(C) dt.9.6.1995

Ex.M6: Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.30.7.1996

Ex.M7: Photocopy of Memorandum of understanding dt. 27.1.1997

Ex.M8: Photocopy of statements giving the particulars of 1989 messenger panel.

Ex.M9: Photocopy of statement of 1989 Non-messenger panel

Ex.M10: Photocopy of statement of 1992 panel

Ex.M11: Photocopy of order of Hon'ble High Court in WA No.86/98 dt. 1.5.98

Ex.M12: Photocopy of order in SLP No.11886-11888 of 1998 dated 10.8.98

नई दिल्ली, 29 जुलाई, 2026

का.आ. 1620.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एस बी आई भारत का के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजको और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में **केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण–सह–श्रम न्यायालय,** हैदराबाद के पंचाट **(सन्दर्भ संख्या 149/2002)** को प्रकाशित करती है,

[सं. एल-12012/49/2000-आई.आर (बी-I)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 29th July, 2026

S.O. 1620.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Reference. I.D. No. 149/2002) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Hyderabad as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the Management of SBI of India and their workmen,

[No. L-12012/49/2000–IR (B-I)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

In The Central Government Industrial Tribunal Cum Labour Court At Hyderabad

Present: **Sri IRFAN QAMAR**

Presiding Officer

Dated the 11th day of May, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. 149/2002

[Old ID No.60/2000 of Industrial Tribunal No.I, Hyderabad]

Between:

Sri M. Narayana,

Ambeelleon colony,

Munnagnur,

Distt. Mahaboodnagar (A.P).

… Petitioner

And

The General Manager,

State Bank of India,

Local Head Office,

Bank Street,

Hyderabad (A.P). …..Respondent

Appearances:

For the Petitioner : Sri Macherla Rangaiah, Advocate

For the Respondent: Sri Y. Ranjeeth Reddy, Advocate

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-12012/49/2000-IR(B.I) dated 13.07.2000 referred the following dispute under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 to Industrial Tribunal No.I, Hyderabad for adjudication and later the same has been transferred to this Tribunal bearing ID No.60/2000, as per orders of Central Government vide Lr.No.H-11026/1/2001-IR(C.II) dated 18.10.2001, requiring this forum to decide the question:

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of State Bank of India, Munnanur Branch in terminating Sri M. Narayana, Non-Messenger, from the services of the Bank by way of oral orders w.e.f. 31.3.1997 is justified? If not, what relief he is entitled to?"

After receipt of the reference, it was numbered as ID No. 149/2002 and notices were issued to both the Workman and the management.

2. Before unfolding the factual matrix of the instant industrial dispute it would be apposite to have a bird eye view of a chequered history of the instant industrial dispute. Earlier instant industrial dispute along with the batch cases was decided by this Tribunal vide common award dated 17.5.2005 and the reference was answered in favour of the Respondent and against the Workman. That said common award dated 17.5.2005 was challenged by the aggrieved Workmen in various Writ petition No.6470/2014 along with batch of writ petitions before the Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh and Hon'ble High Court vide its' judgement dated 23.6.2014 allowed all batch of writ petitions and set aside the common award dated 17.5.2005 passed in ID No.222 of 2001 and other batch of ID cases by Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad and the Respondent management of State Bank of India was directed to reengage the Writ Petitioners in position, which they have been occupying prior to their termination and further directed to consider their cases for regularization as and when the substantive vacancy arises. This judgement dated 23.6.2014 of Hon'ble High Court of AP, passed in WP No.6470/2014 and batch petitions was challenged by Respondent management before the Hon'ble High Court in Writ Appeal No. 1268 of 2014. The aforesaid Writ Appeals No.1268/2014 and other Writ Appeals were decided by Division Bench of High Court of Andhra Pradesh by a common judgement dated 20.3.2019. Hon'ble High Court in aforesaid Writ Appeal was pleased to pass the order which is extracted as below:-

" 7. Hearing the learned senior counsel for the SBI and the learned senior counsel for the contesting unofficial Respondents, we see that while the learned single Judge was justified in setting aside the award af the Tribunal, the proper course to be adopted was to remit all the cases to the Tribunal. This we say for reasons more than one. Firstly, in such matters, claims have to be decided on individual basis, as different persons have different claims as to the length of officiation or discharge of duties and functions; quality of engagement, drawings, accounting of the post for each one of them, who have worked etc. AIl these issues will not be the same in all the cases. Therefore, each case ought to have been directed to be decided by the Tribunal afresh on individual basis. The second and most important aspect is the learned single Judge has in one go ordered re-employment of all the workmen. This is not a relief that could have been granted without answering the individual issues; each issue relating to each case could not have been decided by the writ Court within the format of its adjudication procedures and scope. The adjudicating body, which has to do that activity, is the Industrial Tribunal. Therefore, we are of the view that while we would sustain the order of the learned singe Judge insofar as it interfered and sets aside the award of the Tribunal, the further findings and directions, issued through the impugned order have to go and the individual cases have to be sent back for consideration of the Tribunal. Such further procedure before the Tribunal will have to be carried forward with the materials already on record and also by affording an opportunity to the persons, who have claims as well as the management to place their rival contentions and further material before the Tribunal. The learned counsel appearing for the workmen are justified in pointing out that enormous delay has already happened and further action by the Tribunal in this line may be expedited.

9. In the result, these writ appeals are ordered;

(1) affirming the impugned common order of the learned single Judge to the extent it sets aside the common award dated 17.05.2005 of the Industrial Tribunal;

(2) the further findings and directions issued through the impugned common order are vacated:

(3) all the matters shall be remitted to the Industrial Tribunal with a direction to dispose of them within an outer limit of five (5) months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order; and,

(4) the parties to make appearance before the Tribunal on the given date."

Thus, in view of the above direction of Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh in W.A.No.1268 of 2014 and batch cases. This Tribunal has taken up the matter of industrial dispute for hearing and deciding it afresh in view of the aforesaid guidelines laid down by the Hon'ble High Court in Writ Appeal No.1268/2014 vide judgement dated 20.3.019.

3. The factual matrix of instant industrial dispute as narrated by the Workman in his claim statement are that, the Workman joined in the service of the management institution as Sweeper from 1981 to 1996, and has rendered unblemished service spreading over a period of about 7 years. The Respondent has terminated services of Workman by oral orders with effect from 1.4.1997. Further, it is submitted that the management of Respondent bank decided to give a chance to temporarily employed personnel "found suitable for permanent appointment" by wait- listing them by offering permanent appointment or waitlisting till such opportunity arises.

4. That on 17.11.1987 a settlement was reached between All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and the Management of State Bank of India - settlement one, under this settlement three categories of employees were listed. That is, A) those who have completed 240 days in 12 months or less after 1.7.1975. B) those who have completed 270 days in any continuous block of 36 calendar months after 1.7.1975. C) (i) those who have completed minimum of 30 days aggregate temporary service in any calendar year after 1.7.1975 or (ii) 70 days aggregate temporary service in continuous block of 36 months after 1.7.1975.

5. The persons who satisfied in all the above 4 categories were to be interviewed by a selection committee and the said selection committee would determine the suitability of the said candidate for permanent appointment. Therefore, the bank prescribed certain qualifications and from among the candidates satisfying the qualifications the suitable candidates were enlisted by a selection committee. The Clause 7 of the said agreement provided with the selected candidate would be wait listed in order of their respective categorization and the selected panel would be valid upto December, 1991. Clause 10 of the settlement specifically provided that henceforth. "there will be no temporary appointments in the subordinate cadre", except on a restrictive basis in the specified category, "from amongst empanelled candidates as per existing guidelines of the bank". The Workman further submits that consequent upon the said agreement and the draft, a notification was issued in the newspapers. The last date for responding to the advertisement was 30.8.1988. A written examination followed by viva-voce in May, 1989 was held. A selected panel was prepared, as per Clause 7 of the agreement, ie. Settlement No.1, the selected panel was to be valid upto December, 1991, the Workman submits that circular was issued on 26.4.91 by the said letter it is mentioned that the terms of the agreement dated 17.11.87 was modified vide second agreement dated 16.7.88 was entered into between the parties. In terms of the said agreement a chance was to be given, "to all eligible temporary employees for permanent appointments. The appointments were against the vacancies likely to arise during the years 1995-96, circular made it clear that in view of the

enormity of the problem an extension of the currency of the panel, eligible temporary employees who have been empanelled could not appear in the earlier interviews and have been pursuing their cases thereafter, "will be given another chance to appear for interview".

6. Workman submits that there were total five settlements. The settlement dated 17.11.87 is the 1st settlement (Ex M1), settlement dated 16.7.88 is 2nd settlement (Ex M2), settlement dated 27.10.88 is the 3rd settlement (Ex M3), then settlement dated 9.1.91 is 4th settlement and settlement dated 30.7.96 is 5th settlement (Ex M6). In between there is minutes of conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.95 marked as Ex M5. That due to all these settlements which were extended by subsequent settlements thereby created reasonable expectations in the list of the selected candidates arose with that it's a question of time their appointments or services would be regularized in the services of the bank. The Workman was working with the bank on temporary basis was under the bonafide hope that sooner his services will be regularized with the bank. He is thereby closed all his options elsewhere. It is needless to point out that employing person to whom hope of employment in substantial terms was made is a facet of Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

7. Further Workman submits that the Government of India issued Circular No. F-3/3/104/87-IR, dated 16.8.1990. Under said circular the chief Executives of all public sector banks including the Management herein were specifically instructed that until the problem of existing temporary employees is fully resolved, no bank is permitted to make any permanent appointments. That some of the persons similarly situated like this Workman aggrieved by the inaction on the part of the management of the bank is not regularizing their services from out of the selected panel and not clearly focusing the vacancy position, filed W.P. No. 4194/97 before Hon'ble High court of A.P.. It is specifically averred in the said writ petition that the Management of the bank had failed to implement the settlement and that it violates the various fundamental rights guaranteed under the constitution of India. The Hon'ble High court of A.P .. by order dated 5.3.97 directed the bank to implement the settlement as amended from time to time. It also directed the bank to carry out the terms of settlement before the expiry of March, 1997. The Hon'ble High Court also recorded finding that the Bank cannot escape its liability of enforcement of the Settlement. In view of the directions given by the High Court all candidates whose names appeared in the select panels prepared on the basis of the agreement entered into on 17.11.87 under which the panel was valid upto December, 1991, and on the basis of a settlement dated 27.10.1988 whereby the panels were made alive upto 31.3.1997 under which the panel was valid upto December, 1999. The other agreement dated 16.7.1988 under which the panel was valid upto 1992 and on the basis of the settlement dated 27.10.1998 whereby the panels were made alive upto 31.3.1997 were under the bonafide impression that their cases will be considered for regularization and were living on the basis of the said reasonable expectation. Unfortunately, contrary to the aforesaid directions given by the High Court and contrary to the settlements entered into between the parties, the bank issued proceedings dated 25.3.1997, dated 27.3.1997 and 31.3.1997 instructing the various authorities of the Management not to continue the temporary employees those who are in services of the bank from 1.4.97. The said order was followed by the Management. Aggrieved by the said action the Workman herein and similarly situated candidates have filed a writ petition before the Hon'ble High Court and by way of Writ Petition No.9206/97 seeking a declaration that the proceedings issued by the Deputy General Manager and the Assistant General Manager (Respondents 3,4 and 5 therein) on 25.3.97, 27.3.97 and 31.3.97 as illegal and also non-continuance of the Workmen therein in service by absorbing them in the services of the bank as violative of Section 2(p) and 18(1) read with Rule 58 of Central Rules and sought for specific direction to the bank to absorb them in service.

8. Further, Workman submits that in the counter affidavit filed in Writ Petition No.9206/97, the bank has submitted that it has about 805 branches in Andhra Pradesh alone. It has stated that due to exigencies of circumstances and on account of the urgent need in its banks, it employed temporary employees in subordinate cadre. It is pertinent to mention that it does not state the urgent or need or the nature of temporary employees that it had engaged. Enquiry into the same would reveal that the stand taken by the bank either on the ground of urgent need or of temporary employees is a façade to perpetuate unfair labour practice. It is designed to on the one hand, keep the employed in the erroneous zone of hope and on the other to ensure that benefits that a model employer will extend under various statutes to its employees is not required to be borne out by the bank. A reading of the counter affidavit would show that the bank would opines that being just fair and reasonable are which obviously is reprehensible and is a facet of unfair labour practice.

9. The Workman submits that the bank had referred in its counter affidavit to three settlements dated 17.11.87, 16.7.88 and 27.10.88. The bank in the guise of extending the benefits of the circular of Government dated 16.8.90 stated in its counter affidavit that as follows:

"Government of India, vide its letter dated 16.8.1990, issued guidelines to all the public sector banks with regard to recruitment and absorption of temporary employees in public sector banks. The said guidelines were issued to implement on the lines of the approach paper on the issue provided by a committee constituted in this regard. The Government of India guidelines made it clear that all the public sector banks may follow the provisions laid down in the approach paper.

The approach paper specified that the cases of temporary employees who had put in not less than 240 days of temporary service in 12 consecutive Months and who are entitled to benefit of Section 25-F may be decided by entering into a settlement with the representative union. In respect of temporary employees who had put in less than 240 days of service in 12 consecutive months or less, a settlement could be avoided and however if the Management so desired, they could enter into a conciliation settlement with the representative union. Para 6(h), it is mentioned that only those temporary employees who had put in temporary service of 90 or more days after 1.1 1982 would be eligible for considering under the scheme. Although the Government guidelines envisaged for a settlement in respect of employees who had put in temporary service of 90 or more days, the bank by way of further concession entered into settlements Even in respect of those who had put in less than 90 days. As such, it could be Seen that the settlements are more beneficial to the temporary employees concerned. The approach paper also specify at para 6(c) that the banks would provide one time opportunity to all the temporary employees and for that purpose temporary employees worked in the bank on or after 1.1.1982 could be considered for re-employment in terms of the scheme. The Respondents have gone further wherein even persons working after 1975 were also considered.

As could be seen from the above, there was a genuine effort on the part of the Respondent bank to provide permanent employment for as many as possible subject to availability of the vacancies.

It is further submitted that at para 6(k) of the approach paper, it was made clear that this would be one time exercise in full and final settlement of all the aims and disputes for the past period in respect of temporary workmen covered by the settlement. This would mean that the Government of India guidelines would cover only those persons who were temporarily employed for the period specified therein and not otherwise. As such, it is submitted that the Respondents have not only followed the Government of India guidelines but in fact covered cases of the employees who had worked for less than 90 days. As such, question of violation does not arise and in any case those were only broad guidelines and not directives".

10. The Workman submits that the bank also referred a subsequent settlement dated 9.1.1991 wherein there is a clause to the effect- that the panel of temporary employees and the panel of daily wage employees will be operated to a particular period. Therefore, their cases will not be considered. The Management herein relying upon this settlement in their impugned action. It is submitted that even the settlement dated 9.1.1991 will not empower the management to terminate the services of the temporary employees who are working in the bank services like the Workman herein as it does not specify the termination of the employees. In fact there are so many vacancies wherein the Management has engaged several new persons as temporary messengers/ attendars/ sweepers etc., even after the judgment of Hon'ble High Court without considering the cases of the similarly situated candidates like the Workman herein. It is submitted inspite of engaging fresh candidates as is now being done by the Management they would have continued the similarly situated candidates like the Workman herein in the services of the bank and consider their cases for absorption in view of the circulars issued by Central Government as well as the directions of this Hon'ble Court in Writ Petition No.4194/97, dated 5.3.97. In view of the circulars issued by the Central Government, the Management should not have relied upon the settlement dated 9.1.1991. Hence, the impugned action of the Management is illegal, unjust, violative of fundamental rights such as Articles 14,16 and 21 of the Constitution of India.

11. The Workman submits that in W.P. No.4194/97 filed by the union of temporary employees where in they have complained about the non- implementation of the settlements arrived between the parties and sought for absorption. Such employees in the bank services on permanent basis before the date fixed for carrying out the terms of settlement, the Court held that the members of the union had been empanelled in the list, they were not regularized and the time was going to run out to the near future and the Respondent bank and its officers cannot escape from the liability of enforcing the settlement which has been reached and therefore directed that the bank and the officers shall implement the settlement dated 17.11.87 as amended from time to time before the expiry of 31.3.97.

12. Further, it is submitted that in the clause of Settlement it is specifically mentioned that the workmen to be absorbed/appointed in the bank prohibiting any temporary appointments subsequent to the date of settlement even the authorities want to make temporary appointments that should be made only from among the empanelled can be appointed either for temporary vacancy or permanent vacancy except from among the empanelled candidates like the Workman and that should be continued till they are absorbed. The management committed unfair labour practices and terminated the services of the candidates with effect from 1.4.1997 which is arbitrary, discriminatory, contrary to their own guidelines and violative of the constitutional provisions which are guaranteed in Chapter-III of the Constitution of India.

13. The Workman submits that it is strange as to how the panels were allowed to lapse by a so-called Memorandum of Understanding dated 25.2.1997, that the action of terminating such employees like the Workman by virtue of an impugned oral proceedings without implementing the settlement would be illegal and unfair labour practice which cannot be allowed to be perpetuated. That the discontinuance of the Workman after 31.3.97 who had served in the bank in any capacity amounts to retrenchment. It could not have been done without any notice and it violates Sec.25FF of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and the said action is violative of principles of natural justice guaranteed under Chapter III of the Constitution of India. This amounts to retrenchment without one month's notice and taken in view of such notice. Thus, the main proceedings issued by the Respondent is without jurisdiction and is arbitrary, illegal and therefore liable to be quashed. That the alleged Memorandum of Understanding dated

27.2.97, Ex.M5 does not own any legal entity, as the said Memorandum of Understanding is not published anywhere to brought to the notice of the Workman whose rights are being affected. It is submitted that Management did not adhere to the procedure envisaged by the Central Government in its' instructions dated 16.8.90 in the year 1995. The same was not followed in the year 1997 despite there being vacancies. The management has followed the procedure of calling candidates through Employment exchange instead of giving chance to the empanelled candidates like the Workman here. It is pertinent to mention here that the Respondent Management sent letters to the all similarly situated candidates like the Workman in the month of June, 1997, subsequent to the passing of impugned termination orders. After knowing the facts that the candidates are litigating, the Management refused to engage these candidates. It is once again reiterated that the panels are meant for absorption but not for termination. It was the duty of the Management to engage the empanelled candidates like the Workman even in temporary vacancies till they are absorbed permanently in regular vacancies. Hence, the action of the Respondent Management terminating the services of the Workman by oral order dated 31.3.97 is unjust, illegal, violative of principles of natural justice and hence, the Management be directed to reinstate and absorb the Workman and to grant all incidental and consequential benefits.

14. Per contra, Respondent had filed counter and made a contentions that the reference is not tenable and contrary to the provisions of I.D. Act, 1947. Respondent submitted that to tide over severe sub-ordinate staff constraints which arose out of leave vacancies, exigencies, etc., and also owning to the restrictions imposed by the Government of India/Reserve Bank of India on intake of staff, the Respondent bank used to engage sub-ordinate staff like messengers, sweepers, sweeper cum water boys, etc., depending on the availability of work on purely temporary basis for the smooth and uninterrupted functioning of the branches. It is submitted that the All India State Bank of India Staff Federation which represents majority of the employees in the State Bank of India comprising about 98% of the work force as its' members espoused the cause of temporary employees who have put in less than 240 days of temporary service in 12 calendar months in the bank and who were ineligible for any protection under Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 to give a chance for being considered for absorption and permanent appointments.

15. Discussions were held and on 17.11.1987 an agreement was signed between the federation and the Management bank under Sec. 2(p) read with Sec 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules 1957. A copy of the said settlement dated 17.11.87 which may be herein after referred as first settlement is filed and 4 categories were made as it has already been mentioned in the claim statement above, it need not be repeated here. In the first settlement, it was agreed that the temporary employees as categorized would be given a chance for being considered for permanent appointment in the bank's service against the vacancies which are likely to arise during the period 1987 to 1991. On 16.7.88 second settlement was arrived between the Federation and the Bank whereby it was agreed to substitute the period of consideration of vacancies as 1987 to 1992 in place of 1987 to 1991 as contemplated under the first settlement dated 17.11.1987. This is the second settlement. A 3rd settlement was entered into on 27.10.88 and it was agreed that the bank's service against the vacancies likely to arise from 1988 to 1992 was to be considered. Government of India vide its letter dated 16.8.90 issued guidelines to all the public sector banks with regard to recruitment and absorption of temporary employees in public sector banks. The said guidelines were issued to implement on the lines of approach paper on the issue provided by a committee constituted in this regard. Government of India guidelines made it clear that all the public sector banks may follow the provisions laid down in the approach paper. The approach paper specified that the cases of temporary service in 12 consecutive months and who are entitled to benefit of Sec.25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 may be decided by entering into a settlement with the

representative union. In respect of temporary employees who had put in less than 240 days of service in 12 consecutive months or less, a settlement could be avoided and however if the Management so desired they could enter into a conciliation settlement with the representative union. In para. 6(h) it is mentioned that only those temporary employees who had put in temporary service of 90 days or more days after 1.1.82 would be eligible for considering under the scheme. Although the Government guidelines envisaged for a settlement in respect of employees who had put in temporary service of 90 days or more days, the bank by way of a further concession entered into settlements. Even in respect of those who had put in less than 90 days and also the bank went a step further and said those persons who are working after 1975 were also considered. Hence, there was a genuine effort on the part of the Respondent bank to provide as many as possible jobs subject to the availability of the vacancies. However, para 6 (k) of the approach paper made it clear that it is a one time, exercise in full and final, settlement of all the claims and disputes for the past period, in respect of temporary workmen covered by the settlement. Another settlement was entered on 9.1.91 herein after referred as 4th settlement and the time limit was extended upto 1994 and separate panel was prepared for temporary employees, casual/daily wagers. It was agreed that while vacancies arising between 1988 to 1994 in respect of temporary employees and in respect of casual/daily wagers, they can be considered for the vacancies arising between 1995-96 only.

16. It is submitted that the administrative set up of the Hyderabad Local Head Office comprises of four Zonal Offices (Zones) at Hyderabad, Vijayawada, Visakhapatnam and Tirupathi covering all the Districts of Andhra Pradesh. In terms of the settlement the Management after following the procedure laid down therein prepared the panels of qualified candidates of temporary employees denoted as 1989 panel and also panel of casual/daily wagers denoted as 1992 panel for giving a chance for being considered for permanent absorption. These panels were prepared zone-wise separately for messengers and non-messengers in the descending order of temporary service put in by the candidates during the stipulated period i.e., 1.7.1975 to 31.7.1988. That the Federation approached the Regional Labour Commissioner(C) for implementation of bi-partite settlement in respect of absorption of temporary employees. The Regional Labour Commissioner(C) conducted conciliation proceedings and an agreement was arrived between the Federation and the bank. It was agreed that it would be kept alive upto March, 1997. A copy of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.2.1995 signed by the parties is filed as material paper. A settlement was arrived at and an agreement was signed between the Federation and the Management bank on 30.7.1996 under Sec.2 (p) read with Sec.18(1) of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957, which is hereinafter called as 5th settlement. That on 27.2.1997 a Memorandum of understanding was also signed by the federation's affiliate and the bank Management recording the fact that the exercise of identifying the messengerial vacancies as on 31.12.1994 has since been completed by Central Office and thereby 403 messengerial vacancies were sanctioned . It was agreed that these vacancies may be filled from 1989 panel of temporary employees after effecting conversion from full time non-messengerial staff in the usual manner and the agreement was reached accordingly. It was agreed between the Federation's affiliate and the Management bank that in terms of the settlement dated 30.7.1996 both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees would lapse on 31.3.1997. That as agreed upon vacancies were filled from the panels. The Workman who has put in an aggregate temporary service of less than 240 days in a continuous block of 12 months period during 1.7.1975 to 31.7.1988 has no right to seek a direction to consider his candidature for absorption in the Management bank under any rule/law except under the settlement entered into thereon.

17. Respondent contended that, in fact, the case of the Workman can be considered under all the five settlements having got his case considered under provisions of these settlements. All the other provisions

and terms of the settlements are also binding on him/her. The Management bank has not violated any of the provisions of the terms of the said settlement. That the very preparation and maintenance of panel is in compliance of the terms agreed under these settlements. These settlements were time bound and they ceased to exist on 31.3.1997. That the bank has never promised that all the candidates in the panel will be absorbed. In the advertisement itself it was made clear that candidates will be considered for absorption in the vacancies that may arise upto 1992. Keeping alive the panels after 31.3.1997 is contrary to the settlements arrived between the State Bank of India Staff Federation and the Management bank. That the settlements are binding on the parties. The Workman is also bound under the terms of the said settlement. The settlement does not suffer from any ambiguity as their language is very clear. The right under the settlements is to give them a chance to be considered for future appointment in the bank's services against the vacancies likely to arise. The settlements were effected to balance the expectations of the temporary employees to be absorbed in permanent service as against the constitutional rights for all eligible persons to be considered for employment every time a vacancy arises. That the alleged dispute including the demand for reinstatement has to be decided in this context. It is submitted that the period of panel list got expired on 31.3.97 and it is an integral term of the settlement and cannot be modified in any proceedings under the law. These temporary employees who unfortunately could not be accommodated for want of vacancies have no further rights to be considered for regularization. That the Hon'ble High Court in WP No.12964/94, held as follows, "It is needless to state that the settlement arrived at between the All India State Bank of India Staff Federation which, is the majority union and the bank Management is binding on the Workmen also. It is not at all the case of the Workman that any of the terms of the settlement has been violated by the bank's Management. If the Workman had worked in the bank on part-time basis before 31.5.94, that itself would not vest in him a right to claim that his services should be regularized on permanent basis against a full time cadre post. The claim put forth by the Workman in the present petition is therefore misconceived and not tenable. However, it is open to the Workman to claim any right which flows from the settlement between the union and the bank Management. As already pointed out that it is not the grievance of the Workman that some right which has flown from the settlement in favour of the Workman has been denied by the bank Management. Therefore, I do not find any ground, let alone substantial ground, to grant the kind of relief sought for by the Workman. Writ Petition fails and is accordingly dismissed. No costs."

18. Further, it is contended that if the panels were not lapsed at the end of designated period and allowed to be continued it would result in making the contracts of temporary employment indirectly permanent through back door entry, which would not only be contrary to the settlements but also to Articles 14 and 16 of Constitution of India and deprive the chances of original claimants who would Come through proper recruitment procedure. As their rights have been crystallized by operation of the settlements. Hence, there is no question of any Legitimate expectation being violated.

19. Similarly placed ex-employees filed WP No.9206/1995 and the batch before the Hon'ble High Court of A.P. and the learned Single Judge allowed the Writ Petitions. Aggrieved by the same WA No.86/98 and the batch was filed and the Division Bench set aside the order of the Single Judge. Thereafter the ex-temporary employees filed Special Leave Petition No.11886-11888 of 1998 before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India also dismissed the SLP. Therefore, reference to the Judgement of the Learned Single Judge in WP No.9206/97 is of no consequences as the same has already been set aside. The observations made in the Judgements cannot be relied upon for any purpose what so ever. The question of operation of Sec.25F would not come into play. Further the issue is

covered by various Judgements of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India and various Hon'ble High Courts. Hence, the reference may be ordered that the Workman is not entitled for any relief.

20. In order to fortify his claim Workman has examined himself as WW1 and also filed documents in evidence which has been exhibited as Ex.W1 to W7. Further, the Workman has filed photocopies of documents in support of his claim which are discussed as under:-

Ex.W1 is the Notification. Further Ex.W2 is the Service certificate. Ex.W3 is the service certificate. Ex.W4 is the Panel list. Ex.W5 is the service certificate. Ex.W6 is the letter to employment exchange by Respondent. Ex. W7 is the circular letter 14.07.1999.

21. On the other hand, Respondent has examined witness MW1 Sri Aluru Rama Rao and this witness has exhibited 12 documents, marked as Ex.M1 to M12. The details of these documents are as follows:-

Ex.M.1 is the Settlement dated 17.11.1987. Ex.M2 is the Settlement dated 16.7.1988. Ex.M3 is the Settlement dated 27.10.1988. Ex.M4 is the Settlement dated 9.1.1991. Ex.M5 is the Minutes of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.1995. Ex.M6 is the Settlement dated 30.7.1996. Ex.M7 is the Memorandum of Understanding dt. 27.2.1997. Ex.M8 is the Particulars of 1989 Messengerial Panel. Ex.M9 is the Particulars of 1989 Non-Messengerial Panel. Ex.M10 is the Particulars of 1992 General Attendant Panel. Ex.M11 is the Judgment of Hon'ble High Court of A.P. in Writ Appeal No.86/98 dt.1.5.1998. Ex.M12 is the Judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in SLP No. 11886-11888 of 1998 dt.10.8.1998.

22. Apart from afore mentioned documents, Learned Counsel for Workman has also filed a long list of various judgements of Hon'ble Supreme Court as well as Hon'ble High Court, which we will discuss at appropriate place in this Award.

23. Heard the argument of Learned Counsel for Workman as well as for Respondent.

24. On the basis of rival pleadings of both the parties and submissions made by the Learned Counsel for both the parties, following points arise for determination in the industrial dispute :-

I. Whether the 1st settlement dated 17.11.1987, 2nd settlement dated 16.7.1988, 3rd settlement dated 27.10.1988, 4th settlement dated 9.1.1991 and 5th settlement dated 30.7.1996 entered into between State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and also Memorandum of Understanding are binding upon both the parties?

II. Whether the action of State Bank of India, Munnanur branch, Mahaboob Nagar District in terminating the services of Workman Sri M. Narayana, a Messenger with effect from 31.3.1997 is justified?

III. Whether the Workman is entitled for absorption on permanent post in the Branch of Respondent management as per averments made by him in the claim statement?

IV. To what relief if any the Workman is entitled for?

Findings:-

25. Point No.I:- Undisputedly settlements dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988, 9.1.1991 and 30.7.1996, minutes of conciliation proceedings and memorandum of understanding dated 27.2.1997 were executed between the State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff

Federation under section 2(p) and 18 (1) of I.D. Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Disputes (Central Rules), 1957.

Section 2(p) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 as follows:-

(p) *"settlement" means a settlement arrived at in the course of conciliation proceeding and includes a written agreement between the employer and workmen arrived at otherwise than in the course of conciliation proceeding where such agreement has been signed by the parties thereto in such manner as may be prescribed and a copy thereof has been sent to an officer authorised in this behalf by the appropriate Government and the conciliation officer;*

Section 18(1) provides as follows:-

18. Persons on whom settlements and awards are binding.

- [(1) A settlement arrived at by agreement between the employer and Workman otherwise than in the course of conciliation proceeding shall be binding on the parties to the agreement.

Therefore, in view of the provision contained u/s.18 (1) I.D. Act, 1947, terms and conditions enumerated in the aforesaid settlements are binding on the parties to the agreement. The Learned Counsel for Workman has argued that the Workman after going through the selection procedure has successfully been listed in the panel for appointment on the permanent basis in the Respondent management and the empanelled list has to be valid till last person in the empanelled list is appointed on permanent basis. But the impugned order dated 25.3.97, 27.3.97 and 31.3.97, has been issued by Respondent management thereby the services of the Workman has been terminated and the said order is not in consonance of the terms of the agreement entered into between the parties. Further, Workman submits that the Respondent in the 5th settlement has mentioned the date i.e., 31.3.1997 for lapse of empanel list which is illegal and that is not binding upon the Workman. The condition of lapse of empanelment list on 31.3.97 incorporated in the aforesaid 5th settlement, is arbitrary and illegal.

26. The perusal of the impugned order dated 25.3.1997 goes to reveal that the Chief/Branch Manager, SBI Zonal Office has issued the letter to all the branches with regard to the subject not to make any temporary appointments in the Branch in messengerial category from 1.4.1997. The extract of the said letter is given below:-

"We have been advised by the Deputy General Manager, Zonal Office, Hyderabad that as both the panels of temporary employees of 1989 and daily wagers/casual labours of 1992 will lapse by 31.3.1997, it has been decided by Central Office not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial category from 1.4.1997."

Thus, from the contents of the aforesaid letter, it manifest that Head Office of State Bank of India vide letter dated 25.3.1997 has issued direction to all its branches not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial category from 1.4.1997 due to reason of lapse of both panels i.e., 1989 & 1992 on 31.3.1997 as per terms of settlements entered into by both parties. Further, the contents of the subsequent letter dated 27.3.1997 issued by Respondent Management is also direction to Branch Manager, State Bank of India not to make any temporary messengerial category appointment with effect from 1.4.1997 and it has also been communicated to all concerned that the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers maintained by Zonal offices stand lapsed from 31.1.1997. Further, office order dated 31.3.1997 has been issued by Respondent management that goes to reveal that the said office order has been issued to this effect that, "Consequent on absorption of temporary employees in permanent cadre, it has been decided by the

competent authority that no one onwards, no further daily labour or temporary employees/appointments should be resorted to/engaged/employed." Therefore, it reflects from the contents of the aforesaid orders that the temporary appointment in messengerial category and daily labour has been stopped by the Respondent management with effect from 1.4.1997 because of the lapsed of panel of temporary workers and daily wagers by 31.3.1997. The agreement for lapse of both the panels on 31.3.1997 is contained in the 5th settlement which has been arrived at between the parties on dated 30.7.1996 with the consensus of both the parties. Therefore, Workman can not challenge the terms and conditions contained in settlement dated 30.7.1996 regarding lapse of panel on 31.3.1997 as agreed between State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation. As per provision contained u/s.18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 the said Agreement dated 30.7.1996 is binding on both the parties.

In the case of **Allied Sales Corporation Secunderabad vs.The Authority Under Andhra Pradesh..... 1990 II LLJ 510 AP para 414, Hon'ble Court have held:-**

"*4. There was a settlement between the Management and the workmen under* Section 18(1) *of the Industrial Disputes Act on 25th April 1983 under which the age of superannuation of the workmen was fixed at 55 years. The settlement was to be in force upto 30th June 1986 and the next settlement, incorporating practically the same terms, was again entered into on 4th February 1987 under* Section 18(1) *of the Industrial Disputes Act. There is no dispute that these settlements are under* Section 18(1).

14. Now the Authority constituted under Section 41(1) *of the Act is an authority with very limited jurisdiction. It can only decide in the first appeal whether a termination by the management is valid or not and is within the parameters of* Section 40 *of the Act. The said Authority, in our view, has absolutely no jurisdiction to decide whether a settlement entered into under* Section 18(1) *of the Industrial Disputes Act between the representatives of the Workmen and of the Management, is vitiated by undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion on the part of the Management. The Authority, namely, the Assistant Commissioner of Labour, was never intended by the A.P. Legislature to have jurisdiction to go into the question of the validity of a settlement arrived at under* Section 18 *of the Industrial Disputes Act by an Industrial Court. That Parliament has, in fact, constituted Industrial Courts under the* Industrial Disputes Act, *with extensive powers cannot be disputed. What we mean to say is that the Authority under Section 41(1) of the A.P. Act has no jurisdiction what-so-ever either to question or to decide about the validity of any such settlements. If parties to a settlement have a grievance about the validity of a settlement, it is for them to agitate the matter before the appropriate forum and they cannot ask an Authority constituted under* Section 41(1) *of the A.P. Shops and Establishments Act, 1966 with limited jurisdiction, to go into any such question and, that too, incidentally while deciding whether retirement as per the contract of employment, is legal or not."*

It is not the case of Workman that aforesaid settlements are vitiated by undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion on the part of the management. If the Workman feeling aggrieved by any terms of settlement/ agreement on the aforementioned grounds then he can challenge of settlement before a competent authority under the Act, 1947. But here in the instant matter it is not a case of Workman that aforementioned settlement has been entered into between the parties on the ground of undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion. Therefore, Workman is barred to raise any objection in respect of fixing the date of lapse of both panels on 31.3.1997 as agreed between both the parties and Workman can not challenge any terms of said Agreement.

Further in the case of **Herbertsons Limited Vs. Workmen of Herbertsons Limited and Ors, 1977 AIR 322,** Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

The Tribunal thought that the question of the quantum of membership of the 2nd Respondent did not call for a finding at all in view of 1his Court's order. As observed above that was not a correct assumption. On the other hand, we feel that this view of the Tribunal has led it to approach the matter in an entirely erroneous manner. The Tribunal is, rightly enough, conscious that under section 18 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act the settlement was binding on the company and the members of the 3rd Respondent union. Even so, the Tribunal devoted nearly half of its order in scanning the evidence given by the company and Respondent No. 3 to find out whether the terms of the settlement had been explained by the President of the union to the workmen or not and whether the workers voluntarily accepted the settlement knowing all the "consequences". This to our mind is again an entirely wrong approach.

"When a recognised union negotiates with an employer the workers as individuals do not come into the picture. It is not necessary that each individual worker should know the implications of the settlement since a recognised union, which is expected to protect the legitimate interests of labour, enters into a settlement in the best interests of labour. This would be the normal rule. We cannot altogether rule out exceptional cases where there may be allegations of mala fides, fraud or even corruption or other induce- ments. Nothing of that kind has been suggested against the President of the 3rd Respondent in this case. That being the position, prima facie, this is a settlement in the course of collective bargaining and, therefore, is entitled to due weight and consideration.

It is not possible to scan the settlement in bits and pieces and hold some parts good and acceptable and others bad. Unless it can be demonstrated that the objectionable portion is such that it completely outweighs all the other advantages gained the Court will be slow to hold a settle- ment as unfair and unjust. The settlement has to be accepted or rejected as a whole and we are unable to reject it as a whole as unfair or unjust. Even before this Court the 3rd Respondent representing admittedly the large majority of the workmen has stood by this settlement and that is a strong factor which it is difficult to ignore. As stated elsewhere in the judgment, we cannot also be oblivious of the fact that all workmen of the company have accepted the settlement. Besides, the period of settlement has since expired and we are informed that the employer and the 3rd Respondent are negotiating another settlement with further improvements. These factors, apart from what has been stated above, and the need for industrial peace and harmony when a union backed by a large majority of workmen has accepted a settlement in the course of collective bargaining have impelled us not to interfere with this settlement. That being the position, we unhold the settlement as fair and just and order that the award of the Tribunal shall be substituted by the settlement dated October 18, 1973. The said settlement shall be the substituted award. The appeal is disposed of accordingly. There will be no order as to costs."

Therefore, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above, the contention of the Workman that the date fixed for lapse of empanelled list on 31.3.1997 for appointment to the permanent post vide 5th Settlement dated 30.7.1996 is arbitrary, illegal is not untenable. The recognized union of Workmen has negotiated with the Respondent Bank Management representing large number of Workmen and the Workman as individual do not come into picture. Workman in the instant case has work as temporary Workmen in the Respondent Branch and in response of Notification he had applied for inclusion of his name in the panel and he was selected for inclusion his name in the panel list to be utilized for absorption of such Workman to permanent post in order of their seniority in the list. The Settlement dated 30.7.1996 between State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation

under Sec.2(p) and Sec.18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 has clearly provided as regard non-messengerial position and it is agreed that all such posts sanctioned fallen vacant upto 31.3.1997 shall be filled before empanel list is allowed to lapse. Thus, in view of law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, in the instant case, Agreement dated 30.7.1996 was entered into between both the parties in respect of lapsing of the both the panels on 31.3.1997 and absorption of the Workmen from panel list was subject to availability of vacancy of post likely to arise upto 31.3.1997, have a binding force on Workman as well as management of State Bank of India in view of provision contained under section 18 (1) of I.D. Act, 1947.

Thus, Point No.I is answered against the Workman and in favour of the Respondent.

27. **Point No.II**:- Firstly, it is submitted on behalf of the Workman that the Respondent has terminated his services by oral order on 31.3.1997 without issuing any notice or paying any salary or compensation in lieu thereof. Therefore, the termination order of the Workman from service is in violation of provision contained Under Section 25 F of I.D. Act, 1947. Therefore, the order is liable to be set aside.

28. On the other hand, Respondent counsel contended that Workman has not worked for 240 days in any preceding calendar year. Therefore, reference of the industrial dispute is not relevant. In this context, the Workman has examined himself as WW1 who has reiterated that Workman has been terminated from service by Respondent on 31.3.1997 without notice of salary or compensation in lieu thereof. Before examining the claim of the Workman on merit it would be apposite to reproduce the provision contained under section 25 F:-

Section 25F provides:-

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].

Compensation to workmen in case of transfer of undertakings.

Section 25B defines the term continuous service which provides

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 authorized 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;

In order to prove the fact of 240 days of service within 12 months of a calendar year just preceding from the date of termination, the initial burden of proof lies upon the Workman and the Workman has to prove this factum by adducing his oral as well as documentary evidence in support of his claim.

Further, how to calculate 240 days of service by the Workman in a calendar year. In this context the reference of decisions of Hon'ble Supreme Court is relevant and the same are discussed below:-

In Rajasthan State Ganganagar S. Mills Ltd. v. State of Rajasthan and Anr. (2004) Apex Court held:

"It was the case of the Workman that he had worked for more than 240 days in the year concerned. This claim was denied by the appellant. It was for the claimant to lead evidence to show that he had worked for 240 days in the year preceding the date of his termination. He has filed an affidavit. It is statement which is in his favor and that cannot be regarded as sufficient evidence for any Court or Tribunal to come to the conclusion that in fact the claimant had worked for 240 days in a year These aspects were highlighted in Range Forest Officer v. S.T. Hadimani (2002 (3) SCC 25. No proof of receipt of salary or wages for 240 days or order or record in that regard was produced. Mere non-production of the muster roll for a particular period was not sufficient for the Labour Court held that the Workman had worked for 240 days as claimed."

In Municipal Corporation, Faridabad v. Siri Niwas (2004 (8) SCC 195), held "*the burden was on the Workman to show that he was working for more than 240 days in the preceding one year prior to his alleged retrenchment." In M.P. Electricity Board v. Hariram (2004 (8) SCC 246) the position was again reiterated in paragraph 11 as follows: "The above burden having not been discharged and the Labour Court having held so, in our opinion, the Industrial Court and the High Court erred in basing an order of reinstatement solely on an adverse inference drawn erroneously ..*"

In the case of Manager, RBI, Bangalore vs. S Mani (2005) SCC Page 100, the 3 Judges Bench of the Apex Court held that "*the initial burden of proof was on the Workman to show that he had completed 240 days of service."*

Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of Mohan Lal vs Management BEL 1981 SCC page 225 has laid down the principle that how to count 240 days of service within one year it is held: *"Clause (2)(a) provides for a fiction to treat a Workman in continuous service for a period of one year despite the fact that he has not rendered uninterrupted service for a period of one year but he has rendered period of 240 days during the period of 12 calendar service for months counting backwards and just preceding the relevant date being the date of retrenchment. In other words, in order to invoke the fiction enacted in clause (2)(a) it is necessary to determine first the relevant date, ie the date of termination of service which is complained of as retrenchment. After that date is ascertained. move backward to a period of 12 months just preceding the date of retrenchment and then ascertain whether within the period of 12 months, the Workman has rendered service for a period of 240 days. If these three facts are affirmatively answered in favor of the Workman pursuant to the deeming fiction enacted in clause (2)(a) it will have to be assumed*

that the Workman is in continuous service for a period of one year and he will satisfy the eligibility qualification enacted in Section 25-F"

"14. We have already extracted section 25B since its amendment and the change in language is the legislative exposition of which note must be taken. In fact, we need not further dilate upon this aspect because in Surendra Kumar Verma and Ors. v. Central Government Industrial-cum-Labour *Court, New Delhi and Anr., Chinnappa Reddy. J., after noticing the amendment and referring to the decision in* Sur Enamel and Stamping Works (P) Ltd *case, held as under:*

"These changes brought about by Act 36 of 1964 appear to be clearly designed to provide that a Workman who has actually worked under the employer for not less than 240 days during a period of twelve months shall be deemed to have been in continuous service for a period of one year whether or not he has in fact been in such continuous service for a period of one year. It is enough that he has worked for 240 days in a period of 12 months, it is not necessary that he should have been in the service of the employer for one whole year."

In a concurring judgment Pathak J. agreed with this interpretation of section 25B(2). Therefore, both on principle and on precedent it must be held that section 25B(2) comprehends a situation where a Workman is not in employment for a period of 12 calendar months, but has rendered service for a period of 240 days within the period of 12 calendar months commencing and counting backwards from the relevant date, i.e. the date of retrenchment. If he has, he would be deemed to be in continuous service for a period of one year for the purpose of section 25B and Chapter VA."

Thus, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above the initial burden of proof lies upon the Workman to show that he has completed 240 days of the service with the Respondent just preceding from the date of his termination. Further, in respect of the employment of calculating the 240 days service provision contained Under Section 25-F read with Section 25-B of the I.D. Act, 1947.

29. Now, in view of the provision contained under Section 25 F and law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, we have to examine whether the Workman has discharged his initial burden of proof in respect of his claim of 240 days continuous service in a calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination i.e., 31.3.1997.

In this context, WW1 in his cross examination has stated that,

" I was not sponsored by any employment exchange. I did not undergo the regular process of selection before my engagement as temporary Messenger in the branch."

"It is true that I did not work for 240 days in any year in my entire service in the bank in any branch."

Thus, it is clear from the testimony of WW1 that the Workman had not worked for 240 days continuously in any 12 months of a calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination in the Respondent bank. Therefore, Workman failed to establish his plea by his oral and documentary evidence that he had worked for 240 days continuously in calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination i.e., 31.3.1997. Thus, the claim of the Workman that he has been terminated by oral order without issuing notice or payment in lieu after termination, in contravention of Section 25 F of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is not tenable. However the documents filed by the Workman in support of his claim, number of days worked with the Respondent goes to reveal that the Workman had worked intermittently as daily wager depending upon availability of work in branch. Workman did not file any document of

appointment letter or salary slips in support of his claim for appointment as a non-messenger in the Respondent branch on temporary basis.

30. Per contra, the Learned Counsel for Respondent has submitted the allegation of Workman that he was terminated from services is not correct. As the vacancies were filled up on regular basis in order of their respective seniority the non-engagement of the Workman does not amount to termination. Further, Respondent contended that no law provide that even though there is no work temporary employee should be continued in the bank work as the very engagement of Workman was subject to availability of work. Therefore, the allegation that the bank has indulged in unfair labour practice is incorrect.

31. Thus, in view of the fore gone discussion and contentions made by the Respondent, I find the force in the argument advanced by the Respondent that in the instant matter, Workman was not terminated from service by order dated 31.3.1997 rather he was disengaged in view of the non-availability of the work in the branch. Further, there was direction issued by the Head Office of the Respondent authority not to engage any daily wager Workman/ temporary Worker w.e.f. 1.4.1997. Thus, such disengagement of Workman does not amount to termination. Moreover, the Workman failed to prove his claim that he was terminated in contravention of provision of Sec.25F of the I.D. Act, 1947 as he failed to establish his plea by any oral or documentary evidence that he had worked for 240 days continuously in a twelve months of calendar year just preceding from date of termination i.e., 31.3.1997.

32. Further, perusal of the order dated 25.3.1997 goes to reveal that the Chief Branch Manager, State Bank of India has issued the letter to Zonal Office with direction to all its branches to this effect that they have been advised by the DGM, Zonal Office, Hyderabad that as both the panel of temporary employees of 1989 and daily wagers/casual labour of 1992 will lapse on 31.3.1997 it has been decided by central office not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial cadre from 1.4.1997, therefore it was directed to issue suitable instructions not to make temporary appointments from 1.4.1997. There is no mention in this order that the Workman herein has been terminated from service by this order.

33. Further, the circular dated 27.3.1997 was issued by DGM, SBI to all branches in commercial network in respect of the non-appointment of temporary employees in subordinate cadre and it has directed not to make any temporary employment in the subordinate cadre with effect from 1.4.97 and further, it has directed to ensure that no temporary/casual/daily basis appointment of the petty cash. Further, it is directed to all Branch Managers that any deviation in this regard will be viewed seriously. Thus, these circulars do not reflect that the Workman has been terminated from service by this order.

34. Similarly, office order dated 31.3.1997 is simply a direction to all branches of the Respondent bank by DGM that no further daily labour should be engaged or employed. Therefore, the plea of the Workman that he has been terminated by the aforesaid order dated 25.3.1997, 27.3.1997 and 31.3.1997 from the service by the Respondent is not acceptable. The evidence adduced by the Workman clearly goes to reveal that he had worked as a daily wager for which he has been paid wages according to number of working days. As there was an order for prohibition for engaging temporary workmen, in the bank, therefore, Workman could not be engaged by the Respondent for work from 1.4.1997 and there after. It is settled law that the daily wagers are engaged by the employer depending upon the availability of work and as the work was not available the Workman was not engaged further by the Respondent management. Therefore, the Workman on the ground of number of days he had worked in the Respondent bank cannot claim any right to reinstate him into the employment. As the Workman failed to prove the mandatory condition of 240 days of continuous service as required under Sec.25F of I.D. Act, 1947. Therefore, the

disengagement of Workman from work can not be termed in contravention of provision contained under Sec.25F and 25 B of the I.D. Act, 1947.

Thus, this point is answered against the Workman and in favour of Respondent.

35. **Point No.III**:- In this context, the Workman has contended that the management failed to implement the selected panels during its valid tenure. The management adopted the back door methods contrary to the settlements and filled up the vacancies. The same is evident from the proceedings dated 18.11.1993 a copy of the same is filed in the material papers and the same may be read as part of the claim statement. Further, it is submitted that management has to adhere the procedure issued by the Central Government, the instructions dated 16.8.1990 in the year 1995, but same was not followed in the year 1997 despite there being vacancies. The management has followed the procedure of calling candidates through employment exchange instead of giving chance to the empanelled candidates like the Workman herein. The management sent call letters to the similarly situated candidates like the Workman in the month of June 1997 subsequent to issuance of impugned termination orders. After knowing the fact that they are litigating the issue by way of dispute, the management has refused to engage those candidates, the copies of call letters issued are filed herein along with claim petition. The Workman herein reiterates that the panels are meant for absorption but not for termination. In view of the same a duty is cast upon the Respondent management to engage the empanelled candidates like the Workman herein even in temporary vacancies till they are absorbed permanently in regular vacancies.

36. On the other hand, Respondent has contended that the Federation approached Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) for implementation of bipartite settlement in respect of the absorption of temporary employees. The Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) conducted conciliation proceedings and agreement was arrived at between the Federation and the Management bank. It is submitted that it was agreed between the Federation and the Management that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers /casual labour would be kept alive upto March, 1997 and the vacancies as agreed to under the afore set out settlements will be filled from both the lists concurrently. A copy of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.1995 signed by the parties to the dispute is filed as a material paper. Further, it is submitted that the settlement was arrived at and an agreement was signed between the Federation and the Management bank on 30.7.1996 under Section 2(p) read with Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules 1957 which is binding on the parties. A copy of this agreement which hereinafter may be referred to as 5th settlement for brevity, is also filed as a material paper. The 5th settlement dated 30.7.1996 whereunder the earlier four settlements dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988 and 9.1.1991 were also referred, it was agreed to, by the Federation and the Management bank that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees will be kept alive upto March, 1997 for filling the vacancies existing/arrived at as on 31.12.1994 as per the norms agreed to between the bank and Federation and that thereafter the said panels would lapse. It was also agreed that within the framework of the above settlements the modalities about drawing names from either the panel of temporary employees or the panel of daily wagers and casual labour would be decided administratively on circle to circle basis depending upon the local requirements in consultation with the Federation's affiliate by the Circle management. It was further agreed that all messenger real vacancies/positions in the subordinate cadre including part-time attendants specifically provided as leave reserve will be filled by the end of 31.3.1997. Further, Respondent contended that on 27.2.1997 a memorandum of understanding was also signed between the Federation's affiliate and the bank management regarding the fact that the exercise of identifying the messengerial vacancies as on 31.12.1994 has since been completed by central office and thereby 403

messengerial vacancies were sanctioned to the circle of the Management bank and it was agreed that these vacancies may be filled from 1989 panel of temporary employees after effecting conversion from full time non-messengerial staff in the usual manner and the agreement was reached upon. Further, it was agreed between the Federations affiliate and the management bank that in terms of the settlement dated 30.7.1996 both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers /casual employees would lapse on 31.3.1997.

37. The Workman has contended that the empanelled list prepared by the Respondent management for appointment of temporary and daily wage Workers to the permanent post cannot lapse unless until it is exhausted by appointing all the empanelled persons and it should continue even after 31.3.1997, i.e., the date fixed for the lapse of panel. It is undisputed that the date of lapse of empanelled list of Workmen has been fixed to 31.3.1997 as mentioned in the settlement dated 30.7.1996, and agreed between the parties. It is settled law that and once the life of panel list lapses on the date as agreed between the parties it cannot be extended beyond that date. In the instant case the panel list of the workmen was valid upto 31.3.1997 in view of the terms and conditions enumerated in the 5th Settlement entered into between the parties. As the lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997 has been agreed by State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation through 5th Settlement, the Workman is not competent to challenge the same.

In this context I would like to take reference of the decision of the apex court in the case of **Syndicate Bank and Ors vs. Shankar Paul and Ors , AIR 1997 SC 3091, therein the Hon'ble Apex Court** have held:-

"Till 1982, the branches of the appellant Bank in Calcutta region were recruiting persons locally to work as temporary attenders in leave vacancies. In view of the revised procedure prescribed by the Government of India in respect of such temporary appointments, the Calcutta regional office of the appellant Bank issued a circular to all of its branches on 14.8.1982, instructing all the branches under it to discontinue the old practice from 1.6.1982 and appoint only empanelled candidates. The regional office was to prepare a panel of eligible candidates, after calling names from the local/district employment exchange, and split it up branch-wise. Following that new procedure yearly panels were prepared thereafter. Names of the Respondents were for the first time included in the panel prepared for the period 7.2.1987 to 6.2.1988. By its letter dated 7.2.1987 the Bank had informed the Respondents that the panel was valid for one year only and that inclusion of their names in the panel was not to confer on them any right to seek permanent appointment in the service of the bank. Considering the object with which the panel was prepared and the fact that it was an yearly panel expiring on 6.2.1988, we are of the opinion that the Respondents did not get any right, because of inclusion of their names in the said panel, for permanent absorption in the service of the Bank. Whatever conditional right they had came to an end with the expiry of the panel. The claim of the Respondents, as contained in the writ petition was thus misconceived and therefore the learned single Judge and the Division Bench, when it first decided the appeal, were right in dismissing the writ petition and the appeal respectively."

Thus, in view of the above law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court and in view of the terms and conditions of the 5th Settlement the contention of the Workman that empanelled list should continue even after 31.3.1997 till the last Workman in the panel is absorbed is not tenable. The contention of the Workman is baseless in view of recital in the settlement. Therefore, in view of the fore gone discussion and finding given at Point No. I regarding binding nature of Settlements and terms and conditions enumerated therein, in view of the provision contained u/s.18(1) of the I.D. Act, 1947, I am of the considered view that life of panels lapsed on 31.3.1997 in view of terms of settlement dated 30.7.1996 and

plea of Workman that the panel shall continue even after 31.3.1997 till last man absorbed has no legal force and same is untenable.

38. Undisputedly, settlement agreement dated 30.7.1996 was executed between the State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation and in that settlement it was agreed that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/ casual employees will be used for filling vacancies existing as on 31.12.1994 as per the norms agreed between the bank and the Federation. These empanelled workmen were to be given a chance for permanent appointment in the bank against vacancies arising up to December 1994 whereas the daily wagers/ casual employees were to be considered against the vacancies arise from January 1995 to December 1996, whereby the said panel would lapse. It was agreed that the vacancies falls upto 31.3.1997 shall be filled before the empanelled list is allowed to lapse. Thus, the claim of the Workman to the post of permanent non-messenger in the Respondent management was subject to the availability of the sanctioned post and vacancies arising upto 31.3.1997. The workmen given chance to the permanent post were seniors in number of working days in panel list and Workman herein was junior to those workmen. Therefore, Workman could not be given absorption to permanent post being junior to other workmen in the panel list.

39. In this context the Workman witness WW1 was cross examined by the Respondent counsel and in the cross examination the witness WW1 states:-

"I applied for appointment as Messenger, in response to the advertisement issued by the bank and the union in the year 1989,.... Further, witness states*, "The panel was prepared basing upon the number of days of service, put in by the temporary employees. Some of the temporary employees whose names were included in the panel were given regular appointment in the bank in order of their seniority in the panel....* Further witness states*, "It is true that I am not having any documents to show that any of my juniors are continuing in service in the bank."*

Thus, from the above statement of the Workman witness WW1 it is clear that the panel was prepared in terms of various settlements entered into between Staff Federation of State Bank of India and State Bank of India and it was prepared on the basis of number of days of work put in by the temporary employees. Further, the Workman himself admitted that some of the temporary employees whose names were included in the panel were given regular appointment in the bank in order of their seniority in the panel and he is not having any document to show that any person who worked for less number of days than the Workman was given appointment in the bank. Therefore, the allegation of the Workman that the regular appointment has been made by the bank from the panel list in breach of the terms of the settlement and violation of seniority of panel list is not proved by this evidence of WW1. Thus, there is no evidence on record that bank has given the appointment to the temporary employees as well as daily wagers from the panel list 1989 and 1992 in breach of seniority of the temporary employees in the list. There is no evidence of jumbling in the panel list to make appointment of any permanent Workman in breach of the seniority. Therefore, I am constrained to hold that the Respondent Management has appointed the workmen from panel list in order of seniority and there is no jumbling of workmen in the panel list before it got lapsed on 31.3.1997.

40. However, Workman has taken the plea that the panels of Workmen for absorption in the employment of the Respondent banks (panels of temporary employees and daily wagers) has been lapsed on 31.3.1997 in contravention of terms of settlement as the object of preparing the entire empanelment of temporary and daily wagers was to provide them permanent employment and till the both the panel lists

exhausted the panel list cannot be lapsed on 31.3.1997 and the date of lapsing of the panel on 31.3.1997 has been fixed by the Respondent arbitrarily without any authority.

41. In this context, the perusal of Settlement dated 30.7.1996 reveals that the 5th Settlement dated 30.7.1996 was entered under Section 2(p) and 18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Dispute (Central) Rules 1957. This settlement has been entered into by the competent parties and in this settlement parties thereto agreed that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees will lapse on 31.3.1997. Thus the date of lapse of panel was fixed by both the parties with consensus under the settlement dated 30.7.1996 and same is binding upon the Workman under the provision of Section 18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947. Moreover, this issue of binding force of the settlement dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988 and 9.1.1991 has already been discussed, decided at finding in Point No.I of this award. However, the legality and validity of the aforementioned settlement has not been challenged by the Workman before any competent forum. Thus, claim of Workman that the date of lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997 has been fixed arbitrarily by the Respondent bank is untenable. As regard the claim of Workman for his absorption to the permanent post it is settled law that the Workman can not claim his regularization to permanent post merely on the basis of number of working days.

42. In this context the reference of the decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Oil and Natural Gas Corporation vs Krishan Gopal 2020(3) SCALE 272, date of decision 7.2.2020** is relevant therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have has laid down principle regarding regularization of the Workman on permanent posts. Hon'ble Supreme Court have laid down the prepositions of regularization of the workmen to permanent post is as under:-

"*(i) Wide as they are, the powers of the Labour Court and the Industrial Court cannot extend to a direction to order regularisation, where such a direction would in the context of public employment offend the provisions contained in Article 14 of the Constitution;*

(ii) The statutory power of the Labour Court or Industrial Court to grant relief to workmen including the status of permanency continues to exist in circumstances where the employer has indulged in an unfair labour practice by not filling up permanent posts even though such posts are available and by continuing to employ workmen as temporary or daily wage employees despite their performing the same work as regular workmen on lower wages;

(iii) The power to create permanent or sanctioned posts lies outside the judicial domain and where no posts are available, a direction to grant regularisation would be impermissible merely on the basis of the number of years of service;

(iv) Where an employer has regularised similarly situated workmen either in a scheme or otherwise, it would be open to workmen who have been deprived of the same benefit at par with the workmen who have been regularised to make a complaint before the Labour or Industrial Court, since the deprivation of the benefit would amount to a violation of Article 14; and

(v) In order to constitute an unfair labour practice under Section 2(ra) read with Item 10 of the Vth Schedule of the ID Act, the employer should be engaging workmen as badlis, temporaries or casuals, and continuing them for years, with the object of depriving them of the benefits payable to permanent workmen.

Thus, in view of the principles laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court as discussed above, in the instant matter the Workman utterly failed to prove his claim by adducing any documentary or oral evidence that the employer has indulged in unfair labour practice by not filling the permanent posts even though such

posts are available and by continuing to employ workmen as temporary or daily wage employees despite their performance was the same work, as regular workmen on lower wages.

43. Respondent has contended that all the vacancies exist and arise upto 31.3.1997 has been filled up from the panel list in order of seniority and no vacancy exists or arises as on 31.3.1997 remained unfilled. Further, it is contended that as per terms of settlement the life of panel lists has been lapsed on 31.3.1997, hence, there is no occasion to extend the life of panel lists beyond 31.3.1997. However, the workman failed to prove contrary by any evidence to the aforesaid contention of the Respondent that the vacancies were existing as on 31.3.1997 and the workman was not given absorption to the permanent post in order of his seniority. It is settled law that the power to create permanent or sanctioned post lies outside the judicial domain and where no posts are available, a direction to grant regularization would be impermissible merely on the basis of the number of years of service. Therefore, the claim of the workman on this ground also not acceptable.

44. Further, as per the of settlement, panel was prepared for absorption of the workmen on the permanent posts has already been lapsed on 31.3.1997 and the vacancies existing and arising upto 31.12.1994 and upto 31.3.1997 as settlement dated 30.7.1996 has been filled up from the panel by appointing the workmen as per seniority in the panel list. Workman witness WW1 in his cross examination has himself admitted this fact that, some of the temporary employees whose names were included in the panel were given regular appointment in the bank in order of their seniority in the panel. The Workman failed to show that there was any breach of terms of settlement has been committed by the Respondent in appointment to permanent post from aforesaid panel list.

45. As discussed in preceding paragraph of this Award, the life of the panel has not been extended beyond 31.3.1997, by any further settlement hence, the panel list in which name of the Workman was included got expired on 31.3.1997. It is not the case of the Workman that Respondent has regularized similarly situated workmen either in the scheme or otherwise and the Workman has been deprived of same benefit on par with those workmen or the vacancies remained unfilled on the date of lapse of panels i.e., 31.3.1997, Industrial Tribunal has no jurisdiction to extend the date of lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997. This Tribunal can not order for regularization of workmen to the permanent post in contravention of the provision of Article 14 of the Constitution of India.

In the case of **Mahboob Deepak vs. Nagar Panchayat Gajraula & Anr, Civil Appeal No.5875/2007 date of judgement 13.12.2007,** Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

"8. Respondent is a Local Authority. The terms and conditions of employment of the employees are governed by a statute and statutory rules. No appointment can be made by a Local Authority without following the provisions of the recruitment rules. Any appointment made in violation of the said rules as also the constitutional scheme of equality as contained in Articles 14 *and* 16 *of the Constitution of India would be a nullity.*

9. Due to some exigency of work, although recruitment on daily wages or on an ad hoc basis was permissible, but by reason thereof an employee cannot claim any right to be permanently absorbed in service or made permanent in absence of any statute or statutory rules. Merely because an employee has completed 240 days of work in a year preceding the date of retrenchment, the same would not mean that his services were liable to be regularized."

Therefore, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, the claim of the Workman for absorption merely on the basis of number of day of work in the Respondent bank Branch is not acceptable.

As regard plea of the Workman that the Workman should have been given employment even after 31.3.1997 as temporary Workman, it is the discretion of Respondent to engage the Workman depending upon availability of work and this Tribunal can not direct the Respondent to engage the Workman in the absent of such rule/scheme.

46. In view of principle laid down by Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above, in the instant matter Workman utterly failed to establish the fact of rendering continuous service for a period of 240 days of service within a period of 12 calendar months commencing and coming backward from relevant date i.e., the date of retrenchment, if has he would be denied to be in continuous service for a period of one year. Therefore, the provision contained under Sec.25F of retrenchment is not applicable to Workman.

Counsel for Workman has relied upon number of decisions of Hon'ble High Court and Hon'ble Supreme Court and few of them are discussed herein:-

In the case of **F.C.I., vs. Kamdhenu Cattle Feed Industries 1993 (1) SCC 71,** therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

"7. In contractual sphere as in all other State actions, the State and all its instrumentalities have to conform to Article 14 *of the Constitution of which non-arbitrariness is a significant facet. There is no unfettered discretion in public law: A public authority possesses powers only to use them for public good. This impose the duty to act fairly and to adopt a procedure which is `fairplay in action'. Due observance of this obligation as a part of good administration raises a reasonable or legitimate expectation in every citizen to be treated fairly in his interaction with the State and its instrumentalities, with this element forming a necessary component of the decision making process in all State actions. To satisfy this requirement of non- arbitrariness in a State action, it is, therefore, necessary to consider and give due weight to the reasonable or legitimate expectations of the persons likely lo be affected by the decision or else that unfairness in the exercise of the power may amount to an abuse or excess of power apart from affecting the bona fides of the decision in a given case. The decision so made would be exposed to challenge on the ground of arbitrariness. Rule of law does not completely eliminate discretion in the exercise of power, as it is unrealistic, but providers for control of its exercise by judicial review."*

In the case of **State Bank of India, R.O., Vijayawada vs. Industrial Tribunal, Hyderabad WP No.193/1997,** therein Hon'ble High Court have held,

"*Sri Krovvidi Narasimham, the learned counsel for the 2nd respondent contends, supporting the award that it was a permanent vacancy and even though the 2nd respondent was appointed on temporary basis, his services were not liable to be terminated and he was to be regularised into service on permanent basis. Shastry award warrants that no temporary appointment can be made to a permanent post. But the matter is now covered by two division bench judgements dated 28.11.1986 in W.A. No.791 of 1986 and 25.8.1987 in W.A. No.270 of 1982. The ratio decided in the two judgements is to the effect that there cannot be any mandate to appoint employees on permanent basis when the requirement was for appointment on temporary basis. But it is held in the said judgements that when a temporary appointee is ousted from service and not for misconduct and, if again temporary appointment is to be made, then, the case of such temporary appointee who was ousted, has got to be considered in accordance with Sec. 25-H of the Act."*

In the case of **State of Haryana and others vs. Piara Singh and others. 1992 (4) SCC 118,** therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

" 49. If for any reason an adhoc or temporary employee is continued for a fairly long spell, the authorities must consider his case for regularization provided he is eligible and qualified according to the rules and his service record is satisfactory and his appointment does not run counter to the reservation policy of the state."

In the above cited judgements by the Workman the facts of the case are different hence do not apply to instant case of Workman.

47. On the other hand, in support of his contention Respondent has examined witness MW1 and MW1 in chief examination states that, Settlements i.e., on 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988, 9.1.1991 were entered into between the SBI and SBI Staff Federation for filling up of the vacancies that arise up to 1994 for those temporary employees who has worked on scale wages. Further, MW1 states that two different panels for messengers and non-messengers as per the eligibility criteria prescribed by the bank. There are four modules in Andhra Pradesh and they are Hyderabad, Tirupathi, Vijayawada and Visakhapatnam. MW1 states that the temporary employees so empanelled were given permanent absorption depending upon the vacancies so arise strictly in terms of the settlement. MW1 states that on 9.6.1995 conciliation proceeding was held before the RLC(C), Hyderabad and in said proceedings it was decided that the panels will be kept live up to 31.3.1997 and vacancies will be filled from both the lists concurrently. A copy of the said minutes of proceedings is Ex.M5. Further, MW1 states that on 30.7.1996 another settlement was entered between the SBI and All India SBI Staff Federation providing for filling up of the vacancies arising up to December 1994 in respect of subordinate cadre and daily wage /casual wage employees out of panel so prepared were to be considered against vacancies arising from January 1995 to December 1996, thereafter the said panels lapse. MW1 states that it was also agreed that all the non-messenger positions in subordinate cadre including part time attendants specially provided as leave reserve will be filled before 31.3.1997 and as regards to non-messengerial positions it is agreed that all such posts sanctioned and fallen vacant up to 31.3.1997 shall be filled before the empanelled list is allowed to lapse. Thus in both the cases empanelled list were lapsed on 1.4.1997. Ex.M6 is the copy of the settlement dated 30.7.1996. Further, witness states that on 27.2.1997 a memorandum of understanding was reached between the SBI and SBI Staff Federation providing that both the panels above mentioned will lapse on 31.3.1997. Ex.M7 is the copy of the memorandum of understanding and Ex.M8 is the copy of the statements giving the particulars of 1989 non-messenger panel, Ex.M9 is the copy of the statement of 1989 non- messenger panel, Ex.M10 is the copy of statement of 1992 panel. Further, witness states that petitioner was included in the 1989 panel. As the existing vacancies at that time were exhausted and his turn did not come he could not be given permanent employment in the bank as per the agreements. All the appointments were made strictly in accordance with the settlements reached from time to time between SBI and SBI staff federation and as per seniority, number of days of temporary service put in by them in the bank in the given period. Further, MW1 states petitioner was not sponsored by any employment exchange he did not undergo the regular process of selection required for appointment as a regular non-messenger the petitioner has not worked for 240 days in any year in his entire temporary service in the bank. The petitioner and other temporary employees were terminated from service by the bank. Further, MW1 states that the vacancies were filled up on regular basis with the temporary employees from the panels and these panels were expired in terms of the settlements so reached and there were no vacancies to absorb such employees. Thus, witness MW1 has proved the documents Ex.M1 to Ex.M12 and also contentions made in the counter. However, MW1 was cross examined by the Petitioner Counsel. But nothing has been elicited in his cross examination so as to discredit the testimony of the witness MW1 as regards the date of lapse of both the panels on 31.3.1997 and reasons assigned for non-absorption of the Petitioner from the

panel list to the permanent post. Moreover the witness MW1 was re-examined by the Respondent and the witness MW1 states that panels were expired in terms of the settlement send absorptions to the extent of the available vacancies were made. There was no termination of any temporary messenger as such but their services were not utilized after the cut off date as the available vacancies were already filled up and most of these Petitioners were not in the service of the bank as on the date of the expiry date of the panels. Therefore, in view of the aforesaid testimony of the MW1 in re-examination in the absence of cross examination remained uncontraverted, the claim of the Workman that he was entitled for absorption in permanent post in the branch of Respondent Management on the basis of panel list is found not established.

This point is answered against the Workman.

48. **Point No.IV**:- In view of the discussion and finding given at Point Nos. I, II and III, the Workman is not entitled for any relief and claim statement of Workman sans merit and liable to be dismissed.

This Point is answered accordingly.

AWARD

In view of the fore gone discussion, it is held that the action of the Respondent bank in terminating the services of Sri M. Narayana, Ex. Messenger by way of oral orders w.e.f. 31.3.1997 is justified. Hence, the Petitioner is not entitled for any relief as prayed for. The claim statement filed by Workman sans merit, hence, dismissed. Reference is answered accordingly.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation Smt. K. Phani Gowri, Personal Assistant, transcribed by her, corrected and signed by me on this the 11th day of May, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner	Witnesses examined for the Respondent
WW1: Sri M. Narayana	MW1: Sri Aluru Rama Rao

Documents marked for the Petitioner

Ex.W1: Photocopy of Notification

Ex.W2: Photocopy of Service certificate

Ex.W3: Photocopy of Service certificate

Ex.W4: Photocopy of Service certificate

Ex.W5: Photocopy of Service certificate

Ex.W6: Photocopy of letter to employment exchange by the Respondent

Ex.W7: Photocopy of circular letter dated 14.07.1999

Documents marked for the Respondent

Ex.M1: Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.17.11.87

Ex.M2: Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.16.7.88

Ex.M3: Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.27.10.1988

Ex.M4: Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.9.1.1991

Ex.M5: Photocopy of conciliation proceedings before the Regional Labour Commissioner(C) dt.9.6.1995

Ex.M6: Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.30.7.1996

Ex.M7: Photocopy of Memorandum of understanding dt. 27.1.1997

Ex.M8: Photocopy of statements giving the particulars of 1989 messenger panel.

Ex.M9: Photocopy of statement of 1989 Non-messenger panel

Ex.M10: Photocopy of statement of 1992 panel

Ex.M11: Photocopy of order of Hon'ble High Court in WA No.86/98 dt. 1.5.98

Ex.M12: Photocopy of order in SLP No.11886-11888 of 1998 dated 10.8.98

नई दिल्ली, 29 जुलाई, 2026

का.आ. 1621.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एस बी आई भारत का के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजको और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में **केन्द्रीय सरकार आद्योगिक अधिकरण–सह–श्रम न्यायालय**, हैदराबाद के पंचाट (**सन्दर्भ संख्या 191/2002**) को प्रकाशित करती है,

[सं. एल-12012/38/2000-आई.आर (बी-I)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 29th July, 2026

S.O. 1621.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Reference. I.D. No. 191/2002) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Hyderabad as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the Management of SBI of India and their workmen,

[No. L-12012/38/2000–IR (B-I)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

In The Central Government Industrial Tribunal Cum Labour Court At Hyderabad

Present: **Sri IRFAN QAMAR**

Presiding Officer

Dated the 7th day of May, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. 191/2002

[Old ID No.55/2000 of Industrial Tribunal No.I, Hyderabad]

Between:

Sri M. Jayaram Reddy,

Salakam Cheruvu,

Singanamala(M),

Dist. Anantapur (A.P).

… Petitioner

And

The Dy. General Manager,

State Bank of India,

Zonal Office,

Renigunta Road,

Tirupathi(A.P). …..Respondent

Appearances:

For the Petitioner : Sri Macherla Rangaiah, Advocate

For the Respondent: Sri Y. Ranjeeth Reddy, Advocate

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-12012/38/2000-IR(B.I) dated 14.07.2000 referred the following dispute under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 to Industrial Tribunal No.I, Hyderabad for adjudication and later the same has been transferred to this Tribunal bearing ID No. 55/2000, as per orders of Central Government vide Lr.No.H-11026/1/2001-IR(C.II) dated 18.10.2001, requiring this forum to decide the question:

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the State Bank of India, Salakamchervu Branch in terminating Sri M. Jayaram Reddy, Messenger, from the services of the Bank by way of oral orders w.e.f 31.3.1997 is justified? If not, what relief he is entitled?"

After receipt of the reference, it was numbered as ID No. 191/2002 and notices were issued to both the Workman and the management.

2. Before unfolding the factual matrix of the instant industrial dispute it would be apposite to have a bird eye view of a chequered history of the instant industrial dispute. Earlier instant industrial dispute

along with the batch cases was decided by this Tribunal vide common award dated 17.5.2005 and the reference was answered in favour of the Respondent and against the Workman. That said common award dated 17.5.2005 was challenged by the aggrieved Workmen in various Writ petition No.6470/2014 along with batch of writ petitions before the Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh and Hon'ble High Court vide its' judgement dated 23.6.2014 allowed all batch of writ petitions and set aside the common award dated 17.5.2005 passed in ID No.222 of 2001 and other batch of ID cases by Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad and the Respondent management of State Bank of India was directed to reengage the Writ Petitioners in position, which they have been occupying prior to their termination and further directed to consider their cases for regularization as and when the substantive vacancy arises. This judgement dated 23.6.2014 of Hon'ble High Court of AP, passed in WP No.6470/2014 and batch petitions was challenged by Respondent management before the Hon'ble High Court in Writ Appeal No. 1268 of 2014. The aforesaid Writ Appeals No.1268/2014 and other Writ Appeals were decided by Division Bench of High Court of Andhra Pradesh by a common judgement dated 20.3.2019. Hon'ble High Court in aforesaid Writ Appeal was pleased to pass the order which is extracted as below:-

" 7. Hearing the learned senior counsel for the SBI and the learned senior counsel for the contesting unofficial Respondents, we see that while the learned single Judge was justified in setting aside the award af the Tribunal, the proper course to be adopted was to remit all the cases to the Tribunal. This we say for reasons more than one. Firstly, in such matters, claims have to be decided on individual basis, as different persons have different claims as to the length of officiation or discharge of duties and functions; quality of engagement, drawings, accounting of the post for each one of them, who have worked etc. AIl these issues will not be the same in all the cases. Therefore, each case ought to have been directed to be decided by the Tribunal afresh on individual basis. The second and most important aspect is the learned single Judge has in one go ordered re-employment of all the workmen. This is not a relief that could have been granted without answering the individual issues; each issue relating to each case could not have been decided by the writ Court within the format of its adjudication procedures and scope. The adjudicating body, which has to do that activity, is the Industrial Tribunal. Therefore, we are of the view that while we would sustain the order of the learned singe Judge insofar as it interfered and sets aside the award of the Tribunal, the further findings and directions, issued through the impugned order have to go and the individual cases have to be sent back for consideration of the Tribunal. Such further procedure before the Tribunal will have to be carried forward with the materials already on record and also by affording an opportunity to the persons, who have claims as well as the management to place their rival contentions and further material before the Tribunal. The learned counsel appearing for the workmen are justified in pointing out that enormous delay has already happened and further action by the Tribunal in this line may be expedited.

9. In the result, these writ appeals are ordered;

(1) affirming the impugned common order of the learned single Judge to the extent it sets aside the common award dated 17.05.2005 of the Industrial Tribunal;

(2) the further findings and directions issued through the impugned common order are vacated:

(3) all the matters shall be remitted to the Industrial Tribunal with a direction to dispose of them within an outer limit of five (5) months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order; and,

(4) the parties to make appearance before the Tribunal on the given date."

Thus, in view of the above direction of Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh in W.A.No.1268 of 2014 and batch cases. This Tribunal has taken up the matter of industrial dispute for hearing and deciding it afresh in view of the aforesaid guidelines laid down by the Hon'ble High Court in Writ Appeal No.1268/2014 vide judgement dated 20.3.019.

3. The factual matrix of instant industrial dispute as narrated by the Workman in his claim statement are that, the Workman joined in the service of the management institution as Messenger from 14.9.1989 to 31.3.1997, and has rendered unblemished service spreading over a period of about 9 years. The Respondent has terminated services of Workman by oral orders with effect from 1.4.1997. Further, it is submitted that the management of Respondent bank decided to give a chance to temporarily employed personnel "found suitable for permanent appointment" by wait- listing them by offering permanent appointment or waitlisting till such opportunity arises.

4. That on 17.11.1987 a settlement was reached between All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and the Management of State Bank of India - settlement one, under this settlement three categories of employees were listed. That is, A) those who have completed 240 days in 12 months or less after 1.7.1975. B) those who have completed 270 days in any continuous block of 36 calendar months after 1.7.1975. C) (i) those who have completed minimum of 30 days aggregate temporary service in any calendar year after 1.7.1975 or (ii) 70 days aggregate temporary service in continuous block of 36 months after 1.7.1975.

5. The persons who satisfied in all the above 4 categories were to be interviewed by a selection committee and the said selection committee would determine the suitability of the said candidate for permanent appointment. Therefore, the bank prescribed certain qualifications and from among the candidates satisfying the qualifications the suitable candidates were enlisted by a selection committee. The Clause 7 of the said agreement provided with the selected candidate would be wait listed in order of their respective categorization and the selected panel would be valid upto December, 1991. Clause 10 of the settlement specifically provided that henceforth. "there will be no temporary appointments in the subordinate cadre", except on a restrictive basis in the specified category, "from amongst empanelled candidates as per existing guidelines of the bank". The Workman further submits that consequent upon the said agreement and the draft, a notification was issued in the newspapers. The last date for responding to the advertisement was 30.8.1988. A written examination followed by viva-voce in May, 1989 was held. A selected panel was prepared, as per Clause 7 of the agreement, ie. Settlement No.1, the selected panel was to be valid upto December, 1991, the Workman submits that circular was issued on 26.4.91 by the said letter it is mentioned that the terms of the agreement dated 17.11.87 was modified vide second agreement dated 16.7.88 was entered into between the parties. In terms of the said agreement a chance was to be given, "to all eligible temporary employees for permanent appointments. The appointments were against the vacancies likely to arise during the years 1995-96, circular made it clear that in view of the enormity of the problem an extension of the currency of the panel, eligible temporary employees who have been empanelled could not appear in the earlier interviews and have been pursuing their cases thereafter, "will be given another chance to appear for interview".

6. Workman submits that there were total five settlements. The settlement dated 17.11.87 is the 1st settlement (Ex M1), settlement dated 16.7.88 is 2nd settlement (Ex M2), settlement dated 27.10.88 is the 3rd settlement (Ex M3), then settlement dated 9.1.91 is 4th settlement and settlement dated 30.7.96 is 5th settlement (Ex M6). In between there is minutes of conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.95 marked as Ex M5. That due to all these settlements which were extended by subsequent settlements

thereby created reasonable expectations in the list of the selected candidates arose with that it's a question of time their appointments or services would be regularized in the services of the bank. The Workman was working with the bank on temporary basis was under the bonafide hope that sooner his services will be regularized with the bank. He is thereby closed all his options elsewhere. It is needless to point out that employing person to whom hope of employment in substantial terms was made is a facet of Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

7. Further Workman submits that the Government of India issued Circular No. F-3/3/104/87-IR, dated 16.8.1990. Under said circular the chief Executives of all public sector banks including the Management herein were specifically instructed that until the problem of existing temporary employees is fully resolved, no bank is permitted to make any permanent appointments. That some of the persons similarly situated like this Workman aggrieved by the inaction on the part of the management of the bank is not regularizing their services from out of the selected panel and not clearly focusing the vacancy position, filed W.P. No. 4194/97 before Hon'ble High court of A.P.. It is specifically averred in the said writ petition that the Management of the bank had failed to implement the settlement and that it violates the various fundamental rights guaranteed under the constitution of India. The Hon'ble High court of A.P .. by order dated 5.3.97 directed the bank to implement the settlement as amended from time to time. It also directed the bank to carry out the terms of settlement before the expiry of March, 1997. The Hon'ble High Court also recorded finding that the Bank cannot escape its liability of enforcement of the Settlement. In view of the directions given by the High Court all candidates whose names appeared in the select panels prepared on the basis of the agreement entered into on 17.11.87 under which the panel was valid upto December, 1991, and on the basis of a settlement dated 27.10.1988 whereby the panels were made alive upto 31.3.1997 under which the panel was valid upto December, 1999. The other agreement dated 16.7.1988 under which the panel was valid upto 1992 and on the basis of the settlement dated 27.10.1998 whereby the panels were made alive upto 31.3.1997 were under the bonafide impression that their cases will be considered for regularization and were living on the basis of the said reasonable expectation. Unfortunately, contrary to the aforesaid directions given by the High Court and contrary to the settlements entered into between the parties, the bank issued proceedings dated 25.3.1997, dated 27.3.1997 and 31.3.1997 instructing the various authorities of the Management not to continue the temporary employees those who are in services of the bank from 1.4.97. The said order was followed by the Management. Aggrieved by the said action the Workman herein and similarly situated candidates have filed a writ petition before the Hon'ble High Court and by way of Writ Petition No.9206/97 seeking a declaration that the proceedings issued by the Deputy General Manager and the Assistant General Manager (Respondents 3,4 and 5 therein) on 25.3.97, 27.3.97 and 31.3.97 as illegal and also non-continuance of the Workmen therein in service by absorbing them in the services of the bank as violative of Section 2(p) and 18(1) read with Rule 58 of Central Rules and sought for specific direction to the bank to absorb them in service.

8. Further, Workman submits that in the counter affidavit filed in Writ Petition No.9206/97, the bank has submitted that it has about 805 branches in Andhra Pradesh alone. It has stated that due to exigencies of circumstances and on account of the urgent need in its banks, it employed temporary employees in subordinate cadre. It is pertinent to mention that it does not state the urgent or need or the nature of temporary employees that it had engaged. Enquiry into the same would reveal that the stand taken by the bank either on the ground of urgent need or of temporary employees is a façade to perpetuate unfair labour practice. It is designed to on the one hand, keep the employed in the erroneous zone of hope and on the other to ensure that benefits that a model employer will extend under various statutes to its employees is not required to be borne out by the bank. A reading of the counter affidavit would show that the bank

would opines that being just fair and reasonable are which obviously is reprehensible and is a facet of unfair labour practice.

9. The Workman submits that the bank had referred in its counter affidavit to three settlements dated 17.11.87, 16.7.88 and 27.10.88. The bank in the guise of extending the benefits of the circular of Government dated 16.8.90 stated in its counter affidavit that as follows:

"Government of India, vide its letter dated 16.8.1990, issued guidelines to all the public sector banks with regard to recruitment and absorption of temporary employees in public sector banks. The said guidelines were issued to implement on the lines of the approach paper on the issue provided by a committee constituted in this regard. The Government of India guidelines made it clear that all the public sector banks may follow the provisions laid down in the approach paper.

The approach paper specified that the cases of temporary employees who had put in not less than 240 days of temporary service in 12 consecutive Months and who are entitled to benefit of Section 25-F may be decided by entering into a settlement with the representative union. In respect of temporary employees who had put in less than 240 days of service in 12 consecutive months or less, a settlement could be avoided and however if the Management so desired, they could enter into a conciliation settlement with the representative union. Para 6(h), it is mentioned that only those temporary employees who had put in temporary service of 90 or more days after 1.1 1982 would be eligible for considering under the scheme. Although the Government guidelines envisaged for a settlement in respect of employees who had put in temporary service of 90 or more days, the bank by way of further concession entered into settlements Even in respect of those who had put in less than 90 days. As such, it could be Seen that the settlements are more beneficial to the temporary employees concerned. The approach paper also specify at para 6(c) that the banks would provide one time opportunity to all the temporary employees and for that purpose temporary employees worked in the bank on or after 1.1.1982 could be considered for re-employment in terms of the scheme. The Respondents have gone further wherein even persons working after 1975 were also considered.

As could be seen from the above, there was a genuine effort on the part of the Respondent bank to provide permanent employment for as many as possible subject to availability of the vacancies.

It is further submitted that at para 6(k) of the approach paper, it was made clear that this would be one time exercise in full and final settlement of all the aims and disputes for the past period in respect of temporary workmen covered by the settlement. This would mean that the Government of India guidelines would cover only those persons who were temporarily employed for the period specified therein and not otherwise. As such, it is submitted that the Respondents have not only followed the Government of India guidelines but in fact covered cases of the employees who had worked for less than 90 days. As such, question of violation does not arise and in any case those were only broad guidelines and not directives".

10. The Workman submits that the bank also referred a subsequent settlement dated 9.1.1991 wherein there is a clause to the effect- that the panel of temporary employees and the panel of daily wage employees will be operated to a particular period. Therefore, their cases will not be considered. The Management herein relying upon this settlement in their impugned action. It is submitted that even the settlement dated 9.1.1991 will not empower the management to terminate the services of the temporary employees who are working in the bank services like the Workman herein as it does not specify the termination of the employees. In fact there are so many vacancies wherein the Management has engaged several new persons as temporary messengers/ attendars/ sweepers etc., even after the judgment of Hon’ble

High Court without considering the cases of the similarly situated candidates like the Workman herein. It is submitted inspite of engaging fresh candidates as is now being done by the Management they would have continued the similarly situated candidates like the Workman herein in the services of the bank and consider their cases for absorption in view of the circulars issued by Central Government as well as the directions of this Hon'ble Court in Writ Petition No.4194/97, dated 5.3.97. In view of the circulars issued by the Central Government, the Management should not have relied upon the settlement dated 9.1.1991. Hence, the impugned action of the Management is illegal, unjust, violative of fundamental rights such as Articles 14,16 and 21 of the Constitution of India.

11. The Workman submits that in W.P. No.4194/97 filed by the union of temporary employees where in they have complained about the non- implementation of the settlements arrived between the parties and sought for absorption. Such employees in the bank services on permanent basis before the date fixed for carrying out the terms of settlement, the Court held that the members of the union had been empanelled in the list, they were not regularized and the time was going to run out to the near future and the Respondent bank and its officers cannot escape from the liability of enforcing the settlement which has been reached and therefore directed that the bank and the officers shall implement the settlement dated 17.11.87 as amended from time to time before the expiry of 31.3.97.

12. Further, it is submitted that in the clause of Settlement it is specifically mentioned that the workmen to be absorbed/appointed in the bank prohibiting any temporary appointments subsequent to the date of settlement even the authorities want to make temporary appointments that should be made only from among the empanelled can be appointed either for temporary vacancy or permanent vacancy except from among the empanelled candidates like the Workman and that should be continued till they are absorbed. The management committed unfair labour practices and terminated the services of the candidates with effect from 1.4.1997 which is arbitrary, discriminatory, contrary to their own guidelines and violative of the constitutional provisions which are guaranteed in Chapter-III of the Constitution of India.

13. The Workman submits that it is strange as to how the panels were allowed to lapse by a so-called Memorandum of Understanding dated 25.2.1997, that the action of terminating such employees like the Workman by virtue of an impugned oral proceedings without implementing the settlement would be illegal and unfair labour practice which cannot be allowed to be perpetuated. That the discontinuance of the Workman after 31.3.97 who had served in the bank in any capacity amounts to retrenchment. It could not have been done without any notice and it violates Sec.25FF of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and the said action is violative of principles of natural justice guaranteed under Chapter III of the Constitution of India. This amounts to retrenchment without one month's notice and taken in view of such notice. Thus, the main proceedings issued by the Respondent is without jurisdiction and is arbitrary, illegal and therefore liable to be quashed. That the alleged Memorandum of Understanding dated 27.2.97, Ex.M5 does not own any legal entity, as the said Memorandum of Understanding is not published anywhere to brought to the notice of the Workman whose rights are being affected. It is submitted that Management did not adhere to the procedure envisaged by the Central Government in its' instructions dated 16.8.90 in the year 1995. The same was not followed in the year 1997 despite there being vacancies. The management has followed the procedure of calling candidates through Employment exchange instead of giving chance to the empanelled candidates like the Workman here. It is pertinent to mention here that the Respondent Management sent letters to the all similarly situated candidates like the Workman in the month of June, 1997, subsequent to the passing of impugned

termination orders. After knowing the facts that the candidates are litigating, the Management refused to engage these candidates. It is once again reiterated that the panels are meant for absorption but not for termination. It was the duty of the Management to engage the empanelled candidates like the Workman even in temporary vacancies till they are absorbed permanently in regular vacancies. Hence, the action of the Respondent Management terminating the services of the Workman by oral order dated 31.3.97 is unjust, illegal, violative of principles of natural justice and hence, the Management be directed to reinstate and absorb the Workman and to grant all incidental and consequential benefits.

14. Per contra, Respondent had filed counter and made a contentions that the reference is not tenable and contrary to the provisions of I.D. Act, 1947. Respondent submitted that to tide over severe sub-ordinate staff constraints which arose out of leave vacancies, exigencies, etc., and also owning to the restrictions imposed by the Government of India/Reserve Bank of India on intake of staff, the Respondent bank used to engage sub-ordinate staff like messengers, sweepers, sweeper cum water boys, etc., depending on the availability of work on purely temporary basis for the smooth and uninterrupted functioning of the branches. It is submitted that the All India State Bank of India Staff Federation which represents majority of the employees in the State Bank of India comprising about 98% of the work force as its' members espoused the cause of temporary employees who have put in less than 240 days of temporary service in 12 calendar months in the bank and who were ineligible for any protection under Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 to give a chance for being considered for absorption and permanent appointments.

15. Discussions were held and on 17.11.1987 an agreement was signed between the federation and the Management bank under Sec. 2(p) read with Sec 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules 1957. A copy of the said settlement dated 17.11.87 which may be herein after referred as first settlement is filed and 4 categories were made as it has already been mentioned in the claim statement above, it need not be repeated here. In the first settlement, it was agreed that the temporary employees as categorized would be given a chance for being considered for permanent appointment in the bank's service against the vacancies which are likely to arise during the period 1987 to 1991. On 16.7.88 second settlement was arrived between the Federation and the Bank whereby it was agreed to substitute the period of consideration of vacancies as 1987 to 1992 in place of 1987 to 1991 as contemplated under the first settlement dated 17.11.1987. This is the second settlement. A 3rd settlement was entered into on 27.10.88 and it was agreed that the bank's service against the vacancies likely to arise from 1988 to 1992 was to be considered. Government of India vide its letter dated 16.8.90 issued guidelines to all the public sector banks with regard to recruitment and absorption of temporary employees in public sector banks. The said guidelines were issued to implement on the lines of approach paper on the issue provided by a committee constituted in this regard. Government of India guidelines made it clear that all the public sector banks may follow the provisions laid down in the approach paper. The approach paper specified that the cases of temporary service in 12 consecutive months and who are entitled to benefit of Sec.25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 may be decided by entering into a settlement with the representative union. In respect of temporary employees who had put in less than 240 days of service in 12 consecutive months or less, a settlement could be avoided and however if the Management so desired they could enter into a conciliation settlement with the representative union. In para. 6(h) it is mentioned that only those temporary employees who had put in temporary service of 90 days or more days after 1.1.82 would be eligible for considering under the scheme. Although the Government guidelines envisaged for a settlement in respect of employees who had put in temporary service of 90 days or more days, the bank by way of a further concession entered into settlements. Even in respect of those who had put in less than 90 days and also the bank went a step further and said those persons who are working after

1975 were also considered. Hence, there was a genuine effort on the part of the Respondent bank to provide as many as possible jobs subject to the availability of the vacancies. However, para 6 (k) of the approach paper made it clear that it is a one time, exercise in full and final, settlement of all the claims and disputes for the past period, in respect of temporary workmen covered by the settlement. Another settlement was entered on 9.1.91 herein after referred as 4th settlement and the time limit was extended upto 1994 and separate panel was prepared for temporary employees, casual/daily wagers. It was agreed that while vacancies arising between 1988 to 1994 in respect of temporary employees and in respect of casual/daily wagers, they can be considered for the vacancies arising between 1995-96 only.

16. It is submitted that the administrative set up of the Hyderabad Local Head Office comprises of four Zonal Offices (Zones) at Hyderabad, Vijayawada, Visakhapatnam and Tirupathi covering all the Districts of Andhra Pradesh. In terms of the settlement the Management after following the procedure laid down therein prepared the panels of qualified candidates of temporary employees denoted as 1989 panel and also panel of casual/daily wagers denoted as 1992 panel for giving a chance for being considered for permanent absorption. These panels were prepared zone-wise separately for messengers and non-messengers in the descending order of temporary service put in by the candidates during the stipulated period i.e., 1.7.1975 to 31.7.1988. That the Federation approached the Regional Labour Commissioner(C) for implementation of bi-partite settlement in respect of absorption of temporary employees. The Regional Labour Commissioner(C) conducted conciliation proceedings and an agreement was arrived between the Federation and the bank. It was agreed that it would be kept alive upto March, 1997. A copy of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.2.1995 signed by the parties is filed as material paper. A settlement was arrived at and an agreement was signed between the Federation and the Management bank on 30.7.1996 under Sec.2 (p) read with Sec.18(1) of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957, which is hereinafter called as 5th settlement. That on 27.2.1997 a Memorandum of understanding was also signed by the federation's affiliate and the bank Management recording the fact that the exercise of identifying the messengerial vacancies as on 31.12.1994 has since been completed by Central Office and thereby 403 messengerial vacancies were sanctioned . It was agreed that these vacancies may be filled from 1989 panel of temporary employees after effecting conversion from full time non-messengerial staff in the usual manner and the agreement was reached accordingly. It was agreed between the Federation's affiliate and the Management bank that in terms of the settlement dated 30.7.1996 both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees would lapse on 31.3.1997. That as agreed upon vacancies were filled from the panels. The Workman who has put in an aggregate temporary service of less than 240 days in a continuous block of 12 months period during 1.7.1975 to 31.7.1988 has no right to seek a direction to consider his candidature for absorption in the Management bank under any rule/law except under the settlement entered into thereon.

17. Respondent contended that, in fact, the case of the Workman can be considered under all the five settlements having got his case considered under provisions of these settlements. All the other provisions and terms of the settlements are also binding on him/her. The Management bank has not violated any of the provisions of the terms of the said settlement. That the very preparation and maintenance of panel is in compliance of the terms agreed under these settlements. These settlements were time bound and they ceased to exist on 31.3.1997. That the bank has never promised that all the candidates in the panel will be absorbed. In the advertisement itself it was made clear that candidates will be considered for absorption in the vacancies that may arise upto 1992. Keeping alive the panels after 31.3.1997 is contrary to the settlements arrived between the State Bank of India Staff Federation and the Management bank. That the settlements are binding on the parties. The Workman is also bound under the terms of the said settlement.

The settlement does not suffer from any ambiguity as their language is very clear. The right under the settlements is to give them a chance to be considered for future appointment in the bank's services against the vacancies likely to arise. The settlements were effected to balance the expectations of the temporary employees to be absorbed in permanent service as against the constitutional rights for all eligible persons to be considered for employment every time a vacancy arises. That the alleged dispute including the demand for reinstatement has to be decided in this context. It is submitted that the period of panel list got expired on 31.3.97 and it is an integral term of the settlement and cannot be modified in any proceedings under the law. These temporary employees who unfortunately could not be accommodated for want of vacancies have no further rights to be considered for regularization. That the Hon'ble High Court in WP No.12964/94, held as follows, "It is needless to state that the settlement arrived at between the All India State Bank of India Staff Federation which, is the majority union and the bank Management is binding on the Workmen also. It is not at all the case of the Workman that any of the terms of the settlement has been violated by the bank's Management. If the Workman had worked in the bank on part-time basis before 31.5.94, that itself would not vest in him a right to claim that his services should be regularized on permanent basis against a full time cadre post. The claim put forth by the Workman in the present petition is therefore misconceived and not tenable. However, it is open to the Workman to claim any right which flows from the settlement between the union and the bank Management. As already pointed out that it is not the grievance of the Workman that some right which has flown from the settlement in favour of the Workman has been denied by the bank Management. Therefore, I do not find any ground, let alone substantial ground, to grant the kind of relief sought for by the Workman. Writ Petition fails and is accordingly dismissed. No costs."

18. Further, it is contended that if the panels were not lapsed at the end of designated period and allowed to be continued it would result in making the contracts of temporary employment indirectly permanent through back door entry, which would not only be contrary to the settlements but also to Articles 14 and 16 of Constitution of India and deprive the chances of original claimants who would Come through proper recruitment procedure. As their rights have been crystallized by operation of the settlements. Hence, there is no question of any Legitimate expectation being violated.

19. Similarly placed ex-employees filed WP No.9206/1995 and the batch before the Hon'ble High Court of A.P. and the learned Single Judge allowed the Writ Petitions. Aggrieved by the same WA No.86/98 and the batch was filed and the Division Bench set aside the order of the Single Judge. Thereafter the ex-temporary employees filed Special Leave Petition No.11886-11888 of 1998 before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India also dismissed the SLP. Therefore, reference to the Judgement of the Learned Single Judge in WP No.9206/97 is of no consequences as the same has already been set aside. The observations made in the Judgements cannot be relied upon for any purpose what so ever. The question of operation of Sec.25F would not come into play. Further the issue is covered by various Judgements of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India and various Hon'ble High Courts. Hence, the reference may be ordered that the Workman is not entitled for any relief.

20. In order to fortify his claim Workman has examined himself as WW1 and also filed documents in evidence which has been exhibited as Ex.W1 to W6. Further, the Workman has filed photocopies of documents in support of his claim which are discussed as under:-

Ex. W1 is the Notification. Ex. W2 is the call letter for interview. Ex. W3 is the panel list. Ex. W4 is the Service Certificate. Ex. W5 is the Service Certificate. Ex. W6 is the Circular letter dated 14.7.1999.

21. On the other hand, Respondent has examined witness MW1 Sri K. Bala Kotaiah and this witness has exhibited 12 documents, marked as Ex.M1 to M12. The details of these documents are as follows:-

Ex.M.1 is the Settlement dated 17.11.1987. Ex.M2 is the Settlement dated 16.7.1988. Ex.M3 is the Settlement dated 27.10.1988. Ex.M4 is the Settlement dated 9.1.1991. Ex.M5 is the Minutes of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.1995. Ex.M6 is the Settlement dated 30.7.1996. Ex.M7 is the Memorandum of Understanding dt. 27.2.1997. Ex.M8 is the Particulars of 1989 Messengerial Panel. Ex.M9 is the Particulars of 1989 Non-Messengerial Panel. Ex.M10 is the Particulars of 1992 General Attendant Panel. Ex.M11 is the Judgment of Hon'ble High Court of A.P. in Writ Appeal No.86/98 dt.1.5.1998. Ex.M12 is the Judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in SLP No. 11886-11888 of 1998 dt.10.8.1998.

22. Apart from afore mentioned documents, Learned Counsel for Workman has also filed a long list of various judgements of Hon'ble Supreme Court as well as Hon'ble High Court, which we will discuss at appropriate place in this Award.

23. Heard the argument of Learned Counsel for Workman as well as for Respondent.

24. On the basis of rival pleadings of both the parties and submissions made by the Learned Counsel for both the parties, following points arise for determination in the industrial dispute :-

I. Whether the 1st settlement dated 17.11.1987, 2nd settlement dated 16.7.1988, 3rd settlement dated 27.10.1988, 4th settlement dated 9.1.1991 and 5th settlement dated 30.7.1996 entered into between State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and also Memorandum of Understanding are binding upon both the parties?

II. Whether the action of State Bank of India, Salakam Cheruvu in terminating the services of Workman Sri M. Jayaram Reddy, a Messenger with effect from 31.3.1997 is justified?

III. Whether the Workman is entitled for absorption on permanent post in the Branch of Respondent management as per averments made by him in the claim statement?

IV. To what relief if any the Workman is entitled for?

Findings:-

25. Point No.I:- Undisputedly settlements dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988, 9.1.1991 and 30.7.1996, minutes of conciliation proceedings and memorandum of understanding dated 27.2.1997 were executed between the State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation under section 2(p) and 18 (1) of I.D. Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Disputes (Central Rules), 1957.

Section 2(p) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 as follows:-

(p) "settlement" means a settlement arrived at in the course of conciliation proceeding and includes a written agreement between the employer and workmen arrived at otherwise than in the course of conciliation proceeding where such agreement has been signed by the parties thereto in such manner as may be prescribed and a copy thereof has been sent to an officer authorised in this behalf by the appropriate Government and the conciliation officer;

Section 18(1) provides as follows:-

18. Persons on whom settlements and awards are binding.

- [(1) A settlement arrived at by agreement between the employer and Workman otherwise than in the course of conciliation proceeding shall be binding on the parties to the agreement.

Therefore, in view of the provision contained u/s.18 (1) I.D. Act, 1947, terms and conditions enumerated in the aforesaid settlements are binding on the parties to the agreement. The Learned Counsel for Workman has argued that the Workman after going through the selection procedure has successfully been listed in the panel for appointment on the permanent basis in the Respondent management and the empanelled list has to be valid till last person in the empanelled list is appointed on permanent basis. But the impugned order dated 25.3.97, 27.3.97 and 31.3.97, has been issued by Respondent management thereby the services of the Workman has been terminated and the said order is not in consonance of the terms of the agreement entered into between the parties. Further, Workman submits that the Respondent in the 5th settlement has mentioned the date i.e., 31.3.1997 for lapse of empanel list which is illegal and that is not binding upon the Workman. The condition of lapse of empanelment list on 31.3.97 incorporated in the aforesaid 5th settlement, is arbitrary and illegal.

26. The perusal of the impugned order dated 25.3.1997 goes to reveal that the Chief/Branch Manager, SBI Zonal Office has issued the letter to all the branches with regard to the subject not to make any temporary appointments in the Branch in messengerial category from 1.4.1997. The extract of the said letter is given below:-

"We have been advised by the Deputy General Manager, Zonal Office, Hyderabad that as both the panels of temporary employees of 1989 and daily wagers/casual labours of 1992 will lapse by 31.3.1997, it has been decided by Central Office not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial category from 1.4.1997."

Thus, from the contents of the aforesaid letter, it manifest that Head Office of State Bank of India vide letter dated 25.3.1997 has issued direction to all its branches not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial category from 1.4.1997 due to reason of lapse of both panels i.e., 1989 & 1992 on 31.3.1997 as per terms of settlements entered into by both parties. Further, the contents of the subsequent letter dated 27.3.1997 issued by Respondent Management is also direction to Branch Manager, State Bank of India not to make any temporary messengerial category appointment with effect from 1.4.1997 and it has also been communicated to all concerned that the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers maintained by Zonal offices stand lapsed from 31.1.1997. Further, office order dated 31.3.1997 has been issued by Respondent management that goes to reveal that the said office order has been issued to this effect that, "Consequent on absorption of temporary employees in permanent cadre, it has been decided by the competent authority that no one onwards, no further daily labour or temporary employees/appointments should be resorted to/engaged/employed." Therefore, it reflects from the contents of the aforesaid orders that the temporary appointment in messengerial category and daily labour has been stopped by the Respondent management with effect from 1.4.1997 because of the lapsed of panel of temporary workers and daily wagers by 31.3.1997. The agreement for lapse of both the panels on 31.3.1997 is contained in the 5th settlement which has been arrived at between the parties on dated 30.7.1996 with the consensus of both the parties. Therefore, Workman can not challenge the terms and conditions contained in settlement dated 30.7.1996 regarding lapse of panel on 31.3.1997 as agreed between State Bank of India and State

Bank of India Staff Federation. As per provision contained u/s.18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 the said Agreement dated 30.7.1996 is binding on both the parties.

In the case of **Allied Sales Corporation Secunderabad vs.The Authority Under Andhra Pradesh..... 1990 II LLJ 510 AP para 414, Hon'ble Court have held:-**

"*4. There was a settlement between the Management and the workmen under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act on 25th April 1983 under which the age of superannuation of the workmen was fixed at 55 years. The settlement was to be in force upto 30th June 1986 and the next settlement, incorporating practically the same terms, was again entered into on 4th February 1987 under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act. There is no dispute that these settlements are under Section 18(1).*

14. Now the Authority constituted under Section 41(1) of the Act is an authority with very limited jurisdiction. It can only decide in the first appeal whether a termination by the management is valid or not and is within the parameters of Section 40 of the Act. The said Authority, in our view, has absolutely no jurisdiction to decide whether a settlement entered into under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act between the representatives of the Workmen and of the Management, is vitiated by undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion on the part of the Management. The Authority, namely, the Assistant Commissioner of Labour, was never intended by the A.P. Legislature to have jurisdiction to go into the question of the validity of a settlement arrived at under Section 18 of the Industrial Disputes Act by an Industrial Court. That Parliament has, in fact, constituted Industrial Courts under the Industrial Disputes Act, with extensive powers cannot be disputed. What we mean to say is that the Authority under Section 41(1) of the A.P. Act has no jurisdiction what-so-ever either to question or to decide about the validity of any such settlements. If parties to a settlement have a grievance about the validity of a settlement, it is for them to agitate the matter before the appropriate forum and they cannot ask an Authority constituted under Section 41(1) of the A.P. Shops and Establishments Act, 1966 with limited jurisdiction, to go into any such question and, that too, incidentally while deciding whether retirement as per the contract of employment, is legal or not."

It is not the case of Workman that aforesaid settlements are vitiated by undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion on the part of the management. If the Workman feeling aggrieved by any terms of settlement/ agreement on the aforementioned grounds then he can challenge of settlement before a competent authority under the Act, 1947. But here in the instant matter it is not a case of Workman that aforementioned settlement has been entered into between the parties on the ground of undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion. Therefore, Workman is barred to raise any objection in respect of fixing the date of lapse of both panels on 31.3.1997 as agreed between both the parties and Workman can not challenge any terms of said Agreement.

Further in the case of **Herbertsons Limited Vs. Workmen of Herbertsons Limited and Ors, 1977 AIR 322,** Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

The Tribunal thought that the question of the quantum of membership of the 2nd Respondent did not call for a finding at all in view of 1his Court's order. As observed above that was not a correct assumption. On the other hand, we feel that this view of the Tribunal has led it to approach the matter in an entirely erroneous manner. The Tribunal is, rightly enough, conscious that under section 18 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act the settlement was binding on the company and the members of the 3rd Respondent union. Even so, the Tribunal devoted nearly half of its order in scanning the evidence given by the company and Respondent No. 3 to find out whether the terms of the settlement had been explained by the President of the

union to the workmen or not and whether the workers voluntarily accepted the settlement knowing all the "consequences". This to our mind is again an entirely wrong approach.

"When a recognised union negotiates with an employer the workers as individuals do not come into the picture. It is not necessary that each individual worker should know the implications of the settlement since a recognised union, which is expected to protect the legitimate interests of labour, enters into a settlement in the best interests of labour. This would be the normal rule. We cannot altogether rule out exceptional cases where there may be allegations of mala fides, fraud or even corruption or other induce- ments. Nothing of that kind has been suggested against the President of the 3rd Respondent in this case. That being the position, prima facie, this is a settlement in the course of collective bargaining and, therefore, is entitled to due weight and consideration.

It is not possible to scan the settlement in bits and pieces and hold some parts good and acceptable and others bad. Unless it can be demonstrated that the objectionable portion is such that it completely outweighs all the other advantages gained the Court will be slow to hold a settle- ment as unfair and unjust. The settlement has to be accepted or rejected as a whole and we are unable to reject it as a whole as unfair or unjust. Even before this Court the 3rd Respondent representing admittedly the large majority of the workmen has stood by this settlement and that is a strong factor which it is difficult to ignore. As stated elsewhere in the judgment, we cannot also be oblivious of the fact that all workmen of the company have accepted the settlement. Besides, the period of settlement has since expired and we are informed that the employer and the 3rd Respondent are negotiating another settlement with further improvements. These factors, apart from what has been stated above, and the need for industrial peace and harmony when a union backed by a large majority of workmen has accepted a settlement in the course of collective bargaining have impelled us not to interfere with this settlement. That being the position, we unhold the settlement as fair and just and order that the award of the Tribunal shall be substituted by the settlement dated October 18, 1973. The said settlement shall be the substituted award. The appeal is disposed of accordingly. There will be no order as to costs."

Therefore, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above, the contention of the Workman that the date fixed for lapse of empanelled list on 31.3.1997 for appointment to the permanent post vide 5th Settlement dated 30.7.1996 is arbitrary, illegal is not untenable. The recognized union of Workmen has negotiated with the Respondent Bank Management representing large number of Workmen and the Workman as individual do not come into picture. Workman in the instant case has work as temporary Workmen in the Respondent Branch and in response of Notification he had applied for inclusion of his name in the panel and he was selected for inclusion his name in the panel list to be utilized for absorption of such Workman to permanent post in order of their seniority in the list. The Settlement dated 30.7.1996 between State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation under Sec.2(p) and Sec.18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 has clearly provided as regard non-messengerial position and it is agreed that all such posts sanctioned fallen vacant upto 31.3.1997 shall be filled before empanel list is allowed to lapse. Thus, in view of law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, in the instant case, Agreement dated 30.7.1996 was entered into between both the parties in respect of lapsing of the both the panels on 31.3.1997 and absorption of the Workmen from panel list was subject to availability of vacancy of post likely to arise upto 31.3.1997, have a binding force on Workman as well as management of State Bank of India in view of provision contained under section 18 (1) of I.D. Act, 1947.

Thus, Point No.I is answered against the Workman and in favour of the Respondent.

27. **Point No.II**:- Firstly, it is submitted on behalf of the Workman that the Respondent has terminated his services by oral order on 31.3.1997 without issuing any notice or paying any salary or compensation in lieu thereof. Therefore, the termination order of the Workman from service is in violation of provision contained Under Section 25 F of I.D. Act, 1947. Therefore, the order is liable to be set aside.

28. On the other hand, Respondent counsel contended that Workman has not worked for 240 days in any preceding calendar year. Therefore, reference of the industrial dispute is not relevant. In this context, the Workman has examined himself as WW1 who has reiterated that Workman has been terminated from service by Respondent on 31.3.1997 without notice of salary or compensation in lieu thereof. Before examining the claim of the Workman on merit it would be apposite to reproduce the provision contained under section 25 F:-

Section 25F provides:-

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].

Compensation to workmen in case of transfer of undertakings.

Section 25B defines the term continuous service which provides

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 authorized 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;

In order to prove the fact of 240 days of service within 12 months of a calendar year just preceding from the date of termination, the initial burden of proof lies upon the Workman and the Workman has to prove this factum by adducing his oral as well as documentary evidence in support of his claim.

Further, how to calculate 240 days of service by the Workman in a calendar year. In this context the reference of decisions of Hon'ble Supreme Court is relevant and the same are discussed below:-

In Rajasthan State Ganganagar S. Mills Ltd. v. State of Rajasthan and Anr. (2004) Apex Court held:

"It was the case of the Workman that he had worked for more than 240 days in the year concerned. This claim was denied by the appellant. It was for the claimant to lead evidence to show that he had worked for 240 days in the year preceding the date of his termination. He has filed an affidavit. It is statement which is in his favor and that cannot be regarded as sufficient evidence for any Court or Tribunal to come to the conclusion that in fact the claimant had worked for 240 days in a year These aspects were highlighted in Range Forest Officer v. S.T. Hadimani (2002 (3) SCC 25. No proof of receipt of salary or wages for 240 days or order or record in that regard was produced. Mere non-production of the muster roll for a particular period was not sufficient for the Labour Court held that the Workman had worked for 240 days as claimed."

In Municipal Corporation, Faridabad v. Siri Niwas (2004 (8) SCC 195), held "*the burden was on the Workman to show that he was working for more than 240 days in the preceding one year prior to his alleged retrenchment." In M.P. Electricity Board v. Hariram (2004 (8) SCC 246) the position was again reiterated in paragraph 11 as follows: "The above burden having not been discharged and the Labour Court having held so, in our opinion, the Industrial Court and the High Court erred in basing an order of reinstatement solely on an adverse inference drawn erroneously* .."

In the case of Manager, RBI, Bangalore vs. S Mani (2005) SCC Page 100, the 3 Judges Bench of the Apex Court held that "*the initial burden of proof was on the Workman to show that he had completed 240 days of service."*

Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of Mohan Lal vs Management BEL 1981 SCC page 225 has laid down the principle that how to count 240 days of service within one year it is held: *"Clause (2)(a) provides for a fiction to treat a Workman in continuous service for a period of one year despite the fact that he has not rendered uninterrupted service for a period of one year but he has rendered period of 240 days during the period of 12 calendar service for months counting backwards and just preceding the relevant date being the date of retrenchment. In other words, in order to invoke the fiction enacted in clause (2)(a) it is necessary to determine first the relevant date, ie the date of termination of service which is complained of as retrenchment. After that date is ascertained. move backward to a period of 12 months just preceding the date of retrenchment and then ascertain whether within the period of 12 months, the Workman has rendered service for a period of 240 days. If these three facts are affirmatively answered in favor of the Workman pursuant to the deeming fiction enacted in clause (2)(a) it will have to be assumed that the Workman is in continuous service for a period of one year and he will satisfy the eligibility qualification enacted in Section 25-F"*

"14. We have already extracted section 25B since its amendment and the change in language is the legislative exposition of which note must be taken. In fact, we need not further dilate upon this aspect because in Surendra Kumar Verma and Ors. v. Central Government Industrial-cum-Labour Court, New Delhi and Anr., Chinnappa Reddy. J., after noticing the amendment and referring to the decision in Sur Enamel and Stamping Works (P) Ltd case, held as under:

"These changes brought about by Act 36 of 1964 appear to be clearly designed to provide that a Workman who has actually worked under the employer for not less than 240 days during a period of twelve months shall be deemed to have been in continuous service for a period of one year whether or not he has in fact

been in such continuous service for a period of one year. It is enough that he has worked for 240 days in a period of 12 months, it is not necessary that he should have been in the service of the employer for one whole year."

In a concurring judgment Pathak J. agreed with this interpretation of section 25B(2). Therefore, both on principle and on precedent it must be held that section 25B(2) comprehends a situation where a Workman is not in employment for a period of 12 calendar months, but has rendered service for a period of 240 days within the period of 12 calendar months commencing and counting backwards from the relevant date, i.e. the date of retrenchment. If he has, he would be deemed to be in continuous service for a period of one year for the purpose of section 25B and Chapter VA."

Thus, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above the initial burden of proof lies upon the Workman to show that he has completed 240 days of the service with the Respondent just preceding from the date of his termination. Further, in respect of the employment of calculating the 240 days service provision contained Under of Section 25-F read with Section 25-B of the I.D. Act, 1947.

29. Now, in view of the provision contained under Section 25 F and law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, we have to examine whether the Workman has discharged his initial burden of proof in respect of his claim of 240 days continuous service in a calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination i.e., 31.3.1997.

In this context, WW1 in his cross examination has stated that,

"I was not sponsored by any Employment Exchange for appointment in the Bank. I did not undergo the regular process of selection required for appointment in the Bank."

"I did not work for 240 days in any year in my entire service in the bank."

Thus, it is clear from the testimony of WW1 that the Workman had not worked for 240 days continuously in any 12 months of a calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination in the Respondent bank. Therefore, Workman failed to establish his plea by his oral and documentary evidence that he had worked for 240 days continuously in calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination i.e., 31.3.1997. Thus, the claim of the Workman that he has been terminated by oral order without issuing notice or payment in lieu after termination, in contravention of Section 25 F of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is not tenable. However the documents filed by the Workman in support of his claim, number of days worked with the Respondent goes to reveal that the Workman had worked intermittently as daily wager depending upon availability of work in branch. Workman did not file any document of appointment letter or salary slips in support of his claim for appointment as a non-messenger in the Respondent branch on temporary basis.

30. Per contra, the Learned Counsel for Respondent has submitted the allegation of Workman that he was terminated from services is not correct. As the vacancies were filled up on regular basis in order of their respective seniority the non-engagement of the Workman does not amount to termination. Further, Respondent contended that no law provide that even though there is no work temporary employee should be continued in the bank work as the very engagement of Workman was subject to availability of work. Therefore, the allegation that the bank has indulged in unfair labour practice is incorrect.

31. Thus, in view of the fore gone discussion and contentions made by the Respondent, I find the force in the argument advanced by the Respondent that in the instant matter, Workman was not terminated from service by order dated 31.3.1997 rather he was disengaged in view of the non-availability of the

work in the branch. Further, there was direction issued by the Head Office of the Respondent authority not to engage any daily wager Workman/ temporary Worker w.e.f. 1.4.1997. Thus, such disengagement of Workman does not amount to termination. Moreover, the Workman failed to prove his claim that he was terminated in contravention of provision of Sec.25F of the I.D. Act, 1947 as he failed to establish his plea by any oral or documentary evidence that he had worked for 240 days continuously in a twelve months of calendar year just preceding from date of termination i.e., 31.3.1997.

32. Further, perusal of the order dated 25.3.1997 goes to reveal that the Chief Branch Manager, State Bank of India has issued the letter to Zonal Office with direction to all its branches to this effect that they have been advised by the DGM, Zonal Office, Hyderabad that as both the panel of temporary employees of 1989 and daily wagers/casual labour of 1992 will lapse on 31.3.1997 it has been decided by central office not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial cadre from 1.4.1997, therefore it was directed to issue suitable instructions not to make temporary appointments from 1.4.1997. There is no mention in this order that the Workman herein has been terminated from service by this order.

33. Further, the circular dated 27.3.1997 was issued by DGM, SBI to all branches in commercial network in respect of the non-appointment of temporary employees in subordinate cadre and it has directed not to make any temporary employment in the subordinate cadre with effect from 1.4.97 and further, it has directed to ensure that no temporary/casual/daily basis appointment of the petty cash. Further, it is directed to all Branch Managers that any deviation in this regard will be viewed seriously. Thus, these circulars do not reflect that the Workman has been terminated from service by this order.

34. Similarly, office order dated 31.3.1997 is simply a direction to all branches of the Respondent bank by DGM that no further daily labour should be engaged or employed. Therefore, the plea of the Workman that he has been terminated by the aforesaid order dated 25.3.1997, 27.3.1997 and 31.3.1997 from the service by the Respondent is not acceptable. The evidence adduced by the Workman clearly goes to reveal that he had worked as a daily wager for which he has been paid wages according to number of working days. As there was an order for prohibition for engaging temporary workmen, in the bank, therefore, Workman could not be engaged by the Respondent for work from 1.4.1997 and there after. It is settled law that the daily wagers are engaged by the employer depending upon the availability of work and as the work was not available the Workman was not engaged further by the Respondent management. Therefore, the Workman on the ground of number of days he had worked in the Respondent bank cannot claim any right to reinstate him into the employment. As the Workman failed to prove the mandatory condition of 240 days of continuous service as required under Sec.25F of I.D. Act, 1947. Therefore, the disengagement of Workman from work can not be termed in contravention of provision contained under Sec.25F and 25 B of the I.D. Act, 1947.

Thus, this point is answered against the Workman and in favour of Respondent.

35. **Point No.III**:- In this context, the Workman has contended that the management failed to implement the selected panels during its valid tenure. The management adopted the back door methods contrary to the settlements and filled up the vacancies. The same is evident from the proceedings dated 18.11.1993 a copy of the same is filed in the material papers and the same may be read as part of the claim statement. Further, it is submitted that management has to adhere the procedure issued by the Central Government, the instructions dated 16.8.1990 in the year 1995, but same was not followed in the year 1997 despite there being vacancies. The management has followed the procedure of calling candidates through employment exchange instead of giving chance to the empanelled candidates like the Workman herein. The management sent call letters to the similarly situated candidates like the Workman in the month of

June 1997 subsequent to issuance of impugned termination orders. After knowing the fact that they are litigating the issue by way of dispute, the management has refused to engage those candidates, the copies of call letters issued are filed herein along with claim petition. The Workman herein reiterates that the panels are meant for absorption but not for termination. In view of the same a duty is cast upon the Respondent management to engage the empanelled candidates like the Workman herein even in temporary vacancies till they are absorbed permanently in regular vacancies.

36. On the other hand, Respondent has contended that the Federation approached Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) for implementation of bipartite settlement in respect of the absorption of temporary employees. The Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) conducted conciliation proceedings and agreement was arrived at between the Federation and the Management bank. It is submitted that it was agreed between the Federation and the Management that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers /casual labour would be kept alive upto March, 1997 and the vacancies as agreed to under the afore set out settlements will be filled from both the lists concurrently. A copy of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.1995 signed by the parties to the dispute is filed as a material paper. Further, it is submitted that the settlement was arrived at and an agreement was signed between the Federation and the Management bank on 30.7.1996 under Section 2(p) read with Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules 1957 which is binding on the parties. A copy of this agreement which hereinafter may be referred to as 5th settlement for brevity, is also filed as a material paper. The 5th settlement dated 30.7.1996 whereunder the earlier four settlements dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988 and 9.1.1991 were also referred, it was agreed to, by the Federation and the Management bank that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees will be kept alive upto March, 1997 for filling the vacancies existing/arrived at as on 31.12.1994 as per the norms agreed to between the bank and Federation and that thereafter the said panels would lapse. It was also agreed that within the framework of the above settlements the modalities about drawing names from either the panel of temporary employees or the panel of daily wagers and casual labour would be decided administratively on circle to circle basis depending upon the local requirements in consultation with the Federation's affiliate by the Circle management. It was further agreed that all messenger real vacancies/positions in the subordinate cadre including part-time attendants specifically provided as leave reserve will be filled by the end of 31.3.1997. Further, Respondent contended that on 27.2.1997 a memorandum of understanding was also signed between the Federation's affiliate and the bank management regarding the fact that the exercise of identifying the messengerial vacancies as on 31.12.1994 has since been completed by central office and thereby 403 messengerial vacancies were sanctioned to the circle of the Management bank and it was agreed that these vacancies may be filled from 1989 panel of temporary employees after effecting conversion from full time non-messengerial staff in the usual manner and the agreement was reached upon. Further, it was agreed between the Federations affiliate and the management bank that in terms of the settlement dated 30.7.1996 both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers /casual employees would lapse on 31.3.1997.

37. The Workman has contended that the empanelled list prepared by the Respondent management for appointment of temporary and daily wage Workers to the permanent post cannot lapse unless until it is exhausted by appointing all the empanelled persons and it should continue even after 31.3.1997, i.e., the date fixed for the lapse of panel. It is undisputed that the date of lapse of empanelled list of Workmen has been fixed to 31.3.1997 as mentioned in the settlement dated 30.7.1996, and agreed between the parties. It is settled law that and once the life of panel list lapses on the date as agreed between the parties it cannot be extended beyond that date. In the instant case the panel list of the workmen was valid upto 31.3.1997 in view of the terms and conditions enumerated in the 5th Settlement entered into between the parties. As

the lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997 has been agreed by State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation through 5th Settlement, the Workman is not competent to challenge the same.

In this context I would like to take reference of the decision of the apex court in the case of **Syndicate Bank and Ors vs. Shankar Paul and Ors , AIR 1997 SC 3091, therein the Hon'ble Apex Court** have held:-

"Till 1982, the branches of the appellant Bank in Calcutta region were recruiting persons locally to work as temporary attenders in leave vacancies. In view of the revised procedure prescribed by the Government of India in respect of such temporary appointments, the Calcutta regional office of the appellant Bank issued a circular to all of its branches on 14.8.1982, instructing all the branches under it to discontinue the old practice from 1.6.1982 and appoint only empanelled candidates. The regional office was to prepare a panel of eligible candidates, after calling names from the local/district employment exchange, and split it up branch-wise. Following that new procedure yearly panels were prepared thereafter. Names of the Respondents were for the first time included in the panel prepared for the period 7.2.1987 to 6.2.1988. By its letter dated 7.2.1987 the Bank had informed the Respondents that the panel was valid for one year only and that inclusion of their names in the panel was not to confer on them any right to seek permanent appointment in the service of the bank. Considering the object with which the panel was prepared and the fact that it was an yearly panel expiring on 6.2.1988, we are of the opinion that the Respondents did not get any right, because of inclusion of their names in the said panel, for permanent absorption in the service of the Bank. Whatever conditional right they had came to an end with the expiry of the panel. The claim of the Respondents, as contained in the writ petition was thus misconceived and therefore the learned single Judge and the Division Bench, when it first decided the appeal, were right in dismissing the writ petition and the appeal respectively."

Thus, in view of the above law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court and in view of the terms and conditions of the 5th Settlement the contention of the Workman that empanelled list should continue even after 31.3.1997 till the last Workman in the panel is absorbed is not tenable. The contention of the Workman is baseless in view of recital in the settlement. Therefore, in view of the fore gone discussion and finding given at Point No. I regarding binding nature of Settlements and terms and conditions enumerated therein, in view of the provision contained u/s.18(1) of the I.D. Act, 1947, I am of the considered view that life of panels lapsed on 31.3.1997 in view of terms of settlement dated 30.7.1996 and plea of Workman that the panel shall continue even after 31.3.1997 till last man absorbed has no legal force and same is untenable.

38. Undisputedly, settlement agreement dated 30.7.1996 was executed between the State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation and in that settlement it was agreed that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/ casual employees will be used for filling vacancies existing as on 31.12.1994 as per the norms agreed between the bank and the Federation. These empanelled workmen were to be given a chance for permanent appointment in the bank against vacancies arising up to December 1994 whereas the daily wagers/ casual employees were to be considered against the vacancies arise from January 1995 to December 1996, whereby the said panel would lapse. It was agreed that the vacancies falls upto 31.3.1997 shall be filled before the empanelled list is allowed to lapse. Thus, the claim of the Workman to the post of permanent non-messenger in the Respondent management was subject to the availability of the sanctioned post and vacancies arising upto 31.3.1997. The workmen given chance to the permanent post were seniors in number of working days in panel list and Workman herein was junior

to those workmen. Therefore, Workman could not be given absorption to permanent post being junior to other workmen in the panel list.

39. In this context the Workman witness WW1 was cross examined by the Respondent counsel and in the cross examination the witness WW1 states:-

" I made an application in response to an advertisement issued by the Bank in terms of settlement entered between the Bank and the Union. Further Witness states, "It is true that the panels were prepared on the basis of the number of days of service of the temporary employees and some of the temporary employees who were included in the panels were given regular appointment as per the settlement in order of their seniority in the panel." Further, witness states that, "I am not having any proof to show that any of my juniors are continuing in service in the bank."

Thus, from the above statement of the Workman witness WW1 it is clear that the panel was prepared in terms of various settlements entered into between Staff Federation of State Bank of India and State Bank of India and it was prepared on the basis of number of days of work put in by the temporary employees. Further, the Workman himself admitted that some of the temporary employees whose names were included in the panel were given regular appointment in the bank in order of their seniority in the panel and he is not having any document to show that any person who worked for less number of days than the Workman was given appointment in the bank. Therefore, the allegation of the Workman that the regular appointment has been made by the bank from the panel list in breach of the terms of the settlement and violation of seniority of panel list is not proved by this evidence of WW1. Thus, there is no evidence on record that bank has given the appointment to the temporary employees as well as daily wagers from the panel list 1989 and 1992 in breach of seniority of the temporary employees in the list. There is no evidence of jumbling in the panel list to make appointment of any permanent Workman in breach of the seniority. Therefore, I am constrained to hold that the Respondent Management has appointed the workmen from panel list in order of seniority and there is no jumbling of workmen in the panel list before it got lapsed on 31.3.1997.

40. However, Workman has taken the plea that the panels of Workmen for absorption in the employment of the Respondent banks (panels of temporary employees and daily wagers) has been lapsed on 31.3.1997 in contravention of terms of settlement as the object of preparing the entire empanelment of temporary and daily wagers was to provide them permanent employment and till the both the panel lists exhausted the panel list cannot be lapsed on 31.3.1997 and the date of lapsing of the panel on 31.3.1997 has been fixed by the Respondent arbitrarily without any authority.

41. In this context, the perusal of Settlement dated 30.7.1996 reveals that the 5th Settlement dated 30.7.1996 was entered under Section 2(p) and 18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Dispute (Central) Rules 1957. This settlement has been entered into by the competent parties and in this settlement parties thereto agreed that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees will lapse on 31.3.1997. Thus the date of lapse of panel was fixed by both the parties with consensus under the settlement dated 30.7.1996 and same is binding upon the Workman under the provision of Section 18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947. Moreover, this issue of binding force of the settlement dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988 and 9.1.1991 has already been discussed, decided at finding in Point No.I of this award. However, the legality and validity of the aforementioned settlement has not been challenged by the Workman before any competent forum. Thus, claim of Workman that the date of lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997 has been fixed arbitrarily by the Respondent bank is untenable. As regard the claim

of Workman for his absorption to the permanent post it is settled law that the Workman can not claim his regularization to permanent post merely on the basis of number of working days.

42. In this context the reference of the decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Oil and Natural Gas Corporation vs Krishan Gopal 2020(3) SCALE 272, date of decision 7.2.2020** is relevant therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have has laid down principle regarding regularization of the Workman on permanent posts. Hon'ble Supreme Court have laid down the prepositions of regularization of the workmen to permanent post is as under:-

"*(i) Wide as they are, the powers of the Labour Court and the Industrial Court cannot extend to a direction to order regularisation, where such a direction would in the context of public employment offend the provisions contained in Article 14 of the Constitution;*

(ii) The statutory power of the Labour Court or Industrial Court to grant relief to workmen including the status of permanency continues to exist in circumstances where the employer has indulged in an unfair labour practice by not filling up permanent posts even though such posts are available and by continuing to employ workmen as temporary or daily wage employees despite their performing the same work as regular workmen on lower wages;

(iii) The power to create permanent or sanctioned posts lies outside the judicial domain and where no posts are available, a direction to grant regularisation would be impermissible merely on the basis of the number of years of service;

(iv) Where an employer has regularised similarly situated workmen either in a scheme or otherwise, it would be open to workmen who have been deprived of the same benefit at par with the workmen who have been regularised to make a complaint before the Labour or Industrial Court, since the deprivation of the benefit would amount to a violation of Article 14; and

(v) In order to constitute an unfair labour practice under Section 2(ra) read with Item 10 of the Vth Schedule of the ID Act, the employer should be engaging workmen as badlis, temporaries or casuals, and continuing them for years, with the object of depriving them of the benefits payable to permanent workmen.

Thus, in view of the principles laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court as discussed above, in the instant matter the Workman utterly failed to prove his claim by adducing any documentary or oral evidence that the employer has indulged in unfair labour practice by not filling the permanent posts even though such posts are available and by continuing to employ workmen as temporary or daily wage employees despite their performance was the same work, as regular workmen on lower wages.

43. Respondent has contended that all the vacancies exist and arise upto 31.3.1997 has been filled up from the panel list in order of seniority and no vacancy exists or arises as on 31.3.1997 remained unfilled. Further, it is contended that as per terms of settlement the life of panel lists has been lapsed on 31.3.1997, hence, there is no occasion to extend the life of panel lists beyond 31.3.1997. However, the workman failed to prove contrary by any evidence to the aforesaid contention of the Respondent that the vacancies were existing as on 31.3.1997 and the workman was not given absorption to the permanent post in order of his seniority. It is settled law that the power to create permanent or sanctioned post lies outside the judicial domain and where no posts are available, a direction to grant regularization would be impermissible merely on the basis of the number of years of service. Therefore, the claim of the workman on this ground also not acceptable.

44. Further, as per the of settlement, panel was prepared for absorption of the workmen on the permanent posts has already been lapsed on 31.3.1997 and the vacancies existing and arising upto 31.12.1994 and upto 31.3.1997 as settlement dated 30.7.1996 has been filled up from the panel by appointing the workmen as per seniority in the panel list. Workman witness WW1 in his cross examination has himself admitted this fact that, some of the temporary employees whose names were included in the panel were given regular appointment in the bank in order of their seniority in the panel. The Workman failed to show that there was any breach of terms of settlement has been committed by the Respondent in appointment to permanent post from aforesaid panel list.

45. As discussed in preceding paragraph of this Award, the life of the panel has not been extended beyond 31.3.1997, by any further settlement hence, the panel list in which name of the Workman was included got expired on 31.3.1997. It is not the case of the Workman that Respondent has regularized similarly situated workmen either in the scheme or otherwise and the Workman has been deprived of same benefit on par with those workmen or the vacancies remained unfilled on the date of lapse of panels i.e., 31.3.1997, Industrial Tribunal has no jurisdiction to extend the date of lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997. This Tribunal can not order for regularization of workmen to the permanent post in contravention of the provision of Article 14 of the Constitution of India.

In the case of **Mahboob Deepak vs. Nagar Panchayat Gajraula & Anr, Civil Appeal No.5875/2007 date of judgement 13.12.2007,** Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

"8. Respondent is a Local Authority. The terms and conditions of employment of the employees are governed by a statute and statutory rules. No appointment can be made by a Local Authority without following the provisions of the recruitment rules. Any appointment made in violation of the said rules as also the constitutional scheme of equality as contained in Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India would be a nullity.

9. Due to some exigency of work, although recruitment on daily wages or on an ad hoc basis was permissible, but by reason thereof an employee cannot claim any right to be permanently absorbed in service or made permanent in absence of any statute or statutory rules. Merely because an employee has completed 240 days of work in a year preceding the date of retrenchment, the same would not mean that his services were liable to be regularized."

Therefore, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, the claim of the Workman for absorption merely on the basis of number of day of work in the Respondent bank Branch is not acceptable. As regard plea of the Workman that the Workman should have been given employment even after 31.3.1997 as temporary Workman, it is the discretion of Respondent to engage the Workman depending upon availability of work and this Tribunal can not direct the Respondent to engage the Workman in the absent of such rule/scheme.

46. In view of principle laid down by Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above, in the instant matter Workman utterly failed to establish the fact of rendering continuous service for a period of 240 days of service within a period of 12 calendar months commencing and coming backward from relevant date i.e., the date of retrenchment, if has he would be denied to be in continuous service for a period of one year. Therefore, the provision contained under Sec.25F of retrenchment is not applicable to Workman.

Counsel for Workman has relied upon number of decisions of Hon'ble High Court and Hon'ble Supreme Court and few of them are discussed herein:-

In the case of **F.C.I., vs. Kamdhenu Cattle Feed Industries 1993 (1) SCC 71,** therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

"7. In contractual sphere as in all other State actions, the State and all its instrumentalities have to conform to Article 14 of the Constitution of which non-arbitrariness is a significant facet. There is no unfettered discretion in public law: A public authority possesses powers only to use them for public good. This impose the duty to act fairly and to adopt a procedure which is `fairplay in action'. Due observance of this obligation as a part of good administration raises a reasonable or legitimate expectation in every citizen to be treated fairly in his interaction with the State and its instrumentalities, with this element forming a necessary component of the decision making process in all State actions. To satisfy this requirement of non- arbitrariness in a State action, it is, therefore, necessary to consider and give due weight to the reasonable or legitimate expectations of the persons likely lo be affected by the decision or else that unfairness in the exercise of the power may amount to an abuse or excess of power apart from affecting the bona fides of the decision in a given case. The decision so made would be exposed to challenge on the ground of arbitrariness. Rule of law does not completely eliminate discretion in the exercise of power, as it is unrealistic, but providers for control of its exercise by judicial review."

In the case of **State Bank of India, R.O., Vijayawada vs. Industrial Tribunal, Hyderabad WP No.193/1997,** therein Hon'ble High Court have held,

"*Sri Krovvidi Narasimham, the learned counsel for the 2nd respondent contends, supporting the award that it was a permanent vacancy and even though the 2nd respondent was appointed on temporary basis, his services were not liable to be terminated and he was to be regularised into service on permanent basis. Shastry award warrants that no temporary appointment can be made to a permanent post. But the matter is now covered by two division bench judgements dated 28.11.1986 in W.A. No.791 of 1986 and 25.8.1987 in W.A. No.270 of 1982. The ratio decided in the two judgements is to the effect that there cannot be any mandate to appoint employees on permanent basis when the requirement was for appointment on temporary basis. But it is held in the said judgements that when a temporary appointee is ousted from service and not for misconduct and, if again temporary appointment is to be made, then, the case of such temporary appointee who was ousted, has got to be considered in accordance with Sec. 25-H of the Act."*

In the case of **State of Haryana and others vs. Piara Singh and others. 1992 (4) SCC 118,** therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

" 49. If for any reason an adhoc or temporary employee is continued for a fairly long spell, the authorities must consider his case for regularization provided he is eligible and qualified according to the rules and his service record is satisfactory and his appointment does not run counter to the reservation policy of the state."

In the above cited judgements by the Workman the facts of the case are different hence do not apply to instant case of Workman.

47. On the other hand, in support of his contention Respondent has examined witness MW1 and MW1 in chief examination states that, Settlements i.e., on 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988, 9.1.1991 were entered into between the SBI and SBI Staff Federation for filling up of the vacancies that arise up to 1994 for those temporary employees who has worked on scale wages. Further, MW1 states that two different panels for messengers and non-messengers as per the eligibility criteria prescribed by the bank. There are four modules in Andhra Pradesh and they are Hyderabad, Tirupathi, Vijayawada and

Visakhapatnam. MW1 states that the temporary employees so empanelled were given permanent absorption depending upon the vacancies so arise strictly in terms of the settlement. MW1 states that on 9.6.1995 conciliation proceeding was held before the RLC(C), Hyderabad and in said proceedings it was decided that the panels will be kept live up to 31.3.1997 and vacancies will be filled from both the lists concurrently. A copy of the said minutes of proceedings is Ex.M5. Further, MW1 states that on 30.7.1996 another settlement was entered between the SBI and All India SBI Staff Federation providing for filling up of the vacancies arising up to December 1994 in respect of subordinate cadre and daily wage /casual wage employees out of panel so prepared were to be considered against vacancies arising from January 1995 to December 1996, thereafter the said panels lapse. MW1 states that it was also agreed that all the non-messenger positions in subordinate cadre including part time attendants specially provided as leave reserve will be filled before 31.3.1997 and as regards to non-messengerial positions it is agreed that all such posts sanctioned and fallen vacant up to 31.3.1997 shall be filled before the empanelled list is allowed to lapse. Thus in both the cases empanelled list were lapsed on 1.4.1997. Ex.M6 is the copy of the settlement dated 30.7.1996. Further, witness states that on 27.2.1997 a memorandum of understanding was reached between the SBI and SBI Staff Federation providing that both the panels above mentioned will lapse on 31.3.1997. Ex.M7 is the copy of the memorandum of understanding and Ex.M8 is the copy of the statements giving the particulars of 1989 non-messenger panel, Ex.M9 is the copy of the statement of 1989 non- messenger panel, Ex.M10 is the copy of statement of 1992 panel. Further, witness states that petitioner was included in the 1989 panel. As the existing vacancies at that time were exhausted and his turn did not come he could not be given permanent employment in the bank as per the agreements. All the appointments were made strictly in accordance with the settlements reached from time to time between SBI and SBI staff federation and as per seniority, number of days of temporary service put in by them in the bank in the given period. Further, MW1 states petitioner was not sponsored by any employment exchange he did not undergo the regular process of selection required for appointment as a regular non-messenger the petitioner has not worked for 240 days in any year in his entire temporary service in the bank. The petitioner and other temporary employees were terminated from service by the bank. Further, MW1 states that the vacancies were filled up on regular basis with the temporary employees from the panels and these panels were expired in terms of the settlements so reached and there were no vacancies to absorb such employees. Thus, witness MW1 has proved the documents Ex.M1 to Ex.M12 and also contentions made in the counter. However, MW1 was cross examined by the Petitioner Counsel. But nothing has been elicited in his cross examination so as to discredit the testimony of the witness MW1 as regards the date of lapse of both the panels on 31.3.1997 and reasons assigned for non-absorption of the Petitioner from the panel list to the permanent post. Moreover the witness MW1 was re-examined by the Respondent and the witness MW1 states that panels were expired in terms of the settlement send absorptions to the extent of the available vacancies were made. There was no termination of any temporary messenger as such but their services were not utilized after the cut off date as the available vacancies were already filled up and most of these Petitioners were not in the service of the bank as on the date of the expiry date of the panels. Therefore, in view of the aforesaid testimony of the MW1 in re-examination in the absence of cross examination remained uncontraverted, the claim of the Workman that he was entitled for absorption in permanent post in the branch of Respondent Management on the basis of panel list is found not established.

This point is answered against the Workman.

48. **Point No.IV**:- In view of the discussion and finding given at Point Nos. I, II and III, the Workman is not entitled for any relief and claim statement of Workman sans merit and liable to be dismissed.

This Point is answered accordingly.

AWARD

In view of the fore gone discussion, it is held that the action of the Respondent bank in terminating the services of Sri M. Jayaram Reddy, Ex. Messenger by way of oral orders w.e.f. 31.3.1997 is justified. Hence, the Petitioner is not entitled for any relief as prayed for. The claim statement filed by Workman sans merit, hence, dismissed. Reference is answered accordingly.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, Personal Assistant, transcribed by her, corrected and signed by me on this the 7th day of May, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner	Witnesses examined for the Respondent
WW1: Sri M. Jayaram Reddy	MW1: Sri K. Bala Kotaiah

Documents marked for the Petitioner

Ex.W1:	Photocopy of Notification
Ex.W2:	Photocopy of Interview call letter
.Ex.W3:	Photocopy of Panel list
Ex.W4:	Photocopy of Service Certificate
Ex.W5:	Photocopy of Service Certificate
Ex.W6:	Photocopy of Circular letter dated 14.7.1999

Documents marked for the Respondent

Ex.M1:	Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.17.11.87
Ex.M2:	Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.16.7.88
Ex.M3:	Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.27.10.1988
Ex.M4:	Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.9.1.1991
Ex.M5:	Photocopy of conciliation proceedings before the Regional Labour Commissioner (C) dt.9.6.1995

Ex.M6: Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.30.7.1996

Ex.M7: Photocopy of Memorandum of understanding dt. 27.1.1997

Ex.M8: Photocopy of statements giving the particulars of 1989 messenger panel.

Ex.M9: Photocopy of statement of 1989 Non-messenger panel

Ex.M10: Photocopy of statement of 1992 panel

Ex.M11: Photocopy of order of Hon'ble High Court in WA No.86/98 dt. 1.5.98

Ex.M12: Photocopy of order in SLP No.11886-11888 of 1998 dated 10.8.98

नई दिल्ली, 29 जुलाई, 2026

का.आ. 1622.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एस बी आई भारत का के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजको और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में **केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण–सह–श्रम न्यायालय**, हैदराबाद के पंचाट **(सन्दर्भ संख्या 163/2002)** को प्रकाशित करती है,

[सं. एल-12012/81/2000-आई.आर (बी-I)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 29th July, 2026

S.O. 1622.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Reference. I.D. No. 163/2002) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Hyderabad as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the Management of SBI of India and their workmen,

[No. L-12012/81/2000–IR (B-I)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

In The Central Government Industrial Tribunal Cum Labour Court At Hyderabad

Present: **Sri IRFAN QAMAR**

Presiding Officer

Dated the 11th day of May, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. 163/2002

[Old ID No.74/2000 of Industrial Tribunal No.I, Hyderabad]

Between:

Sri K. Veeranna,
24/83 Subash Road,
Old Town, Anantapur,
Anantapur (A.P).

… Petitioner

And

The Dy. General Manager,
State Bank of India,
Zonal Office,
Renigunta Road,
Tirupathi(A.P) 517501. ....Respondent

Appearances:

For the Petitioner : Sri Macharla Rangaiah, Advocate

For the Respondent: Sri Y. Ranjeeth Reddy, Advocate

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-12012/81/2000-IR(B.I) dated 17.07.2000 referred the following dispute under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 to Industrial Tribunal No.I, Hyderabad for adjudication and later the same has been transferred to this Tribunal bearing ID No. 74/2000, as per orders of Central Government vide Lr.No.H-11026/1/2001-IR(C.II) dated 18.10.2001, requiring this forum to decide the question:

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the State Bank of India, Anantapur Main Branch in terminating Sri K. Veeranna, Messenger, from the services of the Bank by way of oral orders w.e.f. 31.03.1997? If not, what relief he is entitled?"

After receipt of the reference, it was numbered as ID No. 163/2002 and notices were issued to both the Workman and the management.

2. Before unfolding the factual matrix of the instant industrial dispute it would be apposite to have a bird eye view of a chequered history of the instant industrial dispute. Earlier instant industrial dispute along with the batch cases was decided by this Tribunal vide common award dated 17.5.2005 and the reference was answered in favour of the Respondent and against the Workman. That said common award dated 17.5.2005 was challenged by the aggrieved Workmen in various Writ petition No.6470/2014 along with batch of writ petitions before the Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh and Hon'ble High Court vide its' judgement dated 23.6.2014 allowed all batch of writ petitions and set aside the common award dated 17.5.2005 passed in ID No.222 of 2001 and other batch of ID cases by Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad and the Respondent management of State Bank of India was directed to reengage the Writ Petitioners in position, which they have been occupying prior to their termination and further directed to consider their cases for regularization as and when the substantive vacancy arises. This judgement dated 23.6.2014 of Hon'ble High Court of AP, passed in WP No.6470/2014 and batch petitions was challenged by Respondent management before the Hon'ble High Court in Writ Appeal No. 1268 of 2014. The aforesaid Writ Appeals No.1268/2014 and other Writ Appeals were decided by Division Bench of High Court of Andhra Pradesh by a common judgement dated 20.3.2019. Hon'ble High Court in aforesaid Writ Appeal was pleased to pass the order which is extracted as below:-

" 7. Hearing the learned senior counsel for the SBI and the learned senior counsel for the contesting unofficial Respondents, we see that while the learned single Judge was justified in setting aside the award

af the Tribunal, the proper course to be adopted was to remit all the cases to the Tribunal. This we say for reasons more than one. Firstly, in such matters, claims have to be decided on individual basis, as different persons have different claims as to the length of officiation or discharge of duties and functions; quality of engagement, drawings, accounting of the post for each one of them, who have worked etc. AIl these issues will not be the same in all the cases. Therefore, each case ought to have been directed to be decided by the Tribunal afresh on individual basis. The second and most important aspect is the learned single Judge has in one go ordered re-employment of all the workmen. This is not a relief that could have been granted without answering the individual issues; each issue relating to each case could not have been decided by the writ Court within the format of its adjudication procedures and scope. The adjudicating body, which has to do that activity, is the Industrial Tribunal. Therefore, we are of the view that while we would sustain the order of the learned singe Judge insofar as it interfered and sets aside the award of the Tribunal, the further findings and directions, issued through the impugned order have to go and the individual cases have to be sent back for consideration of the Tribunal. Such further procedure before the Tribunal will have to be carried forward with the materials already on record and also by affording an opportunity to the persons, who have claims as well as the management to place their rival contentions and further material before the Tribunal. The learned counsel appearing for the workmen are justified in pointing out that enormous delay has already happened and further action by the Tribunal in this line may be expedited.

9. In the result, these writ appeals are ordered;

(1) affirming the impugned common order of the learned single Judge to the extent it sets aside the common award dated 17.05.2005 of the Industrial Tribuna!;

(2) the further findings and directions issued through the impugned common order are vacated:

(3) all the matters shall be remitted to the Industrial Tribunal with a direction to dispose of them within an outer limit of five (5) months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order; and,

(4) the parties to make appearance before the Tribunal on the given date."

Thus, in view of the above direction of Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh in W.A.No.1268 of 2014 and batch cases. This Tribunal has taken up the matter of industrial dispute for hearing and deciding it afresh in view of the aforesaid guidelines laid down by the Hon'ble High Court in Writ Appeal No.1268/2014 vide judgement dated 20.3.019.

3. The factual matrix of instant industrial dispute as narrated by the Workman in his claim statement are that, the Workman joined in the service of the management institution as Messenger from 1985 to 1992, and has rendered unblemished service spreading over a period of about 7 years. The Respondent has terminated services of Workman by oral orders with effect from 1.4.1997. Further, it is submitted that the management of Respondent bank decided to give a chance to temporarily employed personnel "found suitable for permanent appointment" by wait- listing them by offering permanent appointment or waitlisting till such opportunity arises.

4. That on 17.11.1987 a settlement was reached between All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and the Management of State Bank of India - settlement one, under this settlement three categories of employees were listed. That is, A) those who have completed 240 days in 12 months or less after 1.7.1975. B) those who have completed 270 days in any continuous block of 36 calendar months after 1.7.1975. C) (i) those who have completed minimum of 30 days aggregate temporary service in any

calendar year after 1.7.1975 or (ii) 70 days aggregate temporary service in continuous block of 36 months after 1.7.1975.

5. The persons who satisfied in all the above 4 categories were to be interviewed by a selection committee and the said selection committee would determine the suitability of the said candidate for permanent appointment. Therefore, the bank prescribed certain qualifications and from among the candidates satisfying the qualifications the suitable candidates were enlisted by a selection committee. The Clause 7 of the said agreement provided with the selected candidate would be wait listed in order of their respective categorization and the selected panel would be valid upto December, 1991. Clause 10 of the settlement specifically provided that henceforth. "there will be no temporary appointments in the subordinate cadre", except on a restrictive basis in the specified category, "from amongst empanelled candidates as per existing guidelines of the bank". The Workman further submits that consequent upon the said agreement and the draft, a notification was issued in the newspapers. The last date for responding to the advertisement was 30.8.1988. A written examination followed by viva-voce in May, 1989 was held. A selected panel was prepared, as per Clause 7 of the agreement, ie. Settlement No.1, the selected panel was to be valid upto December, 1991, the Workman submits that circular was issued on 26.4.91 by the said letter it is mentioned that the terms of the agreement dated 17.11.87 was modified vide second agreement dated 16.7.88 was entered into between the parties. In terms of the said agreement a chance was to be given, "to all eligible temporary employees for permanent appointments. The appointments were against the vacancies likely to arise during the years 1995-96, circular made it clear that in view of the enormity of the problem an extension of the currency of the panel, eligible temporary employees who have been empanelled could not appear in the earlier interviews and have been pursuing their cases thereafter, "will be given another chance to appear for interview".

6. Workman submits that there were total five settlements. The settlement dated 17.11.87 is the 1st settlement (Ex M1), settlement dated 16.7.88 is 2nd settlement (Ex M2), settlement dated 27.10.88 is the 3rd settlement (Ex M3), then settlement dated 9.1.91 is 4th settlement and settlement dated 30.7.96 is 5th settlement (Ex M6). In between there is minutes of conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.95 marked as Ex M5. That due to all these settlements which were extended by subsequent settlements thereby created reasonable expectations in the list of the selected candidates arose with that it's a question of time their appointments or services would be regularized in the services of the bank. The Workman was working with the bank on temporary basis was under the bonafide hope that sooner his services will be regularized with the bank. He is thereby closed all his options elsewhere. It is needless to point out that employing person to whom hope of employment in substantial terms was made is a facet of Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

7. Further Workman submits that the Government of India issued Circular No. F-3/3/104/87-IR, dated 16.8.1990. Under said circular the chief Executives of all public sector banks including the Management herein were specifically instructed that until the problem of existing temporary employees is fully resolved, no bank is permitted to make any permanent appointments. That some of the persons similarly situated like this Workman aggrieved by the inaction on the part of the management of the bank is not regularizing their services from out of the selected panel and not clearly focusing the vacancy position, filed W.P. No. 4194/97 before Hon'ble High court of A.P.. It is specifically averred in the said writ petition that the Management of the bank had failed to implement the settlement and that it violates the various fundamental rights guaranteed under the constitution of India. The Hon'ble High court of A.P .. by order dated 5.3.97 directed the bank to implement the settlement as amended from time to time. It also

directed the bank to carry out the terms of settlement before the expiry of March, 1997. The Hon'ble High Court also recorded finding that the Bank cannot escape its liability of enforcement of the Settlement. In view of the directions given by the High Court all candidates whose names appeared in the select panels prepared on the basis of the agreement entered into on 17.11.87 under which the panel was valid upto December, 1991, and on the basis of a settlement dated 27.10.1988 whereby the panels were made alive upto 31.3.1997 under which the panel was valid upto December, 1999. The other agreement dated 16.7.1988 under which the panel was valid upto 1992 and on the basis of the settlement dated 27.10.1998 whereby the panels were made alive upto 31.3.1997 were under the bonafide impression that their cases will be considered for regularization and were living on the basis of the said reasonable expectation. Unfortunately, contrary to the aforesaid directions given by the High Court and contrary to the settlements entered into between the parties, the bank issued proceedings dated 25.3.1997, dated 27.3.1997 and 31.3.1997 instructing the various authorities of the Management not to continue the temporary employees those who are in services of the bank from 1.4.97. The said order was followed by the Management. Aggrieved by the said action the Workman herein and similarly situated candidates have filed a writ petition before the Hon'ble High Court and by way of Writ Petition No.9206/97 seeking a declaration that the proceedings issued by the Deputy General Manager and the Assistant General Manager (Respondents 3,4 and 5 therein) on 25.3.97, 27.3.97 and 31.3.97 as illegal and also non-continuance of the Workmen therein in service by absorbing them in the services of the bank as violative of Section 2(p) and 18(1) read with Rule 58 of Central Rules and sought for specific direction to the bank to absorb them in service.

8. Further, Workman submits that in the counter affidavit filed in Writ Petition No.9206/97, the bank has submitted that it has about 805 branches in Andhra Pradesh alone. It has stated that due to exigencies of circumstances and on account of the urgent need in its banks, it employed temporary employees in subordinate cadre. It is pertinent to mention that it does not state the urgent or need or the nature of temporary employees that it had engaged. Enquiry into the same would reveal that the stand taken by the bank either on the ground of urgent need or of temporary employees is a façade to perpetuate unfair labour practice. It is designed to on the one hand, keep the employed in the erroneous zone of hope and on the other to ensure that benefits that a model employer will extend under various statutes to its employees is not required to be borne out by the bank. A reading of the counter affidavit would show that the bank would opines that being just fair and reasonable are which obviously is reprehensible and is a facet of unfair labour practice.

9. The Workman submits that the bank had referred in its counter affidavit to three settlements dated 17.11.87, 16.7.88 and 27.10.88. The bank in the guise of extending the benefits of the circular of Government dated 16.8.90 stated in its counter affidavit that as follows:

"Government of India, vide its letter dated 16.8.1990, issued guidelines to all the public sector banks with regard to recruitment and absorption of temporary employees in public sector banks. The said guidelines were issued to implement on the lines of the approach paper on the issue provided by a committee constituted in this regard. The Government of India guidelines made it clear that all the public sector banks may follow the provisions laid down in the approach paper.

The approach paper specified that the cases of temporary employees who had put in not less than 240 days of temporary service in 12 consecutive Months and who are entitled to benefit of Section 25-F may be decided by entering into a settlement with the representative union. In respect of temporary employees who had put in less than 240 days of service in 12 consecutive months or less, a settlement could be avoided and however if the Management so desired, they could enter into a conciliation settlement

with the representative union. Para 6(h), it is mentioned that only those temporary employees who had put in temporary service of 90 or more days after 1.1 1982 would be eligible for considering under the scheme. Although the Government guidelines envisaged for a settlement in respect of employees who had put in temporary service of 90 or more days, the bank by way of further concession entered into settlements Even in respect of those who had put in less than 90 days. As such, it could be Seen that the settlements are more beneficial to the temporary employees concerned. The approach paper also specify at para 6(c) that the banks would provide one time opportunity to all the temporary employees and for that purpose temporary employees worked in the bank on or after 1.1.1982 could be considered for re-employment in terms of the scheme. The Respondents have gone further wherein even persons working after 1975 were also considered.

As could be seen from the above, there was a genuine effort on the part of the Respondent bank to provide permanent employment for as many as possible subject to availability of the vacancies.

It is further submitted that at para 6(k) of the approach paper, it was made clear that this would be one time exercise in full and final settlement of all the aims and disputes for the past period in respect of temporary workmen covered by the settlement. This would mean that the Government of India guidelines would cover only those persons who were temporarily employed for the period specified therein and not otherwise. As such, it is submitted that the Respondents have not only followed the Government of India guidelines but in fact covered cases of the employees who had worked for less than 90 days. As such, question of violation does not arise and in any case those were only broad guidelines and not directives".

10. The Workman submits that the bank also referred a subsequent settlement dated 9.1.1991 wherein there is a clause to the effect- that the panel of temporary employees and the panel of daily wage employees will be operated to a particular period. Therefore, their cases will not be considered. The Management herein relying upon this settlement in their impugned action. It is submitted that even the settlement dated 9.1.1991 will not empower the management to terminate the services of the temporary employees who are working in the bank services like the Workman herein as it does not specify the termination of the employees. In fact there are so many vacancies wherein the Management has engaged several new persons as temporary messengers/ attendars/ sweepers etc., even after the judgment of Hon’ble High Court without considering the cases of the similarly situated candidates like the Workman herein. It is submitted inspite of engaging fresh candidates as is now being done by the Management they would have continued the similarly situated candidates like the Workman herein in the services of the bank and consider their cases for absorption in view of the circulars issued by Central Government as well as the directions of this Hon'ble Court in Writ Petition No.4194/97, dated 5.3.97. In view of the circulars issued by the Central Government, the Management should not have relied upon the settlement dated 9.1.1991. Hence, the impugned action of the Management is illegal, unjust, violative of fundamental rights such as Articles 14,16 and 21 of the Constitution of India.

11. The Workman submits that in W.P. No.4194/97 filed by the union of temporary employees where in they have complained about the non- implementation of the settlements arrived between the parties and sought for absorption. Such employees in the bank services on permanent basis before the date fixed for carrying out the terms of settlement, the Court held that the members of the union had been empanelled in the list, they were not regularized and the time was going to run out to the near future and the Respondent bank and its officers cannot escape from the liability of enforcing the settlement which has been reached and therefore directed that the bank and the officers shall implement the settlement dated 17.11.87 as amended from time to time before the expiry of 31.3.97.

12. Further, it is submitted that in the clause of Settlement it is specifically mentioned that the workmen to be absorbed/appointed in the bank prohibiting any temporary appointments subsequent to the date of settlement even the authorities want to make temporary appointments that should be made only from among the empanelled can be appointed either for temporary vacancy or permanent vacancy except from among the empanelled candidates like the Workman and that should be continued till they are absorbed. The management committed unfair labour practices and terminated the services of the candidates with effect from 1.4.1997 which is arbitrary, discriminatory, contrary to their own guidelines and violative of the constitutional provisions which are guaranteed in Chapter-III of the Constitution of India.

13. The Workman submits that it is strange as to how the panels were allowed to lapse by a so-called Memorandum of Understanding dated 25.2.1997, that the action of terminating such employees like the Workman by virtue of an impugned oral proceedings without implementing the settlement would be illegal and unfair labour practice which cannot be allowed to be perpetuated. That the discontinuance of the Workman after 31.3.97 who had served in the bank in any capacity amounts to retrenchment. It could not have been done without any notice and it violates Sec.25FF of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and the said action is violative of principles of natural justice guaranteed under Chapter III of the Constitution of India. This amounts to retrenchment without one month's notice and taken in view of such notice. Thus, the main proceedings issued by the Respondent is without jurisdiction and is arbitrary, illegal and therefore liable to be quashed. That the alleged Memorandum of Understanding dated 27.2.97, Ex.M5 does not own any legal entity, as the said Memorandum of Understanding is not published anywhere to brought to the notice of the Workman whose rights are being affected. It is submitted that Management did not adhere to the procedure envisaged by the Central Government in its' instructions dated 16.8.90 in the year 1995. The same was not followed in the year 1997 despite there being vacancies. The management has followed the procedure of calling candidates through Employment exchange instead of giving chance to the empanelled candidates like the Workman here. It is pertinent to mention here that the Respondent Management sent letters to the all similarly situated candidates like the Workman in the month of June, 1997, subsequent to the passing of impugned termination orders. After knowing the facts that the candidates are litigating, the Management refused to engage these candidates. It is once again reiterated that the panels are meant for absorption but not for termination. It was the duty of the Management to engage the empanelled candidates like the Workman even in temporary vacancies till they are absorbed permanently in regular vacancies. Hence, the action of the Respondent Management terminating the services of the Workman by oral order dated 31.3.97 is unjust, illegal, violative of principles of natural justice and hence, the Management be directed to reinstate and absorb the Workman and to grant all incidental and consequential benefits.

14. Per contra, Respondent had filed counter and made a contentions that the reference is not tenable and contrary to the provisions of I.D. Act, 1947. Respondent submitted that to tide over severe sub-ordinate staff constraints which arose out of leave vacancies, exigencies, etc., and also owning to the restrictions imposed by the Government of India/Reserve Bank of India on intake of staff, the Respondent bank used to engage sub-ordinate staff like messengers, sweepers, sweeper cum water boys, etc., depending on the availability of work on purely temporary basis for the smooth and uninterrupted functioning of the branches. It is submitted that the All India State Bank of India Staff Federation which represents majority of the employees in the State Bank of India comprising about 98% of the work force as its' members espoused the cause of temporary employees who have put in less than 240 days of temporary

service in 12 calendar months in the bank and who were ineligible for any protection under Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 to give a chance for being considered for absorption and permanent appointments.

15. Discussions were held and on 17.11.1987 an agreement was signed between the federation and the Management bank under Sec. 2(p) read with Sec 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules 1957. A copy of the said settlement dated 17.11.87 which may be herein after referred as first settlement is filed and 4 categories were made as it has already been mentioned in the claim statement above, it need not be repeated here. In the first settlement, it was agreed that the temporary employees as categorized would be given a chance for being considered for permanent appointment in the bank's service against the vacancies which are likely to arise during the period 1987 to 1991. On 16.7.88 second settlement was arrived between the Federation and the Bank whereby it was agreed to substitute the period of consideration of vacancies as 1987 to 1992 in place of 1987 to 1991 as contemplated under the first settlement dated 17.11.1987. This is the second settlement. A 3rd settlement was entered into on 27.10.88 and it was agreed that the bank's service against the vacancies likely to arise from 1988 to 1992 was to be considered. Government of India vide its letter dated 16.8.90 issued guidelines to all the public sector banks with regard to recruitment and absorption of temporary employees in public sector banks. The said guidelines were issued to implement on the lines of approach paper on the issue provided by a committee constituted in this regard. Government of India guidelines made it clear that all the public sector banks may follow the provisions laid down in the approach paper. The approach paper specified that the cases of temporary service in 12 consecutive months and who are entitled to benefit of Sec.25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 may be decided by entering into a settlement with the representative union. In respect of temporary employees who had put in less than 240 days of service in 12 consecutive months or less, a settlement could be avoided and however if the Management so desired they could enter into a conciliation settlement with the representative union. In para. 6(h) it is mentioned that only those temporary employees who had put in temporary service of 90 days or more days after 1.1.82 would be eligible for considering under the scheme. Although the Government guidelines envisaged for a settlement in respect of employees who had put in temporary service of 90 days or more days, the bank by way of a further concession entered into settlements. Even in respect of those who had put in less than 90 days and also the bank went a step further and said those persons who are working after 1975 were also considered. Hence, there was a genuine effort on the part of the Respondent bank to provide as many as possible jobs subject to the availability of the vacancies. However, para 6 (k) of the approach paper made it clear that it is a one time, exercise in full and final, settlement of all the claims and disputes for the past period, in respect of temporary workmen covered by the settlement. Another settlement was entered on 9.1.91 herein after referred as 4th settlement and the time limit was extended upto 1994 and separate panel was prepared for temporary employees, casual/daily wagers. It was agreed that while vacancies arising between 1988 to 1994 in respect of temporary employees and in respect of casual/daily wagers, they can be considered for the vacancies arising between 1995-96 only.

16. It is submitted that the administrative set up of the Hyderabad Local Head Office comprises of four Zonal Offices (Zones) at Hyderabad, Vijayawada, Visakhapatnam and Tirupathi covering all the Districts of Andhra Pradesh. In terms of the settlement the Management after following the procedure laid down therein prepared the panels of qualified candidates of temporary employees denoted as 1989 panel and also panel of casual/daily wagers denoted as 1992 panel for giving a chance for being considered for permanent absorption. These panels were prepared zone-wise separately for messengers and non-messengers in the descending order of temporary service put in by the candidates during the stipulated period i.e., 1.7.1975 to 31.7.1988. That the Federation approached the Regional Labour Commissioner(C)

for implementation of bi-partite settlement in respect of absorption of temporary employees. The Regional Labour Commissioner(C) conducted conciliation proceedings and an agreement was arrived between the Federation and the bank. It was agreed that it would be kept alive upto March, 1997. A copy of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.2.1995 signed by the parties is filed as material paper. A settlement was arrived at and an agreement was signed between the Federation and the Management bank on 30.7.1996 under Sec.2 (p) read with Sec.18(1) of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957, which is hereinafter called as 5th settlement. That on 27.2.1997 a Memorandum of understanding was also signed by the federation's affiliate and the bank Management recording the fact that the exercise of identifying the messengerial vacancies as on 31.12.1994 has since been completed by Central Office and thereby 403 messengerial vacancies were sanctioned . It was agreed that these vacancies may be filled from 1989 panel of temporary employees after effecting conversion from full time non-messengerial staff in the usual manner and the agreement was reached accordingly. It was agreed between the Federation's affiliate and the Management bank that in terms of the settlement dated 30.7.1996 both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees would lapse on 31.3.1997. That as agreed upon vacancies were filled from the panels. The Workman who has put in an aggregate temporary service of less than 240 days in a continuous block of 12 months period during 1.7.1975 to 31.7.1988 has no right to seek a direction to consider his candidature for absorption in the Management bank under any rule/law except under the settlement entered into thereon.

17. Respondent contended that, in fact, the case of the Workman can be considered under all the five settlements having got his case considered under provisions of these settlements. All the other provisions and terms of the settlements are also binding on him/her. The Management bank has not violated any of the provisions of the terms of the said settlement. That the very preparation and maintenance of panel is in compliance of the terms agreed under these settlements. These settlements were time bound and they ceased to exist on 31.3.1997. That the bank has never promised that all the candidates in the panel will be absorbed. In the advertisement itself it was made clear that candidates will be considered for absorption in the vacancies that may arise upto 1992. Keeping alive the panels after 31.3.1997 is contrary to the settlements arrived between the State Bank of India Staff Federation and the Management bank. That the settlements are binding on the parties. The Workman is also bound under the terms of the said settlement. The settlement does not suffer from any ambiguity as their language is very clear. The right under the settlements is to give them a chance to be considered for future appointment in the bank's services against the vacancies likely to arise. The settlements were effected to balance the expectations of the temporary employees to be absorbed in permanent service as against the constitutional rights for all eligible persons to be considered for employment every time a vacancy arises. That the alleged dispute including the demand for reinstatement has to be decided in this context. It is submitted that the period of panel list got expired on 31.3.97 and it is an integral term of the settlement and cannot be modified in any proceedings under the law. These temporary employees who unfortunately could not be accommodated for want of vacancies have no further rights to be considered for regularization. That the Hon'ble High Court in WP No.12964/94, held as follows, "It is needless to state that the settlement arrived at between the All India State Bank of India Staff Federation which, is the majority union and the bank Management is binding on the Workmen also. It is not at all the case of the Workman that any of the terms of the settlement has been violated by the bank's Management. If the Workman had worked in the bank on part-time basis before 31.5.94, that itself would not vest in him a right to claim that his services should be regularized on permanent basis against a full time cadre post. The claim put forth by the Workman in the present petition is therefore misconceived and not tenable. However, it is open to the Workman to claim any right which

flows from the settlement between the union and the bank Management. As already pointed out that it is not the grievance of the Workman that some right which has flown from the settlement in favour of the Workman has been denied by the bank Management. Therefore, I do not find any ground, let alone substantial ground, to grant the kind of relief sought for by the Workman. Writ Petition fails and is accordingly dismissed. No costs."

18. Further, it is contended that if the panels were not lapsed at the end of designated period and allowed to be continued it would result in making the contracts of temporary employment indirectly permanent through back door entry, which would not only be contrary to the settlements but also to Articles 14 and 16 of Constitution of India and deprive the chances of original claimants who would Come through proper recruitment procedure. As their rights have been crystallized by operation of the settlements. Hence, there is no question of any Legitimate expectation being violated.

19. Similarly placed ex-employees filed WP No.9206/1995 and the batch before the Hon'ble High Court of A.P. and the learned Single Judge allowed the Writ Petitions. Aggrieved by the same WA No.86/98 and the batch was filed and the Division Bench set aside the order of the Single Judge. Thereafter the ex-temporary employees filed Special Leave Petition No.11886-11888 of 1998 before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India also dismissed the SLP. Therefore, reference to the Judgement of the Learned Single Judge in WP No.9206/97 is of no consequences as the same has already been set aside. The observations made in the Judgements cannot be relied upon for any purpose what so ever. The question of operation of Sec.25F would not come into play. Further the issue is covered by various Judgements of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India and various Hon'ble High Courts. Hence, the reference may be ordered that the Workman is not entitled for any relief.

20. In order to fortify his claim Workman has examined himself as WW1 and also filed documents in evidence which has been exhibited as Ex.W1 to W6. Further, the Workman has filed photocopies of documents in support of his claim which are discussed as under:-

Ex.W1 is the Notification. Further Ex.W2 is the interview call letter. Ex.W3 is the Panel list. Ex.W4 is the recommendation letter through employment exchange. Ex.W5 is the Service Certificate. Ex.W6 is the service certificate.

21. On the other hand, Respondent has examined witness MW1 Sri K. Bala Kotaiah and this witness has exhibited 12 documents, marked as Ex.M1 to M12. The details of these documents are as follows:-

Ex.M.1 is the Settlement dated 17.11.1987. Ex.M2 is the Settlement dated 16.7.1988. Ex.M3 is the Settlement dated 27.10.1988. Ex.M4 is the Settlement dated 9.1.1991. Ex.M5 is the Minutes of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.1995. Ex.M6 is the Settlement dated 30.7.1996. Ex.M7 is the Memorandum of Understanding dt. 27.2.1997. Ex.M8 is the Particulars of 1989 Messengerial Panel. Ex.M9 is the Particulars of 1989 Non-Messengerial Panel. Ex.M10 is the Particulars of 1992 General Attendant Panel. Ex.M11 is the Judgment of Hon’ble High Court of A.P. in Writ Appeal No.86/98 dt.1.5.1998. Ex.M12 is the Judgment of Hon’ble Supreme Court of India in SLP No. 11886-11888 of 1998 dt.10.8.1998.

22. Apart from afore mentioned documents, Learned Counsel for Workman has also filed a long list of various judgements of Hon’ble Supreme Court as well as Hon’ble High Court, which we will discuss at appropriate place in this Award.

23. Heard the argument of Learned Counsel for Workman as well as for Respondent.

24. On the basis of rival pleadings of both the parties and submissions made by the Learned Counsel for both the parties, following points arise for determination in the industrial dispute :-

I. Whether the 1st settlement dated 17.11.1987, 2nd settlement dated 16.7.1988, 3rd settlement dated 27.10.1988, 4th settlement dated 9.1.1991 and 5th settlement dated 30.7.1996 entered into between State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and also Memorandum of Understanding are binding upon both the parties?

II. Whether the action of State Bank of India, Ananthapur Main Branch in terminating the services of Workman Sri K. Veeranna, a Messenger with effect from 31.3.1997 is justified?

III. Whether the Workman is entitled for absorption on permanent post in the Branch of Respondent management as per averments made by him in the claim statement?

IV. To what relief if any the Workman is entitled for?

Findings:-

25. **Point No.I**:- Undisputedly settlements dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988, 9.1.1991 and 30.7.1996, minutes of conciliation proceedings and memorandum of understanding dated 27.2.1997 were executed between the State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation under section 2(p) and 18 (1) of I.D. Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Disputes (Central Rules), 1957.

Section 2(p) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 as follows:-

(p) "settlement" means a settlement arrived at in the course of conciliation proceeding and includes a written agreement between the employer and workmen arrived at otherwise than in the course of conciliation proceeding where such agreement has been signed by the parties thereto in such manner as may be prescribed and a copy thereof has been sent to an officer authorised in this behalf by the appropriate Government and the conciliation officer;

Section 18(1) provides as follows:-

18. Persons on whom settlements and awards are binding.

- [(1) A settlement arrived at by agreement between the employer and Workman otherwise than in the course of conciliation proceeding shall be binding on the parties to the agreement.

Therefore, in view of the provision contained u/s.18 (1) I.D. Act, 1947, terms and conditions enumerated in the aforesaid settlements are binding on the parties to the agreement. The Learned Counsel for Workman has argued that the Workman after going through the selection procedure has successfully been listed in the panel for appointment on the permanent basis in the Respondent management and the empanelled list has to be valid till last person in the empanelled list is appointed on permanent basis. But the impugned order dated 25.3.97, 27.3.97 and 31.3.97, has been issued by Respondent management thereby the services of the Workman has been terminated and the said order is not in consonance of the terms of the agreement entered into between the parties. Further, Workman submits that the Respondent in the 5th settlement has mentioned the date i.e., 31.3.1997 for lapse of empanel list which is illegal and that is not binding upon the Workman. The condition of lapse of empanelment list on 31.3.97 incorporated in the aforesaid 5th settlement, is arbitrary and illegal.

26. The perusal of the impugned order dated 25.3.1997 goes to reveal that the Chief/Branch Manager, SBI Zonal Office has issued the letter to all the branches with regard to the subject not to make

any temporary appointments in the Branch in messengerial category from 1.4.1997. The extract of the said letter is given below:-

"We have been advised by the Deputy General Manager, Zonal Office, Hyderabad that as both the panels of temporary employees of 1989 and daily wagers/casual labours of 1992 will lapse by 31.3.1997, it has been decided by Central Office not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial category from 1.4.1997."

Thus, from the contents of the aforesaid letter, it manifest that Head Office of State Bank of India vide letter dated 25.3.1997 has issued direction to all its branches not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial category from 1.4.1997 due to reason of lapse of both panels i.e., 1989 & 1992 on 31.3.1997 as per terms of settlements entered into by both parties. Further, the contents of the subsequent letter dated 27.3.1997 issued by Respondent Management is also direction to Branch Manager, State Bank of India not to make any temporary messengerial category appointment with effect from 1.4.1997 and it has also been communicated to all concerned that the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers maintained by Zonal offices stand lapsed from 31.1.1997. Further, office order dated 31.3.1997 has been issued by Respondent management that goes to reveal that the said office order has been issued to this effect that, "Consequent on absorption of temporary employees in permanent cadre, it has been decided by the competent authority that no one onwards, no further daily labour or temporary employees/appointments should be resorted to/engaged/employed." Therefore, it reflects from the contents of the aforesaid orders that the temporary appointment in messengerial category and daily labour has been stopped by the Respondent management with effect from 1.4.1997 because of the lapsed of panel of temporary workers and daily wagers by 31.3.1997. The agreement for lapse of both the panels on 31.3.1997 is contained in the 5th settlement which has been arrived at between the parties on dated 30.7.1996 with the consensus of both the parties. Therefore, Workman can not challenge the terms and conditions contained in settlement dated 30.7.1996 regarding lapse of panel on 31.3.1997 as agreed between State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation. As per provision contained u/s.18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 the said Agreement dated 30.7.1996 is binding on both the parties.

In the case of **Allied Sales Corporation Secunderabad vs.The Authority Under Andhra Pradesh..... 1990 II LLJ 510 AP para 414, Hon'ble Court have held:-**

"*4. There was a settlement between the Management and the workmen under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act on 25th April 1983 under which the age of superannuation of the workmen was fixed at 55 years. The settlement was to be in force upto 30th June 1986 and the next settlement, incorporating practically the same terms, was again entered into on 4th February 1987 under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act. There is no dispute that these settlements are under Section 18(1).*

14. Now the Authority constituted under Section 41(1) of the Act is an authority with very limited jurisdiction. It can only decide in the first appeal whether a termination by the management is valid or not and is within the parameters of Section 40 of the Act. The said Authority, in our view, has absolutely no jurisdiction to decide whether a settlement entered into under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act between the representatives of the Workmen and of the Management, is vitiated by undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion on the part of the Management. The Authority, namely, the Assistant Commissioner of Labour, was never intended by the A.P. Legislature to have jurisdiction to go into the question of the validity of a settlement arrived at under Section 18 of the Industrial Disputes Act by an Industrial Court. That Parliament has, in fact, constituted Industrial Courts under the Industrial Disputes Act, with extensive powers cannot be disputed. What we mean to say is that the Authority under Section

41(1) of the A.P. Act has no jurisdiction what-so-ever either to question or to decide about the validity of any such settlements. If parties to a settlement have a grievance about the validity of a settlement, it is for them to agitate the matter before the appropriate forum and they cannot ask an Authority constituted under Section 41(1) of the A.P. Shops and Establishments Act, 1966 with limited jurisdiction, to go into any such question and, that too, incidentally while deciding whether retirement as per the contract of employment, is legal or not."

It is not the case of Workman that aforesaid settlements are vitiated by undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion on the part of the management. If the Workman feeling aggrieved by any terms of settlement/ agreement on the aforementioned grounds then he can challenge of settlement before a competent authority under the Act, 1947. But here in the instant matter it is not a case of Workman that aforementioned settlement has been entered into between the parties on the ground of undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion. Therefore, Workman is barred to raise any objection in respect of fixing the date of lapse of both panels on 31.3.1997 as agreed between both the parties and Workman can not challenge any terms of said Agreement.

Further in the case of **Herbertsons Limited Vs. Workmen of Herbertsons Limited and Ors, 1977 AIR 322,** Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

The Tribunal thought that the question of the quantum of membership of the 2nd Respondent did not call for a finding at all in view of 1his Court's order. As observed above that was not a correct assumption. On the other hand, we feel that this view of the Tribunal has led it to approach the matter in an entirely erroneous manner. The Tribunal is, rightly enough, conscious that under section 18 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act the settlement was binding on the company and the members of the 3rd Respondent union. Even so, the Tribunal devoted nearly half of its order in scanning the evidence given by the company and Respondent No. 3 to find out whether the terms of the settlement had been explained by the President of the union to the workmen or not and whether the workers voluntarily accepted the settlement knowing all the "consequences". This to our mind is again an entirely wrong approach.

"When a recognised union negotiates with an employer the workers as individuals do not come into the picture. It is not necessary that each individual worker should know the implications of the settlement since a recognised union, which is expected to protect the legitimate interests of labour, enters into a settlement in the best interests of labour. This would be the normal rule. We cannot altogether rule out exceptional cases where there may be allegations of mala fides, fraud or even corruption or other induce- ments. Nothing of that kind has been suggested against the President of the 3rd Respondent in this case. That being the position, prima facie, this is a settlement in the course of collective bargaining and, therefore, is entitled to due weight and consideration.

It is not possible to scan the settlement in bits and pieces and hold some parts good and acceptable and others bad. Unless it can be demonstrated that the objectionable portion is such that it completely outweighs all the other advantages gained the Court will be slow to hold a settle- ment as unfair and unjust. The settlement has to be accepted or rejected as a whole and we are unable to reject it as a whole as unfair or unjust. Even before this Court the 3rd Respondent representing admittedly the large majority of the workmen has stood by this settlement and that is a strong factor which it is difficult to ignore. As stated elsewhere in the judgment, we cannot also be oblivious of the fact that all workmen of the company have accepted the settlement. Besides, the period of settlement has since expired and we are informed that the employer and the 3rd Respondent are negotiating another settlement with further improvements. These factors, apart from what has been stated above, and the need for industrial peace and harmony when a

union backed by a large majority of workmen has accepted a settlement in the course of collective bargaining have impelled us not to interfere with this settlement. That being the position, we unhold the settlement as fair and just and order that the award of the Tribunal shall be substituted by the settlement dated October 18, 1973. The said settlement shall be the substituted award. The appeal is disposed of accordingly. There will be no order as to costs."

Therefore, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above, the contention of the Workman that the date fixed for lapse of empanelled list on 31.3.1997 for appointment to the permanent post vide 5th Settlement dated 30.7.1996 is arbitrary, illegal is not untenable. The recognized union of Workmen has negotiated with the Respondent Bank Management representing large number of Workmen and the Workman as individual do not come into picture. Workman in the instant case has work as temporary Workmen in the Respondent Branch and in response of Notification he had applied for inclusion of his name in the panel and he was selected for inclusion his name in the panel list to be utilized for absorption of such Workman to permanent post in order of their seniority in the list. The Settlement dated 30.7.1996 between State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation under Sec.2(p) and Sec.18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 has clearly provided as regard non-messengerial position and it is agreed that all such posts sanctioned fallen vacant upto 31.3.1997 shall be filled before empanel list is allowed to lapse. Thus, in view of law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, in the instant case, Agreement dated 30.7.1996 was entered into between both the parties in respect of lapsing of the both the panels on 31.3.1997 and absorption of the Workmen from panel list was subject to availability of vacancy of post likely to arise upto 31.3.1997, have a binding force on Workman as well as management of State Bank of India in view of provision contained under section 18 (1) of I.D. Act, 1947.

Thus, Point No.I is answered against the Workman and in favour of the Respondent.

27. **Point No.II**:- Firstly, it is submitted on behalf of the Workman that the Respondent has terminated his services by oral order on 31.3.1997 without issuing any notice or paying any salary or compensation in lieu thereof. Therefore, the termination order of the Workman from service is in violation of provision contained Under Section 25 F of I.D. Act, 1947. Therefore, the order is liable to be set aside.

28. On the other hand, Respondent counsel contended that Workman has not worked for 240 days in any preceding calendar year. Therefore, reference of the industrial dispute is not relevant. In this context, the Workman has examined himself as WW1 who has reiterated that Workman has been terminated from service by Respondent on 31.3.1997 without notice of salary or compensation in lieu thereof. Before examining the claim of the Workman on merit it would be apposite to reproduce the provision contained under section 25 F:-

Section 25F provides:-

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].

Compensation to workmen in case of transfer of undertakings.

Section 25B defines the term continuous service which provides

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 authorized 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;

In order to prove the fact of 240 days of service within 12 months of a calendar year just preceding from the date of termination, the initial burden of proof lies upon the Workman and the Workman has to prove this factum by adducing his oral as well as documentary evidence in support of his claim.

Further, how to calculate 240 days of service by the Workman in a calendar year. In this context the reference of decisions of Hon'ble Supreme Court is relevant and the same are discussed below:-

In Rajasthan State Ganganagar S. Mills Ltd. v. State of Rajasthan and Anr. (2004) Apex Court held:

"It was the case of the Workman that he had worked for more than 240 days in the year concerned. This claim was denied by the appellant. It was for the claimant to lead evidence to show that he had worked for 240 days in the year preceding the date of his termination. He has filed an affidavit. It is statement which is in his favor and that cannot be regarded as sufficient evidence for any Court or Tribunal to come to the conclusion that in fact the claimant had worked for 240 days in a year These aspects were highlighted in Range Forest Officer v. S.T. Hadimani (2002 (3) SCC 25. No proof of receipt of salary or wages for 240 days or order or record in that regard was produced. Mere non-production of the muster roll for a particular period was not sufficient for the Labour Court held that the Workman had worked for 240 days as claimed."

In Municipal Corporation, Faridabad v. Siri Niwas (2004 (8) SCC 195), held "*the burden was on the Workman to show that he was working for more than 240 days in the preceding one year prior to his alleged retrenchment." In M.P. Electricity Board v. Hariram (2004 (8) SCC 246) the position was again reiterated in paragraph 11 as follows: "The above burden having not been discharged and the Labour Court having held so, in our opinion, the Industrial Court and the High Court erred in basing an order of reinstatement solely on an adverse inference drawn erroneously ..*"

In the case of Manager, RBI, Bangalore vs. S Mani (2005) SCC Page 100, the 3 Judges Bench of the Apex Court held that "*the initial burden of proof was on the Workman to show that he had completed 240 days of service."*

Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of Mohan Lal vs Management BEL 1981 SCC page 225 has laid down the principle that how to count 240 days of service within one year it is held: *"Clause (2)(a) provides for a fiction to treat a Workman in continuous service for a period of one year despite the fact that he has not rendered uninterrupted service for a period of one year but he has rendered period of 240 days during the period of 12 calendar service for months counting backwards and just preceding the relevant date being the date of retrenchment. In other words, in order to invoke the fiction enacted in clause (2)(a) it is necessary to determine first the relevant date, ie the date of termination of service which is complained of as retrenchment. After that date is ascertained. move backward to a period of 12 months just preceding the date of retrenchment and then ascertain whether within the period of 12 months, the Workman has rendered service for a period of 240 days. If these three facts are affirmatively answered in favor of the Workman pursuant to the deeming fiction enacted in clause (2)(a) it will have to be assumed that the Workman is in continuous service for a period of one year and he will satisfy the eligibility qualification enacted in Section 25-F"*

"14. We have already extracted section 25B since its amendment and the change in language is the legislative exposition of which note must be taken. In fact, we need not further dilate upon this aspect because in Surendra Kumar Verma and Ors. v. Central Government Industrial-cum-Labour Court, New Delhi and Anr., Chinnappa Reddy. J., after noticing the amendment and referring to the decision in Sur Enamel and Stamping Works (P) Ltd case, held as under:

"These changes brought about by Act 36 of 1964 appear to be clearly designed to provide that a Workman who has actually worked under the employer for not less than 240 days during a period of twelve months shall be deemed to have been in continuous service for a period of one year whether or not he has in fact been in such continuous service for a period of one year. It is enough that he has worked for 240 days in a period of 12 months, it is not necessary that he should have been in the service of the employer for one whole year."

In a concurring judgment Pathak J. agreed with this interpretation of section 25B(2). Therefore, both on principle and on precedent it must be held that section 25B(2) comprehends a situation where a Workman is not in employment for a period of 12 calendar months, but has rendered service for a period of 240 days within the period of 12 calendar months commencing and counting backwards from the relevant date, i.e. the date of retrenchment. If he has, he would be deemed to be in continuous service for a period of one year for the purpose of section 25B and Chapter VA."

Thus, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above the initial burden of proof lies upon the Workman to show that he has completed 240 days of the service with the Respondent just preceding from the date of his termination. Further, in respect of the employment of calculating the 240 days service provision contained Under of Section 25-F read with Section 25-B of the I.D. Act, 1947.

29. Now, in view of the provision contained under Section 25 F and law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, we have to examine whether the Workman has discharged his initial burden of proof in respect of his claim of 240 days continuous service in a calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination i.e., 31.3.1997.

In this context, WW1 in his cross examination has stated that,

"I was given appointment as a temporary attender for 27 days from 23.11.1985. I did not undergo the selection process required for appointment in the Bank."

"I did not work for 240 days in any year in my entire service."

Thus, it is clear from the testimony of WW1 that the Workman had not worked for 240 days continuously in any 12 months of a calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination in the Respondent bank. Therefore, Workman failed to establish his plea by his oral and documentary evidence that he had worked for 240 days continuously in calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination i.e., 31.3.1997. Thus, the claim of the Workman that he has been terminated by oral order without issuing notice or payment in lieu after termination, in contravention of Section 25 F of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is not tenable. However the documents filed by the Workman in support of his claim, number of days worked with the Respondent goes to reveal that the Workman had worked intermittently as daily wager depending upon availability of work in branch. Workman did not file any document of appointment letter or salary slips in support of his claim for appointment as a non-messenger in the Respondent branch on temporary basis.

30. Per contra, the Learned Counsel for Respondent has submitted the allegation of Workman that he was terminated from services is not correct. As the vacancies were filled up on regular basis in order of their respective seniority the non-engagement of the Workman does not amount to termination. Further, Respondent contended that no law provide that even though there is no work temporary employee should be continued in the bank work as the very engagement of Workman was subject to availability of work. Therefore, the allegation that the bank has indulged in unfair labour practice is incorrect.

31. Thus, in view of the fore gone discussion and contentions made by the Respondent, I find the force in the argument advanced by the Respondent that in the instant matter, Workman was not terminated from service by order dated 31.3.1997 rather he was disengaged in view of the non-availability of the work in the branch. Further, there was direction issued by the Head Office of the Respondent authority not to engage any daily wager Workman/ temporary Worker w.e.f. 1.4.1997. Thus, such disengagement of Workman does not amount to termination. Moreover, the Workman failed to prove his claim that he was terminated in contravention of provision of Sec.25F of the I.D. Act, 1947 as he failed to establish his plea by any oral or documentary evidence that he had worked for 240 days continuously in a twelve months of calendar year just preceding from date of termination i.e., 31.3.1997.

32. Further, perusal of the order dated 25.3.1997 goes to reveal that the Chief Branch Manager, State Bank of India has issued the letter to Zonal Office with direction to all its branches to this effect that they have been advised by the DGM, Zonal Office, Hyderabad that as both the panel of temporary employees of 1989 and daily wagers/casual labour of 1992 will lapse on 31.3.1997 it has been decided by central office not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial cadre from 1.4.1997, therefore it was directed to issue suitable instructions not to make temporary appointments from 1.4.1997. There is no mention in this order that the Workman herein has been terminated from service by this order.

33. Further, the circular dated 27.3.1997 was issued by DGM, SBI to all branches in commercial network in respect of the non-appointment of temporary employees in subordinate cadre and it has directed not to make any temporary employment in the subordinate cadre with effect from 1.4.97 and further, it has directed to ensure that no temporary/casual/daily basis appointment of the petty cash. Further, it is directed to all Branch Managers that any deviation in this regard will be viewed seriously. Thus, these circulars do not reflect that the Workman has been terminated from service by this order.

34. Similarly, office order dated 31.3.1997 is simply a direction to all branches of the Respondent bank by DGM that no further daily labour should be engaged or employed. Therefore, the plea of the Workman that he has been terminated by the aforesaid order dated 25.3.1997, 27.3.1997 and 31.3.1997 from the service by the Respondent is not acceptable. The evidence adduced by the Workman clearly goes to reveal that he had worked as a daily wager for which he has been paid wages according to number of working days. As there was an order for prohibition for engaging temporary workmen, in the bank, therefore, Workman could not be engaged by the Respondent for work from 1.4.1997 and there after. It is settled law that the daily wagers are engaged by the employer depending upon the availability of work and as the work was not available the Workman was not engaged further by the Respondent management. Therefore, the Workman on the ground of number of days he had worked in the Respondent bank cannot claim any right to reinstate him into the employment. As the Workman failed to prove the mandatory condition of 240 days of continuous service as required under Sec.25F of I.D. Act, 1947. Therefore, the disengagement of Workman from work can not be termed in contravention of provision contained under Sec.25F and 25 B of the I.D. Act, 1947.

Thus, this point is answered against the Workman and in favour of Respondent.

35. **Point No.III**:- In this context, the Workman has contended that the management failed to implement the selected panels during its valid tenure. The management adopted the back door methods contrary to the settlements and filled up the vacancies. The same is evident from the proceedings dated 18.11.1993 a copy of the same is filed in the material papers and the same may be read as part of the claim statement. Further, it is submitted that management has to adhere the procedure issued by the Central Government, the instructions dated 16.8.1990 in the year 1995, but same was not followed in the year 1997 despite there being vacancies. The management has followed the procedure of calling candidates through employment exchange instead of giving chance to the empanelled candidates like the Workman herein. The management sent call letters to the similarly situated candidates like the Workman in the month of June 1997 subsequent to issuance of impugned termination orders. After knowing the fact that they are litigating the issue by way of dispute, the management has refused to engage those candidates, the copies of call letters issued are filed herein along with claim petition. The Workman herein reiterates that the panels are meant for absorption but not for termination. In view of the same a duty is cast upon the Respondent management to engage the empanelled candidates like the Workman herein even in temporary vacancies till they are absorbed permanently in regular vacancies.

36. On the other hand, Respondent has contended that the Federation approached Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) for implementation of bipartite settlement in respect of the absorption of temporary employees. The Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) conducted conciliation proceedings and agreement was arrived at between the Federation and the Management bank. It is submitted that it was agreed between the Federation and the Management that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers /casual labour would be kept alive upto March, 1997 and the vacancies as agreed to under the afore set out settlements will be filled from both the lists concurrently. A copy of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.1995 signed by the parties to the dispute is filed as a material paper. Further, it is submitted that the settlement was arrived at and an agreement was signed between the Federation and the Management bank on 30.7.1996 under Section 2(p) read with Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules 1957 which is binding on the parties. A copy of this agreement which hereinafter may be referred to as 5th settlement for brevity, is also filed as a material paper. The 5th settlement dated 30.7.1996 whereunder the earlier four settlements dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988 and 9.1.1991 were also referred, it was

agreed to, by the Federation and the Management bank that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees will be kept alive upto March, 1997 for filling the vacancies existing/arrived at as on 31.12.1994 as per the norms agreed to between the bank and Federation and that thereafter the said panels would lapse. It was also agreed that within the framework of the above settlements the modalities about drawing names from either the panel of temporary employees or the panel of daily wagers and casual labour would be decided administratively on circle to circle basis depending upon the local requirements in consultation with the Federation's affiliate by the Circle management. It was further agreed that all messenger real vacancies/positions in the subordinate cadre including part-time attendants specifically provided as leave reserve will be filled by the end of 31.3.1997. Further, Respondent contended that on 27.2.1997 a memorandum of understanding was also signed between the Federation's affiliate and the bank management regarding the fact that the exercise of identifying the messengerial vacancies as on 31.12.1994 has since been completed by central office and thereby 403 messengerial vacancies were sanctioned to the circle of the Management bank and it was agreed that these vacancies may be filled from 1989 panel of temporary employees after effecting conversion from full time non-messengerial staff in the usual manner and the agreement was reached upon. Further, it was agreed between the Federations affiliate and the management bank that in terms of the settlement dated 30.7.1996 both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers /casual employees would lapse on 31.3.1997.

37. The Workman has contended that the empanelled list prepared by the Respondent management for appointment of temporary and daily wage Workers to the permanent post cannot lapse unless until it is exhausted by appointing all the empanelled persons and it should continue even after 31.3.1997, i.e., the date fixed for the lapse of panel. It is undisputed that the date of lapse of empanelled list of Workmen has been fixed to 31.3.1997 as mentioned in the settlement dated 30.7.1996, and agreed between the parties. It is settled law that and once the life of panel list lapses on the date as agreed between the parties it cannot be extended beyond that date. In the instant case the panel list of the workmen was valid upto 31.3.1997 in view of the terms and conditions enumerated in the 5th Settlement entered into between the parties. As the lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997 has been agreed by State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation through 5th Settlement, the Workman is not competent to challenge the same.

In this context I would like to take reference of the decision of the apex court in the case of **Syndicate Bank and Ors vs. Shankar Paul and Ors , AIR 1997 SC 3091, therein the Hon'ble Apex Court** have held:-

"Till 1982, the branches of the appellant Bank in Calcutta region were recruiting persons locally to work as temporary attenders in leave vacancies. In view of the revised procedure prescribed by the Government of India in respect of such temporary appointments, the Calcutta regional office of the appellant Bank issued a circular to all of its branches on 14.8.1982, instructing all the branches under it to discontinue the old practice from 1.6.1982 and appoint only empanelled candidates. The regional office was to prepare a panel of eligible candidates, after calling names from the local/district employment exchange, and split it up branch-wise. Following that new procedure yearly panels were prepared thereafter. Names of the Respondents were for the first time included in the panel prepared for the period 7.2.1987 to 6.2.1988. By its letter dated 7.2.1987 the Bank had informed the Respondents that the panel was valid for one year only and that inclusion of their names in the panel was not to confer on them any right to seek permanent appointment in the service of the bank. Considering the object with which the panel was prepared and the fact that it was an yearly panel expiring on 6.2.1988, we are of the opinion that the Respondents did not get any right, because of inclusion of their names in the said panel, for permanent absorption in the service of

the Bank. Whatever conditional right they had came to an end with the expiry of the panel. The claim of the Respondents, as contained in the writ petition was thus misconceived and therefore the learned single Judge and the Division Bench, when it first decided the appeal, were right in dismissing the writ petition and the appeal respectively."

Thus, in view of the above law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court and in view of the terms and conditions of the 5th Settlement the contention of the Workman that empanelled list should continue even after 31.3.1997 till the last Workman in the panel is absorbed is not tenable. The contention of the Workman is baseless in view of recital in the settlement. Therefore, in view of the fore gone discussion and finding given at Point No. I regarding binding nature of Settlements and terms and conditions enumerated therein, in view of the provision contained u/s.18(1) of the I.D. Act, 1947, I am of the considered view that life of panels lapsed on 31.3.1997 in view of terms of settlement dated 30.7.1996 and plea of Workman that the panel shall continue even after 31.3.1997 till last man absorbed has no legal force and same is untenable.

38. Undisputedly, settlement agreement dated 30.7.1996 was executed between the State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation and in that settlement it was agreed that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/ casual employees will be used for filling vacancies existing as on 31.12.1994 as per the norms agreed between the bank and the Federation. These empanelled workmen were to be given a chance for permanent appointment in the bank against vacancies arising up to December 1994 whereas the daily wagers/ casual employees were to be considered against the vacancies arise from January 1995 to December 1996, whereby the said panel would lapse. It was agreed that the vacancies falls upto 31.3.1997 shall be filled before the empanelled list is allowed to lapse. Thus, the claim of the Workman to the post of permanent non-messenger in the Respondent management was subject to the availability of the sanctioned post and vacancies arising upto 31.3.1997. The workmen given chance to the permanent post were seniors in number of working days in panel list and Workman herein was junior to those workmen. Therefore, Workman could not be given absorption to permanent post being junior to other workmen in the panel list.

39. In this context the Workman witness WW1 was cross examined by the Respondent counsel and in the cross examination the witness WW1 states:-

" I applied in response to an advertisement issued by the bank as per the settlements between the Bank and the union. Further, witness states*, "The panels were prepared basing upon the number of days of service of the temporary employees. Some of the temporary employees were also given regular appointment in the order of seniority as per the settlements.* Further witness states*, "I am not having any proof to show that any of my juniors are continuing in service.."*

Thus, from the above statement of the Workman witness WW1 it is clear that the panel was prepared in terms of various settlements entered into between Staff Federation of State Bank of India and State Bank of India and it was prepared on the basis of number of days of work put in by the temporary employees. Further, the Workman himself admitted that some of the temporary employees whose names were included in the panel were given regular appointment in the bank in order of their seniority in the panel and he is not having any document to show that any person who worked for less number of days than the Workman was given appointment in the bank. Therefore, the allegation of the Workman that the regular appointment has been made by the bank from the panel list in breach of the terms of the settlement and violation of seniority of panel list is not proved by this evidence of WW1. Thus, there is no evidence on record that bank has given the appointment to the temporary employees as well as daily wagers from the panel list 1989 and

1992 in breach of seniority of the temporary employees in the list. There is no evidence of jumbling in the panel list to make appointment of any permanent Workman in breach of the seniority. Therefore, I am constrained to hold that the Respondent Management has appointed the workmen from panel list in order of seniority and there is no jumbling of workmen in the panel list before it got lapsed on 31.3.1997.

40. However, Workman has taken the plea that the panels of Workmen for absorption in the employment of the Respondent banks (panels of temporary employees and daily wagers) has been lapsed on 31.3.1997 in contravention of terms of settlement as the object of preparing the entire empanelment of temporary and daily wagers was to provide them permanent employment and till the both the panel lists exhausted the panel list cannot be lapsed on 31.3.1997 and the date of lapsing of the panel on 31.3.1997 has been fixed by the Respondent arbitrarily without any authority.

41. In this context, the perusal of Settlement dated 30.7.1996 reveals that the 5th Settlement dated 30.7.1996 was entered under Section 2(p) and 18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Dispute (Central) Rules 1957. This settlement has been entered into by the competent parties and in this settlement parties thereto agreed that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees will lapse on 31.3.1997. Thus the date of lapse of panel was fixed by both the parties with consensus under the settlement dated 30.7.1996 and same is binding upon the Workman under the provision of Section 18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947. Moreover, this issue of binding force of the settlement dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988 and 9.1.1991 has already been discussed, decided at finding in Point No.I of this award. However, the legality and validity of the aforementioned settlement has not been challenged by the Workman before any competent forum. Thus, claim of Workman that the date of lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997 has been fixed arbitrarily by the Respondent bank is untenable. As regard the claim of Workman for his absorption to the permanent post it is settled law that the Workman can not claim his regularization to permanent post merely on the basis of number of working days.

42. In this context the reference of the decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Oil and Natural Gas Corporation vs Krishan Gopal 2020(3) SCALE 272, date of decision 7.2.2020** is relevant therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have has laid down principle regarding regularization of the Workman on permanent posts. Hon'ble Supreme Court have laid down the prepositions of regularization of the workmen to permanent post is as under:-

"*(i) Wide as they are, the powers of the Labour Court and the Industrial Court cannot extend to a direction to order regularisation, where such a direction would in the context of public employment offend the provisions contained in Article 14 of the Constitution;*

(ii) The statutory power of the Labour Court or Industrial Court to grant relief to workmen including the status of permanency continues to exist in circumstances where the employer has indulged in an unfair labour practice by not filling up permanent posts even though such posts are available and by continuing to employ workmen as temporary or daily wage employees despite their performing the same work as regular workmen on lower wages;

(iii) The power to create permanent or sanctioned posts lies outside the judicial domain and where no posts are available, a direction to grant regularisation would be impermissible merely on the basis of the number of years of service;

(iv) Where an employer has regularised similarly situated workmen either in a scheme or otherwise, it would be open to workmen who have been deprived of the same benefit at par with the workmen who have

been regularised to make a complaint before the Labour or Industrial Court, since the deprivation of the benefit would amount to a violation of Article 14; and

(v) In order to constitute an unfair labour practice under Section 2(ra) read with Item 10 of the Vth Schedule of the ID Act, the employer should be engaging workmen as badlis, temporaries or casuals, and continuing them for years, with the object of depriving them of the benefits payable to permanent workmen.

Thus, in view of the principles laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court as discussed above, in the instant matter the Workman utterly failed to prove his claim by adducing any documentary or oral evidence that the employer has indulged in unfair labour practice by not filling the permanent posts even though such posts are available and by continuing to employ workmen as temporary or daily wage employees despite their performance was the same work, as regular workmen on lower wages.

43. Respondent has contended that all the vacancies exist and arise upto 31.3.1997 has been filled up from the panel list in order of seniority and no vacancy exists or arises as on 31.3.1997 remained unfilled. Further, it is contended that as per terms of settlement the life of panel lists has been lapsed on 31.3.1997, hence, there is no occasion to extend the life of panel lists beyond 31.3.1997. However, the workman failed to prove contrary by any evidence to the aforesaid contention of the Respondent that the vacancies were existing as on 31.3.1997 and the workman was not given absorption to the permanent post in order of his seniority. It is settled law that the power to create permanent or sanctioned post lies outside the judicial domain and where no posts are available, a direction to grant regularization would be impermissible merely on the basis of the number of years of service. Therefore, the claim of the workman on this ground also not acceptable.

44. Further, as per the of settlement, panel was prepared for absorption of the workmen on the permanent posts has already been lapsed on 31.3.1997 and the vacancies existing and arising upto 31.12.1994 and upto 31.3.1997 as settlement dated 30.7.1996 has been filled up from the panel by appointing the workmen as per seniority in the panel list. Workman witness WW1 in his cross examination has himself admitted this fact that, some of the temporary employees whose names were included in the panel were given regular appointment in the bank in order of their seniority in the panel. The Workman failed to show that there was any breach of terms of settlement has been committed by the Respondent in appointment to permanent post from aforesaid panel list.

45. As discussed in preceding paragraph of this Award, the life of the panel has not been extended beyond 31.3.1997, by any further settlement hence, the panel list in which name of the Workman was included got expired on 31.3.1997. It is not the case of the Workman that Respondent has regularized similarly situated workmen either in the scheme or otherwise and the Workman has been deprived of same benefit on par with those workmen or the vacancies remained unfilled on the date of lapse of panels i.e., 31.3.1997, Industrial Tribunal has no jurisdiction to extend the date of lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997. This Tribunal can not order for regularization of workmen to the permanent post in contravention of the provision of Article 14 of the Constitution of India.

In the case of **Mahboob Deepak vs. Nagar Panchayat Gajraula & Anr, Civil Appeal No.5875/2007 date of judgement 13.12.2007,** Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

"8. Respondent is a Local Authority. The terms and conditions of employment of the employees are governed by a statute and statutory rules. No appointment can be made by a Local Authority without following the provisions of the recruitment rules. Any appointment made in violation of the said rules as

also the constitutional scheme of equality as contained in Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India would be a nullity.

9. Due to some exigency of work, although recruitment on daily wages or on an ad hoc basis was permissible, but by reason thereof an employee cannot claim any right to be permanently absorbed in service or made permanent in absence of any statute or statutory rules. Merely because an employee has completed 240 days of work in a year preceding the date of retrenchment, the same would not mean that his services were liable to be regularized."

Therefore, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, the claim of the Workman for absorption merely on the basis of number of day of work in the Respondent bank Branch is not acceptable. As regard plea of the Workman that the Workman should have been given employment even after 31.3.1997 as temporary Workman, it is the discretion of Respondent to engage the Workman depending upon availability of work and this Tribunal can not direct the Respondent to engage the Workman in the absent of such rule/scheme.

46. In view of principle laid down by Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above, in the instant matter Workman utterly failed to establish the fact of rendering continuous service for a period of 240 days of service within a period of 12 calendar months commencing and coming backward from relevant date i.e., the date of retrenchment, if has he would be denied to be in continuous service for a period of one year. Therefore, the provision contained under Sec.25F of retrenchment is not applicable to Workman.

Counsel for Workman has relied upon number of decisions of Hon'ble High Court and Hon'ble Supreme Court and few of them are discussed herein:-

In the case of **F.C.I., vs. Kamdhenu Cattle Feed Industries 1993 (1) SCC 71,** therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

"7. In contractual sphere as in all other State actions, the State and all its instrumentalities have to conform to Article 14 of the Constitution of which non-arbitrariness is a significant facet. There is no unfettered discretion in public law: A public authority possesses powers only to use them for public good. This impose the duty to act fairly and to adopt a procedure which is `fairplay in action'. Due observance of this obligation as a part of good administration raises a reasonable or legitimate expectation in every citizen to be treated fairly in his interaction with the State and its instrumentalities, with this element forming a necessary component of the decision making process in all State actions. To satisfy this requirement of non- arbitrariness in a State action, it is, therefore, necessary to consider and give due weight to the reasonable or legitimate expectations of the persons likely lo be affected by the decision or else that unfairness in the exercise of the power may amount to an abuse or excess of power apart from affecting the bona fides of the decision in a given case. The decision so made would be exposed to challenge on the ground of arbitrariness. Rule of law does not completely eliminate discretion in the exercise of power, as it is unrealistic, but providers for control of its exercise by judicial review."

In the case of **State Bank of India, R.O., Vijayawada vs. Industrial Tribunal, Hyderabad WP No.193/1997,** therein Hon'ble High Court have held,

"*Sri Krovvidi Narasimham, the learned counsel for the 2nd respondent contends, supporting the award that it was a permanent vacancy and even though the 2nd respondent was appointed on temporary basis, his services were not liable to be terminated and he was to be regularised into service on permanent basis. Shastry award warrants that no temporary appointment can be made to a permanent post. But the matter is now covered by two division bench judgements dated 28.11.1986 in W.A. No.791 of 1986 and 25.8.1987 in*

W.A. No.270 of 1982. The ratio decided in the two judgements is to the effect that there cannot be any mandate to appoint employees on permanent basis when the requirement was for appointment on temporary basis. But it is held in the said judgements that when a temporary appointee is ousted from service and not for misconduct and, if again temporary appointment is to be made, then, the case of such temporary appointee who was ousted, has got to be considered in accordance with Sec. 25-H of the Act."

In the case of **State of Haryana and others vs. Piara Singh and others. 1992 (4) SCC 118,** therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

" 49. If for any reason an adhoc or temporary employee is continued for a fairly long spell, the authorities must consider his case for regularization provided he is eligible and qualified according to the rules and his service record is satisfactory and his appointment does not run counter to the reservation policy of the state."

In the above cited judgements by the Workman the facts of the case are different hence do not apply to instant case of Workman.

47. On the other hand, in support of his contention Respondent has examined witness MW1 and MW1 in chief examination states that, Settlements i.e., on 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988, 9.1.1991 were entered into between the SBI and SBI Staff Federation for filling up of the vacancies that arise up to 1994 for those temporary employees who has worked on scale wages. Further, MW1 states that two different panels for messengers and non-messengers as per the eligibility criteria prescribed by the bank. There are four modules in Andhra Pradesh and they are Hyderabad, Tirupathi, Vijayawada and Visakhapatnam. MW1 states that the temporary employees so empanelled were given permanent absorption depending upon the vacancies so arise strictly in terms of the settlement. MW1 states that on 9.6.1995 conciliation proceeding was held before the RLC(C), Hyderabad and in said proceedings it was decided that the panels will be kept live up to 31.3.1997 and vacancies will be filled from both the lists concurrently. A copy of the said minutes of proceedings is Ex.M5. Further, MW1 states that on 30.7.1996 another settlement was entered between the SBI and All India SBI Staff Federation providing for filling up of the vacancies arising up to December 1994 in respect of subordinate cadre and daily wage /casual wage employees out of panel so prepared were to be considered against vacancies arising from January 1995 to December 1996, thereafter the said panels lapse. MW1 states that it was also agreed that all the non-messenger positions in subordinate cadre including part time attendants specially provided as leave reserve will be filled before 31.3.1997 and as regards to non-messengerial positions it is agreed that all such posts sanctioned and fallen vacant up to 31.3.1997 shall be filled before the empanelled list is allowed to lapse. Thus in both the cases empanelled list were lapsed on 1.4.1997. Ex.M6 is the copy of the settlement dated 30.7.1996. Further, witness states that on 27.2.1997 a memorandum of understanding was reached between the SBI and SBI Staff Federation providing that both the panels above mentioned will lapse on 31.3.1997. Ex.M7 is the copy of the memorandum of understanding and Ex.M8 is the copy of the statements giving the particulars of 1989 non-messenger panel, Ex.M9 is the copy of the statement of 1989 non- messenger panel, Ex.M10 is the copy of statement of 1992 panel. Further, witness states that petitioner was included in the 1989 panel. As the existing vacancies at that time were exhausted and his turn did not come he could not be given permanent employment in the bank as per the agreements. All the appointments were made strictly in accordance with the settlements reached from time to time between SBI and SBI staff federation and as per seniority, number of days of temporary service put in by them in the bank in the given period. Further, MW1 states petitioner was not sponsored by any employment exchange he did not undergo the regular process of selection required for appointment as a regular non-messenger the petitioner has not

worked for 240 days in any year in his entire temporary service in the bank. The petitioner and other temporary employees were terminated from service by the bank. Further, MW1 states that the vacancies were filled up on regular basis with the temporary employees from the panels and these panels were expired in terms of the settlements so reached and there were no vacancies to absorb such employees. Thus, witness MW1 has proved the documents Ex.M1 to Ex.M12 and also contentions made in the counter. However, MW1 was cross examined by the Petitioner Counsel. But nothing has been elicited in his cross examination so as to discredit the testimony of the witness MW1 as regards the date of lapse of both the panels on 31.3.1997 and reasons assigned for non-absorption of the Petitioner from the panel list to the permanent post. Moreover the witness MW1 was re-examined by the Respondent and the witness MW1 states that panels were expired in terms of the settlement send absorptions to the extent of the available vacancies were made. There was no termination of any temporary messenger as such but their services were not utilized after the cut off date as the available vacancies were already filled up and most of these Petitioners were not in the service of the bank as on the date of the expiry date of the panels. Therefore, in view of the aforesaid testimony of the MW1 in re-examination in the absence of cross examination remained uncontraverted, the claim of the Workman that he was entitled for absorption in permanent post in the branch of Respondent Management on the basis of panel list is found not established.

This point is answered against the Workman.

48. **Point No.IV**:- In view of the discussion and finding given at Point Nos. I, II and III, the Workman is not entitled for any relief and claim statement of Workman sans merit and liable to be dismissed.

This Point is answered accordingly.

AWARD

In view of the fore gone discussion, it is held that the action of the Respondent bank in terminating the services of Sri K. Veeranna, Ex. Messenger by way of oral orders w.e.f. 31.3.1997 is justified. Hence, the Petitioner is not entitled for any relief as prayed for. The claim statement filed by Workman sans merit, hence, dismissed. Reference is answered accordingly.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, Personal Assistant, transcribed by her, corrected and signed by me on this the 11th day of May, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner	Witnesses examined for the Respondent
WW1: Sri K. Veeranna	MW1: Sri K. Bala Kotaiah

Documents marked for the Petitioner

Ex.W1: Photocopy of Notification

Ex.W2: Photocopy of interview letter

Ex.W3: Photocopy of Panel list

Ex.W4: Photocopy of recommendation letter through employment exchange

Ex.W5: Photocopy of Service Certificate

Ex.W6: Photocopy of service certificate

Documents marked for the Respondent

Ex.M1: Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.17.11.87

Ex.M2: Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.16.7.88

Ex.M3: Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.27.10.1988

Ex.M4: Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.9.1.1991

Ex.M5: Photocopy of conciliation proceedings before the Regional Labour Commissioner(C) dt.9.6.1995

Ex.M6: Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.30.7.1996

Ex.M7: Photocopy of Memorandum of understanding dt. 27.1.1997

Ex.M8: Photocopy of statements giving the particulars of 1989 messenger panel.

Ex.M9: Photocopy of statement of 1989 Non-messenger panel

Ex.M10: Photocopy of statement of 1992 panel

Ex.M11: Photocopy of order of Hon'ble High Court in WA No.86/98 dt. 1.5.98

Ex.M12: Photocopy of order in SLP No.11886-11888 of 1998 dated 10.8.98

नई दिल्ली, 29 जुलाई, 2026

का.आ. 1623.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एस बी आई भारत का के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजको और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में **केन्द्रीय सरकार आद्योगिक अधिकरण–सह–श्रम न्यायालय,** हैदराबाद के पंचाट **(सन्दर्भ संख्या 193/2002)** को प्रकाशित करती है,

[सं. एल-12012/35/2000-आई.आर (बी-I)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 29th July, 2026

S.O. 1623.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Reference. I.D. No. 193/2002) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Hyderabad as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the Management of SBI of India and their workmen,

[No. L-12012/35/2000–IR (B-I)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

In The Central Government Industrial Tribunal Cum Labour Court At Hyderabad

Present: **Sri IRFAN QAMAR**

Presiding Officer

Dated the 6th day of May, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. 193/2002

[Old ID No.54/2000 of Industrial Tribunal No.I, Hyderabad]

Between:

Sri A. Narasimhulu,

Peddamastur,

Uravakonda,

Dist. Anantapur (A.P).

… Petitioner

And

The Dy. General Manager,

State Bank of India,

Zonal Office,

Renigunta Road,

Tirupathi(A.P) 517501. …..Respondent

Appearances:

For the Petitioner : Sri Macherla Rangaiah, Advocate

For the Respondent: Sri Y. Ranjeeth Reddy, Advocate

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-12012/35/2000-IR(B.I) dated 14.07.2000 referred the following dispute under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 to Industrial Tribunal No.I, Hyderabad for adjudication and later the same has been transferred to this Tribunal bearing ID No. 54/2000, as per orders of Central Government vide Lr.No.H-11026/1/2001-IR(C.II) dated 18.10.2001, requiring this forum to decide the question:

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the State Bank of India, Uravakonda Branch in terminating Sri A. Narasimhulu, Sweeper-cum-Waterboy, from the services of the Bank by way of oral orders w.e.f 31.3.1997 is justified? If not, what relief he is entitled to?"

After receipt of the reference, it was numbered as ID No. 193/2002 and notices were issued to both the Workman and the management.

2. Before unfolding the factual matrix of the instant industrial dispute it would be apposite to have a bird eye view of a chequered history of the instant industrial dispute. Earlier instant industrial dispute along with the batch cases was decided by this Tribunal vide common award dated 17.5.2005 and the reference was answered in favour of the Respondent and against the Workman. That said common award dated 17.5.2005 was challenged by the aggrieved Workmen in various Writ petition No.6470/2014 along with batch of writ petitions before the Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh and Hon'ble High Court vide its' judgement dated 23.6.2014 allowed all batch of writ petitions and set aside the common award dated 17.5.2005 passed in ID No.222 of 2001 and other batch of ID cases by Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad and the Respondent management of State Bank of India was directed to reengage the Writ Petitioners in position, which they have been occupying prior to their termination and further directed to consider their cases for regularization as and when the substantive vacancy arises. This judgement dated 23.6.2014 of Hon'ble High Court of AP, passed in WP No.6470/2014 and batch petitions was challenged by Respondent management before the Hon'ble High Court in Writ Appeal No. 1268 of 2014. The aforesaid Writ Appeals No.1268/2014 and other Writ Appeals were decided by Division Bench of High Court of Andhra Pradesh by a common judgement dated 20.3.2019. Hon'ble High Court in aforesaid Writ Appeal was pleased to pass the order which is extracted as below:-

" 7. Hearing the learned senior counsel for the SBI and the learned senior counsel for the contesting unofficial Respondents, we see that while the learned single Judge was justified in setting aside the award af the Tribunal, the proper course to be adopted was to remit all the cases to the Tribunal. This we say for reasons more than one. Firstly, in such matters, claims have to be decided on individual basis, as different persons have different claims as to the length of officiation or discharge of duties and functions; quality of engagement, drawings, accounting of the post for each one of them, who have worked etc. AIl these issues will not be the same in all the cases. Therefore, each case ought to have been directed to be decided by the Tribunal afresh on individual basis. The second and most important aspect is the learned single Judge has in one go ordered re-employment of all the workmen. This is not a relief that could have been granted without answering the individual issues; each issue relating to each case could not have been decided by the writ Court within the format of its adjudication procedures and scope. The adjudicating body, which has to do that activity, is the Industrial Tribunal. Therefore, we are of the view that while we would sustain the order of the learned singe Judge insofar as it interfered and sets aside the award of the Tribunal, the further findings and directions, issued through the impugned order have to go and the individual cases have to be sent back for consideration of the Tribunal. Such further procedure before the Tribunal will have to be carried forward with the materials already on record and also by affording an opportunity to the persons, who have claims as well as the management to place their rival contentions and further material before the Tribunal. The learned counsel appearing for the workmen are justified in pointing out that enormous delay has already happened and further action by the Tribunal in this line may be expedited.

9. In the result, these writ appeals are ordered;

(1) affirming the impugned common order of the learned single Judge to the extent it sets aside the common award dated 17.05.2005 of the Industrial Tribuna!;

(2) the further findings and directions issued through the impugned common order are vacated:

(3) all the matters shall be remitted to the Industrial Tribunal with a direction to dispose of them within an outer limit of five (5) months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order; and,

(4) the parties to make appearance before the Tribunal on the given date."

Thus, in view of the above direction of Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh in W.A.No.1268 of 2014 and batch cases. This Tribunal has taken up the matter of industrial dispute for hearing and deciding it afresh in view of the aforesaid guidelines laid down by the Hon'ble High Court in Writ Appeal No.1268/2014 vide judgement dated 20.3.019.

3. The factual matrix of instant industrial dispute as narrated by the Workman in his claim statement are that, the Workman joined in the service of the management institution as Messenger from 1985 to 1997, and has rendered unblemished service spreading over a period of about 8 years. The Respondent has terminated services of Workman by oral orders with effect from 1.4.1997. Further, it is submitted that the management of Respondent bank decided to give a chance to temporarily employed personnel "found suitable for permanent appointment" by wait- listing them by offering permanent appointment or waitlisting till such opportunity arises.

4. That on 17.11.1987 a settlement was reached between All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and the Management of State Bank of India - settlement one, under this settlement three categories of employees were listed. That is, A) those who have completed 240 days in 12 months or less after 1.7.1975. B) those who have completed 270 days in any continuous block of 36 calendar months after 1.7.1975. C) (i) those who have completed minimum of 30 days aggregate temporary service in any calendar year after 1.7.1975 or (ii) 70 days aggregate temporary service in continuous block of 36 months after 1.7.1975.

5. The persons who satisfied in all the above 4 categories were to be interviewed by a selection committee and the said selection committee would determine the suitability of the said candidate for permanent appointment. Therefore, the bank prescribed certain qualifications and from among the candidates satisfying the qualifications the suitable candidates were enlisted by a selection committee. The Clause 7 of the said agreement provided with the selected candidate would be wait listed in order of their respective categorization and the selected panel would be valid upto December, 1991. Clause 10 of the settlement specifically provided that henceforth. "there will be no temporary appointments in the subordinate cadre", except on a restrictive basis in the specified category, "from amongst empanelled candidates as per existing guidelines of the bank". The Workman further submits that consequent upon the said agreement and the draft, a notification was issued in the newspapers. The last date for responding to the advertisement was 30.8.1988. A written examination followed by viva-voce in May, 1989 was held. A selected panel was prepared, as per Clause 7 of the agreement, ie. Settlement No.1, the selected panel was to be valid upto December, 1991, the Workman submits that circular was issued on 26.4.91 by the said letter it is mentioned that the terms of the agreement dated 17.11.87 was modified vide second agreement dated 16.7.88 was entered into between the parties. In terms of the said agreement a chance was to be given, "to all eligible temporary employees for permanent appointments. The appointments were against the vacancies likely to arise during the years 1995-96, circular made it clear that in view of the enormity of the problem an extension of the currency of the panel, eligible temporary employees who have been empanelled could not appear in the earlier interviews and have been pursuing their cases thereafter, "will be given another chance to appear for interview".

6. Workman submits that there were total five settlements. The settlement dated 17.11.87 is the 1st settlement (Ex M1), settlement dated 16.7.88 is 2nd settlement (Ex M2), settlement dated 27.10.88 is the 3rd settlement (Ex M3), then settlement dated 9.1.91 is 4th settlement and settlement dated 30.7.96 is 5th settlement (Ex M6). In between there is minutes of conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.95 marked as Ex

M5. That due to all these settlements which were extended by subsequent settlements thereby created reasonable expectations in the list of the selected candidates arose with that it's a question of time their appointments or services would be regularized in the services of the bank. The Workman was working with the bank on temporary basis was under the bonafide hope that sooner his services will be regularized with the bank. He is thereby closed all his options elsewhere. It is needless to point out that employing person to whom hope of employment in substantial terms was made is a facet of Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

7. Further Workman submits that the Government of India issued Circular No. F-3/3/104/87-IR, dated 16.8.1990. Under said circular the chief Executives of all public sector banks including the Management herein were specifically instructed that until the problem of existing temporary employees is fully resolved, no bank is permitted to make any permanent appointments. That some of the persons similarly situated like this Workman aggrieved by the inaction on the part of the management of the bank is not regularizing their services from out of the selected panel and not clearly focusing the vacancy position, filed W.P. No. 4194/97 before Hon'ble High court of A.P.. It is specifically averred in the said writ petition that the Management of the bank had failed to implement the settlement and that it violates the various fundamental rights guaranteed under the constitution of India. The Hon'ble High court of A.P .. by order dated 5.3.97 directed the bank to implement the settlement as amended from time to time. It also directed the bank to carry out the terms of settlement before the expiry of March, 1997. The Hon'ble High Court also recorded finding that the Bank cannot escape its liability of enforcement of the Settlement. In view of the directions given by the High Court all candidates whose names appeared in the select panels prepared on the basis of the agreement entered into on 17.11.87 under which the panel was valid upto December, 1991, and on the basis of a settlement dated 27.10.1988 whereby the panels were made alive upto 31.3.1997 under which the panel was valid upto December, 1999. The other agreement dated 16.7.1988 under which the panel was valid upto 1992 and on the basis of the settlement dated 27.10.1998 whereby the panels were made alive upto 31.3.1997 were under the bonafide impression that their cases will be considered for regularization and were living on the basis of the said reasonable expectation. Unfortunately, contrary to the aforesaid directions given by the High Court and contrary to the settlements entered into between the parties, the bank issued proceedings dated 25.3.1997, dated 27.3.1997 and 31.3.1997 instructing the various authorities of the Management not to continue the temporary employees those who are in services of the bank from 1.4.97. The said order was followed by the Management. Aggrieved by the said action the Workman herein and similarly situated candidates have filed a writ petition before the Hon'ble High Court and by way of Writ Petition No.9206/97 seeking a declaration that the proceedings issued by the Deputy General Manager and the Assistant General Manager (Respondents 3,4 and 5 therein) on 25.3.97, 27.3.97 and 31.3.97 as illegal and also non-continuance of the Workmen therein in service by absorbing them in the services of the bank as violative of Section 2(p) and 18(1) read with Rule 58 of Central Rules and sought for specific direction to the bank to absorb them in service.

8. Further, Workman submits that in the counter affidavit filed in Writ Petition No.9206/97, the bank has submitted that it has about 805 branches in Andhra Pradesh alone. It has stated that due to exigencies of circumstances and on account of the urgent need in its banks, it employed temporary employees in subordinate cadre. It is pertinent to mention that it does not state the urgent or need or the nature of temporary employees that it had engaged. Enquiry into the same would reveal that the stand taken by the bank either on the ground of urgent need or of temporary employees is a façade to perpetuate unfair labour practice. It is designed to on the one hand, keep the employed in the erroneous zone of hope and on the other to ensure that benefits that a model employer will extend under various statutes to its employees is

not required to be borne out by the bank. A reading of the counter affidavit would show that the bank would opines that being just fair and reasonable are which obviously is reprehensible and is a facet of unfair labour practice.

9. The Workman submits that the bank had referred in its counter affidavit to three settlements dated 17.11.87, 16.7.88 and 27.10.88. The bank in the guise of extending the benefits of the circular of Government dated 16.8.90 stated in its counter affidavit that as follows:

"Government of India, vide its letter dated 16.8.1990, issued guidelines to all the public sector banks with regard to recruitment and absorption of temporary employees in public sector banks. The said guidelines were issued to implement on the lines of the approach paper on the issue provided by a committee constituted in this regard. The Government of India guidelines made it clear that all the public sector banks may follow the provisions laid down in the approach paper.

The approach paper specified that the cases of temporary employees who had put in not less than 240 days of temporary service in 12 consecutive Months and who are entitled to benefit of Section 25-F may be decided by entering into a settlement with the representative union. In respect of temporary employees who had put in less than 240 days of service in 12 consecutive months or less, a settlement could be avoided and however if the Management so desired, they could enter into a conciliation settlement with the representative union. Para 6(h), it is mentioned that only those temporary employees who had put in temporary service of 90 or more days after 1.1 1982 would be eligible for considering under the scheme. Although the Government guidelines envisaged for a settlement in respect of employees who had put in temporary service of 90 or more days, the bank by way of further concession entered into settlements Even in respect of those who had put in less than 90 days. As such, it could be Seen that the settlements are more beneficial to the temporary employees concerned. The approach paper also specify at para 6(c) that the banks would provide one time opportunity to all the temporary employees and for that purpose temporary employees worked in the bank on or after 1.1.1982 could be considered for re-employment in terms of the scheme. The Respondents have gone further wherein even persons working after 1975 were also considered.

As could be seen from the above, there was a genuine effort on the part of the Respondent bank to provide permanent employment for as many as possible subject to availability of the vacancies.

It is further submitted that at para 6(k) of the approach paper, it was made clear that this would be one time exercise in full and final settlement of all the aims and disputes for the past period in respect of temporary workmen covered by the settlement. This would mean that the Government of India guidelines would cover only those persons who were temporarily employed for the period specified therein and not otherwise. As such, it is submitted that the Respondents have not only followed the Government of India guidelines but in fact covered cases of the employees who had worked for less than 90 days. As such, question of violation does not arise and in any case those were only broad guidelines and not directives".

10. The Workman submits that the bank also referred a subsequent settlement dated 9.1.1991 wherein there is a clause to the effect- that the panel of temporary employees and the panel of daily wage employees will be operated to a particular period. Therefore, their cases will not be considered. The Management herein relying upon this settlement in their impugned action. It is submitted that even the settlement dated 9.1.1991 will not empower the management to terminate the services of the temporary employees who are working in the bank services like the Workman herein as it does not specify the termination of the employees. In fact there are so many vacancies wherein the Management has engaged

several new persons as temporary messengers/ attendars/ sweepers etc., even after the judgment of Hon'ble High Court without considering the cases of the similarly situated candidates like the Workman herein. It is submitted inspite of engaging fresh candidates as is now being done by the Management they would have continued the similarly situated candidates like the Workman herein in the services of the bank and consider their cases for absorption in view of the circulars issued by Central Government as well as the directions of this Hon'ble Court in Writ Petition No.4194/97, dated 5.3.97. In view of the circulars issued by the Central Government, the Management should not have relied upon the settlement dated 9.1.1991. Hence, the impugned action of the Management is illegal, unjust, violative of fundamental rights such as Articles 14,16 and 21 of the Constitution of India.

11. The Workman submits that in W.P. No.4194/97 filed by the union of temporary employees where in they have complained about the non- implementation of the settlements arrived between the parties and sought for absorption. Such employees in the bank services on permanent basis before the date fixed for carrying out the terms of settlement, the Court held that the members of the union had been empanelled in the list, they were not regularized and the time was going to run out to the near future and the Respondent bank and its officers cannot escape from the liability of enforcing the settlement which has been reached and therefore directed that the bank and the officers shall implement the settlement dated 17.11.87 as amended from time to time before the expiry of 31.3.97.

12. Further, it is submitted that in the clause of Settlement it is specifically mentioned that the workmen to be absorbed/appointed in the bank prohibiting any temporary appointments subsequent to the date of settlement even the authorities want to make temporary appointments that should be made only from among the empanelled can be appointed either for temporary vacancy or permanent vacancy except from among the empanelled candidates like the Workman and that should be continued till they are absorbed. The management committed unfair labour practices and terminated the services of the candidates with effect from 1.4.1997 which is arbitrary, discriminatory, contrary to their own guidelines and violative of the constitutional provisions which are guaranteed in Chapter-III of the Constitution of India.

13. The Workman submits that it is strange as to how the panels were allowed to lapse by a so-called Memorandum of Understanding dated 25.2.1997, that the action of terminating such employees like the Workman by virtue of an impugned oral proceedings without implementing the settlement would be illegal and unfair labour practice which cannot be allowed to be perpetuated. That the discontinuance of the Workman after 31.3.97 who had served in the bank in any capacity amounts to retrenchment. It could not have been done without any notice and it violates Sec.25FF of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and the said action is violative of principles of natural justice guaranteed under Chapter III of the Constitution of India. This amounts to retrenchment without one month's notice and taken in view of such notice. Thus, the main proceedings issued by the Respondent is without jurisdiction and is arbitrary, illegal and therefore liable to be quashed. That the alleged Memorandum of Understanding dated 27.2.97, Ex.M5 does not own any legal entity, as the said Memorandum of Understanding is not published anywhere to brought to the notice of the Workman whose rights are being affected. It is submitted that Management did not adhere to the procedure envisaged by the Central Government in its' instructions dated 16.8.90 in the year 1995. The same was not followed in the year 1997 despite there being vacancies. The management has followed the procedure of calling candidates through Employment exchange instead of giving chance to the empanelled candidates like the Workman here. It is pertinent to mention here that the Respondent Management sent letters to the all similarly situated candidates like the Workman in the month of June, 1997, subsequent to

the passing of impugned termination orders. After knowing the facts that the candidates are litigating, the Management refused to engage these candidates. It is once again reiterated that the panels are meant for absorption but not for termination. It was the duty of the Management to engage the empanelled candidates like the Workman even in temporary vacancies till they are absorbed permanently in regular vacancies. Hence, the action of the Respondent Management terminating the services of the Workman by oral order dated 31.3.97 is unjust, illegal, violative of principles of natural justice and hence, the Management be directed to reinstate and absorb the Workman and to grant all incidental and consequential benefits.

14. Per contra, Respondent had filed counter and made a contentions that the reference is not tenable and contrary to the provisions of I.D. Act, 1947. Respondent submitted that to tide over severe sub-ordinate staff constraints which arose out of leave vacancies, exigencies, etc., and also owning to the restrictions imposed by the Government of India/Reserve Bank of India on intake of staff, the Respondent bank used to engage sub-ordinate staff like messengers, sweepers, sweeper cum water boys, etc., depending on the availability of work on purely temporary basis for the smooth and uninterrupted functioning of the branches. It is submitted that the All India State Bank of India Staff Federation which represents majority of the employees in the State Bank of India comprising about 98% of the work force as its' members espoused the cause of temporary employees who have put in less than 240 days of temporary service in 12 calendar months in the bank and who were ineligible for any protection under Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 to give a chance for being considered for absorption and permanent appointments.

15. Discussions were held and on 17.11.1987 an agreement was signed between the federation and the Management bank under Sec. 2(p) read with Sec 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules 1957. A copy of the said settlement dated 17.11.87 which may be herein after referred as first settlement is filed and 4 categories were made as it has already been mentioned in the claim statement above, it need not be repeated here. In the first settlement, it was agreed that the temporary employees as categorized would be given a chance for being considered for permanent appointment in the bank's service against the vacancies which are likely to arise during the period 1987 to 1991. On 16.7.88 second settlement was arrived between the Federation and the Bank whereby it was agreed to substitute the period of consideration of vacancies as 1987 to 1992 in place of 1987 to 1991 as contemplated under the first settlement dated 17.11.1987. This is the second settlement. A 3rd settlement was entered into on 27.10.88 and it was agreed that the bank's service against the vacancies likely to arise from 1988 to 1992 was to be considered. Government of India vide its letter dated 16.8.90 issued guidelines to all the public sector banks with regard to recruitment and absorption of temporary employees in public sector banks. The said guidelines were issued to implement on the lines of approach paper on the issue provided by a committee constituted in this regard. Government of India guidelines made it clear that all the public sector banks may follow the provisions laid down in the approach paper. The approach paper specified that the cases of temporary service in 12 consecutive months and who are entitled to benefit of Sec.25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 may be decided by entering into a settlement with the representative union. In respect of temporary employees who had put in less than 240 days of service in 12 consecutive months or less, a settlement could be avoided and however if the Management so desired they could enter into a conciliation settlement with the representative union. In para. 6(h) it is mentioned that only those temporary employees who had put in temporary service of 90 days or more days after 1.1.82 would be eligible for considering under the scheme. Although the Government guidelines envisaged for a settlement in respect of employees who had put in temporary service of 90 days or more days, the bank by way of a further concession entered into settlements. Even in respect of those who had put in less than 90 days and also the bank went a step further and said those persons who are working after 1975 were also

considered. Hence, there was a genuine effort on the part of the Respondent bank to provide as many as possible jobs subject to the availability of the vacancies. However, para 6 (k) of the approach paper made it clear that it is a one time, exercise in full and final, settlement of all the claims and disputes for the past period, in respect of temporary workmen covered by the settlement. Another settlement was entered on 9.1.91 herein after referred as 4th settlement and the time limit was extended upto 1994 and separate panel was prepared for temporary employees, casual/daily wagers. It was agreed that while vacancies arising between 1988 to 1994 in respect of temporary employees and in respect of casual/daily wagers, they can be considered for the vacancies arising between 1995-96 only.

16. It is submitted that the administrative set up of the Hyderabad Local Head Office comprises of four Zonal Offices (Zones) at Hyderabad, Vijayawada, Visakhapatnam and Tirupathi covering all the Districts of Andhra Pradesh. In terms of the settlement the Management after following the procedure laid down therein prepared the panels of qualified candidates of temporary employees denoted as 1989 panel and also panel of casual/daily wagers denoted as 1992 panel for giving a chance for being considered for permanent absorption. These panels were prepared zone-wise separately for messengers and non-messengers in the descending order of temporary service put in by the candidates during the stipulated period i.e., 1.7.1975 to 31.7.1988. That the Federation approached the Regional Labour Commissioner(C) for implementation of bi-partite settlement in respect of absorption of temporary employees. The Regional Labour Commissioner(C) conducted conciliation proceedings and an agreement was arrived between the Federation and the bank. It was agreed that it would be kept alive upto March, 1997. A copy of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.2.1995 signed by the parties is filed as material paper. A settlement was arrived at and an agreement was signed between the Federation and the Management bank on 30.7.1996 under Sec.2 (p) read with Sec.18(1) of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957, which is hereinafter called as 5th settlement. That on 27.2.1997 a Memorandum of understanding was also signed by the federation's affiliate and the bank Management recording the fact that the exercise of identifying the messengerial vacancies as on 31.12.1994 has since been completed by Central Office and thereby 403 messengerial vacancies were sanctioned . It was agreed that these vacancies may be filled from 1989 panel of temporary employees after effecting conversion from full time non-messengerial staff in the usual manner and the agreement was reached accordingly. It was agreed between the Federation's affiliate and the Management bank that in terms of the settlement dated 30.7.1996 both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees would lapse on 31.3.1997. That as agreed upon vacancies were filled from the panels. The Workman who has put in an aggregate temporary service of less than 240 days in a continuous block of 12 months period during 1.7.1975 to 31.7.1988 has no right to seek a direction to consider his candidature for absorption in the Management bank under any rule/law except under the settlement entered into thereon.

17. Respondent contended that, in fact, the case of the Workman can be considered under all the five settlements having got his case considered under provisions of these settlements. All the other provisions and terms of the settlements are also binding on him/her. The Management bank has not violated any of the provisions of the terms of the said settlement. That the very preparation and maintenance of panel is in compliance of the terms agreed under these settlements. These settlements were time bound and they ceased to exist on 31.3.1997. That the bank has never promised that all the candidates in the panel will be absorbed. In the advertisement itself it was made clear that candidates will be considered for absorption in the vacancies that may arise upto 1992. Keeping alive the panels after 31.3.1997 is contrary to the settlements arrived between the State Bank of India Staff Federation and the Management bank. That the settlements are binding on the parties. The Workman is also bound under the terms of the said settlement.

The settlement does not suffer from any ambiguity as their language is very clear. The right under the settlements is to give them a chance to be considered for future appointment in the bank's services against the vacancies likely to arise. The settlements were effected to balance the expectations of the temporary employees to be absorbed in permanent service as against the constitutional rights for all eligible persons to be considered for employment every time a vacancy arises. That the alleged dispute including the demand for reinstatement has to be decided in this context. It is submitted that the period of panel list got expired on 31.3.97 and it is an integral term of the settlement and cannot be modified in any proceedings under the law. These temporary employees who unfortunately could not be accommodated for want of vacancies have no further rights to be considered for regularization. That the Hon'ble High Court in WP No.12964/94, held as follows, "It is needless to state that the settlement arrived at between the All India State Bank of India Staff Federation which, is the majority union and the bank Management is binding on the Workmen also. It is not at all the case of the Workman that any of the terms of the settlement has been violated by the bank's Management. If the Workman had worked in the bank on part-time basis before 31.5.94, that itself would not vest in him a right to claim that his services should be regularized on permanent basis against a full time cadre post. The claim put forth by the Workman in the present petition is therefore misconceived and not tenable. However, it is open to the Workman to claim any right which flows from the settlement between the union and the bank Management. As already pointed out that it is not the grievance of the Workman that some right which has flown from the settlement in favour of the Workman has been denied by the bank Management. Therefore, I do not find any ground, let alone substantial ground, to grant the kind of relief sought for by the Workman. Writ Petition fails and is accordingly dismissed. No costs."

18. Further, it is contended that if the panels were not lapsed at the end of designated period and allowed to be continued it would result in making the contracts of temporary employment indirectly permanent through back door entry, which would not only be contrary to the settlements but also to Articles 14 and 16 of Constitution of India and deprive the chances of original claimants who would Come through proper recruitment procedure. As their rights have been crystallized by operation of the settlements. Hence, there is no question of any Legitimate expectation being violated.

19. Similarly placed ex-employees filed WP No.9206/1995 and the batch before the Hon'ble High Court of A.P. and the learned Single Judge allowed the Writ Petitions. Aggrieved by the same WA No.86/98 and the batch was filed and the Division Bench set aside the order of the Single Judge. Thereafter the ex-temporary employees filed Special Leave Petition No.11886-11888 of 1998 before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India also dismissed the SLP. Therefore, reference to the Judgement of the Learned Single Judge in WP No.9206/97 is of no consequences as the same has already been set aside. The observations made in the Judgements cannot be relied upon for any purpose what so ever. The question of operation of Sec.25F would not come into play. Further the issue is covered by various Judgements of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India and various Hon'ble High Courts. Hence, the reference may be ordered that the Workman is not entitled for any relief.

20. In order to fortify his claim Workman has examined himself as WW1 and also filed documents in evidence which has been exhibited as Ex.W1 to W5. Further, the Workman has filed photocopies of documents in support of his claim which are discussed as under:-

Ex. W1 is the Notification. Ex. W2 is the Interview call letter. Ex. W3 is the panel list. Ex. W4 is the Service Certificate. Ex. W5 is the Service Certificate.

21. On the other hand, Respondent has examined witness MW1 Sri K. Bala Kotaiah and this witness has exhibited 12 documents, marked as Ex.M1 to M12. The details of these documents are as follows:-

Ex.M.1 is the Settlement dated 17.11.1987. Ex.M2 is the Settlement dated 16.7.1988. Ex.M3 is the Settlement dated 27.10.1988. Ex.M4 is the Settlement dated 9.1.1991. Ex.M5 is the Minutes of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.1995. Ex.M6 is the Settlement dated 30.7.1996. Ex.M7 is the Memorandum of Understanding dt. 27.2.1997. Ex.M8 is the Particulars of 1989 Messengerial Panel. Ex.M9 is the Particulars of 1989 Non-Messengerial Panel. Ex.M10 is the Particulars of 1992 General Attendant Panel. Ex.M11 is the Judgment of Hon'ble High Court of A.P. in Writ Appeal No.86/98 dt.1.5.1998. Ex.M12 is the Judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in SLP No. 11886-11888 of 1998 dt.10.8.1998.

22. Apart from afore mentioned documents, Learned Counsel for Workman has also filed a long list of various judgements of Hon'ble Supreme Court as well as Hon'ble High Court, which we will discuss at appropriate place in this Award.

23. Heard the argument of Learned Counsel for Workman as well as for Respondent.

24. On the basis of rival pleadings of both the parties and submissions made by the Learned Counsel for both the parties, following points arise for determination in the industrial dispute :-

I. Whether the 1st settlement dated 17.11.1987, 2nd settlement dated 16.7.1988, 3rd settlement dated 27.10.1988, 4th settlement dated 9.1.1991 and 5th settlement dated 30.7.1996 entered into between State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and also Memorandum of Understanding are binding upon both the parties?

II. Whether the action of State Bank of India, Uravakonda Branch in terminating the services of Workman Sri A. Narasimhulu, a Messenger with effect from 31.3.1997 is justified?

III. Whether the Workman is entitled for absorption on permanent post in the Branch of Respondent management as per averments made by him in the claim statement?

IV. To what relief if any the Workman is entitled for?

Findings:-

25. Point No.I:- Undisputedly settlements dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988, 9.1.1991 and 30.7.1996, minutes of conciliation proceedings and memorandum of understanding dated 27.2.1997 were executed between the State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation under section 2(p) and 18 (1) of I.D. Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Disputes (Central Rules), 1957.

Section 2(p) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 as follows:-

(p) "settlement" means a settlement arrived at in the course of conciliation proceeding and includes a written agreement between the employer and workmen arrived at otherwise than in the course of conciliation proceeding where such agreement has been signed by the parties thereto in such manner as may be prescribed and a copy thereof has been sent to an officer authorised in this behalf by the appropriate Government and the conciliation officer;

Section 18(1) provides as follows:-

18. Persons on whom settlements and awards are binding.

- [(1) A settlement arrived at by agreement between the employer and Workman otherwise than in the course of conciliation proceeding shall be binding on the parties to the agreement.

Therefore, in view of the provision contained u/s.18 (1) I.D. Act, 1947, terms and conditions enumerated in the aforesaid settlements are binding on the parties to the agreement. The Learned Counsel for Workman has argued that the Workman after going through the selection procedure has successfully been listed in the panel for appointment on the permanent basis in the Respondent management and the empanelled list has to be valid till last person in the empanelled list is appointed on permanent basis. But the impugned order dated 25.3.97, 27.3.97 and 31.3.97, has been issued by Respondent management thereby the services of the Workman has been terminated and the said order is not in consonance of the terms of the agreement entered into between the parties. Further, Workman submits that the Respondent in the 5th settlement has mentioned the date i.e., 31.3.1997 for lapse of empanel list which is illegal and that is not binding upon the Workman. The condition of lapse of empanelment list on 31.3.97 incorporated in the aforesaid 5th settlement, is arbitrary and illegal.

26. The perusal of the impugned order dated 25.3.1997 goes to reveal that the Chief/Branch Manager, SBI Zonal Office has issued the letter to all the branches with regard to the subject not to make any temporary appointments in the Branch in messengerial category from 1.4.1997. The extract of the said letter is given below:-

"We have been advised by the Deputy General Manager, Zonal Office, Hyderabad that as both the panels of temporary employees of 1989 and daily wagers/casual labours of 1992 will lapse by 31.3.1997, it has been decided by Central Office not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial category from 1.4.1997."

Thus, from the contents of the aforesaid letter, it manifest that Head Office of State Bank of India vide letter dated 25.3.1997 has issued direction to all its branches not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial category from 1.4.1997 due to reason of lapse of both panels i.e., 1989 & 1992 on 31.3.1997 as per terms of settlements entered into by both parties. Further, the contents of the subsequent letter dated 27.3.1997 issued by Respondent Management is also direction to Branch Manager, State Bank of India not to make any temporary messengerial category appointment with effect from 1.4.1997 and it has also been communicated to all concerned that the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers maintained by Zonal offices stand lapsed from 31.1.1997. Further, office order dated 31.3.1997 has been issued by Respondent management that goes to reveal that the said office order has been issued to this effect that, "Consequent on absorption of temporary employees in permanent cadre, it has been decided by the competent authority that no one onwards, no further daily labour or temporary employees/appointments should be resorted to/engaged/employed." Therefore, it reflects from the contents of the aforesaid orders that the temporary appointment in messengerial category and daily labour has been stopped by the Respondent management with effect from 1.4.1997 because of the lapsed of panel of temporary workers and daily wagers by 31.3.1997. The agreement for lapse of both the panels on 31.3.1997 is contained in the 5th settlement which has been arrived at between the parties on dated 30.7.1996 with the consensus of both the parties. Therefore, Workman can not challenge the terms and conditions contained in settlement dated 30.7.1996 regarding lapse of panel on 31.3.1997 as agreed between State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation. As per provision contained u/s.18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 the said Agreement dated 30.7.1996 is binding on both the parties.

In the case of **Allied Sales Corporation Secunderabad vs.The Authority Under Andhra Pradesh..... 1990 II LLJ 510 AP para 414, Hon'ble Court have held:-**

"*4. There was a settlement between the Management and the workmen under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act on 25th April 1983 under which the age of superannuation of the workmen was fixed at 55 years. The settlement was to be in force upto 30th June 1986 and the next settlement, incorporating practically the same terms, was again entered into on 4th February 1987 under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act. There is no dispute that these settlements are under Section 18(1).*

14. Now the Authority constituted under Section 41(1) of the Act is an authority with very limited jurisdiction. It can only decide in the first appeal whether a termination by the management is valid or not and is within the parameters of Section 40 of the Act. The said Authority, in our view, has absolutely no jurisdiction to decide whether a settlement entered into under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act between the representatives of the Workmen and of the Management, is vitiated by undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion on the part of the Management. The Authority, namely, the Assistant Commissioner of Labour, was never intended by the A.P. Legislature to have jurisdiction to go into the question of the validity of a settlement arrived at under Section 18 of the Industrial Disputes Act by an Industrial Court. That Parliament has, in fact, constituted Industrial Courts under the Industrial Disputes Act, with extensive powers cannot be disputed. What we mean to say is that the Authority under Section 41(1) of the A.P. Act has no jurisdiction what-so-ever either to question or to decide about the validity of any such settlements. If parties to a settlement have a grievance about the validity of a settlement, it is for them to agitate the matter before the appropriate forum and they cannot ask an Authority constituted under Section 41(1) of the A.P. Shops and Establishments Act, 1966 with limited jurisdiction, to go into any such question and, that too, incidentally while deciding whether retirement as per the contract of employment, is legal or not."

It is not the case of Workman that aforesaid settlements are vitiated by undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion on the part of the management. If the Workman feeling aggrieved by any terms of settlement/ agreement on the aforementioned grounds then he can challenge of settlement before a competent authority under the Act, 1947. But here in the instant matter it is not a case of Workman that aforementioned settlement has been entered into between the parties on the ground of undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion. Therefore, Workman is barred to raise any objection in respect of fixing the date of lapse of both panels on 31.3.1997 as agreed between both the parties and Workman can not challenge any terms of said Agreement.

Further in the case of **Herbertsons Limited Vs. Workmen of Herbertsons Limited and Ors, 1977 AIR 322,** Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

The Tribunal thought that the question of the quantum of membership of the 2nd Respondent did not call for a finding at all in view of 1his Court's order. As observed above that was not a correct assumption. On the other hand, we feel that this view of the Tribunal has led it to approach the matter in an entirely erroneous manner. The Tribunal is, rightly enough, conscious that under section 18 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act the settlement was binding on the company and the members of the 3rd Respondent union. Even so, the Tribunal devoted nearly half of its order in scanning the evidence given by the company and Respondent No. 3 to find out whether the terms of the settlement had been explained by the President of the union to the workmen or not and whether the workers voluntarily accepted the settlement knowing all the "consequences". This to our mind is again an entirely wrong approach.

"When a recognised union negotiates with an employer the workers as individuals do not come into the picture. It is not necessary that each individual worker should know the implications of the settlement since a recognised union, which is expected to protect the legitimate interests of labour, enters into a settlement

in the best interests of labour. This would be the normal rule. We cannot altogether rule out exceptional cases where there may be allegations of mala fides, fraud or even corruption or other induce- ments. Nothing of that kind has been suggested against the President of the 3rd Respondent in this case. That being the position, prima facie, this is a settlement in the course of collective bargaining and, therefore, is entitled to due weight and consideration.

It is not possible to scan the settlement in bits and pieces and hold some parts good and acceptable and others bad. Unless it can be demonstrated that the objectionable portion is such that it completely outweighs all the other advantages gained the Court will be slow to hold a settle- ment as unfair and unjust. The settlement has to be accepted or rejected as a whole and we are unable to reject it as a whole as unfair or unjust. Even before this Court the 3rd Respondent representing admittedly the large majority of the workmen has stood by this settlement and that is a strong factor which it is difficult to ignore. As stated elsewhere in the judgment, we cannot also be oblivious of the fact that all workmen of the company have accepted the settlement. Besides, the period of settlement has since expired and we are informed that the employer and the 3rd Respondent are negotiating another settlement with further improvements. These factors, apart from what has been stated above, and the need for industrial peace and harmony when a union backed by a large majority of workmen has accepted a settlement in the course of collective bargaining have impelled us not to interfere with this settlement. That being the position, we unhold the settlement as fair and just and order that the award of the Tribunal shall be substituted by the settlement dated October 18, 1973. The said settlement shall be the substituted award. The appeal is disposed of accordingly. There will be no order as to costs."

Therefore, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above, the contention of the Workman that the date fixed for lapse of empanelled list on 31.3.1997 for appointment to the permanent post vide 5th Settlement dated 30.7.1996 is arbitrary, illegal is not untenable. The recognized union of Workmen has negotiated with the Respondent Bank Management representing large number of Workmen and the Workman as individual do not come into picture. Workman in the instant case has work as temporary Workmen in the Respondent Branch and in response of Notification he had applied for inclusion of his name in the panel and he was selected for inclusion his name in the panel list to be utilized for absorption of such Workman to permanent post in order of their seniority in the list. The Settlement dated 30.7.1996 between State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation under Sec.2(p) and Sec.18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 has clearly provided as regard non-messengerial position and it is agreed that all such posts sanctioned fallen vacant upto 31.3.1997 shall be filled before empanel list is allowed to lapse. Thus, in view of law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, in the instant case, Agreement dated 30.7.1996 was entered into between both the parties in respect of lapsing of the both the panels on 31.3.1997 and absorption of the Workmen from panel list was subject to availability of vacancy of post likely to arise upto 31.3.1997, have a binding force on Workman as well as management of State Bank of India in view of provision contained under section 18 (1) of I.D. Act, 1947.

Thus, Point No.I is answered against the Workman and in favour of the Respondent.

27. **Point No.II**:- Firstly, it is submitted on behalf of the Workman that the Respondent has terminated his services by oral order on 31.3.1997 without issuing any notice or paying any salary or compensation in lieu thereof. Therefore, the termination order of the Workman from service is in violation of provision contained Under Section 25 F of I.D. Act, 1947. Therefore, the order is liable to be set aside.

28. On the other hand, Respondent counsel contended that Workman has not worked for 240 days in any preceding calendar year. Therefore, reference of the industrial dispute is not relevant. In this context, the Workman has examined himself as WW1 who has reiterated that Workman has been terminated from service by Respondent on 31.3.1997 without notice of salary or compensation in lieu thereof. Before examining the claim of the Workman on merit it would be apposite to reproduce the provision contained under section 25 F:-

Section 25F provides:-

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].

Compensation to workmen in case of transfer of undertakings.

Section 25B defines the term continuous service which provides

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 authorized 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;

In order to prove the fact of 240 days of service within 12 months of a calendar year just preceding from the date of termination, the initial burden of proof lies upon the Workman and the Workman has to prove this factum by adducing his oral as well as documentary evidence in support of his claim.

Further, how to calculate 240 days of service by the Workman in a calendar year. In this context the reference of decisions of Hon'ble Supreme Court is relevant and the same are discussed below:-

In Rajasthan State Ganganagar S. Mills Ltd. v. State of Rajasthan and Anr. (2004) Apex Court held:

"It was the case of the Workman that he had worked for more than 240 days in the year concerned. This claim was denied by the appellant. It was for the claimant to lead evidence to show that he had worked for 240 days in the year preceding the date of his termination. He has filed an affidavit. It is statement which is in his favor and that cannot be regarded as sufficient evidence for any Court or Tribunal to come to the conclusion that in fact the claimant had worked for 240 days in a year These aspects were highlighted in Range Forest Officer v. S.T. Hadimani (2002 (3) SCC 25. No proof of receipt of salary or wages for 240 days or order or record in that regard was produced. Mere non-production of the muster roll for a particular period was not sufficient for the Labour Court held that the Workman had worked for 240 days as claimed."

In Municipal Corporation, Faridabad v. Siri Niwas (2004 (8) SCC 195), held "*the burden was on the Workman to show that he was working for more than 240 days in the preceding one year prior to his alleged retrenchment." In M.P. Electricity Board v. Hariram (2004 (8) SCC 246) the position was again reiterated in paragraph 11 as follows: "The above burden having not been discharged and the Labour Court having held so, in our opinion, the Industrial Court and the High Court erred in basing an order of reinstatement solely on an adverse inference drawn erroneously ..*"

In the case of Manager, RBI, Bangalore vs. S Mani (2005) SCC Page 100, the 3 Judges Bench of the Apex Court held that "*the initial burden of proof was on the Workman to show that he had completed 240 days of service."*

Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of Mohan Lal vs Management BEL 1981 SCC page 225 has laid down the principle that how to count 240 days of service within one year it is held: *"Clause (2)(a) provides for a fiction to treat a Workman in continuous service for a period of one year despite the fact that he has not rendered uninterrupted service for a period of one year but he has rendered period of 240 days during the period of 12 calendar service for months counting backwards and just preceding the relevant date being the date of retrenchment. In other words, in order to invoke the fiction enacted in clause (2)(a) it is necessary to determine first the relevant date, ie the date of termination of service which is complained of as retrenchment. After that date is ascertained. move backward to a period of 12 months just preceding the date of retrenchment and then ascertain whether within the period of 12 months, the Workman has rendered service for a period of 240 days. If these three facts are affirmatively answered in favor of the Workman pursuant to the deeming fiction enacted in clause (2)(a) it will have to be assumed that the Workman is in continuous service for a period of one year and he will satisfy the eligibility qualification enacted in Section 25-F"*

"14. We have already extracted section 25B since its amendment and the change in language is the legislative exposition of which note must be taken. In fact, we need not further dilate upon this aspect because in Surendra Kumar Verma and Ors. v. Central Government Industrial-cum-Labour Court, New Delhi and Anr., Chinnappa Reddy. J., after noticing the amendment and referring to the decision in Sur Enamel and Stamping Works (P) Ltd case, held as under:

"These changes brought about by Act 36 of 1964 appear to be clearly designed to provide that a Workman who has actually worked under the employer for not less than 240 days during a period of twelve months shall be deemed to have been in continuous service for a period of one year whether or not he has in fact been in such continuous service for a period of one year. It is enough that he has worked for 240 days in a period of 12 months, it is not necessary that he should have been in the service of the employer for one whole year."

In a concurring judgment Pathak J. agreed with this interpretation of section 25B(2). Therefore, both on principle and on precedent it must be held that section 25B(2) comprehends a situation where a Workman is not in employment for a period of 12 calendar months, but has rendered service for a period of 240 days within the period of 12 calendar months commencing and counting backwards from the relevant date, i.e. the date of retrenchment. If he has, he would be deemed to be in continuous service for a period of one year for the purpose of section 25B and Chapter VA."

Thus, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above the initial burden of proof lies upon the Workman to show that he has completed 240 days of the service with the Respondent just preceding from the date of his termination. Further, in respect of the employment of calculating the 240 days service provision contained Under of Section 25-F read with Section 25-B of the I.D. Act, 1947.

29. Now, in view of the provision contained under Section 25 F and law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, we have to examine whether the Workman has discharged his initial burden of proof in respect of his claim of 240 days continuous service in a calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination i.e., 31.3.1997.

In this context, WW1 in his cross examination has stated that,

"I was not sponsored by any Employment Exchange. I did not undergo the regular selection process required for appointment in the Bank."

"I did not work for 240 days in any year in my entire service."

Thus, it is clear from the testimony of WW1 that the Workman had not worked for 240 days continuously in any 12 months of a calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination in the Respondent bank. Therefore, Workman failed to establish his plea by his oral and documentary evidence that he had worked for 240 days continuously in calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination i.e., 31.3.1997. Thus, the claim of the Workman that he has been terminated by oral order without issuing notice or payment in lieu after termination, in contravention of Section 25 F of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is not tenable. However the documents filed by the Workman in support of his claim, number of days worked with the Respondent goes to reveal that the Workman had worked intermittently as daily wager depending upon availability of work in branch. Workman did not file any document of appointment letter or salary slips in support of his claim for appointment as a non-messenger in the Respondent branch on temporary basis.

30. Per contra, the Learned Counsel for Respondent has submitted the allegation of Workman that he was terminated from services is not correct. As the vacancies were filled up on regular basis in order of their respective seniority the non-engagement of the Workman does not amount to termination. Further, Respondent contended that no law provide that even though there is no work temporary employee should be continued in the bank work as the very engagement of Workman was subject to availability of work. Therefore, the allegation that the bank has indulged in unfair labour practice is incorrect.

31. Thus, in view of the fore gone discussion and contentions made by the Respondent, I find the force in the argument advanced by the Respondent that in the instant matter, Workman was not terminated from service by order dated 31.3.1997 rather he was disengaged in view of the non-availability of the work in the branch. Further, there was direction issued by the Head Office of the Respondent authority not to engage any daily wager Workman/ temporary Worker w.e.f. 1.4.1997. Thus, such disengagement of Workman does not amount to termination. Moreover, the Workman failed to prove his claim that he was terminated in contravention of provision of Sec.25F of the I.D. Act, 1947 as he failed to establish his plea

by any oral or documentary evidence that he had worked for 240 days continuously in a twelve months of calendar year just preceding from date of termination i.e., 31.3.1997.

32. Further, perusal of the order dated 25.3.1997 goes to reveal that the Chief Branch Manager, State Bank of India has issued the letter to Zonal Office with direction to all its branches to this effect that they have been advised by the DGM, Zonal Office, Hyderabad that as both the panel of temporary employees of 1989 and daily wagers/casual labour of 1992 will lapse on 31.3.1997 it has been decided by central office not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial cadre from 1.4.1997, therefore it was directed to issue suitable instructions not to make temporary appointments from 1.4.1997. There is no mention in this order that the Workman herein has been terminated from service by this order.

33. Further, the circular dated 27.3.1997 was issued by DGM, SBI to all branches in commercial network in respect of the non-appointment of temporary employees in subordinate cadre and it has directed not to make any temporary employment in the subordinate cadre with effect from 1.4.97 and further, it has directed to ensure that no temporary/casual/daily basis appointment of the petty cash. Further, it is directed to all Branch Managers that any deviation in this regard will be viewed seriously. Thus, these circulars do not reflect that the Workman has been terminated from service by this order.

34. Similarly, office order dated 31.3.1997 is simply a direction to all branches of the Respondent bank by DGM that no further daily labour should be engaged or employed. Therefore, the plea of the Workman that he has been terminated by the aforesaid order dated 25.3.1997, 27.3.1997 and 31.3.1997 from the service by the Respondent is not acceptable. The evidence adduced by the Workman clearly goes to reveal that he had worked as a daily wager for which he has been paid wages according to number of working days. As there was an order for prohibition for engaging temporary workmen, in the bank, therefore, Workman could not be engaged by the Respondent for work from 1.4.1997 and there after. It is settled law that the daily wagers are engaged by the employer depending upon the availability of work and as the work was not available the Workman was not engaged further by the Respondent management. Therefore, the Workman on the ground of number of days he had worked in the Respondent bank cannot claim any right to reinstate him into the employment. As the Workman failed to prove the mandatory condition of 240 days of continuous service as required under Sec.25F of I.D. Act, 1947. Therefore, the disengagement of Workman from work can not be termed in contravention of provision contained under Sec.25F and 25 B of the I.D. Act, 1947.

Thus, this point is answered against the Workman and in favour of Respondent.

35. **Point No.III**:- In this context, the Workman has contended that the management failed to implement the selected panels during its valid tenure. The management adopted the back door methods contrary to the settlements and filled up the vacancies. The same is evident from the proceedings dated 18.11.1993 a copy of the same is filed in the material papers and the same may be read as part of the claim statement. Further, it is submitted that management has to adhere the procedure issued by the Central Government, the instructions dated 16.8.1990 in the year 1995, but same was not followed in the year 1997 despite there being vacancies. The management has followed the procedure of calling candidates through employment exchange instead of giving chance to the empanelled candidates like the Workman herein. The management sent call letters to the similarly situated candidates like the Workman in the month of June 1997 subsequent to issuance of impugned termination orders. After knowing the fact that they are litigating the issue by way of dispute, the management has refused to engage those candidates, the copies of call letters issued are filed herein along with claim petition. The Workman herein reiterates that the panels are meant for absorption but not for termination. In view of the same a duty is cast upon the

Respondent management to engage the empanelled candidates like the Workman herein even in temporary vacancies till they are absorbed permanently in regular vacancies.

36. On the other hand, Respondent has contended that the Federation approached Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) for implementation of bipartite settlement in respect of the absorption of temporary employees. The Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) conducted conciliation proceedings and agreement was arrived at between the Federation and the Management bank. It is submitted that it was agreed between the Federation and the Management that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers /casual labour would be kept alive upto March, 1997 and the vacancies as agreed to under the afore set out settlements will be filled from both the lists concurrently. A copy of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.1995 signed by the parties to the dispute is filed as a material paper. Further, it is submitted that the settlement was arrived at and an agreement was signed between the Federation and the Management bank on 30.7.1996 under Section 2(p) read with Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules 1957 which is binding on the parties. A copy of this agreement which hereinafter may be referred to as 5th settlement for brevity, is also filed as a material paper. The 5th settlement dated 30.7.1996 whereunder the earlier four settlements dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988 and 9.1.1991 were also referred, it was agreed to, by the Federation and the Management bank that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees will be kept alive upto March, 1997 for filling the vacancies existing/arrived at as on 31.12.1994 as per the norms agreed to between the bank and Federation and that thereafter the said panels would lapse. It was also agreed that within the framework of the above settlements the modalities about drawing names from either the panel of temporary employees or the panel of daily wagers and casual labour would be decided administratively on circle to circle basis depending upon the local requirements in consultation with the Federation's affiliate by the Circle management. It was further agreed that all messenger real vacancies/positions in the subordinate cadre including part-time attendants specifically provided as leave reserve will be filled by the end of 31.3.1997. Further, Respondent contended that on 27.2.1997 a memorandum of understanding was also signed between the Federation's affiliate and the bank management regarding the fact that the exercise of identifying the messengerial vacancies as on 31.12.1994 has since been completed by central office and thereby 403 messengerial vacancies were sanctioned to the circle of the Management bank and it was agreed that these vacancies may be filled from 1989 panel of temporary employees after effecting conversion from full time non-messengerial staff in the usual manner and the agreement was reached upon. Further, it was agreed between the Federations affiliate and the management bank that in terms of the settlement dated 30.7.1996 both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers /casual employees would lapse on 31.3.1997.

37. The Workman has contended that the empanelled list prepared by the Respondent management for appointment of temporary and daily wage Workers to the permanent post cannot lapse unless until it is exhausted by appointing all the empanelled persons and it should continue even after 31.3.1997, i.e., the date fixed for the lapse of panel. It is undisputed that the date of lapse of empanelled list of Workmen has been fixed to 31.3.1997 as mentioned in the settlement dated 30.7.1996, and agreed between the parties. It is settled law that and once the life of panel list lapses on the date as agreed between the parties it cannot be extended beyond that date. In the instant case the panel list of the workmen was valid upto 31.3.1997 in view of the terms and conditions enumerated in the 5th Settlement entered into between the parties. As the lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997 has been agreed by State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation through 5th Settlement, the Workman is not competent to challenge the same.

In this context I would like to take reference of the decision of the apex court in the case of **Syndicate Bank and Ors vs. Shankar Paul and Ors , AIR 1997 SC 3091, therein the Hon'ble Apex Court** have held:-

"Till 1982, the branches of the appellant Bank in Calcutta region were recruiting persons locally to work as temporary attenders in leave vacancies. In view of the revised procedure prescribed by the Government of India in respect of such temporary appointments, the Calcutta regional office of the appellant Bank issued a circular to all of its branches on 14.8.1982, instructing all the branches under it to discontinue the old practice from 1.6.1982 and appoint only empanelled candidates. The regional office was to prepare a panel of eligible candidates, after calling names from the local/district employment exchange, and split it up branch-wise. Following that new procedure yearly panels were prepared thereafter. Names of the Respondents were for the first time included in the panel prepared for the period 7.2.1987 to 6.2.1988. By its letter dated 7.2.1987 the Bank had informed the Respondents that the panel was valid for one year only and that inclusion of their names in the panel was not to confer on them any right to seek permanent appointment in the service of the bank. Considering the object with which the panel was prepared and the fact that it was an yearly panel expiring on 6.2.1988, we are of the opinion that the Respondents did not get any right, because of inclusion of their names in the said panel, for permanent absorption in the service of the Bank. Whatever conditional right they had came to an end with the expiry of the panel. The claim of the Respondents, as contained in the writ petition was thus misconceived and therefore the learned single Judge and the Division Bench, when it first decided the appeal, were right in dismissing the writ petition and the appeal respectively."

Thus, in view of the above law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court and in view of the terms and conditions of the 5th Settlement the contention of the Workman that empanelled list should continue even after 31.3.1997 till the last Workman in the panel is absorbed is not tenable. The contention of the Workman is baseless in view of recital in the settlement. Therefore, in view of the fore gone discussion and finding given at Point No. I regarding binding nature of Settlements and terms and conditions enumerated therein, in view of the provision contained u/s.18(1) of the I.D. Act, 1947, I am of the considered view that life of panels lapsed on 31.3.1997 in view of terms of settlement dated 30.7.1996 and plea of Workman that the panel shall continue even after 31.3.1997 till last man absorbed has no legal force and same is untenable.

38. Undisputedly, settlement agreement dated 30.7.1996 was executed between the State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation and in that settlement it was agreed that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/ casual employees will be used for filling vacancies existing as on 31.12.1994 as per the norms agreed between the bank and the Federation. These empanelled workmen were to be given a chance for permanent appointment in the bank against vacancies arising up to December 1994 whereas the daily wagers/ casual employees were to be considered against the vacancies arise from January 1995 to December 1996, whereby the said panel would lapse. It was agreed that the vacancies falls upto 31.3.1997 shall be filled before the empanelled list is allowed to lapse. Thus, the claim of the Workman to the post of permanent non-messenger in the Respondent management was subject to the availability of the sanctioned post and vacancies arising upto 31.3.1997. The workmen given chance to the permanent post were seniors in number of working days in panel list and Workman herein was junior to those workmen. Therefore, Workman could not be given absorption to permanent post being junior to other workmen in the panel list.

39. In this context the Workman witness WW1 was cross examined by the Respondent counsel and in the cross examination the witness WW1 states:-

" I applied in response to an advertisement issued by the bank and I was called for interview and my name was included in the panel in the year 1989. Some of the employees included in the panel were given regular appointment as per their seniority. The panels were prepared on the basis of the number of days of service of the employees. Further Witness states, "No junior to me is continuing in the service."

Thus, from the above statement of the Workman witness WW1 it is clear that the panel was prepared in terms of various settlements entered into between Staff Federation of State Bank of India and State Bank of India and it was prepared on the basis of number of days of work put in by the temporary employees. Further, the Workman himself admitted that some of the temporary employees whose names were included in the panel were given regular appointment in the bank in order of their seniority in the panel and he is not having any document to show that any person who worked for less number of days than the Workman was given appointment in the bank. Therefore, the allegation of the Workman that the regular appointment has been made by the bank from the panel list in breach of the terms of the settlement and violation of seniority of panel list is not proved by this evidence of WW1. Thus, there is no evidence on record that bank has given the appointment to the temporary employees as well as daily wagers from the panel list 1989 and 1992 in breach of seniority of the temporary employees in the list. There is no evidence of jumbling in the panel list to make appointment of any permanent Workman in breach of the seniority. Therefore, I am constrained to hold that the Respondent Management has appointed the workmen from panel list in order of seniority and there is no jumbling of workmen in the panel list before it got lapsed on 31.3.1997.

40. However, Workman has taken the plea that the panels of Workmen for absorption in the employment of the Respondent banks (panels of temporary employees and daily wagers) has been lapsed on 31.3.1997 in contravention of terms of settlement as the object of preparing the entire empanelment of temporary and daily wagers was to provide them permanent employment and till the both the panel lists exhausted the panel list cannot be lapsed on 31.3.1997 and the date of lapsing of the panel on 31.3.1997 has been fixed by the Respondent arbitrarily without any authority.

41. In this context, the perusal of Settlement dated 30.7.1996 reveals that the 5th Settlement dated 30.7.1996 was entered under Section 2(p) and 18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Dispute (Central) Rules 1957. This settlement has been entered into by the competent parties and in this settlement parties thereto agreed that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees will lapse on 31.3.1997. Thus the date of lapse of panel was fixed by both the parties with consensus under the settlement dated 30.7.1996 and same is binding upon the Workman under the provision of Section 18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947. Moreover, this issue of binding force of the settlement dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988 and 9.1.1991 has already been discussed, decided at finding in Point No.I of this award. However, the legality and validity of the aforementioned settlement has not been challenged by the Workman before any competent forum. Thus, claim of Workman that the date of lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997 has been fixed arbitrarily by the Respondent bank is untenable. As regard the claim of Workman for his absorption to the permanent post it is settled law that the Workman can not claim his regularization to permanent post merely on the basis of number of working days.

42. In this context the reference of the decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Oil and Natural Gas Corporation vs Krishan Gopal 2020(3) SCALE 272, date of decision 7.2.2020** is relevant therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have has laid down principle regarding regularization of the Workman on

permanent posts. Hon'ble Supreme Court have laid down the prepositions of regularization of the workmen to permanent post is as under:-

"*(i) Wide as they are, the powers of the Labour Court and the Industrial Court cannot extend to a direction to order regularisation, where such a direction would in the context of public employment offend the provisions contained in Article 14 of the Constitution;*

(ii) The statutory power of the Labour Court or Industrial Court to grant relief to workmen including the status of permanency continues to exist in circumstances where the employer has indulged in an unfair labour practice by not filling up permanent posts even though such posts are available and by continuing to employ workmen as temporary or daily wage employees despite their performing the same work as regular workmen on lower wages;

(iii) The power to create permanent or sanctioned posts lies outside the judicial domain and where no posts are available, a direction to grant regularisation would be impermissible merely on the basis of the number of years of service;

(iv) Where an employer has regularised similarly situated workmen either in a scheme or otherwise, it would be open to workmen who have been deprived of the same benefit at par with the workmen who have been regularised to make a complaint before the Labour or Industrial Court, since the deprivation of the benefit would amount to a violation of Article 14; and

(v) In order to constitute an unfair labour practice under Section 2(ra) read with Item 10 of the Vth Schedule of the ID Act, the employer should be engaging workmen as badlis, temporaries or casuals, and continuing them for years, with the object of depriving them of the benefits payable to permanent workmen.

Thus, in view of the principles laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court as discussed above, in the instant matter the Workman utterly failed to prove his claim by adducing any documentary or oral evidence that the employer has indulged in unfair labour practice by not filling the permanent posts even though such posts are available and by continuing to employ workmen as temporary or daily wage employees despite their performance was the same work, as regular workmen on lower wages.

43. Respondent has contended that all the vacancies exist and arise upto 31.3.1997 has been filled up from the panel list in order of seniority and no vacancy exists or arises as on 31.3.1997 remained unfilled. Further, it is contended that as per terms of settlement the life of panel lists has been lapsed on 31.3.1997, hence, there is no occasion to extend the life of panel lists beyond 31.3.1997. However, the workman failed to prove contrary by any evidence to the aforesaid contention of the Respondent that the vacancies were existing as on 31.3.1997 and the workman was not given absorption to the permanent post in order of his seniority. It is settled law that the power to create permanent or sanctioned post lies outside the judicial domain and where no posts are available, a direction to grant regularization would be impermissible merely on the basis of the number of years of service. Therefore, the claim of the workman on this ground also not acceptable.

44. Further, as per the of settlement, panel was prepared for absorption of the workmen on the permanent posts has already been lapsed on 31.3.1997 and the vacancies existing and arising upto 31.12.1994 and upto 31.3.1997 as settlement dated 30.7.1996 has been filled up from the panel by appointing the workmen as per seniority in the panel list. Workman witness WW1 in his cross examination has himself admitted this fact that, some of the temporary employees whose names were included in the panel were given regular appointment in the bank in order of their seniority in the panel. The Workman

failed to show that there was any breach of terms of settlement has been committed by the Respondent in appointment to permanent post from aforesaid panel list.

45. As discussed in preceding paragraph of this Award, the life of the panel has not been extended beyond 31.3.1997, by any further settlement hence, the panel list in which name of the Workman was included got expired on 31.3.1997. It is not the case of the Workman that Respondent has regularized similarly situated workmen either in the scheme or otherwise and the Workman has been deprived of same benefit on par with those workmen or the vacancies remained unfilled on the date of lapse of panels i.e., 31.3.1997, Industrial Tribunal has no jurisdiction to extend the date of lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997. This Tribunal can not order for regularization of workmen to the permanent post in contravention of the provision of Article 14 of the Constitution of India.

In the case of **Mahboob Deepak vs. Nagar Panchayat Gajraula & Anr, Civil Appeal No.5875/2007 date of judgement 13.12.2007,** Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

"8. Respondent is a Local Authority. The terms and conditions of employment of the employees are governed by a statute and statutory rules. No appointment can be made by a Local Authority without following the provisions of the recruitment rules. Any appointment made in violation of the said rules as also the constitutional scheme of equality as contained in Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India would be a nullity.

9. Due to some exigency of work, although recruitment on daily wages or on an ad hoc basis was permissible, but by reason thereof an employee cannot claim any right to be permanently absorbed in service or made permanent in absence of any statute or statutory rules. Merely because an employee has completed 240 days of work in a year preceding the date of retrenchment, the same would not mean that his services were liable to be regularized."

Therefore, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, the claim of the Workman for absorption merely on the basis of number of day of work in the Respondent bank Branch is not acceptable. As regard plea of the Workman that the Workman should have been given employment even after 31.3.1997 as temporary Workman, it is the discretion of Respondent to engage the Workman depending upon availability of work and this Tribunal can not direct the Respondent to engage the Workman in the absent of such rule/scheme.

46. In view of principle laid down by Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above, in the instant matter Workman utterly failed to establish the fact of rendering continuous service for a period of 240 days of service within a period of 12 calendar months commencing and coming backward from relevant date i.e., the date of retrenchment, if has he would be denied to be in continuous service for a period of one year. Therefore, the provision contained under Sec.25F of retrenchment is not applicable to Workman.

Counsel for Workman has relied upon number of decisions of Hon'ble High Court and Hon'ble Supreme Court and few of them are discussed herein:-

In the case of **F.C.I., vs. Kamdhenu Cattle Feed Industries 1993 (1) SCC 71,** therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

"7. In contractual sphere as in all other State actions, the State and all its instrumentalities have to conform to Article 14 of the Constitution of which non-arbitrariness is a significant facet. There is no unfettered discretion in public law: A public authority possesses powers only to use them for public good. This impose the duty to act fairly and to adopt a procedure which is `fairplay in action'. Due observance of

this obligation as a part of good administration raises a reasonable or legitimate expectation in every citizen to be treated fairly in his interaction with the State and its instrumentalities, with this element forming a necessary component of the decision making process in all State actions. To satisfy this requirement of non- arbitrariness in a State action, it is, therefore, necessary to consider and give due weight to the reasonable or legitimate expectations of the persons likely lo be affected by the decision or else that unfairness in the exercise of the power may amount to an abuse or excess of power apart from affecting the bona fides of the decision in a given case. The decision so made would be exposed to challenge on the ground of arbitrariness. Rule of law does not completely eliminate discretion in the exercise of power, as it is unrealistic, but providers for control of its exercise by judicial review."

In the case of **State Bank of India, R.O., Vijayawada vs. Industrial Tribunal, Hyderabad WP No.193/1997,** therein Hon'ble High Court have held,

"*Sri Krovvidi Narasimham, the learned counsel for the 2nd respondent contends, supporting the award that it was a permanent vacancy and even though the 2nd respondent was appointed on temporary basis, his services were not liable to be terminated and he was to be regularised into service on permanent basis. Shastry award warrants that no temporary appointment can be made to a permanent post. But the matter is now covered by two division bench judgements dated 28.11.1986 in W.A. No.791 of 1986 and 25.8.1987 in W.A. No.270 of 1982. The ratio decided in the two judgements is to the effect that there cannot be any mandate to appoint employees on permanent basis when the requirement was for appointment on temporary basis. But it is held in the said judgements that when a temporary appointee is ousted from service and not for misconduct and, if again temporary appointment is to be made, then, the case of such temporary appointee who was ousted, has got to be considered in accordance with Sec. 25-H of the Act."*

In the case of **State of Haryana and others vs. Piara Singh and others. 1992 (4) SCC 118,** therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

" 49. If for any reason an adhoc or temporary employee is continued for a fairly long spell, the authorities must consider his case for regularization provided he is eligible and qualified according to the rules and his service record is satisfactory and his appointment does not run counter to the reservation policy of the state."

In the above cited judgements by the Workman the facts of the case are different hence do not apply to instant case of Workman.

47. On the other hand, in support of his contention Respondent has examined witness MW1 and MW1 in chief examination states that, Settlements i.e., on 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988, 9.1.1991 were entered into between the SBI and SBI Staff Federation for filling up of the vacancies that arise up to 1994 for those temporary employees who has worked on scale wages. Further, MW1 states that two different panels for messengers and non-messengers as per the eligibility criteria prescribed by the bank. There are four modules in Andhra Pradesh and they are Hyderabad, Tirupathi, Vijayawada and Visakhapatnam. MW1 states that the temporary employees so empanelled were given permanent absorption depending upon the vacancies so arise strictly in terms of the settlement. MW1 states that on 9.6.1995 conciliation proceeding was held before the RLC(C), Hyderabad and in said proceedings it was decided that the panels will be kept live up to 31.3.1997 and vacancies will be filled from both the lists concurrently. A copy of the said minutes of proceedings is Ex.M5. Further, MW1 states that on 30.7.1996 another settlement was entered between the SBI and All India SBI Staff Federation providing for filling up of the vacancies arising up to December 1994 in respect of subordinate cadre and daily wage /casual wage employees out of panel

so prepared were to be considered against vacancies arising from January 1995 to December 1996, thereafter the said panels lapse. MW1 states that it was also agreed that all the non- messenger positions in subordinate cadre including part time attendants specially provided as leave reserve will be filled before 31.3.1997 and as regards to non-messengerial positions it is agreed that all such posts sanctioned and fallen vacant up to 31.3.1997 shall be filled before the empanelled list is allowed to lapse. Thus in both the cases empanelled list were lapsed on 1.4.1997. Ex.M6 is the copy of the settlement dated 30.7.1996. Further, witness states that on 27.2.1997 a memorandum of understanding was reached between the SBI and SBI Staff Federation providing that both the panels above mentioned will lapse on 31.3.1997. Ex.M7 is the copy of the memorandum of understanding and Ex.M8 is the copy of the statements giving the particulars of 1989 non-messenger panel, Ex.M9 is the copy of the statement of 1989 non- messenger panel, Ex.M10 is the copy of statement of 1992 panel. Further, witness states that petitioner was included in the 1989 panel. As the existing vacancies at that time were exhausted and his turn did not come he could not be given permanent employment in the bank as per the agreements. All the appointments were made strictly in accordance with the settlements reached from time to time between SBI and SBI staff federation and as per seniority, number of days of temporary service put in by them in the bank in the given period. Further, MW1 states petitioner was not sponsored by any employment exchange he did not undergo the regular process of selection required for appointment as a regular non-messenger the petitioner has not worked for 240 days in any year in his entire temporary service in the bank. The petitioner and other temporary employees were terminated from service by the bank. Further, MW1 states that the vacancies were filled up on regular basis with the temporary employees from the panels and these panels were expired in terms of the settlements so reached and there were no vacancies to absorb such employees. Thus, witness MW1 has proved the documents Ex.M1 to Ex.M12 and also contentions made in the counter. However, MW1 was cross examined by the Petitioner Counsel. But nothing has been elicited in his cross examination so as to discredit the testimony of the witness MW1 as regards the date of lapse of both the panels on 31.3.1997 and reasons assigned for non-absorption of the Petitioner from the panel list to the permanent post. Moreover the witness MW1 was re-examined by the Respondent and the witness MW1 states that panels were expired in terms of the settlement send absorptions to the extent of the available vacancies were made. There was no termination of any temporary messenger as such but their services were not utilized after the cut off date as the available vacancies were already filled up and most of these Petitioners were not in the service of the bank as on the date of the expiry date of the panels. Therefore, in view of the aforesaid testimony of the MW1 in re-examination in the absence of cross examination remained uncontraverted, the claim of the Workman that he was entitled for absorption in permanent post in the branch of Respondent Management on the basis of panel list is found not established.

This point is answered against the Workman.

48. **Point No.IV**:- In view of the discussion and finding given at Point Nos. I, II and III, the Workman is not entitled for any relief and claim statement of Workman sans merit and liable to be dismissed.

This Point is answered accordingly.

AWARD

In view of the fore gone discussion, it is held that the action of the Respondent bank in terminating the services of Sri A. Narasimhulu, Ex. Messenger by way of oral orders w.e.f. 31.3.1997 is justified. Hence, the Petitioner is not entitled for any relief as prayed for. The claim statement filed by Workman sans merit, hence, dismissed. Reference is answered accordingly.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, Personal Assistant, transcribed by her, corrected and signed by me on this the day of 6th day of May, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner	Witnesses examined for the Respondent
WW1: Sri A. Narasimhulu	MW1: Sri K. Bala Kotaiah

Documents marked for the Petitioner

Ex.W1: Photocopy of Notification

Ex.W2: Photocopy of Interview call letter

Ex.W3: Photocopy of Panel list

Ex.W4: Photocopy of Service Certificate

Ex.W5: Photocopy of Service Certificate

Documents marked for the Respondent

Ex.M1: Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.17.11.87

Ex.M2: Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.16.7.88

Ex.M3: Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.27.10.1988

Ex.M4: Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.9.1.1991

Ex.M5: Photocopy of conciliation proceedings before the Regional Labour Commissioner(C) dt.9.6.1995

Ex.M6: Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.30.7.1996

Ex.M7: Photocopy of Memorandum of understanding dt. 27.1.1997

Ex.M8: Photocopy of statements giving the particulars of 1989 messenger panel.

Ex.M9: Photocopy of statement of 1989 Non-messenger panel

Ex.M10: Photocopy of statement of 1992 panel

Ex.M11: Photocopy of order of Hon'ble High Court in WA No.86/98 dt. 1.5.98

Ex.M12: Photocopy of order in SLP No.11886-11888 of 1998 dated 10.8.98

नई दिल्ली, 29 जुलाई, 2026

का.आ. 1624.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार **पंजाब नेशनल बैंक** के प्रबंधतत्र, संबद्ध नियोजको और उनके कर्मकार **श्री सुन्दर लाल** के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय **कानपूर** के पंचाट **(32/2003)** प्रकाशित करती है।

[सं. एल-12012/128/2003-आई.आर (बी- II)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 29th July, 2026

S.O. 1624.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award **(Ref. 32/2003)** of the ***Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court Kanpur*** as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of **Punjab National Bank** and **Shri Sunder Lal.**

[No. L-12012/128/2003–IR (B-I)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, KANPUR

ID Case No. 32 of 2003

Present Shri Rajendra Prasad Srivastava, H.J.S. (Retd.)

Sh. Sunder Lal S/o Late Sh. Rarman Lall,

R/o Gawal Toli Hansari,

Jhansi, U.P.

…….Workman

Vs.

The Regional Manager,

Punjab National Bank,

Regional Office, Near Sudha Nursing Home, Kanpur Rd.

Jhansi- 284001

……Management

(JUDGMENT)

(Passed on this 18th day of June, 2026)

As per letter dated 20.09.2003 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-12012/128/2003-IR (B-II) dt. 20.09.2003. The dispute under reference relates to:

> ***"Whether any employer-employee relationship exists between the management of Punjab National bank and Shri Sunder Lal? Whether the action of Regional Manager, Punjab National Bank, Jhansi in terminating the services of Shri Sunder Lal S/o Late Shri Serman Lal w.e.f. 01.03.2002 is legal and justified? If not, what relief is the workman concerned entitled to?"***

Claimant/workman Sunder Lal (hereinafter stated as the claimant) has filed the statement of claim with averments which may be concisely stated as hereunder:

1. The applicant was employed in April, 2000 by the Manager of the Lead Bank Office, Punjab National Bank, near Sudha Nursing Home, Kanpur Road, Jhansi—"who shall hereinafter be referred to as" the Respondent Bank—to perform duties carried out by a peon in the Lead Bank Office, such as mail distribution and other miscellaneous tasks.

2. Along with performing mail distribution and other miscellaneous tasks, the petitioner was also required to perform duties such as making tea and serving water for the office staff and visitors. Mail distribution and arranging tea and water for the staff are tasks of a regular nature. The expenses incurred in making tea etc. were paid separately by the Bank.

3. At the time of employing the petitioner, a salary of only Rs. 100/- per month was fixed, which was subsequently increased to Rs. 250/- per month. The petitioner was assured that after working for a few days, he would be given the pay scale of a Peon.

4. The employers of the respondent Bank took the petitioner into employment at the Lead Bank Office, but neither was the petitioner's name entered into the attendance register, nor was he given the designation of a Peon, despite taking tasks from him that are performed by a Peon.

5. Before making the monthly salary payment, the employers of the respondent Bank used to pay the fixed salary of Rs. 250/- through cheques by taking letters from the petitioner and showing his acceptance, so that when the time arose, the petitioner's employment could be denied to evade labour laws.

6. Due to continuous working since April 2000 and the existence of the regular nature of work performed by the petitioner, when the petitioner strongly demanded the designation and pay scale of a Peon, the entry of his name in the attendance register, and formal payment of salary in February 2002, the employers of the respondent Bank became displeased with the petitioner and terminated his services by removing him from work with effect from 01-03-2002.

7. The applicant, by remaining regularly employed since April 2000, had completed more than 240 days of service. However, prior to terminating his services with effect from 01-03-2002, the employers neither gave any one-month prior notice nor paid any notice pay equivalent to one month's salary or retrenchment compensation in lieu of the notice. Thus, the employers committed a clear violation of Section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

8. That the employers of the respondent Bank, by presenting a reply before the Assistant Labour Commissioner (Central), Kanpur, made a false statement that a canteen was started in the 'Lead Bank Office' and the contract to run the canteen was given to the applicant, and the canteen subsidy was continuously paid to the applicant at the prescribed rate. Due to administrative reasons, the Lead Bank Office, Jhansi, was shifted to the Regional Office of the respondent Bank with effect from 01.03.2002, where a canteen already existed and there was no need for a separate canteen, hence the applicant was advised accordingly.

9. Neither was any contract given to the applicant to run a canteen in the Lead Bank Office, Punjab National Bank, nor was any canteen ever started in the Lead Bank Office, Punjab National Bank, Jhansi. The employers of the respondent Bank must prove the statements presented during the conciliation proceedings before the Assistant Labour Commissioner (Central), Kanpur, by

producing documentary evidence. The reality is that the applicant was employed by the employers of the respondent Bank to perform duties that are typically executed by a peon in the Lead Bank Office. Before making the monthly payment of the fixed salary, the employers would take a letter from the applicant every month detailing 'expenses incurred under various heads', approve it, and make the payment via cheque. The applicant was paid a monthly salary of ₹250/-, which can be verified from the letters taken from the applicant by the employers of the respondent Bank before releasing the monthly salary, because a fixed and exact amount of money cannot be spent under miscellaneous heads every single month.

Respondent side has submitted the written statement with averments which may be summarized as stated below:

1. It is submitted that the bank purely by way of a welfare activity has introduced the facility of canteen at all the offices/branches of the bank in terms of which necessary subsidy is paid to the person running the canteen. It is further submit-ted as under :-

   i. The same canteen committee enters into a contract with the canteen contractor for providing snacks etc., to employees as well as to the customers.

   ii. The canteen contractor sells eatables to the employees and customers and charges from them directly earning its.

   iii. The canteen contractor acts independently and he is free to engage employees of his choice to carry on the work.

2. It is clear from the aforesaid facts that there is no employer-employee relationship between the bank and the person running the canteen at any office of the bank and accordingly so called dispute raised by Shri Sunder Lal is not at all maintainable.

3. In terms of above guidelines a canteen was started in Lead District Manager's Office at Jhansi and the applicant was given the contract for operation of the canteen with effect from April, 2000.

4. In support of above contention we enclose herewith monthly payment vouchers through which payment of subsidy was made to the applicant from time to time.

5. The said Lead District Manager Office, Jhansi where was carrying on a canteen, was housed in the rented building old RTD Office Compound, opposite Jhansi Hotel, Jhansi. Due administrative reasons, we shifted this office to the present rented premises w.e.f. 01/03/2002 from where Regional Office is functioning. Since, a canteen is already in extent there was no need for a separate canteen for LDM's Office and the was advised accordingly.

6. The contents of 3 are and denied Sunder Lal was never given any payment by way of salary nor any assurance as alleged or otherwise was ever given to him. It is submitted that Shri Sunder Lal was running the canteen as stated above and he was being paid necessary subsidy in terms of canteen facility scheme.

7. In reply to para 4, it is submitted that Shri Sunder Lal was neither appointed as peon nor any work of Peon was ever taken from him. The submissions made hereinbefore also reiterated.

8. The contents of paras 5 & 6 as stated are denied and the submissions made hereinbefore are reiterated.

9. The contents of para 7 are wrong and denied. It is reiterated that due to shifting of the LDM's Office to the premises of Regional Office building, there was no requirement of separate canteen facility at LDM Office and the same was discontinued w.e.f.01/03/2002.

Applicant filed some documents which are read as under:

1. Photocopies of some cash payment receipt.

In rebuttal opposite party some documents which are read as under:

1. Attested copy of letter dated 26.02.2000 to relieve Ashok Kumar Ludure (Peon).
2. Attested copy of letter dated 08.06.2000 to join Bhagwan Das (Peon).
3. Attested copy of letter dated 10.07.2001 regarding Bhagwan Das (Peon).
4. Copy of scheme for welfare of Staff Canteen Facility.

Main question in this reference is that whether any employer-employee relationship exists between the management of Punjab National bank and Shri Sunder Lal? Whether the action of Regional Manager, Punjab National Bank, Jhansi in terminating the services of Shri Sunder Lal S/o Late Shri Serman Lal w.e.f. 01.03.2002 is legal and justified? If not, what relief is the workman concerned entitled to?

Applicant said in our claim statement that he worked as a Peon and other miscellaneous work from April, 2000. He also worked as making tea, giving water, distribution of postal work etc. for that bank paid to him separately. In starting the opposite party paid one hundred rupees per month and after some time enhanced the wages two hundred fifty rupees per month but the opposite party never give name of Peon and always paid by way of cheque. He continuously worked from April, 2000 till 01.03.2000. He had worked 240 days in previous year but the compliance of the ID Act was not make by the opposite party.

Against that the opposite party said in our written statement there is no employer-employee relationship between the bank and the canteen. The applicant is running the canteen in office of the bank. The applicant as per guideline started the canteen in LDM's office. The applicant was neither given any payment by way of salary nor any assurance as alleged or otherwise above given. The applicant was running the canteen and he was being paid necessary subsidy in terms of canteen facility scheme, he neither appointed as a peon nor any work of peon was taken from him. There is a canteen committee.

Now, the question arise whether the applicant is employee of the opposite party as stated in our claim statement or he only canteen boy as stated in our written statement of the opposite party.

The some provision of the ID Act is important to mention here that the definition of workman in ***section 2 (s)*** is read as under:

> *"**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 [one thousand rupees] per menses 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.

And employer definition is given in ***section 2 (g)*** is read as under:

"employer" *means-*

(i) in relation to an industry carried on by or under the authority of any department of '[the Central Government or a State Government] the authority prescribed in this behalf, or where no authority is prescribed, the head of the department;

(ii) in relation to an industry carried on by or on behalf of a local authority, the chief executive officer of that authority;

The applicant said that there is violation of section 25-H of the Act. Section 25-H is said that:

25-H. 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 to the retrenched workmen who are citizens of India to offer themselves for re-employment, and such retrenched workmen] who offer themselves for re-employment shall have preference over other persons.*

As per the question of benefits of Section 25-B of the Act which is as read as under:

[25-B. Definition of continuous service*- For the purpose of this Chapter-*

(1) a workmen 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; [25-B. Definition of continuous service

(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.

It is also important to mention here that this case was decided by my predecessor on 01.05.2013. Upon an application moved by the opposite party and after hearing objections, my predecessor set aside that order on 15.01.2015.

To, decide the above question, the documentary and oral evidence are of vital importance. The applicant examined himself as a W.W.1. In chief examination he supported the claims made in his statement as the core question is whether an employer-employee relationship is exist between the parties.

However, upon cross-examination, the applicant admitted that no appointment letter was given to him. Hence it is clear that the applicant have no any appointment letter and he admitted this fact and not filed any appointment letter also.

He further stated that he never worked in Lead District Manager's Office as a canteen boy. However, he admitted his signature on paper number 7/16. He further stated, "I occasionally made tea. Therefore, it appears that for the payment purpose the opposite party designated him strictly as a 'canteen boy'. He also admitted his signature is on paper number 7/18 is mentioned as canteen boy.

At this stage, the aforementioned papers require close scrutiny. Among the filed papers (7/5 to 7/50), some pages are illegible because they are photocopies. Paper number 7/16 shows a payment of four hundred rupees only for matchboxes for the bank office canteen, and the applicant admitted his signature on it. He similarly admitted his signature on paper number 7/18. Both papers were admitted during the cross-examination of the applicant. Paper number 7/18 specifically states: '2.5 liters of Kerosene, costing Rs. 30, were procured for the Lead Bank Office Canteen; please arrange for the payment.'

Furthermore, paper number 7/5 and paper number 7/7 both designate him as a canteen boy. Paper number 7/8 also refers to him as a canteen boy and bears the applicant's signature, which matches the signature on his claim statement. Similarly, paper number 7/9 notes the designation 'canteen boy' followed by the applicant's signature. Numerous other papers clearly state 'canteen boy' alongside the applicant's signature. On page 3 of his cross-examination, he admitted that paper numbers 7/19, 7/21, 7/22, 7/24, 7/25, 7/26, 7/27, 7/35, and 7/49 explicitly mention canteen-related work. As discussed above, several documents specifically identify him as a canteen boy, bearing his verified signature, while the applicant simultaneously admitted that no appointment letter was issued to him.

Regarding the question of wages, we must examine how he received payments as stated in his claim statement and examination-in-chief. He claimed that at the time of his employment, the opposite party paid him one hundred rupees per month, which was later increased to two hundred and fifty rupees. He further asserted in his claim statement that the opposite party assured him he would eventually be granted a regular post and pay scale. However, regarding these wages, the applicant stated on page 3 of his cross-examination that payments were made by a committee via cheque. The applicant filed paper numbers 8/5 to 8/25 and admitted this fact during his cross-examination. These papers (8/5 to 8/25) are crucial to note. Paper number 8/5 indicates a demand and subsequent payment of one hundred rupees for 'miscellaneous work,' and a similar pattern continues through the remaining papers up to 8/25. These documents clearly show that the payments made by the opposite party were for miscellaneous tasks. While some papers mention postal and market work, the applicant has failed to file any document proving or establishing that he received wages in the capacity of a Peon. Therefore, the applicant's own documents fail to establish that he is an employee of the opposite party.

The opposite party is a banking institution, which follows a specific, formalized procedure for appointments to any post, involving tests, interviews, etc. Although the applicant admitted that no appointment letter was issued by the Bank, he claims that a Master-Servant relationship existed. However, he has failed to produce any documentary evidence to establish such a relationship between himself and the opposite party. The applicant asserted in his claim statement and examination-in-chief that he worked for 240 days, pointing to paper numbers 8/1 to 8/25 in his cross-examination to support this claim. As previously evaluated, paper numbers 8/1 to 8/25 consist merely of monetary requests and subsequent ad-hoc payments by the opposite party for sporadic market and postal tasks. None of these payments were disbursed by the opposite party as regular wages, and the applicant has supplied no documentation proving that he completed 240 days of continuous service in the opposite party's organization.

While the applicant maintains that he worked as a Peon and relies on paper numbers 8/1 to 8/25, the opposite party strongly denies this. In their defence, the opposite party submitted documentary evidence regarding the employment of Shri Ashok Kumar and Shri Bhagwan Das. If the applicant had truly worked as a Peon and received regular wages from the opposite party, he logically should have summoned the Bank's payment register to substantiate his claim. However, he explicitly admitted: 'I have not summoned the payment register of the bank.

Finally, the evidence produced by the opposite party is highly relevant. In addition to the documentary evidence discussed (papers 7/1 to 7/49), the opposite party examined Shri Suneel Chawla as a witness. In his examination-in-chief, Shri Chawla fully supported the Bank's written statement. In paragraph 4 of his deposition, Shri Chawla stated that prior to 01.03.2002, the claimant was never in continuous service for 240 days in a calendar year, making him ineligible for the claimed relief. He reiterated that the applicant worked strictly as a canteen boy and was compensated accordingly via cheques issued by the canteen committee.

During his cross-examination, Shri Chawla clarified that he was not posted at the Lead Bank Office where the applicant/workman claims to have worked between the years 2000 and 2002. He noted that the Bank strictly issues formal appointment letters to anyone appointed, even on a daily-wage basis. He stated he had no personal information regarding who served as the peon between 2000 and 2002, though he possessed general information regarding the work performed by the applicant/workman during that period. He added that the application submitted by the applicant regarding the demand for money is unavailable in the Bank's records. Upon reviewing paper number 8/8, the witness stated he did not know who verified it. He raised a systemic objection, questioning how the notary public could certify photocopies of the verified documents without inspecting the originals. Because the original documents were neither presented before me nor available in our office records, these photocopies cannot be accepted as reliable evidence. Lastly, he affirmed that Ashok was working in the post of peon until February 2000, after which Bhagwan Das took over the role from June 2000 to 2002. No peon was deployed at the branch during the interim period from February 2000 to June 2000.

The applicant filed a written argument and some case law is also filed by the applicant is read as under:

The applicant filed case law passed by the Hon'ble Apex Court in ***Sita Ram and others Vs. Motilal Nehru Rarmers Training Institute reported in 2008 (117) FLR 1191*** is held as under:

> ***"Industrial Disputes Act, 1947-Section 25-F-U.P. Industrial Disputes Act, 1947-Section 6-N-Distinction-Between the provisions under Central and State Act-Whereas under Central Act the workman has to prove that he has worked for more than 240 days in preceding 12 months-But***

there is no such requirement in case under the State Act-Burden to prove that he has worked for 240 days is on the workman."

In this case law held by the Hon'ble Apex Court as above mentioned the applicant failed to prove to work for 240 days as stated by him in our claim statement.

Further he filed case law passed by the Hon'ble Madhya Pradesh High Court in ***M.P. Police Housing Corporation Vs. Sher Sigh and another reported in 2012 (133) FLR 66*** is read as under:

"Industrial Disputes Act, 1947-Sections 25-F and 2 (oo)(bb)-Oral termination-Petitioner a daily wage employee, engaged as Driver on 26.9.1988 and continued to work continuously upto 24.1.1991, when his services terminated-He had completed 240 days of service in current year-Condition precedent under section 25-F not complied with-Labour Court held it a retrenchment and directed reinstatement without back wages-Labour Court has not committed any error in holding the order of termination as Illegal and directing reinstatement-As he was a daily wager, back wages rightly denied-Hence warrants no interference."

In this case the applicant is the driver and engaged as a daily wages employee but in the present case the applicant was not engaged as a Driver he worked as a canteen boy only. Hence, the law laid down by the Hon'ble Court is not applicable.

Further he filed case law passed by the Hon'ble Apex Court in ***H.S. Rajashekara Vs. State Bank of Mysore & Anr. Reported in Special Leave Petition (C) No. 10845 of 2009.***

Facts and circumstances are not the same.

The opposite party filed case law passed by the Hon'ble Apex Court in ***State Bank of India and others Vs. State Bank of India Canteen Employees' Union of India (Bengal Circle) and others reported in 2000 LAB I.C. 1481*** is read as under:

"Industrial Disputes Act (14 of 1947), Sch. 3, Item 1 - Sastry Award-Paras 602, 603, 604-Canteen facilities to employees of Bank Sastry award does not cast any obligation on State Bank of India to provide Canteen facilities by running a canteen.

Industrial Disputes Act (14 of 1947), Sch. 3, Item 1, S. 2(s)-Employees of canteen run by local implementation committee cannot claim to be absorbed as employees of Bank - Canteens run by Local Implementation Committees are non-statutory canteens."

The applicant is not filed and documentary evidence which proof/established that he is employee of the opposite party as stated in his claim statement. He has no appointment letter/ termination letter and he have no any wages certificate as stated his claim statement. As per documentary evidence he admitted his signature upon those documents which is filed by the opposite party and there is a specific mention he worked as a canteen boy. The papers were filed by the applicant only that is only a receipt of the postal work and market work. No as such documents that prove the applicant is employee of the opposite party organisation as said in his claim statement.

In view of the above, the applicant has failed to prove the existence of a valid employer-employee relationship or the completion of 240 days of service.

The claim of the applicant is hereby dismissed. The applicant is not entitled to any relief of reinstatement, back wages, or compensation.

Accordingly, the reference is answered in the **negative and against the workman**. The claimant is not entitled to any relief.

Parties are left to bear their respective costs.

Date: 18.06.2026 RAJENDRA PRASAD SRIVASTAVA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 29 जुलाई, 2026

का.आ. 1625.—औघोगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार **यूनियन बैंक ऑफ़ इंडिया** के प्रबंधतत्र, संबद्ध नियोजको और **सेक्रेटरी, यूनियन बैंक ऑफ इंडिया स्टाफ एसोसिएशन (यू.पी.)** के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औघोगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औघोगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय **कानपूर** के पंचाट **(05/2012)** प्रकाशित करती है।

[सं. एल-12011/50/2011-आई.आर (बी- II)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 29th July, 2026

S.O. 1625.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award **(Ref. 05/2012*)*** of the ***Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court Kanpur*** as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of **Union Bank of India** and **The Secretary, Union Bank of India Staff Association (U.P.).**

[No. L-12011/50/2011–IR (B-II)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, KANPUR

ID Case No. 05 of 2012

Present Shri Rajendra Prasad Srivastava, H.J.S. (Retd.)

The Secretary,

Union Bank of India Staff Association (U.P.),

C/o Union Bank of India, Sarvodaya

Nagar Branch,

Kanpur (U.P.)-

…….Workman

Vs.

1. The General Manager,

   Union Bank of India, H.R. Deptt. Central Office,

   239, Vidhan Bhawan Marg,

   Nariman Point,

   Mumbai-

2. The General Manager,

   Union Bank of India, Nodal Regional Office,

   Kapoorthala Complex, Sarda Tower,

   Aliganj,

   Lucknow-

3. The Asstt. General Manager,

   Union Bank of India, Regioal Office,

   177/H-1/240, Pandu Nagar,

   Kanpur (U.P.)-

……..Management

(JUDGMENT)

(Passed on this 11th day of March, 2026)

By order No. L-12011/50/2011-IR(B-II) dated: 17.01.2012 the present industrial dispute has been referred for adjudication to this Tribunal for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section (2A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) by the Central Government, with following schedule:

> *"Whether the action of the management of Union Bank of India, Kanpur in refusing to extend the Employees' Pension Scheme to Smt. Manju Awasthi working at Union Bank of India, General Ganj Branch, Kanpur is just, fair & legal? What relief the workman concerned is entitled to?"*

In response to reference on 26.09.2012, statement of claim has been field, thereafter, written statement alongwith preliminary objection was filed on behalf of respondent, to which rejoinder statement has been filed.

The applicant, Smt. Manju Awasthi, filed a claim seeking the extension of the Employees' Pension Scheme, which was initially refused by the Management. During the protracted pendency of this industrial dispute, the workman continued in service and subsequently attained superannuation.

On 11.03.2026, the Authorized Representative for the Respondent/Management placed on record the Bio-data and pensionary records of Smt. Manju Awasthi. The records confirm that the workman retired from the services of the Bank on 31.01.2020. Crucially, the Management has submitted that the Pension Option has been extended to the workman and he has been processed for benefits under the Employees' Pension Scheme.

Applicant is not filed any evidence. The Opposite Party documents is clear that applicant is in pension option.

In view of the above facts and the documents filed by the Management on 11.03.2026, it is evident that the primary grievance of the workman namely, the refusal to extend the Pension Scheme has been redressed by the Management post-retirement. Since the Pension Scheme has now been extended to the applicant, the dispute regarding the "refusal" no longer survives for adjudication on merits.

The action of the Management in extending the Pension Scheme to Smt. Manju Awasthi is noted and accepted.

The Management is directed to ensure that all pensionary arrears from the date of retirement (31.01.2020) till date are released to the workman (if not already paid) within a period of three months from the date of publication of this Award.

The reference is disposed of as satisfied/settled in terms of the pension extension granted.

Reference is answered accordingly.

Parties are left to bear their respective costs.

Date: 11.03.2026 RAJENDRA PRASAD SRIVASTAVA, H.J.S. (Retd.), Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 29 जुलाई, 2026

का.आ. 1626.—औघोगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार **यूनियन बैंक ऑफ़ इंडिया** के प्रबंधतत्र, संबद्ध नियोजको और **सेक्रेटरी, यूनियन बैंक ऑफ इंडिया स्टाफ एसोसिएशन (यू.पी.).** के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औघोगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औघोगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय **कानपूर** के पंचाट **(07/2012)** प्रकाशित करती है।

[सं. एल-12011/62/2011-आई.आर (बी- II)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 29th July, 2026

S.O. 1626.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award **(Ref. 07/2012*)*** of the ***Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court Kanpur*** as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of **Union Bank of India** and **The Secretary, Union Bank of India Staff Association (U.P.).**

[No. L-12011/62/2011–IR (B-II)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, KANPUR

ID Case No. 07 of 2012

Present Shri Rajendra Prasad Srivastava, H.J.S. (Retd.)

The Secretary,

Union Bank of India Staff Association (U.P.),

C/o Union Bank of India, Sarvodaya

Nagar Branch,

Kanpur (U.P.)-

…….Workman

Vs.

1. The General Manager,

   Union Bank of India, H.R. Deptt. Central Office,

   239, Vidhan Bhawan Marg,

   Narimon Point,

   Mumbai- 400021.

2. The General Manager,

   Union Bank of India, Nodal Regional Office,

   Kapoorthala Complex, Sarda Tower,

   Aliganj,

   Lucknow-

3. The Asstt. General Manager,

   Union Bank of India, Regioal Office,

   177/H-1/240, Pandu Nagar,

   Kanpur (U.P.)-

……..Management

(JUDGMENT)

(Passed on this 11th day of March, 2026)

By order No. L-12011/62/2011-IR(B-II) dated: 17.01.2012 the present industrial dispute has been referred for adjudication to this Tribunal for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section (2A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) by the Central Government, with following schedule:

> *"Whether the action of the management of Union Bank of India, Kanpur in refusing to extend the Employees' Pension Scheme to Smt. Radha Bajpai working at Union Bank of India, Birhana Road Branch, Kanpur is just, fair & legal? What relief the workman concerned is entitled to?"*

In response to reference on 26.09.2012, statement of claim has been field, thereafter, written statement alongwith preliminary objection was filed on behalf of respondent, to which rejoinder statement has been filed.

The applicant, Smt. Radha Bajpai filed a claim seeking the extension of the Employees' Pension Scheme, which was initially refused by the Management. During the protracted pendency of this industrial dispute, the workman continued in service and subsequently attained superannuation.

On 11.03.2026, the Authorized Representative for the Respondent/Management placed on record the Bio-data and pensionary records of Smt. Radha Bajpai. The records confirm that the workman retired from the

services of the Bank on 28.02.2015. Crucially, the Management has submitted that the Pension Option has been extended to the workman and he has been processed for benefits under the Employees' Pension Scheme.

Applicant is not filed any evidence. The Opposite Party documents is clear that applicant is in pension option.

In view of the above facts and the documents filed by the Management on 11.03.2026, it is evident that the primary grievance of the workman namely, the refusal to extend the Pension Scheme has been redressed by the Management post-retirement. Since the Pension Scheme has now been extended to the applicant, the dispute regarding the "refusal" no longer survives for adjudication on merits.

The action of the Management in extending the Pension Scheme to Smt. Radha Bajpai is noted and accepted.

The Management is directed to ensure that all pensionary arrears from the date of retirement (28.02.2015) till date are released to the workman (if not already paid) within a period of three months from the date of publication of this Award.

The reference is disposed of as satisfied/settled in terms of the pension extension granted.

Reference is answered accordingly.

Parties are left to bear their respective costs.

Date: 11.03.2026 RAJENDRA PRASAD SRIVASTAVA, H.J.S. (Retd.), Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 29 जुलाई, 2026

का.आ. 1627.—औघोगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार **यूनियन बैंक ऑफ़ इंडिया** के प्रबंधतत्र, संबद्ध नियोजको और **सेक्रेटरी, यूनियन बैंक ऑफ इंडिया स्टाफ एसोसिएशन (यू.पी.).** के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औघोगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औघोगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय **कानपूर** के पंचाट **(35/2012)** प्रकाशित करती है।

[सं. एल-12011/57/2011-आई.आर (बी- II)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 29th July, 2026

S.O. 1627.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award **(Ref. 35/2012*)*** of the ***Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court Kanpur*** as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of **Union Bank of India** and **The Secretary, Union Bank of India Staff Association (U.P.).**

[No. L-12011/57/2011–IR (B-II)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, KANPUR

ID Case No. 35 of 2012

Present Shri Rajendra Prasad Srivastava, H.J.S. (Retd.)

The Secretary,

Union Bank of India Staff Association (U.P.),

C/o Union Bank of India, Sarvodaya

Nagar Branch,

Kanpur (U.P.)-

…….Workman

Vs.

1. The General Manager,
   Union Bank of India, Nodal Regional Office,
   Kapoorthala Complex, Sarda Tower,
   Aliganj,
   Lucknow-
2. The Asstt. General Manager,
   Union Bank of India, Regioal Office,
   177/H-1/240, Pandu Nagar,
   Kanpur (U.P.)-
3. The General Manager,
   Union Bank of India, H.R. Deptt.
   Central Office, 239, Vidhan Bhawan Marg,
   Narimon Point,
   MUMABAI-

……..Management

(JUDGMENT)

(Passed on this 11th day of March, 2026)

By order No. L-12011/57/2011-IR(B-II) dated: 30.04.2012 the present industrial dispute has been referred for adjudication to this Tribunal for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section (2A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) by the Central Government, with following schedule:

> *"Whether the action of the management of Union Bank of India, Kanpur in refusing to extend the Employees' Pension Scheme to Smt. Sunita Singh working at Union Bank of India, Birhana Road Branch, Kanpur is just, fair & legal? What relief the workman concerned is entitled to?"*

In response to reference on 07.09.2012, statement of claim has been field, thereafter, written statement alongwith preliminary objection was filed on behalf of respondent, to which rejoinder statement has been filed.

The applicant, Smt. Sunita Singh filed a claim seeking the extension of the Employees' Pension Scheme, which was initially refused by the Management. During the protracted pendency of this industrial dispute, the workman continued in service and subsequently attained superannuation.

On 11.03.2026, the Authorized Representative for the Respondent/Management placed on record the Bio-data and pensionary records of Smt. Sunita Singh. The records confirm that the workman retired from the services of the Bank on 30.06.2021. Crucially, the Management has submitted that the Pension Option has been extended to the workman and he has been processed for benefits under the Employees' Pension Scheme.

Applicant is not filed any evidence. The Opposite Party documents is clear that applicant is in pension option.

In view of the above facts and the documents filed by the Management on 11.03.2026, it is evident that the primary grievance of the workman namely, the refusal to extend the Pension Scheme has been redressed by the Management post-retirement. Since the Pension Scheme has now been extended to the applicant, the dispute regarding the "refusal" no longer survives for adjudication on merits. The action of the Management in extending the Pension Scheme to Smt. Sunita Singh is noted and accepted.

The Management is directed to ensure that all pensionary arrears from the date of retirement (30.06.2021) till date are released to the workman (if not already paid) within a period of three months from the date of publication of this Award.

The reference is disposed of as satisfied/settled in terms of the pension extension granted.

Reference is answered accordingly.

Parties are left to bear their respective costs.

Date: 11.03.2026 RAJENDRA PRASAD SRIVASTAVA, H.J.S. (Retd.), Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 29 जुलाई, 2026

का.आ. 1628.—औघोगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार **यूनियन बैंक ऑफ़ इंडिया** के प्रबंधतत्र, संबद्ध नियोजको और **सेक्रेटरी, यूनियन बैंक ऑफ इंडिया स्टाफ एसोसिएशन (यू.पी.)** के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औघोगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औघोगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय **कानपूर** के पंचाट **(43/2012)** प्रकाशित करती है।

[सं. एल-12011/61/2011-आई.आर (बी- II)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 29th July, 2026

S.O. 1628.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award **(Ref. 43/2012*)*** of the ***Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court Kanpur*** as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of **Union Bank of India** and **The Secretary, Union Bank of India Staff Association (U.P.).**

[No. L-12011/61/2011–IR (B-II)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, KANPUR

ID Case No. 43 of 2012

Present Shri Rajendra Prasad Srivastava, H.J.S. (Retd.)

The Secretary,

Union Bank of India Staff Association (U.P.),

C/o Union Bank of India, Sarvodaya

Nagar Branch,

Kanpur (U.P.)-

…….Workman

Vs.

1. The General Manager,
   Union Bank of India, H.R. Deptt. Central Office,
   239, Vidhan Bhawan Marg,
   Nariman Point,
   Mumbai- 400021.
2. The General Manager,
   Union Bank of India, Nodal Regional Office,
   Kapoorthala Complex, Sarda Tower,
   Aliganj,
   Lucknow-
3. The Asstt. General Manager,
   Union Bank of India, Regioal Office,
   177/H-1/240, Pandu Nagar,
   Kanpur (U.P.)-

……..Management

(JUDGMENT)

(Passed on this 11th day of March, 2026)

By order No. L-12011/61/2011-IR(B-II) dated: 31.05.2012 the present industrial dispute has been referred for adjudication to this Tribunal for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section (2A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) by the Central Government, with following schedule:

> *"Whether the action of the management of Union Bank of India, Kanpur in refusing to extend the Employees' Pension Scheme to Shri Ajay Kumar Awasthi working at Union Bank of India, Birhana Road Branch, Kanpur is just, fair & legal? What relief the workman concerned is entitled to ?"*

In response to reference on 07.09.2012, statement of claim has been field, thereafter, written statement alongwith preliminary objection was filed on behalf of respondent, to which rejoinder statement has been filed.

The workman, Shri Ajay Kumar Awasthi, filed a claim seeking the extension of the Employees' Pension Scheme, which was initially refused by the Management. During the protracted pendency of this industrial dispute, the workman continued in service and subsequently attained superannuation.

On 11.03.2026, the Authorized Representative for the Respondent/Management placed on record the Bio-data and pensionary records of Shri Ajay Kumar Awasthi. The records confirm that the workman retired from the services of the Bank on 31.07.2020. Crucially, the Management has submitted that the Pension Option has been extended to the workman and he has been processed for benefits under the Employees' Pension Scheme.

Applicant is not filed any evidence. The Opposite Party documents is clear that applicant is in pension option.

In view of the above facts and the documents filed by the Management on 11.03.2026, it is evident that the primary grievance of the workman namely, the refusal to extend the Pension Scheme has been redressed by the Management post-retirement. Since the Pension Scheme has now been extended to the applicant, the dispute regarding the "refusal" no longer survives for adjudication on merits.

The action of the Management in extending the Pension Scheme to Shri Ajay Kumar Awasthi is noted and accepted.

The Management is directed to ensure that all pensionary arrears from the date of retirement (31.07.2020) till date are released to the workman (if not already paid) within a period of three months from the date of publication of this Award.

The reference is disposed of as satisfied/settled in terms of the pension extension granted.

Reference is answered accordingly.

Parties are left to bear their respective costs.

Date: 11.03.2026 RAJENDRA PRASAD SRIVASTAVA, H.J.S. (Retd.), Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 29 जुलाई, 2026

का.आ. 1629.—औघोगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार **यूनियन बैंक ऑफ़ इंडिया** के प्रबंधतत्र, संबद्ध नियोजको और **सेक्रेटरी, यूनियन बैंक ऑफ इंडिया स्टाफ एसोसिएशन (यू.पी.)** के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औघोगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औघोगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय **कानपूर** के पंचाट **(62/2017)** प्रकाशित करती है।

[सं. एल-12011/34/2017-आई.आर (बी- II)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 29th July, 2026

S.O. 1629.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award **(Ref. 62/2017*)*** of the ***Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court Kanpur*** as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of **Union Bank of India** and **The Secretary, Union Bank of India Staff Association (U.P.).**

[No. L-12011/34/2017–IR (B-II)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, KANPUR

Present Shri Rajendra Prasad Srivastava, H.J.S. (Retd.)

ID Case No. 62 of 2017

The Secretary,

Union Bank Staff Association (U.P.)

C/o Union Bank of India,

Main Branch, 24/53, Birhana Road,

Kanpur (U.P.)- 208001.

…….Workman

Vs.

1. **The Chief Manager,**

   Union Bank of India,

   General Ganj Branch,

   Kanpur (U.P.)-

2. **The Deputy General Manager,**

   Union Bank of India, Regional Office,

   117/H-1/240, Pandu Nagar,

   Kanpur (U.P.)- 208005

3. The General Manager,

Union Bank of India,

Field General Manager Office,

Gomti Nagar,

Lucknow-

4. The General Manager (P),

Union Bank of India,

Central Office, 229, Vidhan Sabha Marg,

Mumbai-

……Management

(JUDGMENT)

(Passed on this 7th day of April, 2026)

As per letter dated 08/08/2017 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-12011/34/2017-IR (B-II) dt. 08.08.2017. The dispute under reference relates to:

> *"Whether the action of the management of Union Bank of India, Kanpur in making payment of conveyance allowance to physically handicapped employee Shri Deewan Singh, SWO-B, General Ganj Branch, Kanpur w.e.f. 01.02.2015 and not from the date of submission of his first application dated 27.02.2012 is just, fair and legal? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled to?"*

Accordingly, an industrial dispute No. 62/2017 has been registered on 14.08.2017.

From the perusal of record, the position which emerge out is that on 09.01.2018 the claimant filed statement of claim and in reply thereto respondent filed its preliminary objection as well as written statement on 10.08.2018.

However, claimant did not file its rejoinder affidavit in spite of several opportunities.

From the perusal of order sheet, it appears that neither workman nor his authorized representative has appeared to press the case on behalf of the claimant since 23.09.2019.

Accordingly, after hearing Sri Sunil Mehrotra, learned authorized representative of the opposite parties and taking into consideration the facts the position which emerges out is that as no oral/documentary evidence has been filed on behalf of the claimant to support his claim, as such, the adjudication case is liable to be dismissed.

Thus, taking into consideration the facts on record that in the present case the workman has not filed any oral/documentary evidence in support of his claim, so the same is liable to be dismissed.

For the foregoing reasons, the case is dismissed and; and the workman is not entitled for any relief.

Accordingly, the reference is answered in the **negative**. The claimant is not entitled to any relief. A **'Nil'** Award is hereby passed.

Parties are left to bear their respective costs.

Date: 07.04.2026 RAJENDRA PRASAD SRIVASTAVA, H.J.S. (Retd.), Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 29 जुलाई, 2026

का.आ. 1630.—औघोगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार **बैंक ऑफ इंडिया** के प्रबंधतत्र, संबद्ध नियोजको और उनके कर्मकार **श्री विनोद कुमार भारती** के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औघोगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औघोगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय **कानपूर** के पंचाट **(68/2015)** प्रकाशित करती है।

[सं. एल-12012/47/2017-आई.आर (बी- II)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 29th July, 2026

S.O. 1630.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award **(Ref. 68/2015)** of the ***Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court Kanpur*** as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of **Bank of India** and **Shri Vinod Kumar Bharti.**

[No. L-12012/47/2017–IR (B-II)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT,

KANPUR

ID Case No. 68 of 2015

Present Shri Rajendra Prasad Srivastava, H.J.S (Retd.)

Between:-

Shri Vinod Kumar Bharti S/o Sh. Mishri lal

Village-Tarapur, Post-Mughalsarai,

Chanduali-232101

……Workman

AND

The Chief Manager,

Bank of India, Parmar Bhawan,

G.T. Road, Mughalsarai,

Chandauli-232101

……Management

Award

06.02.2026

Central Government, MOL, vide notification no. L-12012/47/2017-IR(B-II) dated 07/09/2017 has referred the Industrial Dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication.

This award arises in response to the reference made by Government of India, Ministry of Labour department in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub section (2A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947(14 of 1947) the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Kanpur. The Reference is stated as follows:-

> ***"Whether the action of the bank of India in alleged terminating the services of Shri Vinod Kumar Bharti working form 09/10/2010 and removed with effect from 18.03.2016 is legal & justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled for"***

The averments made claimant workman in claim Statement are as follows:-

After completion of all the formalities, Shri Vinood Kumar son of shri Mishri Lal was appointed as temporary/permanent on the post of peon on 09/10/2010 by the O.P Bank of India. Since his appointment the petitioner was working continuously without giving any chance to O.P bank to complaint. His work was satisfactory. He was never given any warning or chargesheet. It is further stated by the petitioner that his salary was meagre and no facility was provided. He was a temporary worker but he deserves to be permanent. Even he requested several times but in return he got assurance only every time to get permanent post of peon. His service was terminated on 18.03.2016 without any prior notice. Further he stated that he worked from 2010 to 18.03.2016 continuously and every year he worked more than 240 days. His termination was illegal and unfair as no prior notice or retrenchment compensation was ever given to him. He also stated that after his termination O.P bank has appointed a new person Shri Dinesh Kumar in his place. In his prayer he requested that he should be reinstated with full backwages and other benefits which deems fit in the eyes of the Hon'ble Tribunal.

The averments of O.P management made in the written statement are as follows:-

O.P management claimed that Shri Vinod Kumar Bharti is not a workman of the opposite party Bank. No employer employee relationship exists between the opposite party Bank and the applicant. O.P management submitted that Shri Vinod Kumar Bharti had never gone through any test or interview for any post in the opposite party bank. The opposite party Bank has never appointed the applicant on any post and no appointment letter has been issued by the opposite party bank to the applicant Shri Vinod Kumar Bharti therefore the question of his continuously working in the bank does not arise. It is pertinent to mention here that the opposite party bank is a nationalized Bank. The Bank has to work under control and guidelines of the Government of India. If any post is to be filled up the bank has to invite applications through employment exchange/newspapers as per guidelines mentioning criteria like age qualification reservation if any etc. The candidate is required to appear in a test. Interview and selected candidate is issued an appointment letter by the competent authority mentioning therein name of post place of posting pay scale etc. Shri Vinod Kumar Bharti has never gone through recruitment process and he has never been issued an appointment letter. He is not employee of the bank and hence the question of his satisfactory work or calling any explanation from him or issue of charge sheet to him does not arise. And the question of working on temporary or on regular post or less payment as alleged by the applicant does not arise.

Similarly the question of his permanency also does not arise and termination also does not arise. It is prayed by the O.P management to reject the claim of the applicant in the interest of justice.

As per reference main question is:-

"Whether the action of the Bank of India in alleged terminating the services of Shri Vinod Kumar Bharti working from 09/10/2010 and removed with effect from 18.03.2016 is legal & justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled for?'

Applicant said in Claim statement that opposite party after completion of all formality appointed as peon on 09.10.2010 and he worked continuously. His work was satisfactory and never gave any opportunity of complain. O.P management paid him less wages though he was entitled for permanency in post but O.P not do so and on date 18.03.2016 the services of applicant is terminated when he asked they misbehaved. He worked from 2010 to 18.03.2016 regularly and more than 240 days hence the termination of O.P illegal and unjust and never given him compensation. In response O.P said in written statement that applicant is not workman of bank. No employer employee relationship exists between O.P bank and appellant. Appellant had never gone for test or interview when there is procedure of appointment. No appointment letter is issued to the applicant hence the question of his continuously working does not arise. Applicant has not been appointed and he did not been appointed and he did not work in O.P bank. He is not employee of bank hence there is no question of temporary or regular post or less payment as alleged by applicant. Applicant is not employee of bank and no salary is paid to him.

After filing of written statement no any rejoinder is filed by applicant hence my predecessor closed opportunity of filing rejoinder on 20.09.2022.

As alleged by applicant he is employee of O.P as permanent / adhoc but he have not filed any documentary /oral document that applicant is employee of O.P and there is clear denial of O.P that applicant is never employee of said bank. After perusal of file it is also clear that applicant as alleged but he have not given any documentary evidence as appointment letter, salary and wages etc.

After above discussion and averments, applicant fails to prove as alleged in claim statement.

In view of foregoing discussions and findings, answered in the negative.

Answered Accordingly.

Parties are left to bear their respective costs.

Date: 06.02.2026 RAJENDRA PRASAD SRIVASTAVA, H.J.S. (Retd.), Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 29 जुलाई, 2026

का.आ. 1631.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एस बी आई भारत का के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजको और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में **केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण–सह–श्रम न्यायालय,** हैदराबाद के पंचाट (**सन्दर्भ संख्या 115/2002**) को प्रकाशित करती है,

[सं. एल-12012/53/2000-आई.आर (बी- I)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 29th July, 2026

S.O. 1631.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Reference. I.D. No. 115/2002) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Hyderabad as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the Management of SBI of India and their workmen,

[No. L-12012/53/2000–IR (B-I)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

In The Central Government Industrial Tribunal Cum Labour Court At Hyderabad

Present: **Sri IRFAN QAMAR**

Presiding Officer

Dated the 11th day of May 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. 115/2002

[Old ID No.38/2000 of Industrial Tribunal No.I, Hyderabad]

Between:

Sri Munagala Swamy,

New Harijanwad,

Addakal(PO),

Distt, Mahaboobnagar(A.P).

… Petitioner

And

The General Manager,

State Bank of India,

Local Head Office,

Bank Street,

Hyderabad(A.P). …..Respondent

Appearances:

For the Petitioner : Sri Macherla Rangaiah, Advocate

For the Respondent: Sri Y. Ranjeeth Reddy, Advocate

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-12012/53/2000-IR(B.I) dated 06.07.2000 referred the following dispute under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 to Industrial Tribunal No.I, Hyderabad for adjudication and later the same has been transferred to this Tribunal bearing ID No.38/2000, as per orders of Central Government vide Lr.No.H-11026/1/2001-IR(C.II) dated 18.10.2001, requiring this forum to decide the question:

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the State Bank of India, Addakal Branch in terminating Sri Munagala Swamy, Sweeper-cum-water Boy from services of the Bank by way of oral order w.e.f. 31.3.97 is justified? If not, what relief he is entitled to?"

After receipt of the reference, it was numbered as ID No.115/2002 and notices were issued to both the Workman and the management.

2. Before unfolding the factual matrix of the instant industrial dispute it would be apposite to have a bird eye view of a chequered history of the instant industrial dispute. Earlier instant industrial dispute along with the batch cases was decided by this Tribunal vide common award dated 17.5.2005 and the reference was answered in favour of the Respondent and against the Workman. That said common award dated 17.5.2005 was challenged by the aggrieved Workmen in various Writ petition No.6470/2014 along with batch of writ petitions before the Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh and Hon'ble High Court vide its' judgement dated 23.6.2014 allowed all batch of writ petitions and set aside the common award dated 17.5.2005 passed in ID No.222 of 2001 and other batch of ID cases by Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad and the Respondent management of State Bank of India was directed to reengage the Writ Petitioners in position, which they have been occupying prior to their termination and further directed to consider their cases for regularization as and when the substantive vacancy arises. This judgement dated 23.6.2014 of Hon'ble High Court of AP, passed in WP No.6470/2014 and batch petitions was challenged by Respondent management before the Hon'ble High Court in Writ Appeal No. 1268 of 2014. The aforesaid Writ Appeals No.1268/2014 and other Writ Appeals were decided by Division Bench of High Court of Andhra Pradesh by a common judgement dated 20.3.2019. Hon'ble High Court in aforesaid Writ Appeal was pleased to pass the order which is extracted as below:-

" 7. Hearing the learned senior counsel for the SBI and the learned senior counsel for the contesting unofficial Respondents, we see that while the learned single Judge was justified in setting aside the award af the Tribunal, the proper course to be adopted was to remit all the cases to the Tribunal. This we say for reasons more than one. Firstly, in such matters, claims have to be decided on individual basis, as different persons have different claims as to the length of officiation or discharge of duties and functions; quality of engagement, drawings, accounting of the post for each one of them, who have worked etc. All these issues will not be the same in all the cases. Therefore, each case ought to have been directed to be decided by the Tribunal afresh on individual basis. The second and most important aspect is the learned single Judge has in one go ordered re-employment of all the workmen. This is not a relief that could have been granted without answering the individual issues; each issue relating to each case could not have been decided by the writ Court within the format of its adjudication procedures and scope. The adjudicating body, which has to do that activity, is the Industrial Tribunal. Therefore, we are of the view that while we would sustain the order of the learned singe Judge insofar as it interfered and sets aside the award of the Tribunal, the

further findings and directions, issued through the impugned order have to go and the individual cases have to be sent back for consideration of the Tribunal. Such further procedure before the Tribunal will have to be carried forward with the materials already on record and also by affording an opportunity to the persons, who have claims as well as the management to place their rival contentions and further material before the Tribunal. The learned counsel appearing for the workmen are justified in pointing out that enormous delay has already happened and further action by the Tribunal in this line may be expedited.

9. In the result, these writ appeals are ordered;

(1) affirming the impugned common order of the learned single Judge to the extent it sets aside the common award dated 17.05.2005 of the Industrial Tribunal;

(2) the further findings and directions issued through the impugned common order are vacated:

(3) all the matters shall be remitted to the Industrial Tribunal with a direction to dispose of them within an outer limit of five (5) months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order; and,

(4) the parties to make appearance before the Tribunal on the given date."

Thus, in view of the above direction of Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh in W.A.No.1268 of 2014 and batch cases. This Tribunal has taken up the matter of industrial dispute for hearing and deciding it afresh in view of the aforesaid guidelines laid down by the Hon'ble High Court in Writ Appeal No.1268/2014 vide judgement dated 20.3.019.

3. The factual matrix of instant industrial dispute as narrated by the Workman in his claim statement are that, the Workman joined in the service of the management institution as Messenger from 1983 to 1997, and has rendered unblemished service spreading over a period of about 5 years. The Respondent has terminated services of Workman by oral orders with effect from 1.4.1997. Further, it is submitted that the management of Respondent bank decided to give a chance to temporarily employed personnel "found suitable for permanent appointment" by wait- listing them by offering permanent appointment or waitlisting till such opportunity arises.

4. That on 17.11.1987 a settlement was reached between All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and the Management of State Bank of India - settlement one, under this settlement three categories of employees were listed. That is, A) those who have completed 240 days in 12 months or less after 1.7.1975. B) those who have completed 270 days in any continuous block of 36 calendar months after 1.7.1975. C) (i) those who have completed minimum of 30 days aggregate temporary service in any calendar year after 1.7.1975 or (ii) 70 days aggregate temporary service in continuous block of 36 months after 1.7.1975.

5. The persons who satisfied in all the above 4 categories were to be interviewed by a selection committee and the said selection committee would determine the suitability of the said candidate for permanent appointment. Therefore, the bank prescribed certain qualifications and from among the candidates satisfying the qualifications the suitable candidates were enlisted by a selection committee. The Clause 7 of the said agreement provided with the selected candidate would be wait listed in order of their respective categorization and the selected panel would be valid upto December, 1991. Clause 10 of the settlement specifically provided that henceforth. "there will be no temporary appointments in the subordinate cadre", except on a restrictive basis in the specified category, "from amongst empanelled candidates as per existing guidelines of the bank". The Workman further submits that consequent upon the

said agreement and the draft, a notification was issued in the newspapers. The last date for responding to the advertisement was 30.8.1988. A written examination followed by viva-voce in May, 1989 was held. A selected panel was prepared, as per Clause 7 of the agreement, ie. Settlement No.1, the selected panel was to be valid upto December, 1991, the Workman submits that circular was issued on 26.4.91 by the said letter it is mentioned that the terms of the agreement dated 17.11.87 was modified vide second agreement dated 16.7.88 was entered into between the parties. In terms of the said agreement a chance was to be given, "to all eligible temporary employees for permanent appointments. The appointments were against the vacancies likely to arise during the years 1995-96, circular made it clear that in view of the enormity of the problem an extension of the currency of the panel, eligible temporary employees who have been empanelled could not appear in the earlier interviews and have been pursuing their cases thereafter, "will be given another chance to appear for interview".

6. Workman submits that there were total five settlements. The settlement dated 17.11.87 is the 1st settlement (Ex M1), settlement dated 16.7.88 is 2nd settlement (Ex M2), settlement dated 27.10.88 is the 3rd settlement (Ex M3), then settlement dated 9.1.91 is 4th settlement and settlement dated 30.7.96 is 5th settlement (Ex M6). In between there is minutes of conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.95 marked as Ex M5. That due to all these settlements which were extended by subsequent settlements thereby created reasonable expectations in the list of the selected candidates arose with that it's a question of time their appointments or services would be regularized in the services of the bank. The Workman was working with the bank on temporary basis was under the bonafide hope that sooner his services will be regularized with the bank. He is thereby closed all his options elsewhere. It is needless to point out that employing person to whom hope of employment in substantial terms was made is a facet of Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

7. Further Workman submits that the Government of India issued Circular No. F-3/3/104/87-IR, dated 16.8.1990. Under said circular the chief Executives of all public sector banks including the Management herein were specifically instructed that until the problem of existing temporary employees is fully resolved, no bank is permitted to make any permanent appointments. That some of the persons similarly situated like this Workman aggrieved by the inaction on the part of the management of the bank is not regularizing their services from out of the selected panel and not clearly focusing the vacancy position, filed W.P. No. 4194/97 before Hon'ble High court of A.P.. It is specifically averred in the said writ petition that the Management of the bank had failed to implement the settlement and that it violates the various fundamental rights guaranteed under the constitution of India. The Hon'ble High court of A.P .. by order dated 5.3.97 directed the bank to implement the settlement as amended from time to time. It also directed the bank to carry out the terms of settlement before the expiry of March, 1997. The Hon'ble High Court also recorded finding that the Bank cannot escape its liability of enforcement of the Settlement. In view of the directions given by the High Court all candidates whose names appeared in the select panels prepared on the basis of the agreement entered into on 17.11.87 under which the panel was valid upto December, 1991, and on the basis of a settlement dated 27.10.1988 whereby the panels were made alive upto 31.3.1997 under which the panel was valid upto December, 1999. The other agreement dated 16.7.1988 under which the panel was valid upto 1992 and on the basis of the settlement dated 27.10.1998 whereby the panels were made alive upto 31.3.1997 were under the bonafide impression that their cases will be considered for regularization and were living on the basis of the said reasonable expectation. Unfortunately, contrary to the aforesaid directions given by the High Court and contrary to the settlements entered into between the parties, the bank issued proceedings dated 25.3.1997, dated 27.3.1997 and 31.3.1997 instructing the various authorities of the Management not to continue the temporary employees

those who are in services of the bank from 1.4.97. The said order was followed by the Management. Aggrieved by the said action the Workman herein and similarly situated candidates have filed a writ petition before the Hon'ble High Court and by way of Writ Petition No.9206/97 seeking a declaration that the proceedings issued by the Deputy General Manager and the Assistant General Manager (Respondents 3,4 and 5 therein) on 25.3.97, 27.3.97 and 31.3.97 as illegal and also non-continuance of the Workmen therein in service by absorbing them in the services of the bank as violative of Section 2(p) and 18(1) read with Rule 58 of Central Rules and sought for specific direction to the bank to absorb them in service.

8. Further, Workman submits that in the counter affidavit filed in Writ Petition No.9206/97, the bank has submitted that it has about 805 branches in Andhra Pradesh alone. It has stated that due to exigencies of circumstances and on account of the urgent need in its banks, it employed temporary employees in subordinate cadre. It is pertinent to mention that it does not state the urgent or need or the nature of temporary employees that it had engaged. Enquiry into the same would reveal that the stand taken by the bank either on the ground of urgent need or of temporary employees is a façade to perpetuate unfair labour practice. It is designed to on the one hand, keep the employed in the erroneous zone of hope and on the other to ensure that benefits that a model employer will extend under various statutes to its employees is not required to be borne out by the bank. A reading of the counter affidavit would show that the bank would opines that being just fair and reasonable are which obviously is reprehensible and is a facet of unfair labour practice.

9. The Workman submits that the bank had referred in its counter affidavit to three settlements dated 17.11.87, 16.7.88 and 27.10.88. The bank in the guise of extending the benefits of the circular of Government dated 16.8.90 stated in its counter affidavit that as follows:

"Government of India, vide its letter dated 16.8.1990, issued guidelines to all the public sector banks with regard to recruitment and absorption of temporary employees in public sector banks. The said guidelines were issued to implement on the lines of the approach paper on the issue provided by a committee constituted in this regard. The Government of India guidelines made it clear that all the public sector banks may follow the provisions laid down in the approach paper.

The approach paper specified that the cases of temporary employees who had put in not less than 240 days of temporary service in 12 consecutive Months and who are entitled to benefit of Section 25-F may be decided by entering into a settlement with the representative union. In respect of temporary employees who had put in less than 240 days of service in 12 consecutive months or less, a settlement could be avoided and however if the Management so desired, they could enter into a conciliation settlement with the representative union. Para 6(h), it is mentioned that only those temporary employees who had put in temporary service of 90 or more days after 1.1 1982 would be eligible for considering under the scheme. Although the Government guidelines envisaged for a settlement in respect of employees who had put in temporary service of 90 or more days, the bank by way of further concession entered into settlements Even in respect of those who had put in less than 90 days. As such, it could be Seen that the settlements are more beneficial to the temporary employees concerned. The approach paper also specify at para 6(c) that the banks would provide one time opportunity to all the temporary employees and for that purpose temporary employees worked in the bank on or after 1.1.1982 could be considered for re-employment in terms of the scheme. The Respondents have gone further wherein even persons working after 1975 were also considered.

As could be seen from the above, there was a genuine effort on the part of the Respondent bank to provide permanent employment for as many as possible subject to availability of the vacancies.

It is further submitted that at para 6(k) of the approach paper, it was made clear that this would be one time exercise in full and final settlement of all the aims and disputes for the past period in respect of temporary workmen covered by the settlement. This would mean that the Government of India guidelines would cover only those persons who were temporarily employed for the period specified therein and not otherwise. As such, it is submitted that the Respondents have not only followed the Government of India guidelines but in fact covered cases of the employees who had worked for less than 90 days. As such, question of violation does not arise and in any case those were only broad guidelines and not directives".

10. The Workman submits that the bank also referred a subsequent settlement dated 9.1.1991 wherein there is a clause to the effect- that the panel of temporary employees and the panel of daily wage employees will be operated to a particular period. Therefore, their cases will not be considered. The Management herein relying upon this settlement in their impugned action. It is submitted that even the settlement dated 9.1.1991 will not empower the management to terminate the services of the temporary employees who are working in the bank services like the Workman herein as it does not specify the termination of the employees. In fact there are so many vacancies wherein the Management has engaged several new persons as temporary messengers/ attendars/ sweepers etc., even after the judgment of Hon'ble High Court without considering the cases of the similarly situated candidates like the Workman herein. It is submitted inspite of engaging fresh candidates as is now being done by the Management they would have continued the similarly situated candidates like the Workman herein in the services of the bank and consider their cases for absorption in view of the circulars issued by Central Government as well as the directions of this Hon'ble Court in Writ Petition No.4194/97, dated 5.3.97. In view of the circulars issued by the Central Government, the Management should not have relied upon the settlement dated 9.1.1991. Hence, the impugned action of the Management is illegal, unjust, violative of fundamental rights such as Articles 14,16 and 21 of the Constitution of India.

11. The Workman submits that in W.P. No.4194/97 filed by the union of temporary employees where in they have complained about the non- implementation of the settlements arrived between the parties and sought for absorption. Such employees in the bank services on permanent basis before the date fixed for carrying out the terms of settlement, the Court held that the members of the union had been empanelled in the list, they were not regularized and the time was going to run out to the near future and the Respondent bank and its officers cannot escape from the liability of enforcing the settlement which has been reached and therefore directed that the bank and the officers shall implement the settlement dated 17.11.87 as amended from time to time before the expiry of 31.3.97.

12. Further, it is submitted that in the clause of Settlement it is specifically mentioned that the workmen to be absorbed/appointed in the bank prohibiting any temporary appointments subsequent to the date of settlement even the authorities want to make temporary appointments that should be made only from among the empanelled can be appointed either for temporary vacancy or permanent vacancy except from among the empanelled candidates like the Workman and that should be continued till they are absorbed. The management committed unfair labour practices and terminated the services of the candidates with effect from 1.4.1997 which is arbitrary, discriminatory, contrary to their own guidelines and violative of the constitutional provisions which are guaranteed in Chapter-III of the Constitution of India.

13. The Workman submits that it is strange as to how the panels were allowed to lapse by a so-called Memorandum of Understanding dated 25.2.1997, that the action of terminating such employees like the Workman by virtue of an impugned oral proceedings without implementing the settlement would be illegal

and unfair labour practice which cannot be allowed to be perpetuated. That the discontinuance of the Workman after 31.3.97 who had served in the bank in any capacity amounts to retrenchment. It could not have been done without any notice and it violates Sec.25FF of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and the said action is violative of principles of natural justice guaranteed under Chapter III of the Constitution of India. This amounts to retrenchment without one month's notice and taken in view of such notice. Thus, the main proceedings issued by the Respondent is without jurisdiction and is arbitrary, illegal and therefore liable to be quashed. That the alleged Memorandum of Understanding dated 27.2.97, Ex.M5 does not own any legal entity, as the said Memorandum of Understanding is not published anywhere to brought to the notice of the Workman whose rights are being affected. It is submitted that Management did not adhere to the procedure envisaged by the Central Government in its' instructions dated 16.8.90 in the year 1995. The same was not followed in the year 1997 despite there being vacancies. The management has followed the procedure of calling candidates through Employment exchange instead of giving chance to the empanelled candidates like the Workman here. It is pertinent to mention here that the Respondent Management sent letters to the all similarly situated candidates like the Workman in the month of June, 1997, subsequent to the passing of impugned termination orders. After knowing the facts that the candidates are litigating, the Management refused to engage these candidates. It is once again reiterated that the panels are meant for absorption but not for termination. It was the duty of the Management to engage the empanelled candidates like the Workman even in temporary vacancies till they are absorbed permanently in regular vacancies. Hence, the action of the Respondent Management terminating the services of the Workman by oral order dated 31.3.97 is unjust, illegal, violative of principles of natural justice and hence, the Management be directed to reinstate and absorb the Workman and to grant all incidental and consequential benefits.

14. Per contra, Respondent had filed counter and made a contentions that the reference is not tenable and contrary to the provisions of I.D. Act, 1947. Respondent submitted that to tide over severe sub-ordinate staff constraints which arose out of leave vacancies, exigencies, etc., and also owning to the restrictions imposed by the Government of India/Reserve Bank of India on intake of staff, the Respondent bank used to engage sub-ordinate staff like messengers, sweepers, sweeper cum water boys, etc., depending on the availability of work on purely temporary basis for the smooth and uninterrupted functioning of the branches. It is submitted that the All India State Bank of India Staff Federation which represents majority of the employees in the State Bank of India comprising about 98% of the work force as its' members espoused the cause of temporary employees who have put in less than 240 days of temporary service in 12 calendar months in the bank and who were ineligible for any protection under Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 to give a chance for being considered for absorption and permanent appointments.

15. Discussions were held and on 17.11.1987 an agreement was signed between the federation and the Management bank under Sec. 2(p) read with Sec 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules 1957. A copy of the said settlement dated 17.11.87 which may be herein after referred as first settlement is filed and 4 categories were made as it has already been mentioned in the claim statement above, it need not be repeated here. In the first settlement, it was agreed that the temporary employees as categorized would be given a chance for being considered for permanent appointment in the bank's service against the vacancies which are likely to arise during the period 1987 to 1991. On 16.7.88 second settlement was arrived between the Federation and the Bank whereby it was agreed to substitute the period of consideration of vacancies as 1987 to 1992 in place of 1987 to 1991 as contemplated under the first settlement dated 17.11.1987. This is the second settlement. A 3rd settlement was entered into on 27.10.88 and it was agreed that the bank's service against the vacancies likely to arise

from 1988 to 1992 was to be considered. Government of India vide its letter dated 16.8.90 issued guidelines to all the public sector banks with regard to recruitment and absorption of temporary employees in public sector banks. The said guidelines were issued to implement on the lines of approach paper on the issue provided by a committee constituted in this regard. Government of India guidelines made it clear that all the public sector banks may follow the provisions laid down in the approach paper. The approach paper specified that the cases of temporary service in 12 consecutive months and who are entitled to benefit of Sec.25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 may be decided by entering into a settlement with the representative union. In respect of temporary employees who had put in less than 240 days of service in 12 consecutive months or less, a settlement could be avoided and however if the Management so desired they could enter into a conciliation settlement with the representative union. In para. 6(h) it is mentioned that only those temporary employees who had put in temporary service of 90 days or more days after 1.1.82 would be eligible for considering under the scheme. Although the Government guidelines envisaged for a settlement in respect of employees who had put in temporary service of 90 days or more days, the bank by way of a further concession entered into settlements. Even in respect of those who had put in less than 90 days and also the bank went a step further and said those persons who are working after 1975 were also considered. Hence, there was a genuine effort on the part of the Respondent bank to provide as many as possible jobs subject to the availability of the vacancies. However, para 6 (k) of the approach paper made it clear that it is a one time, exercise in full and final, settlement of all the claims and disputes for the past period, in respect of temporary workmen covered by the settlement. Another settlement was entered on 9.1.91 herein after referred as 4th settlement and the time limit was extended upto 1994 and separate panel was prepared for temporary employees, casual/daily wagers. It was agreed that while vacancies arising between 1988 to 1994 in respect of temporary employees and in respect of casual/daily wagers, they can be considered for the vacancies arising between 1995-96 only.

16. It is submitted that the administrative set up of the Hyderabad Local Head Office comprises of four Zonal Offices (Zones) at Hyderabad, Vijayawada, Visakhapatnam and Tirupathi covering all the Districts of Andhra Pradesh. In terms of the settlement the Management after following the procedure laid down therein prepared the panels of qualified candidates of temporary employees denoted as 1989 panel and also panel of casual/daily wagers denoted as 1992 panel for giving a chance for being considered for permanent absorption. These panels were prepared zone-wise separately for messengers and non-messengers in the descending order of temporary service put in by the candidates during the stipulated period i.e., 1.7.1975 to 31.7.1988. That the Federation approached the Regional Labour Commissioner(C) for implementation of bi-partite settlement in respect of absorption of temporary employees. The Regional Labour Commissioner(C) conducted conciliation proceedings and an agreement was arrived between the Federation and the bank. It was agreed that it would be kept alive upto March, 1997. A copy of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.2.1995 signed by the parties is filed as material paper. A settlement was arrived at and an agreement was signed between the Federation and the Management bank on 30.7.1996 under Sec.2 (p) read with Sec.18(1) of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957, which is hereinafter called as 5th settlement. That on 27.2.1997 a Memorandum of understanding was also signed by the federation's affiliate and the bank Management recording the fact that the exercise of identifying the messengerial vacancies as on 31.12.1994 has since been completed by Central Office and thereby 403 messengerial vacancies were sanctioned. It was agreed that these vacancies may be filled from 1989 panel of temporary employees after effecting conversion from full time non-messengerial staff in the usual manner and the agreement was reached accordingly. It was agreed between the Federation's affiliate and the Management bank that in terms of the settlement dated 30.7.1996 both the panels of temporary

employees and daily wagers/casual employees would lapse on 31.3.1997. That as agreed upon vacancies were filled from the panels. The Workman who has put in an aggregate temporary service of less than 240 days in a continuous block of 12 months period during 1.7.1975 to 31.7.1988 has no right to seek a direction to consider his candidature for absorption in the Management bank under any rule/law except under the settlement entered into thereon.

17. Respondent contended that, in fact, the case of the Workman can be considered under all the five settlements having got his case considered under provisions of these settlements. All the other provisions and terms of the settlements are also binding on him/her. The Management bank has not violated any of the provisions of the terms of the said settlement. That the very preparation and maintenance of panel is in compliance of the terms agreed under these settlements. These settlements were time bound and they ceased to exist on 31.3.1997. That the bank has never promised that all the candidates in the panel will be absorbed. In the advertisement itself it was made clear that candidates will be considered for absorption in the vacancies that may arise upto 1992. Keeping alive the panels after 31.3.1997 is contrary to the settlements arrived between the State Bank of India Staff Federation and the Management bank. That the settlements are binding on the parties. The Workman is also bound under the terms of the said settlement. The settlement does not suffer from any ambiguity as their language is very clear. The right under the settlements is to give them a chance to be considered for future appointment in the bank's services against the vacancies likely to arise. The settlements were effected to balance the expectations of the temporary employees to be absorbed in permanent service as against the constitutional rights for all eligible persons to be considered for employment every time a vacancy arises. That the alleged dispute including the demand for reinstatement has to be decided in this context. It is submitted that the period of panel list got expired on 31.3.97 and it is an integral term of the settlement and cannot be modified in any proceedings under the law. These temporary employees who unfortunately could not be accommodated for want of vacancies have no further rights to be considered for regularization. That the Hon'ble High Court in WP No.12964/94, held as follows, "It is needless to state that the settlement arrived at between the All India State Bank of India Staff Federation which, is the majority union and the bank Management is binding on the Workmen also. It is not at all the case of the Workman that any of the terms of the settlement has been violated by the bank's Management. If the Workman had worked in the bank on part-time basis before 31.5.94, that itself would not vest in him a right to claim that his services should be regularized on permanent basis against a full time cadre post. The claim put forth by the Workman in the present petition is therefore misconceived and not tenable. However, it is open to the Workman to claim any right which flows from the settlement between the union and the bank Management. As already pointed out that it is not the grievance of the Workman that some right which has flown from the settlement in favour of the Workman has been denied by the bank Management. Therefore, I do not find any ground, let alone substantial ground, to grant the kind of relief sought for by the Workman. Writ Petition fails and is accordingly dismissed. No costs."

18. Further, it is contended that if the panels were not lapsed at the end of designated period and allowed to be continued it would result in making the contracts of temporary employment indirectly permanent through back door entry, which would not only be contrary to the settlements but also to Articles 14 and 16 of Constitution of India and deprive the chances of original claimants who would Come through proper recruitment procedure. As their rights have been crystallized by operation of the settlements. Hence, there is no question of any Legitimate expectation being violated.

19. Similarly placed ex-employees filed WP No.9206/1995 and the batch before the Hon'ble High Court of A.P. and the learned Single Judge allowed the Writ Petitions. Aggrieved by the same WA No.86/98 and the batch was filed and the Division Bench set aside the order of the Single Judge. Thereafter the ex-temporary employees filed Special Leave Petition No.11886-11888 of 1998 before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India also dismissed the SLP. Therefore, reference to the Judgement of the Learned Single Judge in WP No.9206/97 is of no consequences as the same has already been set aside. The observations made in the Judgements cannot be relied upon for any purpose what so ever. The question of operation of Sec.25F would not come into play. Further the issue is covered by various Judgements of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India and various Hon'ble High Courts. Hence, the reference may be ordered that the Workman is not entitled for any relief.

20. In order to fortify his claim Workman has examined himself as WW1 and also filed documents in evidence which has been exhibited as Ex.W1 to W9. Further, the Workman has filed photocopies of documents in support of his claim which are discussed as under:-

Ex.W1 is the Service Certificate. Further Ex.W2 is the Notification. Ex.W3 is the interview call letter. Ex.W4 is the Panel list. Ex.W5 is the service certificate. Ex.W6 is the service certificate. Ex. W7 is the Service Certificate. Ex. W8 is the letter to employment exchange by the Respondent. Ex. W9 is the circular letter dated 14.07.1999.

21. On the other hand, Respondent has examined witness MW1 Sri Aluru Rama Rao and this witness has exhibited 12 documents, marked as Ex.M1 to M12. The details of these documents are as follows:-

Ex.M.1 is the Settlement dated 17.11.1987. Ex.M2 is the Settlement dated 16.7.1988. Ex.M3 is the Settlement dated 27.10.1988. Ex.M4 is the Settlement dated 9.1.1991. Ex.M5 is the Minutes of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.1995. Ex.M6 is the Settlement dated 30.7.1996. Ex.M7 is the Memorandum of Understanding dt. 27.2.1997. Ex.M8 is the Particulars of 1989 Messengerial Panel. Ex.M9 is the Particulars of 1989 Non-Messengerial Panel. Ex.M10 is the Particulars of 1992 General Attendant Panel. Ex.M11 is the Judgment of Hon'ble High Court of A.P. in Writ Appeal No.86/98 dt.1.5.1998. Ex.M12 is the Judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in SLP No. 11886-11888 of 1998 dt.10.8.1998.

22. Apart from afore mentioned documents, Learned Counsel for Workman has also filed a long list of various judgements of Hon'ble Supreme Court as well as Hon'ble High Court, which we will discuss at appropriate place in this Award.

23. Heard the argument of Learned Counsel for Workman as well as for Respondent.

24. On the basis of rival pleadings of both the parties and submissions made by the Learned Counsel for both the parties, following points arise for determination in the industrial dispute :-

I. Whether the 1st settlement dated 17.11.1987, 2nd settlement dated 16.7.1988, 3rd settlement dated 27.10.1988, 4th settlement dated 9.1.1991 and 5th settlement dated 30.7.1996 entered into between State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and also Memorandum of Understanding are binding upon both the parties?

II. Whether the action of State Bank of India, Addakala branch in terminating the services of Workman Sri Munagala Swamy, a Messenger with effect from 31.3.1997 is justified?

III. Whether the Workman is entitled for absorption on permanent post in the Branch of Respondent management as per averments made by him in the claim statement?

IV. To what relief if any the Workman is entitled for?

Findings:-

25. Point No.I:- Undisputedly settlements dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988, 9.1.1991 and 30.7.1996, minutes of conciliation proceedings and memorandum of understanding dated 27.2.1997 were executed between the State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation under section 2(p) and 18 (1) of I.D. Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Disputes (Central Rules), 1957.

Section 2(p) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 as follows:-

(p) "settlement" means a settlement arrived at in the course of conciliation proceeding and includes a written agreement between the employer and workmen arrived at otherwise than in the course of conciliation proceeding where such agreement has been signed by the parties thereto in such manner as may be prescribed and a copy thereof has been sent to an officer authorised in this behalf by the appropriate Government and the conciliation officer;

Section 18(1) provides as follows:-

18. Persons on whom settlements and awards are binding.

- [(1) A settlement arrived at by agreement between the employer and Workman otherwise than in the course of conciliation proceeding shall be binding on the parties to the agreement.

Therefore, in view of the provision contained u/s.18 (1) I.D. Act, 1947, terms and conditions enumerated in the aforesaid settlements are binding on the parties to the agreement. The Learned Counsel for Workman has argued that the Workman after going through the selection procedure has successfully been listed in the panel for appointment on the permanent basis in the Respondent management and the empanelled list has to be valid till last person in the empanelled list is appointed on permanent basis. But the impugned order dated 25.3.97, 27.3.97 and 31.3.97, has been issued by Respondent management thereby the services of the Workman has been terminated and the said order is not in consonance of the terms of the agreement entered into between the parties. Further, Workman submits that the Respondent in the 5th settlement has mentioned the date i.e., 31.3.1997 for lapse of empanel list which is illegal and that is not binding upon the Workman. The condition of lapse of empanelment list on 31.3.97 incorporated in the aforesaid 5th settlement, is arbitrary and illegal.

26. The perusal of the impugned order dated 25.3.1997 goes to reveal that the Chief/Branch Manager, SBI Zonal Office has issued the letter to all the branches with regard to the subject not to make any temporary appointments in the Branch in messengerial category from 1.4.1997. The extract of the said letter is given below:-

"We have been advised by the Deputy General Manager, Zonal Office, Hyderabad that as both the panels of temporary employees of 1989 and daily wagers/casual labours of 1992 will lapse by 31.3.1997, it has been decided by Central Office not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial category from 1.4.1997."

Thus, from the contents of the aforesaid letter, it manifest that Head Office of State Bank of India vide letter dated 25.3.1997 has issued direction to all its branches not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial category from 1.4.1997 due to reason of lapse of both panels i.e., 1989 & 1992 on 31.3.1997 as per terms of settlements entered into by both parties. Further, the contents of the subsequent letter dated 27.3.1997 issued by Respondent Management is also direction to Branch Manager, State Bank of India not

to make any temporary messengerial category appointment with effect from 1.4.1997 and it has also been communicated to all concerned that the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers maintained by Zonal offices stand lapsed from 31.1.1997. Further, office order dated 31.3.1997 has been issued by Respondent management that goes to reveal that the said office order has been issued to this effect that, "Consequent on absorption of temporary employees in permanent cadre, it has been decided by the competent authority that no one onwards, no further daily labour or temporary employees/appointments should be resorted to/engaged/employed." Therefore, it reflects from the contents of the aforesaid orders that the temporary appointment in messengerial category and daily labour has been stopped by the Respondent management with effect from 1.4.1997 because of the lapsed of panel of temporary workers and daily wagers by 31.3.1997. The agreement for lapse of both the panels on 31.3.1997 is contained in the 5th settlement which has been arrived at between the parties on dated 30.7.1996 with the consensus of both the parties. Therefore, Workman can not challenge the terms and conditions contained in settlement dated 30.7.1996 regarding lapse of panel on 31.3.1997 as agreed between State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation. As per provision contained u/s.18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 the said Agreement dated 30.7.1996 is binding on both the parties.

In the case of **Allied Sales Corporation Secunderabad vs.The Authority Under Andhra Pradesh..... 1990 II LLJ 510 AP para 414, Hon'ble Court have held:-**

"*4. There was a settlement between the Management and the workmen under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act on 25th April 1983 under which the age of superannuation of the workmen was fixed at 55 years. The settlement was to be in force upto 30th June 1986 and the next settlement, incorporating practically the same terms, was again entered into on 4th February 1987 under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act. There is no dispute that these settlements are under Section 18(1).*

14. Now the Authority constituted under Section 41(1) of the Act is an authority with very limited jurisdiction. It can only decide in the first appeal whether a termination by the management is valid or not and is within the parameters of Section 40 of the Act. The said Authority, in our view, has absolutely no jurisdiction to decide whether a settlement entered into under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act between the representatives of the Workmen and of the Management, is vitiated by undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion on the part of the Management. The Authority, namely, the Assistant Commissioner of Labour, was never intended by the A.P. Legislature to have jurisdiction to go into the question of the validity of a settlement arrived at under Section 18 of the Industrial Disputes Act by an Industrial Court. That Parliament has, in fact, constituted Industrial Courts under the Industrial Disputes Act, with extensive powers cannot be disputed. What we mean to say is that the Authority under Section 41(1) of the A.P. Act has no jurisdiction what-so-ever either to question or to decide about the validity of any such settlements. If parties to a settlement have a grievance about the validity of a settlement, it is for them to agitate the matter before the appropriate forum and they cannot ask an Authority constituted under Section 41(1) of the A.P. Shops and Establishments Act, 1966 with limited jurisdiction, to go into any such question and, that too, incidentally while deciding whether retirement as per the contract of employment, is legal or not."

It is not the case of Workman that aforesaid settlements are vitiated by undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion on the part of the management. If the Workman feeling aggrieved by any terms of settlement/ agreement on the aforementioned grounds then he can challenge of settlement before a competent authority under the Act, 1947. But here in the instant matter it is not a case of Workman that aforementioned settlement has been entered into between the parties on the ground of undue influence or

misrepresentation or coercion. Therefore, Workman is barred to raise any objection in respect of fixing the date of lapse of both panels on 31.3.1997 as agreed between both the parties and Workman can not challenge any terms of said Agreement.

Further in the case of **Herbertsons Limited Vs. Workmen of Herbertsons Limited and Ors, 1977 AIR 322,** Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

The Tribunal thought that the question of the quantum of membership of the 2nd Respondent did not call for a finding at all in view of 1his Court's order. As observed above that was not a correct assumption. On the other hand, we feel that this view of the Tribunal has led it to approach the matter in an entirely erroneous manner. The Tribunal is, rightly enough, conscious that under section 18 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act the settlement was binding on the company and the members of the 3rd Respondent union. Even so, the Tribunal devoted nearly half of its order in scanning the evidence given by the company and Respondent No. 3 to find out whether the terms of the settlement had been explained by the President of the union to the workmen or not and whether the workers voluntarily accepted the settlement knowing all the "consequences". This to our mind is again an entirely wrong approach.

"When a recognised union negotiates with an employer the workers as individuals do not come into the picture. It is not necessary that each individual worker should know the implications of the settlement since a recognised union, which is expected to protect the legitimate interests of labour, enters into a settlement in the best interests of labour. This would be the normal rule. We cannot altogether rule out exceptional cases where there may be allegations of mala fides, fraud or even corruption or other induce- ments. Nothing of that kind has been suggested against the President of the 3rd Respondent in this case. That being the position, prima facie, this is a settlement in the course of collective bargaining and, therefore, is entitled to due weight and consideration.

It is not possible to scan the settlement in bits and pieces and hold some parts good and acceptable and others bad. Unless it can be demonstrated that the objectionable portion is such that it completely outweighs all the other advantages gained the Court will be slow to hold a settle- ment as unfair and unjust. The settlement has to be accepted or rejected as a whole and we are unable to reject it as a whole as unfair or unjust. Even before this Court the 3rd Respondent representing admittedly the large majority of the workmen has stood by this settlement and that is a strong factor which it is difficult to ignore. As stated elsewhere in the judgment, we cannot also be oblivious of the fact that all workmen of the company have accepted the settlement. Besides, the period of settlement has since expired and we are informed that the employer and the 3rd Respondent are negotiating another settlement with further improvements. These factors, apart from what has been stated above, and the need for industrial peace and harmony when a union backed by a large majority of workmen has accepted a settlement in the course of collective bargaining have impelled us not to interfere with this settlement. That being the position, we unhold the settlement as fair and just and order that the award of the Tribunal shall be substituted by the settlement dated October 18, 1973. The said settlement shall be the substituted award. The appeal is disposed of accordingly. There will be no order as to costs."

Therefore, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above, the contention of the Workman that the date fixed for lapse of empanelled list on 31.3.1997 for appointment to the permanent post vide 5th Settlement dated 30.7.1996 is arbitrary, illegal is not untenable. The recognized union of Workmen has negotiated with the Respondent Bank Management representing large number of Workmen and the Workman as individual do not come into picture. Workman in the instant case has work as temporary Workmen in the Respondent Branch and in response of Notification he had applied for

inclusion of his name in the panel and he was selected for inclusion his name in the panel list to be utilized for absorption of such Workman to permanent post in order of their seniority in the list. The Settlement dated 30.7.1996 between State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation under Sec.2(p) and Sec.18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 has clearly provided as regard non-messengerial position and it is agreed that all such posts sanctioned fallen vacant upto 31.3.1997 shall be filled before empanel list is allowed to lapse. Thus, in view of law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, in the instant case, Agreement dated 30.7.1996 was entered into between both the parties in respect of lapsing of the both the panels on 31.3.1997 and absorption of the Workmen from panel list was subject to availability of vacancy of post likely to arise upto 31.3.1997, have a binding force on Workman as well as management of State Bank of India in view of provision contained under section 18 (1) of I.D. Act, 1947.

Thus, Point No.I is answered against the Workman and in favour of the Respondent.

27. **Point No.II**:- Firstly, it is submitted on behalf of the Workman that the Respondent has terminated his services by oral order on 31.3.1997 without issuing any notice or paying any salary or compensation in lieu thereof. Therefore, the termination order of the Workman from service is in violation of provision contained Under Section 25 F of I.D. Act, 1947. Therefore, the order is liable to be set aside.

28. On the other hand, Respondent counsel contended that Workman has not worked for 240 days in any preceding calendar year. Therefore, reference of the industrial dispute is not relevant. In this context, the Workman has examined himself as WW1 who has reiterated that Workman has been terminated from service by Respondent on 31.3.1997 without notice of salary or compensation in lieu thereof. Before examining the claim of the Workman on merit it would be apposite to reproduce the provision contained under section 25 F:-

Section 25F provides:-

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].

Compensation to workmen in case of transfer of undertakings.

Section 25B defines the term continuous service which provides

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 authorized 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;

In order to prove the fact of 240 days of service within 12 months of a calendar year just preceding from the date of termination, the initial burden of proof lies upon the Workman and the Workman has to prove this factum by adducing his oral as well as documentary evidence in support of his claim.

Further, how to calculate 240 days of service by the Workman in a calendar year. In this context the reference of decisions of Hon'ble Supreme Court is relevant and the same are discussed below:-

In Rajasthan State Ganganagar S. Mills Ltd. v. State of Rajasthan and Anr. (2004) Apex Court held:

"It was the case of the Workman that he had worked for more than 240 days in the year concerned. This claim was denied by the appellant. It was for the claimant to lead evidence to show that he had worked for 240 days in the year preceding the date of his termination. He has filed an affidavit. It is statement which is in his favor and that cannot be regarded as sufficient evidence for any Court or Tribunal to come to the conclusion that in fact the claimant had worked for 240 days in a year These aspects were highlighted in Range Forest Officer v. S.T. Hadimani (2002 (3) SCC 25. No proof of receipt of salary or wages for 240 days or order or record in that regard was produced. Mere non-production of the muster roll for a particular period was not sufficient for the Labour Court held that the Workman had worked for 240 days as claimed."

In Municipal Corporation, Faridabad v. Siri Niwas (2004 (8) SCC 195), held "*the burden was on the Workman to show that he was working for more than 240 days in the preceding one year prior to his alleged retrenchment." In M.P. Electricity Board v. Hariram (2004 (8) SCC 246) the position was again reiterated in paragraph 11 as follows: "The above burden having not been discharged and the Labour Court having held so, in our opinion, the Industrial Court and the High Court erred in basing an order of reinstatement solely on an adverse inference drawn erroneously ..*"

In the case of Manager, RBI, Bangalore vs. S Mani (2005) SCC Page 100, the 3 Judges Bench of the Apex Court held that "*the initial burden of proof was on the Workman to show that he had completed 240 days of service."*

Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of Mohan Lal vs Management BEL 1981 SCC page 225 has laid down the principle that how to count 240 days of service within one year it is held: *"Clause (2)(a) provides for a fiction to treat a Workman in continuous service for a period of one year despite the fact that he has not rendered uninterrupted service for a period of one year but he has rendered period of 240 days during the period of 12 calendar service for months counting backwards and just preceding the relevant date being the date of retrenchment. In other words, in order to invoke the fiction enacted in clause (2)(a) it is necessary to determine first the relevant date, ie the date of termination of service which is complained of as retrenchment. After that date is ascertained. move backward to a period of 12 months just preceding the date of retrenchment and then ascertain whether within the period of 12 months, the Workman has rendered service for a period of 240 days. If these three facts are affirmatively answered in*

favor of the Workman pursuant to the deeming fiction enacted in clause (2)(a) it will have to be assumed that the Workman is in continuous service for a period of one year and he will satisfy the eligibility qualification enacted in Section 25-F"

"14. We have already extracted section 25B since its amendment and the change in language is the legislative exposition of which note must be taken. In fact, we need not further dilate upon this aspect because in Surendra Kumar Verma and Ors. v. Central Government Industrial-cum-Labour Court, New Delhi and Anr., Chinnappa Reddy. J., after noticing the amendment and referring to the decision in Sur Enamel and Stamping Works (P) Ltd case, held as under:

"These changes brought about by Act 36 of 1964 appear to be clearly designed to provide that a Workman who has actually worked under the employer for not less than 240 days during a period of twelve months shall be deemed to have been in continuous service for a period of one year whether or not he has in fact been in such continuous service for a period of one year. It is enough that he has worked for 240 days in a period of 12 months, it is not necessary that he should have been in the service of the employer for one whole year."

In a concurring judgment Pathak J. agreed with this interpretation of section 25B(2). Therefore, both on principle and on precedent it must be held that section 25B(2) comprehends a situation where a Workman is not in employment for a period of 12 calendar months, but has rendered service for a period of 240 days within the period of 12 calendar months commencing and counting backwards from the relevant date, i.e. the date of retrenchment. If he has, he would be deemed to be in continuous service for a period of one year for the purpose of section 25B and Chapter VA."

Thus, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above the initial burden of proof lies upon the Workman to show that he has completed 240 days of the service with the Respondent just preceding from the date of his termination. Further, in respect of the employment of calculating the 240 days service provision contained under Section 25-F read with Section 25-B of the I.D. Act, 1947.

29. Now, in view of the provision contained under Section 25 F and law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, we have to examine whether the Workman has discharged his initial burden of proof in respect of his claim of 240 days continuous service in a calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination i.e., 31.3.1997.

In this context, WW1 in his cross examination has stated that,

"I was not sponsored by any employment exchange. I did not undergo the regular process of selection before my engagement as temporary Non-Messenger in the branch.."

" It is true that I did not work for 240 days in any year, in my entire service in the bank in any branch."

Thus, it is clear from the testimony of WW1 that the Workman had not worked for 240 days continuously in any 12 months of a calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination in the Respondent bank. Therefore, Workman failed to establish his plea by his oral and documentary evidence that he had worked for 240 days continuously in calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination i.e., 31.3.1997. Thus, the claim of the Workman that he has been terminated by oral order without issuing notice or payment in lieu after termination, in contravention of Section 25 F of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is not tenable. However the documents filed by the Workman in support of his claim, number of days worked with the Respondent goes to reveal that the Workman had worked intermittently as daily wager depending upon availability of work in branch. Workman did not file any document of appointment letter or salary

slips in support of his claim for appointment as a non-messenger in the Respondent branch on temporary basis.

30. Per contra, the Learned Counsel for Respondent has submitted the allegation of Workman that he was terminated from services is not correct. As the vacancies were filled up on regular basis in order of their respective seniority the non-engagement of the Workman does not amount to termination. Further, Respondent contended that no law provide that even though there is no work temporary employee should be continued in the bank work as the very engagement of Workman was subject to availability of work. Therefore, the allegation that the bank has indulged in unfair labour practice is incorrect.

31. Thus, in view of the fore gone discussion and contentions made by the Respondent, I find the force in the argument advanced by the Respondent that in the instant matter, Workman was not terminated from service by order dated 31.3.1997 rather he was disengaged in view of the non-availability of the work in the branch. Further, there was direction issued by the Head Office of the Respondent authority not to engage any daily wager Workman/ temporary Worker w.e.f. 1.4.1997. Thus, such disengagement of Workman does not amount to termination. Moreover, the Workman failed to prove his claim that he was terminated in contravention of provision of Sec.25F of the I.D. Act, 1947 as he failed to establish his plea by any oral or documentary evidence that he had worked for 240 days continuously in a twelve months of calendar year just preceding from date of termination i.e., 31.3.1997.

32. Further, perusal of the order dated 25.3.1997 goes to reveal that the Chief Branch Manager, State Bank of India has issued the letter to Zonal Office with direction to all its branches to this effect that they have been advised by the DGM, Zonal Office, Hyderabad that as both the panel of temporary employees of 1989 and daily wagers/casual labour of 1992 will lapse on 31.3.1997 it has been decided by central office not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial cadre from 1.4.1997, therefore it was directed to issue suitable instructions not to make temporary appointments from 1.4.1997. There is no mention in this order that the Workman herein has been terminated from service by this order.

33. Further, the circular dated 27.3.1997 was issued by DGM, SBI to all branches in commercial network in respect of the non-appointment of temporary employees in subordinate cadre and it has directed not to make any temporary employment in the subordinate cadre with effect from 1.4.97 and further, it has directed to ensure that no temporary/casual/daily basis appointment of the petty cash. Further, it is directed to all Branch Managers that any deviation in this regard will be viewed seriously. Thus, these circulars do not reflect that the Workman has been terminated from service by this order.

34. Similarly, office order dated 31.3.1997 is simply a direction to all branches of the Respondent bank by DGM that no further daily labour should be engaged or employed. Therefore, the plea of the Workman that he has been terminated by the aforesaid order dated 25.3.1997, 27.3.1997 and 31.3.1997 from the service by the Respondent is not acceptable. The evidence adduced by the Workman clearly goes to reveal that he had worked as a daily wager for which he has been paid wages according to number of working days. As there was an order for prohibition for engaging temporary workmen, in the bank, therefore, Workman could not be engaged by the Respondent for work from 1.4.1997 and there after. It is settled law that the daily wagers are engaged by the employer depending upon the availability of work and as the work was not available the Workman was not engaged further by the Respondent management. Therefore, the Workman on the ground of number of days he had worked in the Respondent bank cannot claim any right to reinstate him into the employment. As the Workman failed to prove the mandatory condition of 240 days of continuous service as required under Sec.25F of I.D. Act, 1947. Therefore, the disengagement of

Workman from work can not be termed in contravention of provision contained under Sec.25F and 25 B of the I.D. Act, 1947.

Thus, this point is answered against the Workman and in favour of Respondent.

35. **Point No.III**:- In this context, the Workman has contended that the management failed to implement the selected panels during its valid tenure. The management adopted the back door methods contrary to the settlements and filled up the vacancies. The same is evident from the proceedings dated 18.11.1993 a copy of the same is filed in the material papers and the same may be read as part of the claim statement. Further, it is submitted that management has to adhere the procedure issued by the Central Government, the instructions dated 16.8.1990 in the year 1995, but same was not followed in the year 1997 despite there being vacancies. The management has followed the procedure of calling candidates through employment exchange instead of giving chance to the empanelled candidates like the Workman herein. The management sent call letters to the similarly situated candidates like the Workman in the month of June 1997 subsequent to issuance of impugned termination orders. After knowing the fact that they are litigating the issue by way of dispute, the management has refused to engage those candidates, the copies of call letters issued are filed herein along with claim petition. The Workman herein reiterates that the panels are meant for absorption but not for termination. In view of the same a duty is cast upon the Respondent management to engage the empanelled candidates like the Workman herein even in temporary vacancies till they are absorbed permanently in regular vacancies.

36. On the other hand, Respondent has contended that the Federation approached Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) for implementation of bipartite settlement in respect of the absorption of temporary employees. The Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) conducted conciliation proceedings and agreement was arrived at between the Federation and the Management bank. It is submitted that it was agreed between the Federation and the Management that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers /casual labour would be kept alive upto March, 1997 and the vacancies as agreed to under the afore set out settlements will be filled from both the lists concurrently. A copy of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.1995 signed by the parties to the dispute is filed as a material paper. Further, it is submitted that the settlement was arrived at and an agreement was signed between the Federation and the Management bank on 30.7.1996 under Section 2(p) read with Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules 1957 which is binding on the parties. A copy of this agreement which hereinafter may be referred to as 5th settlement for brevity, is also filed as a material paper. The 5th settlement dated 30.7.1996 whereunder the earlier four settlements dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988 and 9.1.1991 were also referred, it was agreed to, by the Federation and the Management bank that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees will be kept alive upto March, 1997 for filling the vacancies existing/arrived at as on 31.12.1994 as per the norms agreed to between the bank and Federation and that thereafter the said panels would lapse. It was also agreed that within the framework of the above settlements the modalities about drawing names from either the panel of temporary employees or the panel of daily wagers and casual labour would be decided administratively on circle to circle basis depending upon the local requirements in consultation with the Federation's affiliate by the Circle management. It was further agreed that all messenger real vacancies/positions in the subordinate cadre including part-time attendants specifically provided as leave reserve will be filled by the end of 31.3.1997. Further, Respondent contended that on 27.2.1997 a memorandum of understanding was also signed between the Federation's affiliate and the bank management regarding the fact that the exercise of identifying the messengerial vacancies as on 31.12.1994 has since been completed by central office and thereby 403

messengerial vacancies were sanctioned to the circle of the Management bank and it was agreed that these vacancies may be filled from 1989 panel of temporary employees after effecting conversion from full time non-messengerial staff in the usual manner and the agreement was reached upon. Further, it was agreed between the Federations affiliate and the management bank that in terms of the settlement dated 30.7.1996 both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers /casual employees would lapse on 31.3.1997.

37. The Workman has contended that the empanelled list prepared by the Respondent management for appointment of temporary and daily wage Workers to the permanent post cannot lapse unless until it is exhausted by appointing all the empanelled persons and it should continue even after 31.3.1997, i.e., the date fixed for the lapse of panel. It is undisputed that the date of lapse of empanelled list of Workmen has been fixed to 31.3.1997 as mentioned in the settlement dated 30.7.1996, and agreed between the parties. It is settled law that and once the life of panel list lapses on the date as agreed between the parties it cannot be extended beyond that date. In the instant case the panel list of the workmen was valid upto 31.3.1997 in view of the terms and conditions enumerated in the 5th Settlement entered into between the parties. As the lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997 has been agreed by State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation through 5th Settlement, the Workman is not competent to challenge the same.

In this context I would like to take reference of the decision of the apex court in the case of **Syndicate Bank and Ors vs. Shankar Paul and Ors , AIR 1997 SC 3091, therein the Hon'ble Apex Court** have held:-

"Till 1982, the branches of the appellant Bank in Calcutta region were recruiting persons locally to work as temporary attenders in leave vacancies. In view of the revised procedure prescribed by the Government of India in respect of such temporary appointments, the Calcutta regional office of the appellant Bank issued a circular to all of its branches on 14.8.1982, instructing all the branches under it to discontinue the old practice from 1.6.1982 and appoint only empanelled candidates. The regional office was to prepare a panel of eligible candidates, after calling names from the local/district employment exchange, and split it up branch-wise. Following that new procedure yearly panels were prepared thereafter. Names of the Respondents were for the first time included in the panel prepared for the period 7.2.1987 to 6.2.1988. By its letter dated 7.2.1987 the Bank had informed the Respondents that the panel was valid for one year only and that inclusion of their names in the panel was not to confer on them any right to seek permanent appointment in the service of the bank. Considering the object with which the panel was prepared and the fact that it was an yearly panel expiring on 6.2.1988, we are of the opinion that the Respondents did not get any right, because of inclusion of their names in the said panel, for permanent absorption in the service of the Bank. Whatever conditional right they had came to an end with the expiry of the panel. The claim of the Respondents, as contained in the writ petition was thus misconceived and therefore the learned single Judge and the Division Bench, when it first decided the appeal, were right in dismissing the writ petition and the appeal respectively."

Thus, in view of the above law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court and in view of the terms and conditions of the 5th Settlement the contention of the Workman that empanelled list should continue even after 31.3.1997 till the last Workman in the panel is absorbed is not tenable. The contention of the Workman is baseless in view of recital in the settlement. Therefore, in view of the fore gone discussion and finding given at Point No. I regarding binding nature of Settlements and terms and conditions enumerated therein, in view of the provision contained u/s.18(1) of the I.D. Act, 1947, I am of the considered view that life of panels lapsed on 31.3.1997 in view of terms of settlement dated 30.7.1996 and plea of Workman

that the panel shall continue even after 31.3.1997 till last man absorbed has no legal force and same is untenable.

38. Undisputedly, settlement agreement dated 30.7.1996 was executed between the State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation and in that settlement it was agreed that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/ casual employees will be used for filling vacancies existing as on 31.12.1994 as per the norms agreed between the bank and the Federation. These empanelled workmen were to be given a chance for permanent appointment in the bank against vacancies arising up to December 1994 whereas the daily wagers/ casual employees were to be considered against the vacancies arise from January 1995 to December 1996, whereby the said panel would lapse. It was agreed that the vacancies falls upto 31.3.1997 shall be filled before the empanelled list is allowed to lapse. Thus, the claim of the Workman to the post of permanent non-messenger in the Respondent management was subject to the availability of the sanctioned post and vacancies arising upto 31.3.1997. The workmen given chance to the permanent post were seniors in number of working days in panel list and Workman herein was junior to those workmen. Therefore, Workman could not be given absorption to permanent post being junior to other workmen in the panel list.

39. In this context the Workman witness WW1 was cross examined by the Respondent counsel and in the cross examination the witness WW1 states:-

"I applied for appointment as Non-Messenger, in response to the advertisement issued by the bank and the union in the year 1989,..... Further, witness states, *"The panel was prepared basing upon the number of days of service put in by the temporary employees. Some of the employees whose names were included in the panel were given regular appointment in the bank in order of their seniority in the panel....* Further witness states, *"It is true that I am not having any documents to show that any of my juniors are continuing in service in the bank."*

Thus, from the above statement of the Workman witness WW1 it is clear that the panel was prepared in terms of various settlements entered into between Staff Federation of State Bank of India and State Bank of India and it was prepared on the basis of number of days of work put in by the temporary employees. Further, the Workman himself admitted that some of the temporary employees whose names were included in the panel were given regular appointment in the bank in order of their seniority in the panel and he is not having any document to show that any person who worked for less number of days than the Workman was given appointment in the bank. Therefore, the allegation of the Workman that the regular appointment has been made by the bank from the panel list in breach of the terms of the settlement and violation of seniority of panel list is not proved by this evidence of WW1. Thus, there is no evidence on record that bank has given the appointment to the temporary employees as well as daily wagers from the panel list 1989 and 1992 in breach of seniority of the temporary employees in the list. There is no evidence of jumbling in the panel list to make appointment of any permanent Workman in breach of the seniority. Therefore, I am constrained to hold that the Respondent Management has appointed the workmen from panel list in order of seniority and there is no jumbling of workmen in the panel list before it got lapsed on 31.3.1997.

40. However, Workman has taken the plea that the panels of Workmen for absorption in the employment of the Respondent banks (panels of temporary employees and daily wagers) has been lapsed on 31.3.1997 in contravention of terms of settlement as the object of preparing the entire empanelment of temporary and daily wagers was to provide them permanent employment and till the both the panel lists exhausted the panel list cannot be lapsed on 31.3.1997 and the date of lapsing of the panel on 31.3.1997 has been fixed by the Respondent arbitrarily without any authority.

41. In this context, the perusal of Settlement dated 30.7.1996 reveals that the 5th Settlement dated 30.7.1996 was entered under Section 2(p) and 18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Dispute (Central) Rules 1957. This settlement has been entered into by the competent parties and in this settlement parties thereto agreed that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees will lapse on 31.3.1997. Thus the date of lapse of panel was fixed by both the parties with consensus under the settlement dated 30.7.1996 and same is binding upon the Workman under the provision of Section 18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947. Moreover, this issue of binding force of the settlement dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988 and 9.1.1991 has already been discussed, decided at finding in Point No.I of this award. However, the legality and validity of the aforementioned settlement has not been challenged by the Workman before any competent forum. Thus, claim of Workman that the date of lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997 has been fixed arbitrarily by the Respondent bank is untenable. As regard the claim of Workman for his absorption to the permanent post it is settled law that the Workman can not claim his regularization to permanent post merely on the basis of number of working days.

42. In this context the reference of the decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Oil and Natural Gas Corporation vs Krishan Gopal 2020(3) SCALE 272, date of decision 7.2.2020** is relevant therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have has laid down principle regarding regularization of the Workman on permanent posts. Hon'ble Supreme Court have laid down the prepositions of regularization of the workmen to permanent post is as under:-

"*(i) Wide as they are, the powers of the Labour Court and the Industrial Court cannot extend to a direction to order regularisation, where such a direction would in the context of public employment offend the provisions contained in Article 14 of the Constitution;*

(ii) The statutory power of the Labour Court or Industrial Court to grant relief to workmen including the status of permanency continues to exist in circumstances where the employer has indulged in an unfair labour practice by not filling up permanent posts even though such posts are available and by continuing to employ workmen as temporary or daily wage employees despite their performing the same work as regular workmen on lower wages;

(iii) The power to create permanent or sanctioned posts lies outside the judicial domain and where no posts are available, a direction to grant regularisation would be impermissible merely on the basis of the number of years of service;

(iv) Where an employer has regularised similarly situated workmen either in a scheme or otherwise, it would be open to workmen who have been deprived of the same benefit at par with the workmen who have been regularised to make a complaint before the Labour or Industrial Court, since the deprivation of the benefit would amount to a violation of Article 14; and

(v) In order to constitute an unfair labour practice under Section 2(ra) read with Item 10 of the Vth Schedule of the ID Act, the employer should be engaging workmen as badlis, temporaries or casuals, and continuing them for years, with the object of depriving them of the benefits payable to permanent workmen.

Thus, in view of the principles laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court as discussed above, in the instant matter the Workman utterly failed to prove his claim by adducing any documentary or oral evidence that the employer has indulged in unfair labour practice by not filling the permanent posts even though such posts are available and by continuing to employ workmen as temporary or daily wage employees despite their performance was the same work, as regular workmen on lower wages.

43. Respondent has contended that all the vacancies exist and arise upto 31.3.1997 has been filled up from the panel list in order of seniority and no vacancy exists or arises as on 31.3.1997 remained unfilled. Further, it is contended that as per terms of settlement the life of panel lists has been lapsed on 31.3.1997, hence, there is no occasion to extend the life of panel lists beyond 31.3.1997. However, the workman failed to prove contrary by any evidence to the aforesaid contention of the Respondent that the vacancies were existing as on 31.3.1997 and the workman was not given absorption to the permanent post in order of his seniority. It is settled law that the power to create permanent or sanctioned post lies outside the judicial domain and where no posts are available, a direction to grant regularization would be impermissible merely on the basis of the number of years of service. Therefore, the claim of the workman on this ground also not acceptable.

44. Further, as per the of settlement, panel was prepared for absorption of the workmen on the permanent posts has already been lapsed on 31.3.1997 and the vacancies existing and arising upto 31.12.1994 and upto 31.3.1997 as settlement dated 30.7.1996 has been filled up from the panel by appointing the workmen as per seniority in the panel list. Workman witness WW1 in his cross examination has himself admitted this fact that, some of the temporary employees whose names were included in the panel were given regular appointment in the bank in order of their seniority in the panel. The Workman failed to show that there was any breach of terms of settlement has been committed by the Respondent in appointment to permanent post from aforesaid panel list.

45. As discussed in preceding paragraph of this Award, the life of the panel has not been extended beyond 31.3.1997, by any further settlement hence, the panel list in which name of the Workman was included got expired on 31.3.1997. It is not the case of the Workman that Respondent has regularized similarly situated workmen either in the scheme or otherwise and the Workman has been deprived of same benefit on par with those workmen or the vacancies remained unfilled on the date of lapse of panels i.e., 31.3.1997, Industrial Tribunal has no jurisdiction to extend the date of lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997. This Tribunal can not order for regularization of workmen to the permanent post in contravention of the provision of Article 14 of the Constitution of India.

In the case of **Mahboob Deepak vs. Nagar Panchayat Gajraula & Anr, Civil Appeal No.5875/2007 date of judgement 13.12.2007,** Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

"8. Respondent is a Local Authority. The terms and conditions of employment of the employees are governed by a statute and statutory rules. No appointment can be made by a Local Authority without following the provisions of the recruitment rules. Any appointment made in violation of the said rules as also the constitutional scheme of equality as contained in Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India would be a nullity.

9. Due to some exigency of work, although recruitment on daily wages or on an ad hoc basis was permissible, but by reason thereof an employee cannot claim any right to be permanently absorbed in service or made permanent in absence of any statute or statutory rules. Merely because an employee has completed 240 days of work in a year preceding the date of retrenchment, the same would not mean that his services were liable to be regularized."

Therefore, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, the claim of the Workman for absorption merely on the basis of number of day of work in the Respondent bank Branch is not acceptable. As regard plea of the Workman that the Workman should have been given employment even after 31.3.1997 as temporary Workman, it is the discretion of Respondent to engage the Workman depending

upon availability of work and this Tribunal can not direct the Respondent to engage the Workman in the absent of such rule/scheme.

46. In view of principle laid down by Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above, in the instant matter Workman utterly failed to establish the fact of rendering continuous service for a period of 240 days of service within a period of 12 calendar months commencing and coming backward from relevant date i.e., the date of retrenchment, if has he would be denied to be in continuous service for a period of one year. Therefore, the provision contained under Sec.25F of retrenchment is not applicable to Workman.

Counsel for Workman has relied upon number of decisions of Hon'ble High Court and Hon'ble Supreme Court and few of them are discussed herein:-

In the case of **F.C.I., vs. Kamdhenu Cattle Feed Industries 1993 (1) SCC 71,** therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

"7. In contractual sphere as in all other State actions, the State and all its instrumentalities have to conform to Article 14 of the Constitution of which non-arbitrariness is a significant facet. There is no unfettered discretion in public law: A public authority possesses powers only to use them for public good. This impose the duty to act fairly and to adopt a procedure which is `fairplay in action'. Due observance of this obligation as a part of good administration raises a reasonable or legitimate expectation in every citizen to be treated fairly in his interaction with the State and its instrumentalities, with this element forming a necessary component of the decision making process in all State actions. To satisfy this requirement of non- arbitrariness in a State action, it is, therefore, necessary to consider and give due weight to the reasonable or legitimate expectations of the persons likely lo be affected by the decision or else that unfairness in the exercise of the power may amount to an abuse or excess of power apart from affecting the bona fides of the decision in a given case. The decision so made would be exposed to challenge on the ground of arbitrariness. Rule of law does not completely eliminate discretion in the exercise of power, as it is unrealistic, but providers for control of its exercise by judicial review."

In the case of **State Bank of India, R.O., Vijayawada vs. Industrial Tribunal, Hyderabad WP No.193/1997,** therein Hon'ble High Court have held,

"*Sri Krovvidi Narasimham, the learned counsel for the 2nd respondent contends, supporting the award that it was a permanent vacancy and even though the 2nd respondent was appointed on temporary basis, his services were not liable to be terminated and he was to be regularised into service on permanent basis. Shastry award warrants that no temporary appointment can be made to a permanent post. But the matter is now covered by two division bench judgements dated 28.11.1986 in W.A. No.791 of 1986 and 25.8.1987 in W.A. No.270 of 1982. The ratio decided in the two judgements is to the effect that there cannot be any mandate to appoint employees on permanent basis when the requirement was for appointment on temporary basis. But it is held in the said judgements that when a temporary appointee is ousted from service and not for misconduct and, if again temporary appointment is to be made, then, the case of such temporary appointee who was ousted, has got to be considered in accordance with Sec. 25-H of the Act."*

In the case of **State of Haryana and others vs. Piara Singh and others. 1992 (4) SCC 118,** therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

" 49. If for any reason an adhoc or temporary employee is continued for a fairly long spell, the authorities must consider his case for regularization provided he is eligible and qualified according to the rules and his service record is satisfactory and his appointment does not run counter to the reservation policy of the state."

In the above cited judgements by the Workman the facts of the case are different hence do not apply to instant case of Workman.

47. On the other hand, in support of his contention Respondent has examined witness MW1 and MW1 in chief examination states that, Settlements i.e., on 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988, 9.1.1991 were entered into between the SBI and SBI Staff Federation for filling up of the vacancies that arise up to 1994 for those temporary employees who has worked on scale wages. Further, MW1 states that two different panels for messengers and non-messengers as per the eligibility criteria prescribed by the bank. There are four modules in Andhra Pradesh and they are Hyderabad, Tirupathi, Vijayawada and Visakhapatnam. MW1 states that the temporary employees so empanelled were given permanent absorption depending upon the vacancies so arise strictly in terms of the settlement. MW1 states that on 9.6.1995 conciliation proceeding was held before the RLC(C), Hyderabad and in said proceedings it was decided that the panels will be kept live up to 31.3.1997 and vacancies will be filled from both the lists concurrently. A copy of the said minutes of proceedings is Ex.M5. Further, MW1 states that on 30.7.1996 another settlement was entered between the SBI and All India SBI Staff Federation providing for filling up of the vacancies arising up to December 1994 in respect of subordinate cadre and daily wage /casual wage employees out of panel so prepared were to be considered against vacancies arising from January 1995 to December 1996, thereafter the said panels lapse. MW1 states that it was also agreed that all the non- messenger positions in subordinate cadre including part time attendants specially provided as leave reserve will be filled before 31.3.1997 and as regards to non-messengerial positions it is agreed that all such posts sanctioned and fallen vacant up to 31.3.1997 shall be filled before the empanelled list is allowed to lapse. Thus in both the cases empanelled list were lapsed on 1.4.1997. Ex.M6 is the copy of the settlement dated 30.7.1996. Further, witness states that on 27.2.1997 a memorandum of understanding was reached between the SBI and SBI Staff Federation providing that both the panels above mentioned will lapse on 31.3.1997. Ex.M7 is the copy of the memorandum of understanding and Ex.M8 is the copy of the statements giving the particulars of 1989 non-messenger panel, Ex.M9 is the copy of the statement of 1989 non- messenger panel, Ex.M10 is the copy of statement of 1992 panel. Further, witness states that petitioner was included in the 1989 panel. As the existing vacancies at that time were exhausted and his turn did not come he could not be given permanent employment in the bank as per the agreements. All the appointments were made strictly in accordance with the settlements reached from time to time between SBI and SBI staff federation and as per seniority, number of days of temporary service put in by them in the bank in the given period. Further, MW1 states petitioner was not sponsored by any employment exchange he did not undergo the regular process of selection required for appointment as a regular non-messenger the petitioner has not worked for 240 days in any year in his entire temporary service in the bank. The petitioner and other temporary employees were terminated from service by the bank. Further, MW1 states that the vacancies were filled up on regular basis with the temporary employees from the panels and these panels were expired in terms of the settlements so reached and there were no vacancies to absorb such employees. Thus, witness MW1 has proved the documents Ex.M1 to Ex.M12 and also contentions made in the counter. However, MW1 was cross examined by the Petitioner Counsel. But nothing has been elicited in his cross examination so as to discredit the testimony of the witness MW1 as regards the date of lapse of both the panels on 31.3.1997 and reasons assigned for non-absorption of the Petitioner from the panel list to the permanent post. Moreover the witness MW1 was re-examined by the Respondent and the witness MW1 states that panels were expired in terms of the settlement send absorptions to the extent of the available vacancies were made. There was no termination of any temporary messenger as such but their services were not utilized after the cut off date as the available vacancies were already filled up and most of these Petitioners were

not in the service of the bank as on the date of the expiry date of the panels. Therefore, in view of the aforesaid testimony of the MW1 in re-examination in the absence of cross examination remained uncontraverted, the claim of the Workman that he was entitled for absorption in permanent post in the branch of Respondent Management on the basis of panel list is found not established.

This point is answered against the Workman.

48. **Point No.IV**:- In view of the discussion and finding given at Point Nos. I, II and III, the Workman is not entitled for any relief and claim statement of Workman sans merit and liable to be dismissed.

This Point is answered accordingly.

AWARD

In view of the fore gone discussion, it is held that the action of the Respondent bank in terminating the services of Sri Munagala Swamy, Ex. Messenger by way of oral orders w.e.f. 31.3.1997 is justified. Hence, the Petitioner is not entitled for any relief as prayed for. The claim statement filed by Workman sans merit, hence, dismissed. Reference is answered accordingly.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, Personal Assistant, transcribed by her, corrected and signed by me on this the 11th day of May, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner	Witnesses examined for the Respondent
WW1: Sri Munagala Swamy	MW1: Sri Aluru Rama Rao

Documents marked for the Petitioner

Ex.W1:	Photocopy of Service Certificate
Ex.W2:	Photocopy of Notification
Ex.W3:	Photocopy of interview call letter
Ex.W4:	Photocopy of Panel list
Ex.W5:	Photocopy of Service certificate
Ex.W6:	Photocopy of service certificate
Ex.W7:	Photocopy of Service certificate
Ex.W8:	Photocopy of lr. to employment exchange by the Respondent
Ex.W9:	Photocopy of circular letter dated 14.07.1999

Documents marked for the Respondent

Ex.M1: Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.17.11.87

Ex.M2: Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.16.7.88

Ex.M3: Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.27.10.1988

Ex.M4: Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.9.1.1991

Ex.M5: Photocopy of conciliation proceedings before the Regional Labour Commissioner(C) dt.9.6.1995

Ex.M6: Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.30.7.1996

Ex.M7: Photocopy of Memorandum of understanding dt. 27.1.1997

Ex.M8: Photocopy of statements giving the particulars of 1989 messenger panel.

Ex.M9: Photocopy of statement of 1989 Non-messenger panel

Ex.M10: Photocopy of statement of 1992 panel

Ex.M11: Photocopy of order of Hon'ble High Court in WA No.86/98 dt. 1.5.98

Ex.M12: Photocopy of order in SLP No.11886-11888 of 1998 dated 10.8.98

नई दिल्ली, 29 जुलाई, 2026

का.आ. 1632.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एसबीआई के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजको और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में **केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण–सह–श्रम न्यायालय,** हैदराबाद के पंचाट (सन्दर्भ संख्या **137/2000**) को प्रकाशित करती है,

[सं. एल-12012/230/2000-आई.आर (बी- I)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 29th July, 2026

S.O. 1632.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Reference. I.D. No. 137/2002) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Hyderabad as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the Management of SBI and their workmen,

[No. L-12012/230/2000–IR (B-I)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

In The Central Government Industrial Tribunal Cum Labour Court At Hyderabad

Present: **Sri IRFAN QAMAR**

Presiding Officer

Dated the 7th day of May, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. 137/2002

[Old ID No. 131/2000 of Industrial Tribunal No.I, Hyderabad]

Between:

Smt. Lal Bee,

D/o Sri S. Nabi Saheb,

Garledinna Mandal,

Kallur,

Dist. Ananthapur. … Petitioner

And

The Dy. General Manager,

State Bank of India,

Zonal Office, Renigunta Road,

Tirupathi – 517 501. …..Respondent

Appearances:

For the Petitioner : Sri Macherla Rangaiah, Advocate

For the Respondent: Sri Y. Ranjeeth Reddy, Advocate

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-12012/230/2000-IR(B.I) dated 29.9.2000 referred the following dispute under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 to Industrial Tribunal No.I, Hyderabad for adjudication and later the same has been transferred to this Tribunal bearing ID No.131/2000, as per orders of Central Government vide Lr.No.H-11026/1/2001-IR(C.II) dated 18.10.2001, requiring this forum to decide the question:

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of State Bank of India, Kallur branch is justified in terminating Smt. Lal Bee, Sweeper cum Water Man, from the services of the bank? If not, what relief the workman is entitled?"

After receipt of the reference, it was numbered as ID No. 137/2002 and notices were issued to both the Workman and the management.

2. Before unfolding the factual matrix of the instant industrial dispute it would be apposite to have a bird eye view of a chequered history of the instant industrial dispute. Earlier instant industrial dispute along with the batch cases was decided by this Tribunal vide common award dated 17.5.2005 and the reference

was answered in favour of the Respondent and against the Workman. That said common award dated 17.5.2005 was challenged by the aggrieved Workmen in various Writ petition No.6470/2014 along with batch of writ petitions before the Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh and Hon'ble High Court vide its' judgement dated 23.6.2014 allowed all batch of writ petitions and set aside the common award dated 17.5.2005 passed in ID No.222 of 2001 and other batch of ID cases by Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad and the Respondent management of State Bank of India was directed to reengage the Writ Petitioners in position, which they have been occupying prior to their termination and further directed to consider their cases for regularization as and when the substantive vacancy arises. This judgement dated 23.6.2014 of Hon'ble High Court of AP, passed in WP No.6470/2014 and batch petitions was challenged by Respondent management before the Hon'ble High Court in Writ Appeal No. 1268 of 2014. The aforesaid Writ Appeals No.1268/2014 and other Writ Appeals were decided by Division Bench of High Court of Andhra Pradesh by a common judgement dated 20.3.2019. Hon'ble High Court in aforesaid Writ Appeal was pleased to pass the order which is extracted as below:-

" 7. Hearing the learned senior counsel for the SBI and the learned senior counsel for the contesting unofficial Respondents, we see that while the learned single Judge was justified in setting aside the award af the Tribunal, the proper course to be adopted was to remit all the cases to the Tribunal. This we say for reasons more than one. Firstly, in such matters, claims have to be decided on individual basis, as different persons have different claims as to the length of officiation or discharge of duties and functions; quality of engagement, drawings, accounting of the post for each one of them, who have worked etc. All these issues will not be the same in all the cases. Therefore, each case ought to have been directed to be decided by the Tribunal afresh on individual basis. The second and most important aspect is the learned single Judge has in one go ordered re-employment of all the workmen. This is not a relief that could have been granted without answering the individual issues; each issue relating to each case could not have been decided by the writ Court within the format of its adjudication procedures and scope. The adjudicating body, which has to do that activity, is the Industrial Tribunal. Therefore, we are of the view that while we would sustain the order of the learned singe Judge insofar as it interfered and sets aside the award of the Tribunal, the further findings and directions, issued through the impugned order have to go and the individual cases have to be sent back for consideration of the Tribunal. Such further procedure before the Tribunal will have to be carried forward with the materials already on record and also by affording an opportunity to the persons, who have claims as well as the management to place their rival contentions and further material before the Tribunal. The learned counsel appearing for the workmen are justified in pointing out that enormous delay has already happened and further action by the Tribunal in this line may be expedited.

9. In the result, these writ appeals are ordered;

(1) affirming the impugned common order of the learned single Judge to the extent it sets aside the common award dated 17.05.2005 of the Industrial Tribunal;

(2) the further findings and directions issued through the impugned common order are vacated:

(3) all the matters shall be remitted to the Industrial Tribunal with a direction to dispose of them within an outer limit of five (5) months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order; and,

(4) the parties to make appearance before the Tribunal on the given date."

Thus, in view of the above direction of Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh in W.A.No.1268 of 2014 and batch cases. This Tribunal has taken up the matter of industrial dispute for hearing and deciding it afresh in view of the aforesaid guidelines laid down by the Hon'ble High Court in Writ Appeal No.1268/2014 vide judgement dated 20.3.019.

3. The factual matrix of instant industrial dispute as narrated by the Workman in her claim statement are that, the Workman joined in the service of the management institution as Messenger from 1988 to 1997, and has rendered unblemished service spreading over a period of about 10 years. The Respondent has terminated services of Workman by oral orders with effect from 1.4.1997. Further, it is submitted that the management of Respondent bank decided to give a chance to temporarily employed personnel "found suitable for permanent appointment" by wait- listing them by offering permanent appointment or waitlisting till such opportunity arises.

4. That on 17.11.1987 a settlement was reached between All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and the Management of State Bank of India - settlement one, under this settlement three categories of employees were listed. That is, A) those who have completed 240 days in 12 months or less after 1.7.1975. B) those who have completed 270 days in any continuous block of 36 calendar months after 1.7.1975. C) (i) those who have completed minimum of 30 days aggregate temporary service in any calendar year after 1.7.1975 or (ii) 70 days aggregate temporary service in continuous block of 36 months after 1.7.1975.

5. The persons who satisfied in all the above 4 categories were to be interviewed by a selection committee and the said selection committee would determine the suitability of the said candidate for permanent appointment. Therefore, the bank prescribed certain qualifications and from among the candidates satisfying the qualifications the suitable candidates were enlisted by a selection committee. The Clause 7 of the said agreement provided with the selected candidate would be wait listed in order of their respective categorization and the selected panel would be valid upto December, 1991. Clause 10 of the settlement specifically provided that henceforth. "there will be no temporary appointments in the subordinate cadre", except on a restrictive basis in the specified category, "from amongst empanelled candidates as per existing guidelines of the bank". The Workman further submits that consequent upon the said agreement and the draft, a notification was issued in the newspapers. The last date for responding to the advertisement was 30.8.1988. A written examination followed by viva-voce in May, 1989 was held. A selected panel was prepared, as per Clause 7 of the agreement, ie. Settlement No.1, the selected panel was to be valid upto December, 1991, the Workman submits that circular was issued on 26.4.91 by the said letter it is mentioned that the terms of the agreement dated 17.11.87 was modified vide second agreement dated 16.7.88 was entered into between the parties. In terms of the said agreement a chance was to be given, "to all eligible temporary employees for permanent appointments. The appointments were against the vacancies likely to arise during the years 1995-96, circular made it clear that in view of the enormity of the problem an extension of the currency of the panel, eligible temporary employees who have been empanelled could not appear in the earlier interviews and have been pursuing their cases thereafter, "will be given another chance to appear for interview".

6. Workman submits that there were total five settlements. The settlement dated 17.11.87 is the 1st settlement (Ex M1), settlement dated 16.7.88 is 2nd settlement (Ex M2), settlement dated 27.10.88 is the 3rd settlement (Ex M3), then settlement dated 9.1.91 is 4th settlement and settlement dated 30.7.96 is 5th settlement (Ex M6). In between there is minutes of conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.95 marked as Ex M5. That due to all these settlements which were extended by subsequent settlements thereby created

reasonable expectations in the list of the selected candidates arose with that it's a question of time their appointments or services would be regularized in the services of the bank. The Workman was working with the bank on temporary basis was under the bonafide hope that sooner her services will be regularized with the bank. He is thereby closed all her options elsewhere. It is needless to point out that employing person to whom hope of employment in substantial terms was made is a facet of Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

7. Further Workman submits that the Government of India issued Circular No. F-3/3/104/87-IR, dated 16.8.1990. Under said circular the chief Executives of all public sector banks including the Management herein were specifically instructed that until the problem of existing temporary employees is fully resolved, no bank is permitted to make any permanent appointments. That some of the persons similarly situated like this Workman aggrieved by the inaction on the part of the management of the bank is not regularizing their services from out of the selected panel and not clearly focusing the vacancy position, filed W.P. No. 4194/97 before Hon'ble High court of A.P.. It is specifically averred in the said writ petition that the Management of the bank had failed to implement the settlement and that it violates the various fundamental rights guaranteed under the constitution of India. The Hon'ble High court of A.P .. by order dated 5.3.97 directed the bank to implement the settlement as amended from time to time. It also directed the bank to carry out the terms of settlement before the expiry of March, 1997. The Hon'ble High Court also recorded finding that the Bank cannot escape its liability of enforcement of the Settlement. In view of the directions given by the High Court all candidates whose names appeared in the select panels prepared on the basis of the agreement entered into on 17.11.87 under which the panel was valid upto December, 1991, and on the basis of a settlement dated 27.10.1988 whereby the panels were made alive upto 31.3.1997 under which the panel was valid upto December, 1999. The other agreement dated 16.7.1988 under which the panel was valid upto 1992 and on the basis of the settlement dated 27.10.1998 whereby the panels were made alive upto 31.3.1997 were under the bonafide impression that their cases will be considered for regularization and were living on the basis of the said reasonable expectation. Unfortunately, contrary to the aforesaid directions given by the High Court and contrary to the settlements entered into between the parties, the bank issued proceedings dated 25.3.1997, dated 27.3.1997 and 31.3.1997 instructing the various authorities of the Management not to continue the temporary employees those who are in services of the bank from 1.4.97. The said order was followed by the Management. Aggrieved by the said action the Workman herein and similarly situated candidates have filed a writ petition before the Hon'ble High Court and by way of Writ Petition No.9206/97 seeking a declaration that the proceedings issued by the Deputy General Manager and the Assistant General Manager (Respondents 3,4 and 5 therein) on 25.3.97, 27.3.97 and 31.3.97 as illegal and also non-continuance of the Workmen therein in service by absorbing them in the services of the bank as violative of Section 2(p) and 18(1) read with Rule 58 of Central Rules and sought for specific direction to the bank to absorb them in service.

8. Further, Workman submits that in the counter affidavit filed in Writ Petition No.9206/97, the bank has submitted that it has about 805 branches in Andhra Pradesh alone. It has stated that due to exigencies of circumstances and on account of the urgent need in its banks, it employed temporary employees in subordinate cadre. It is pertinent to mention that it does not state the urgent or need or the nature of temporary employees that it had engaged. Enquiry into the same would reveal that the stand taken by the bank either on the ground of urgent need or of temporary employees is a façade to perpetuate unfair labour practice. It is designed to on the one hand, keep the employed in the erroneous zone of hope and on the other to ensure that benefits that a model employer will extend under various statutes to its employees is not required to be borne out by the bank. A reading of the counter affidavit would show that the bank

would opines that being just fair and reasonable are which obviously is reprehensible and is a facet of unfair labour practice.

9. The Workman submits that the bank had referred in its counter affidavit to three settlements dated 17.11.87, 16.7.88 and 27.10.88. The bank in the guise of extending the benefits of the circular of Government dated 16.8.90 stated in its counter affidavit that as follows:

"Government of India, vide its letter dated 16.8.1990, issued guidelines to all the public sector banks with regard to recruitment and absorption of temporary employees in public sector banks. The said guidelines were issued to implement on the lines of the approach paper on the issue provided by a committee constituted in this regard. The Government of India guidelines made it clear that all the public sector banks may follow the provisions laid down in the approach paper.

The approach paper specified that the cases of temporary employees who had put in not less than 240 days of temporary service in 12 consecutive Months and who are entitled to benefit of Section 25-F may be decided by entering into a settlement with the representative union. In respect of temporary employees who had put in less than 240 days of service in 12 consecutive months or less, a settlement could be avoided and however if the Management so desired, they could enter into a conciliation settlement with the representative union. Para 6(h), it is mentioned that only those temporary employees who had put in temporary service of 90 or more days after 1.1 1982 would be eligible for considering under the scheme. Although the Government guidelines envisaged for a settlement in respect of employees who had put in temporary service of 90 or more days, the bank by way of further concession entered into settlements Even in respect of those who had put in less than 90 days. As such, it could be Seen that the settlements are more beneficial to the temporary employees concerned. The approach paper also specify at para 6(c) that the banks would provide one time opportunity to all the temporary employees and for that purpose temporary employees worked in the bank on or after 1.1.1982 could be considered for re-employment in terms of the scheme. The Respondents have gone further wherein even persons working after 1975 were also considered.

As could be seen from the above, there was a genuine effort on the part of the Respondent bank to provide permanent employment for as many as possible subject to availability of the vacancies.

It is further submitted that at para 6(k) of the approach paper, it was made clear that this would be one time exercise in full and final settlement of all the aims and disputes for the past period in respect of temporary workmen covered by the settlement. This would mean that the Government of India guidelines would cover only those persons who were temporarily employed for the period specified therein and not otherwise. As such, it is submitted that the Respondents have not only followed the Government of India guidelines but in fact covered cases of the employees who had worked for less than 90 days. As such, question of violation does not arise and in any case those were only broad guidelines and not directives".

10. The Workman submits that the bank also referred a subsequent settlement dated 9.1.1991 wherein there is a clause to the effect- that the panel of temporary employees and the panel of daily wage employees will be operated to a particular period. Therefore, their cases will not be considered. The Management herein relying upon this settlement in their impugned action. It is submitted that even the settlement dated 9.1.1991 will not empower the management to terminate the services of the temporary employees who are working in the bank services like the Workman herein as it does not specify the termination of the employees. In fact there are so many vacancies wherein the Management has engaged several new persons as temporary messengers/ attendars/ sweepers etc., even after the judgment of Hon’ble

High Court without considering the cases of the similarly situated candidates like the Workman herein. It is submitted inspite of engaging fresh candidates as is now being done by the Management they would have continued the similarly situated candidates like the Workman herein in the services of the bank and consider their cases for absorption in view of the circulars issued by Central Government as well as the directions of this Hon'ble Court in Writ Petition No.4194/97, dated 5.3.97. In view of the circulars issued by the Central Government, the Management should not have relied upon the settlement dated 9.1.1991. Hence, the impugned action of the Management is illegal, unjust, violative of fundamental rights such as Articles 14,16 and 21 of the Constitution of India.

11. The Workman submits that in W.P. No.4194/97 filed by the union of temporary employees where in they have complained about the non- implementation of the settlements arrived between the parties and sought for absorption. Such employees in the bank services on permanent basis before the date fixed for carrying out the terms of settlement, the Court held that the members of the union had been empanelled in the list, they were not regularized and the time was going to run out to the near future and the Respondent bank and its officers cannot escape from the liability of enforcing the settlement which has been reached and therefore directed that the bank and the officers shall implement the settlement dated 17.11.87 as amended from time to time before the expiry of 31.3.97.

12. Further, it is submitted that in the clause of Settlement it is specifically mentioned that the workmen to be absorbed/appointed in the bank prohibiting any temporary appointments subsequent to the date of settlement even the authorities want to make temporary appointments that should be made only from among the empanelled can be appointed either for temporary vacancy or permanent vacancy except from among the empanelled candidates like the Workman and that should be continued till they are absorbed. The management committed unfair labour practices and terminated the services of the candidates with effect from 1.4.1997 which is arbitrary, discriminatory, contrary to their own guidelines and violative of the constitutional provisions which are guaranteed in Chapter-III of the Constitution of India.

13. The Workman submits that it is strange as to how the panels were allowed to lapse by a so-called Memorandum of Understanding dated 25.2.1997, that the action of terminating such employees like the Workman by virtue of an impugned oral proceedings without implementing the settlement would be illegal and unfair labour practice which cannot be allowed to be perpetuated. That the discontinuance of the Workman after 31.3.97 who had served in the bank in any capacity amounts to retrenchment. It could not have been done without any notice and it violates Sec.25FF of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and the said action is violative of principles of natural justice guaranteed under Chapter III of the Constitution of India. This amounts to retrenchment without one month's notice and taken in view of such notice. Thus, the main proceedings issued by the Respondent is without jurisdiction and is arbitrary, illegal and therefore liable to be quashed. That the alleged Memorandum of Understanding dated 27.2.97, Ex.M5 does not own any legal entity, as the said Memorandum of Understanding is not published anywhere to brought to the notice of the Workman whose rights are being affected. It is submitted that Management did not adhere to the procedure envisaged by the Central Government in its' instructions dated 16.8.90 in the year 1995. The same was not followed in the year 1997 despite there being vacancies. The management has followed the procedure of calling candidates through Employment exchange instead of giving chance to the empanelled candidates like the Workman here. It is pertinent to mention here that the Respondent Management sent letters to the all similarly situated candidates like the Workman in the month of June, 1997, subsequent to the passing of impugned termination orders. After knowing the facts that the candidates are litigating, the

Management refused to engage these candidates. It is once again reiterated that the panels are meant for absorption but not for termination. It was the duty of the Management to engage the empanelled candidates like the Workman even in temporary vacancies till they are absorbed permanently in regular vacancies. Hence, the action of the Respondent Management terminating the services of the Workman by oral order dated 31.3.97 is unjust, illegal, violative of principles of natural justice and hence, the Management be directed to reinstate and absorb the Workman and to grant all incidental and consequential benefits.

14. Per contra, Respondent had filed counter and made a contentions that the reference is not tenable and contrary to the provisions of I.D. Act, 1947. Respondent submitted that to tide over severe sub-ordinate staff constraints which arose out of leave vacancies, exigencies, etc., and also owning to the restrictions imposed by the Government of India/Reserve Bank of India on intake of staff, the Respondent bank used to engage sub-ordinate staff like messengers, sweepers, sweeper cum water boys, etc., depending on the availability of work on purely temporary basis for the smooth and uninterrupted functioning of the branches. It is submitted that the All India State Bank of India Staff Federation which represents majority of the employees in the State Bank of India comprising about 98% of the work force as its' members espoused the cause of temporary employees who have put in less than 240 days of temporary service in 12 calendar months in the bank and who were ineligible for any protection under Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 to give a chance for being considered for absorption and permanent appointments.

15. Discussions were held and on 17.11.1987 an agreement was signed between the federation and the Management bank under Sec. 2(p) read with Sec 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules 1957. A copy of the said settlement dated 17.11.87 which may be herein after referred as first settlement is filed and 4 categories were made as it has already been mentioned in the claim statement above, it need not be repeated here. In the first settlement, it was agreed that the temporary employees as categorized would be given a chance for being considered for permanent appointment in the bank's service against the vacancies which are likely to arise during the period 1987 to 1991. On 16.7.88 second settlement was arrived between the Federation and the Bank whereby it was agreed to substitute the period of consideration of vacancies as 1987 to 1992 in place of 1987 to 1991 as contemplated under the first settlement dated 17.11.1987. This is the second settlement. A 3rd settlement was entered into on 27.10.88 and it was agreed that the bank's service against the vacancies likely to arise from 1988 to 1992 was to be considered. Government of India vide its letter dated 16.8.90 issued guidelines to all the public sector banks with regard to recruitment and absorption of temporary employees in public sector banks. The said guidelines were issued to implement on the lines of approach paper on the issue provided by a committee constituted in this regard. Government of India guidelines made it clear that all the public sector banks may follow the provisions laid down in the approach paper. The approach paper specified that the cases of temporary service in 12 consecutive months and who are entitled to benefit of Sec.25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 may be decided by entering into a settlement with the representative union. In respect of temporary employees who had put in less than 240 days of service in 12 consecutive months or less, a settlement could be avoided and however if the Management so desired they could enter into a conciliation settlement with the representative union. In para. 6(h) it is mentioned that only those temporary employees who had put in temporary service of 90 days or more days after 1.1.82 would be eligible for considering under the scheme. Although the Government guidelines envisaged for a settlement in respect of employees who had put in temporary service of 90 days or more days, the bank by way of a further concession entered into settlements. Even in respect of those who had put in less than 90 days and also the bank went a step further and said those persons who are working after 1975 were also considered. Hence, there was a genuine effort on the part of the Respondent bank to provide as many as

possible jobs subject to the availability of the vacancies. However, para 6 (k) of the approach paper made it clear that it is a one time, exercise in full and final, settlement of all the claims and disputes for the past period, in respect of temporary workmen covered by the settlement. Another settlement was entered on 9.1.91 herein after referred as 4th settlement and the time limit was extended upto 1994 and separate panel was prepared for temporary employees, casual/daily wagers. It was agreed that while vacancies arising between 1988 to 1994 in respect of temporary employees and in respect of casual/daily wagers, they can be considered for the vacancies arising between 1995-96 only.

16. It is submitted that the administrative set up of the Hyderabad Local Head Office comprises of four Zonal Offices (Zones) at Hyderabad, Vijayawada, Visakhapatnam and Tirupathi covering all the Districts of Andhra Pradesh. In terms of the settlement the Management after following the procedure laid down therein prepared the panels of qualified candidates of temporary employees denoted as 1989 panel and also panel of casual/daily wagers denoted as 1992 panel for giving a chance for being considered for permanent absorption. These panels were prepared zone-wise separately for messengers and non-messengers in the descending order of temporary service put in by the candidates during the stipulated period i.e., 1.7.1975 to 31.7.1988. That the Federation approached the Regional Labour Commissioner(C) for implementation of bi-partite settlement in respect of absorption of temporary employees. The Regional Labour Commissioner(C) conducted conciliation proceedings and an agreement was arrived between the Federation and the bank. It was agreed that it would be kept alive upto March, 1997. A copy of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.2.1995 signed by the parties is filed as material paper. A settlement was arrived at and an agreement was signed between the Federation and the Management bank on 30.7.1996 under Sec.2 (p) read with Sec.18(1) of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957, which is hereinafter called as 5th settlement. That on 27.2.1997 a Memorandum of understanding was also signed by the federation's affiliate and the bank Management recording the fact that the exercise of identifying the messengerial vacancies as on 31.12.1994 has since been completed by Central Office and thereby 403 messengerial vacancies were sanctioned . It was agreed that these vacancies may be filled from 1989 panel of temporary employees after effecting conversion from full time non-messengerial staff in the usual manner and the agreement was reached accordingly. It was agreed between the Federation's affiliate and the Management bank that in terms of the settlement dated 30.7.1996 both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees would lapse on 31.3.1997. That as agreed upon vacancies were filled from the panels. The Workman who has put in an aggregate temporary service of less than 240 days in a continuous block of 12 months period during 1.7.1975 to 31.7.1988 has no right to seek a direction to consider her candidature for absorption in the Management bank under any rule/law except under the settlement entered into thereon.

17. Respondent contended that, in fact, the case of the Workman can be considered under all the five settlements having got her case considered under provisions of these settlements. All the other provisions and terms of the settlements are also binding on him/her. The Management bank has not violated any of the provisions of the terms of the said settlement. That the very preparation and maintenance of panel is in compliance of the terms agreed under these settlements. These settlements were time bound and they ceased to exist on 31.3.1997. That the bank has never promised that all the candidates in the panel will be absorbed. In the advertisement itself it was made clear that candidates will be considered for absorption in the vacancies that may arise upto 1992. Keeping alive the panels after 31.3.1997 is contrary to the settlements arrived between the State Bank of India Staff Federation and the Management bank. That the settlements are binding on the parties. The Workman is also bound under the terms of the said settlement. The settlement does not suffer from any ambiguity as their language is very clear. The right under the

settlements is to give them a chance to be considered for future appointment in the bank's services against the vacancies likely to arise. The settlements were effected to balance the expectations of the temporary employees to be absorbed in permanent service as against the constitutional rights for all eligible persons to be considered for employment every time a vacancy arises. That the alleged dispute including the demand for reinstatement has to be decided in this context. It is submitted that the period of panel list got expired on 31.3.97 and it is an integral term of the settlement and cannot be modified in any proceedings under the law. These temporary employees who unfortunately could not be accommodated for want of vacancies have no further rights to be considered for regularization. That the Hon'ble High Court in WP No.12964/94, held as follows, "It is needless to state that the settlement arrived at between the All India State Bank of India Staff Federation which, is the majority union and the bank Management is binding on the Workmen also. It is not at all the case of the Workman that any of the terms of the settlement has been violated by the bank's Management. If the Workman had worked in the bank on part-time basis before 31.5.94, that itself would not vest in him a right to claim that her services should be regularized on permanent basis against a full time cadre post. The claim put forth by the Workman in the present petition is therefore misconceived and not tenable. However, it is open to the Workman to claim any right which flows from the settlement between the union and the bank Management. As already pointed out that it is not the grievance of the Workman that some right which has flown from the settlement in favour of the Workman has been denied by the bank Management. Therefore, I do not find any ground, let alone substantial ground, to grant the kind of relief sought for by the Workman. Writ Petition fails and is accordingly dismissed. No costs."

18. Further, it is contended that if the panels were not lapsed at the end of designated period and allowed to be continued it would result in making the contracts of temporary employment indirectly permanent through back door entry, which would not only be contrary to the settlements but also to Articles 14 and 16 of Constitution of India and deprive the chances of original claimants who would Come through proper recruitment procedure. As their rights have been crystallized by operation of the settlements. Hence, there is no question of any Legitimate expectation being violated.

19. Similarly placed ex-employees filed WP No.9206/1995 and the batch before the Hon'ble High Court of A.P. and the learned Single Judge allowed the Writ Petitions. Aggrieved by the same WA No.86/98 and the batch was filed and the Division Bench set aside the order of the Single Judge. Thereafter the ex-temporary employees filed Special Leave Petition No.11886-11888 of 1998 before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India also dismissed the SLP. Therefore, reference to the Judgement of the Learned Single Judge in WP No.9206/97 is of no consequences as the same has already been set aside. The observations made in the Judgements cannot be relied upon for any purpose what so ever. The question of operation of Sec.25F would not come into play. Further the issue is covered by various Judgements of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India and various Hon'ble High Courts. Hence, the reference may be ordered that the Workman is not entitled for any relief.

20. In order to fortify her claim Workman has examined herself as WW1 and also filed documents in evidence which has been exhibited as Ex.W1 to W5. Further, the Workman has filed photocopies of documents in support of her claim which are discussed as under:-

Ex.W1 is the notification. Further Ex.W2 is the interview call letter. Ex.W3 is the panel list. Ex.W4 is the service certificate. Ex.W5 is the service certificate.

21. On the other hand, Respondent has examined witness MW1 Sri K. Bala Kotaiah and this witness has exhibited 12 documents, marked as Ex.M1 to M12. The details of these documents are as follows:-

Ex.M.1 is the Settlement dated 17.11.1987. Ex.M2 is the Settlement dated 16.7.1988. Ex.M3 is the Settlement dated 27.10.1988. Ex.M4 is the Settlement dated 9.1.1991. Ex.M5 is the Minutes of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.1995. Ex.M6 is the Settlement dated 30.7.1996. Ex.M7 is the Memorandum of Understanding dt. 27.2.1997. Ex.M8 is the Particulars of 1989 Messengerial Panel. Ex.M9 is the Particulars of 1989 Non-Messengerial Panel. Ex.M10 is the Particulars of 1992 General Attendant Panel. Ex.M11 is the Judgment of Hon'ble High Court of A.P. in Writ Appeal No.86/98 dt.1.5.1998. Ex.M12 is the Judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in SLP No. 11886-11888 of 1998 dt.10.8.1998.

22. Apart from afore mentioned documents, Learned Counsel for Workman has also filed a long list of various judgements of Hon'ble Supreme Court as well as Hon'ble High Court, which we will discuss at appropriate place in this Award.

23. Heard the argument of Learned Counsel for Workman as well as for Respondent.

24. On the basis of rival pleadings of both the parties and submissions made by the Learned Counsel for both the parties, following points arise for determination in the industrial dispute :-

I. Whether the 1st settlement dated 17.11.1987, 2nd settlement dated 16.7.1988, 3rd settlement dated 27.10.1988, 4th settlement dated 9.1.1991 and 5th settlement dated 30.7.1996 entered into between State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and also Memorandum of Understanding are binding upon both the parties?

II. Whether the action of State Bank of India, SBI Main Kallur branch in terminating the services of Workman Smt. Lal Bee, a Messenger with effect from 31.3.1997 is justified?

III. Whether the Workman is entitled for absorption on permanent post in the Branch of Respondent management as per averments made by him in the claim statement?

IV. To what relief if any the Workman is entitled for?

Findings:-

25. Point No.I:- Undisputedly settlements dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988, 9.1.1991 and 30.7.1996, minutes of conciliation proceedings and memorandum of understanding dated 27.2.1997 were executed between the State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation under section 2(p) and 18 (1) of I.D. Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Disputes (Central Rules), 1957.

Section 2(p) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 as follows:-

(p) "settlement" means a settlement arrived at in the course of conciliation proceeding and includes a written agreement between the employer and workmen arrived at otherwise than in the course of conciliation proceeding where such agreement has been signed by the parties thereto in such manner as may be prescribed and a copy thereof has been sent to an officer authorised in this behalf by the appropriate Government and the conciliation officer;

Section 18(1) provides as follows:-

18. Persons on whom settlements and awards are binding.

- [(1) A settlement arrived at by agreement between the employer and Workman otherwise than in the course of conciliation proceeding shall be binding on the parties to the agreement.

Therefore, in view of the provision contained u/s.18 (1) I.D. Act, 1947, terms and conditions enumerated in the aforesaid settlements are binding on the parties to the agreement. The Learned Counsel for Workman has argued that the Workman after going through the selection procedure has successfully been listed in the panel for appointment on the permanent basis in the Respondent management and the empanelled list has to be valid till last person in the empanelled list is appointed on permanent basis. But the impugned order dated 25.3.97, 27.3.97 and 31.3.97, has been issued by Respondent management thereby the services of the Workman has been terminated and the said order is not in consonance of the terms of the agreement entered into between the parties. Further, Workman submits that the Respondent in the 5th settlement has mentioned the date i.e., 31.3.1997 for lapse of empanel list which is illegal and that is not binding upon the Workman. The condition of lapse of empanelment list on 31.3.97 incorporated in the aforesaid 5th settlement, is arbitrary and illegal.

26. The perusal of the impugned order dated 25.3.1997 goes to reveal that the Chief/Branch Manager, SBI Zonal Office has issued the letter to all the branches with regard to the subject not to make any temporary appointments in the Branch in messengerial category from 1.4.1997. The extract of the said letter is given below:-

"We have been advised by the Deputy General Manager, Zonal Office, Hyderabad that as both the panels of temporary employees of 1989 and daily wagers/casual labours of 1992 will lapse by 31.3.1997, it has been decided by Central Office not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial category from 1.4.1997."

Thus, from the contents of the aforesaid letter, it manifest that Head Office of State Bank of India vide letter dated 25.3.1997 has issued direction to all its branches not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial category from 1.4.1997 due to reason of lapse of both panels i.e., 1989 & 1992 on 31.3.1997 as per terms of settlements entered into by both parties. Further, the contents of the subsequent letter dated 27.3.1997 issued by Respondent Management is also direction to Branch Manager, State Bank of India not to make any temporary messengerial category appointment with effect from 1.4.1997 and it has also been communicated to all concerned that the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers maintained by Zonal offices stand lapsed from 31.1.1997. Further, office order dated 31.3.1997 has been issued by Respondent management that goes to reveal that the said office order has been issued to this effect that, "Consequent on absorption of temporary employees in permanent cadre, it has been decided by the competent authority that no one onwards, no further daily labour or temporary employees/appointments should be resorted to/engaged/employed." Therefore, it reflects from the contents of the aforesaid orders that the temporary appointment in messengerial category and daily labour has been stopped by the Respondent management with effect from 1.4.1997 because of the lapsed of panel of temporary workers and daily wagers by 31.3.1997. The agreement for lapse of both the panels on 31.3.1997 is contained in the 5th settlement which has been arrived at between the parties on dated 30.7.1996 with the consensus of both the parties. Therefore, Workman can not challenge the terms and conditions contained in settlement dated 30.7.1996 regarding lapse of panel on 31.3.1997 as agreed between State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation. As per provision contained u/s.18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 the said Agreement dated 30.7.1996 is binding on both the parties.

In the case of **Allied Sales Corporation Secunderabad vs.The Authority Under Andhra Pradesh..... 1990 II LLJ 510 AP para 414, Hon'ble Court have held:-**

"*4. There was a settlement between the Management and the workmen under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act on 25th April 1983 under which the age of superannuation of the workmen was fixed at 55 years. The settlement was to be in force upto 30th June 1986 and the next settlement, incorporating practically the same terms, was again entered into on 4th February 1987 under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act. There is no dispute that these settlements are under Section 18(1).*

14. Now the Authority constituted under Section 41(1) of the Act is an authority with very limited jurisdiction. It can only decide in the first appeal whether a termination by the management is valid or not and is within the parameters of Section 40 of the Act. The said Authority, in our view, has absolutely no jurisdiction to decide whether a settlement entered into under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act between the representatives of the Workmen and of the Management, is vitiated by undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion on the part of the Management. The Authority, namely, the Assistant Commissioner of Labour, was never intended by the A.P. Legislature to have jurisdiction to go into the question of the validity of a settlement arrived at under Section 18 of the Industrial Disputes Act by an Industrial Court. That Parliament has, in fact, constituted Industrial Courts under the Industrial Disputes Act, with extensive powers cannot be disputed. What we mean to say is that the Authority under Section 41(1) of the A.P. Act has no jurisdiction what-so-ever either to question or to decide about the validity of any such settlements. If parties to a settlement have a grievance about the validity of a settlement, it is for them to agitate the matter before the appropriate forum and they cannot ask an Authority constituted under Section 41(1) of the A.P. Shops and Establishments Act, 1966 with limited jurisdiction, to go into any such question and, that too, incidentally while deciding whether retirement as per the contract of employment, is legal or not."

It is not the case of Workman that aforesaid settlements are vitiated by undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion on the part of the management. If the Workman feeling aggrieved by any terms of settlement/ agreement on the aforementioned grounds then she can challenge of settlement before a competent authority under the Act, 1947. But here in the instant matter it is not a case of Workman that aforementioned settlement has been entered into between the parties on the ground of undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion. Therefore, Workman is barred to raise any objection in respect of fixing the date of lapse of both panels on 31.3.1997 as agreed between both the parties and Workman can not challenge any terms of said Agreement.

Further in the case of **Herbertsons Limited Vs. Workmen of Herbertsons Limited and Ors, 1977 AIR 322,** Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

The Tribunal thought that the question of the quantum of membership of the 2nd Respondent did not call for a finding at all in view of 1his Court's order. As observed above that was not a correct assumption. On the other hand, we feel that this view of the Tribunal has led it to approach the matter in an entirely erroneous manner. The Tribunal is, rightly enough, conscious that under section 18 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act the settlement was binding on the company and the members of the 3rd Respondent union. Even so, the Tribunal devoted nearly half of its order in scanning the evidence given by the company and Respondent No. 3 to find out whether the terms of the settlement had been explained by the President of the union to the workmen or not and whether the workers voluntarily accepted the settlement knowing all the "consequences". This to our mind is again an entirely wrong approach.

"When a recognised union negotiates with an employer the workers as individuals do not come into the picture. It is not necessary that each individual worker should know the implications of the settlement since a recognised union, which is expected to protect the legitimate interests of labour, enters into a settlement in the best interests of labour. This would be the normal rule. We cannot altogether rule out exceptional cases where there may be allegations of mala fides, fraud or even corruption or other induce- ments. Nothing of that kind has been suggested against the President of the 3rd Respondent in this case. That being the position, prima facie, this is a settlement in the course of collective bargaining and, therefore, is entitled to due weight and consideration.

It is not possible to scan the settlement in bits and pieces and hold some parts good and acceptable and others bad. Unless it can be demonstrated that the objectionable portion is such that it completely outweighs all the other advantages gained the Court will be slow to hold a settle- ment as unfair and unjust. The settlement has to be accepted or rejected as a whole and we are unable to reject it as a whole as unfair or unjust. Even before this Court the 3rd Respondent representing admittedly the large majority of the workmen has stood by this settlement and that is a strong factor which it is difficult to ignore. As stated elsewhere in the judgment, we cannot also be oblivious of the fact that all workmen of the company have accepted the settlement. Besides, the period of settlement has since expired and we are informed that the employer and the 3rd Respondent are negotiating another settlement with further improvements. These factors, apart from what has been stated above, and the need for industrial peace and harmony when a union backed by a large majority of workmen has accepted a settlement in the course of collective bargaining have impelled us not to interfere with this settlement. That being the position, we unhold the settlement as fair and just and order that the award of the Tribunal shall be substituted by the settlement dated October 18, 1973. The said settlement shall be the substituted award. The appeal is disposed of accordingly. There will be no order as to costs."

Therefore, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above, the contention of the Workman that the date fixed for lapse of empanelled list on 31.3.1997 for appointment to the permanent post vide 5th Settlement dated 30.7.1996 is arbitrary, illegal is not untenable. The recognized union of Workmen has negotiated with the Respondent Bank Management representing large number of Workmen and the Workman as individual do not come into picture. Workman in the instant case has work as temporary Workmen in the Respondent Branch and in response of Notification she had applied for inclusion of her name in the panel and she was selected for inclusion her name in the panel list to be utilized for absorption of such Workman to permanent post in order of their seniority in the list. The Settlement dated 30.7.1996 between State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation under Sec.2(p) and Sec.18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 has clearly provided as regard non-messengerial position and it is agreed that all such posts sanctioned fallen vacant upto 31.3.1997 shall be filled before empanel list is allowed to lapse. Thus, in view of law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, in the instant case, Agreement dated 30.7.1996 was entered into between both the parties in respect of lapsing of the both the panels on 31.3.1997 and absorption of the Workmen from panel list was subject to availability of vacancy of post likely to arise upto 31.3.1997, have a binding force on Workman as well as management of State Bank of India in view of provision contained under section 18 (1) of I.D. Act, 1947.

Thus, Point No.I is answered against the Workman and in favour of the Respondent.

27. **Point No.II**:- Firstly, it is submitted on behalf of the Workman that the Respondent has terminated her services by oral order on 31.3.1997 without issuing any notice or paying any salary or compensation in

lieu thereof. Therefore, the termination order of the Workman from service is in violation of provision contained Under Section 25 F of I.D. Act, 1947. Therefore, the order is liable to be set aside.

28. On the other hand, Respondent counsel contended that Workman has not worked for 240 days in any preceding calendar year. Therefore, reference of the industrial dispute is not relevant. In this context, the Workman has examined herself as WW1 who has reiterated that Workman has been terminated from service by Respondent on 31.3.1997 without notice of salary or compensation in lieu thereof. Before examining the claim of the Workman on merit it would be apposite to reproduce the provision contained under section 25 F:-

Section 25F provides:-

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].

Compensation to workmen in case of transfer of undertakings.

Section 25B defines the term continuous service which provides

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 authorized 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;

In order to prove the fact of 240 days of service within 12 months of a calendar year just preceding from the date of termination, the initial burden of proof lies upon the Workman and the Workman has to prove this factum by adducing her oral as well as documentary evidence in support of her claim.

Further, how to calculate 240 days of service by the Workman in a calendar year. In this context the reference of decisions of Hon’ble Supreme Court is relevant and the same are discussed below:-

In Rajasthan State Ganganagar S. Mills Ltd. v. State of Rajasthan and Anr. (2004) Apex Court held:

"It was the case of the Workman that he had worked for more than 240 days in the year concerned. This claim was denied by the appellant. It was for the claimant to lead evidence to show that he had worked for 240 days in the year preceding the date of his termination. He has filed an affidavit. It is statement which is in his favor and that cannot be regarded as sufficient evidence for any Court or Tribunal to come to the conclusion that in fact the claimant had worked for 240 days in a year These aspects were highlighted in Range Forest Officer v. S.T. Hadimani (2002 (3) SCC 25. No proof of receipt of salary or wages for 240 days or order or record in that regard was produced. Mere non-production of the muster roll for a particular period was not sufficient for the Labour Court held that the Workman had worked for 240 days as claimed."

In Municipal Corporation, Faridabad v. Siri Niwas (2004 (8) SCC 195), held "*the burden was on the Workman to show that he was working for more than 240 days in the preceding one year prior to his alleged retrenchment." In M.P. Electricity Board v. Hariram (2004 (8) SCC 246) the position was again reiterated in paragraph 11 as follows: "The above burden having not been discharged and the Labour Court having held so, in our opinion, the Industrial Court and the High Court erred in basing an order of reinstatement solely on an adverse inference drawn erroneously ..*"

In the case of Manager, RBI, Bangalore vs. S Mani (2005) SCC Page 100, the 3 Judges Bench of the Apex Court held that "*the initial burden of proof was on the Workman to show that he had completed 240 days of service."*

Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of Mohan Lal vs Management BEL 1981 SCC page 225 has laid down the principle that how to count 240 days of service within one year it is held: *"Clause (2)(a) provides for a fiction to treat a Workman in continuous service for a period of one year despite the fact that he has not rendered uninterrupted service for a period of one year but he has rendered period of 240 days during the period of 12 calendar service for months counting backwards and just preceding the relevant date being the date of retrenchment. In other words, in order to invoke the fiction enacted in clause (2)(a) it is necessary to determine first the relevant date, ie the date of termination of service which is complained of as retrenchment. After that date is ascertained. move backward to a period of 12 months just preceding the date of retrenchment and then ascertain whether within the period of 12 months, the Workman has rendered service for a period of 240 days. If these three facts are affirmatively answered in favor of the Workman pursuant to the deeming fiction enacted in clause (2)(a) it will have to be assumed that the Workman is in continuous service for a period of one year and he will satisfy the eligibility qualification enacted in Section 25-F"*

"14. We have already extracted section 25B since its amendment and the change in language is the legislative exposition of which note must be taken. In fact, we need not further dilate upon this aspect because in Surendra Kumar Verma and Ors. v. Central Government Industrial-cum-Labour Court, New Delhi and Anr., Chinnappa Reddy. J., after noticing the amendment and referring to the decision in Sur Enamel and Stamping Works (P) Ltd case, held as under:

"These changes brought about by Act 36 of 1964 appear to be clearly designed to provide that a Workman who has actually worked under the employer for not less than 240 days during a period of twelve months shall be deemed to have been in continuous service for a period of one year whether or not he has in fact been in such continuous service for a period of one year. It is enough that he has worked for 240 days in a

period of 12 months, it is not necessary that he should have been in the service of the employer for one whole year."

In a concurring judgment Pathak J. agreed with this interpretation of section 25B(2). Therefore, both on principle and on precedent it must be held that section 25B(2) comprehends a situation where a Workman is not in employment for a period of 12 calendar months, but has rendered service for a period of 240 days within the period of 12 calendar months commencing and counting backwards from the relevant date, i.e. the date of retrenchment. If he has, he would be deemed to be in continuous service for a period of one year for the purpose of section 25B and Chapter VA."

Thus, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above the initial burden of proof lies upon the Workman to show that she has completed 240 days of the service with the Respondent just preceding from the date of her termination. Further, in respect of the employment of calculating the 240 days service in view of the contents of Section 25-F read with Section 25-B of the I.D. Act, 1947.

29. Now, in view of the provision contained under Section 25 F and law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, we have to examine whether the Workman has discharged her initial burden of proof in respect of her claim of 240 days continuous service in a calendar year just preceding from the date of her termination i.e., 31.3.1997.

In this context, WW1 in her cross examination has stated that,

"I was not sponsored by any employment exchange and I did not undergo the required selection process for appointment in the bank. I did not work for 240 days in any year."

Thus, it is clear from the testimony of WW1 that the Workman had not worked for 240 days continuously in any 12 months of a calendar year just preceding from the date of her termination in the Respondent bank. Therefore, Workman failed to establish her plea by her oral and documentary evidence that he had worked for 240 days continuously in calendar year just preceding from the date of her termination i.e., 31.3.1997. Thus, the claim of the Workman that he has been terminated by oral order without issuing notice or payment in lieu after termination, in contravention of Section 25 F of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is not tenable. However the documents filed by the Workman in support of her claim, number of days worked with the Respondent goes to reveal that the Workman had worked intermittently as daily wager depending upon availability of work in branch. Workman did not file any document of appointment letter or salary slips in support of her claim for appointment as a non-messenger in the Respondent branch on temporary basis.

30. Per contra, the Learned Counsel for Respondent has submitted the allegation of Workman that he was terminated from services is not correct. As the vacancies were filled up on regular basis in order of their respective seniority the non-engagement of the Workman does not amount to termination. Further, Respondent contended that no law provide that even though there is no work temporary employee should be continued in the bank work as the very engagement of Workman was subject to availability of work. Therefore, the allegation that the bank has indulged in unfair labour practice is incorrect.

31. Thus, in view of the fore gone discussion and contentions made by the Respondent, I find the force in the argument advanced by the Respondent that in the instant matter, Workman was not terminated from service by order dated 31.3.1997 rather she was disengaged in view of the non-availability of the work in the branch. Further, there was direction issued by the Head Office of the Respondent authority not to engage any daily wager Workman/ temporary Worker w.e.f. 1.4.1997. Thus, such disengagement of Workman does not amount to termination. Moreover, the Workman failed to prove her claim that she was

terminated in contravention of provision of Sec.25F of the I.D. Act, 1947 as she failed to establish her plea by any oral or documentary evidence that she had worked for 240 days continuously in a twelve months of calendar year just preceding from date of termination i.e., 31.3.1997.

32. Further, perusal of the order dated 25.3.1997 goes to reveal that the Chief Branch Manager, State Bank of India has issued the letter to Zonal Office with direction to all its branches to this effect that they have been advised by the DGM, Zonal Office, Hyderabad that as both the panel of temporary employees of 1989 and daily wagers/casual labour of 1992 will lapse on 31.3.1997 it has been decided by central office not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial cadre from 1.4.1997, therefore it was directed to issue suitable instructions not to make temporary appointments from 1.4.1997. There is no mention in this order that the Workman herein has been terminated from service by this order.

33. Further, the circular dated 27.3.1997 was issued by DGM, SBI to all branches in commercial network in respect of the non-appointment of temporary employees in subordinate cadre and it has directed not to make any temporary employment in the subordinate cadre with effect from 1.4.97 and further, it has directed to ensure that no temporary/casual/daily basis appointment of the petty cash. Further, it is directed to all Branch Managers that any deviation in this regard will be viewed seriously. Thus, these circulars do not reflect that the Workman has been terminated from service by this order.

34. Similarly, office order dated 31.3.1997 is simply a direction to all branches of the Respondent bank by DGM that no further daily labour should be engaged or employed. Therefore, the plea of the Workman that she has been terminated by the aforesaid order dated 25.3.1997, 27.3.1997 and 31.3.1997 from the service by the Respondent is not acceptable. The evidence adduced by the Workman clearly goes to reveal that she had worked as a daily wager for which she has been paid wages according to number of working days. As there was an order for prohibition for engaging temporary workmen, in the bank, therefore, Workman could not be engaged by the Respondent for work from 1.4.1997 and there after. It is settled law that the daily wagers are engaged by the employer depending upon the availability of work and as the work was not available the Workman was not engaged further by the Respondent management. Therefore, the Workman on the ground of number of days she had worked in the Respondent bank cannot claim any right to reinstate him into the employment. As the Workman failed to prove the mandatory condition of 240 days of continuous service as required under Sec.25F of I.D. Act, 1947. Therefore, the disengagement of Workman from work can not be termed in contravention of provision contained under Sec.25F and 25 B of the I.D. Act, 1947.

Thus, this point is answered against the Workman and in favour of Respondent.

35. **Point No.III**:- In this context, the Workman has contended that the management failed to implement the selected panels during its valid tenure. The management adopted the back door methods contrary to the settlements and filled up the vacancies. The same is evident from the proceedings dated 18.11.1993 a copy of the same is filed in the material papers and the same may be read as part of the claim statement. Further, it is submitted that management has to adhere the procedure issued by the Central Government, the instructions dated 16.8.1990 in the year 1995, but same was not followed in the year 1997 despite there being vacancies. The management has followed the procedure of calling candidates through employment exchange instead of giving chance to the empanelled candidates like the Workman herein. The management sent call letters to the similarly situated candidates like the Workman in the month of June 1997 subsequent to issuance of impugned termination orders. After knowing the fact that they are litigating the issue by way of dispute, the management has refused to engage those candidates, the copies of call letters issued are filed herein along with claim petition. The Workman herein reiterates that the

panels are meant for absorption but not for termination. In view of the same a duty is cast upon the Respondent management to engage the empanelled candidates like the Workman herein even in temporary vacancies till they are absorbed permanently in regular vacancies.

36. On the other hand, Respondent has contended that the Federation approached Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) for implementation of bipartite settlement in respect of the absorption of temporary employees. The Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) conducted conciliation proceedings and agreement was arrived at between the Federation and the Management bank. It is submitted that it was agreed between the Federation and the Management that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers /casual labour would be kept alive upto March, 1997 and the vacancies as agreed to under the afore set out settlements will be filled from both the lists concurrently. A copy of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.1995 signed by the parties to the dispute is filed as a material paper. Further, it is submitted that the settlement was arrived at and an agreement was signed between the Federation and the Management bank on 30.7.1996 under Section 2(p) read with Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules 1957 which is binding on the parties. A copy of this agreement which hereinafter may be referred to as 5th settlement for brevity, is also filed as a material paper. The 5th settlement dated 30.7.1996 whereunder the earlier four settlements dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988 and 9.1.1991 were also referred, it was agreed to, by the Federation and the Management bank that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees will be kept alive upto March, 1997 for filling the vacancies existing/arrived at as on 31.12.1994 as per the norms agreed to between the bank and Federation and that thereafter the said panels would lapse. It was also agreed that within the framework of the above settlements the modalities about drawing names from either the panel of temporary employees or the panel of daily wagers and casual labour would be decided administratively on circle to circle basis depending upon the local requirements in consultation with the Federation's affiliate by the Circle management. It was further agreed that all messenger real vacancies/positions in the subordinate cadre including part-time attendants specifically provided as leave reserve will be filled by the end of 31.3.1997. Further, Respondent contended that on 27.2.1997 a memorandum of understanding was also signed between the Federation's affiliate and the bank management regarding the fact that the exercise of identifying the messengerial vacancies as on 31.12.1994 has since been completed by central office and thereby 403 messengerial vacancies were sanctioned to the circle of the Management bank and it was agreed that these vacancies may be filled from 1989 panel of temporary employees after effecting conversion from full time non-messengerial staff in the usual manner and the agreement was reached upon. Further, it was agreed between the Federations affiliate and the management bank that in terms of the settlement dated 30.7.1996 both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers /casual employees would lapse on 31.3.1997.

37. The Workman has contended that the empanelled list prepared by the Respondent management for appointment of temporary and daily wage Workers to the permanent post cannot lapse unless until it is exhausted by appointing all the empanelled persons and it should continue even after 31.3.1997, i.e., the date fixed for the lapse of panel. It is undisputed that the date of lapse of empanelled list of Workmen has been fixed to 31.3.1997 as mentioned in the settlement dated 30.7.1996, and agreed between the parties. It is settled law that and once the life of panel list lapses on the date as agreed between the parties it cannot be extended beyond that date. In the instant case the panel list of the workmen was valid upto 31.3.1997 in view of the terms and conditions enumerated in the 5th Settlement entered into between the parties. As the lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997 has been agreed by State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation through 5th Settlement, the Workman is not competent to challenge the same.

In this context I would like to take reference of the decision of the apex court in the case of **Syndicate Bank and Ors vs. Shankar Paul and Ors , AIR 1997 SC 3091, therein the Hon'ble Apex Court** have held:-

"Till 1982, the branches of the appellant Bank in Calcutta region were recruiting persons locally to work as temporary attenders in leave vacancies. In view of the revised procedure prescribed by the Government of India in respect of such temporary appointments, the Calcutta regional office of the appellant Bank issued a circular to all of its branches on 14.8.1982, instructing all the branches under it to discontinue the old practice from 1.6.1982 and appoint only empanelled candidates. The regional office was to prepare a panel of eligible candidates, after calling names from the local/district employment exchange, and split it up branch-wise. Following that new procedure yearly panels were prepared thereafter. Names of the Respondents were for the first time included in the panel prepared for the period 7.2.1987 to 6.2.1988. By its letter dated 7.2.1987 the Bank had informed the Respondents that the panel was valid for one year only and that inclusion of their names in the panel was not to confer on them any right to seek permanent appointment in the service of the bank. Considering the object with which the panel was prepared and the fact that it was an yearly panel expiring on 6.2.1988, we are of the opinion that the Respondents did not get any right, because of inclusion of their names in the said panel, for permanent absorption in the service of the Bank. Whatever conditional right they had came to an end with the expiry of the panel. The claim of the Respondents, as contained in the writ petition was thus misconceived and therefore the learned single Judge and the Division Bench, when it first decided the appeal, were right in dismissing the writ petition and the appeal respectively."

Thus, in view of the above law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court and in view of the terms and conditions of the 5th Settlement the contention of the Workman that empanelled list should continue even after 31.3.1997 till the last Workman in the panel is absorbed is not tenable. The contention of the Workman is baseless in view of recital in the settlement. Therefore, in view of the fore gone discussion and finding given at Point No. I regarding binding nature of Settlements and terms and conditions enumerated therein, in view of the provision contained u/s.18(1) of the I.D. Act, 1947, I am of the considered view that life of panels lapsed on 31.3.1997 in view of terms of settlement dated 30.7.1996 and plea of Workman that the panel shall continue even after 31.3.1997 till last man absorbed has no legal force and same is untenable.

38. Undisputedly, settlement agreement dated 30.7.1996 was executed between the State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation and in that settlement it was agreed that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/ casual employees will be used for filling vacancies existing as on 31.12.1994 as per the norms agreed between the bank and the Federation. These empanelled workmen were to be given a chance for permanent appointment in the bank against vacancies arising up to December 1994 whereas the daily wagers/ casual employees were to be considered against the vacancies arise from January 1995 to December 1996, whereby the said panel would lapse. It was agreed that the vacancies falls upto 31.3.1997 shall be filled before the empanelled list is allowed to lapse. Thus, the claim of the Workman to the post of permanent non-messenger in the Respondent management was subject to the availability of the sanctioned post and vacancies arising upto 31.3.1997. The workmen given chance to the permanent post were seniors in number of working days in panel list and Workman herein was junior to those workmen. Therefore, Workman could not be given absorption to permanent post being junior to other workmen in the panel list.

39. In this context the Workman witness WW1 was cross examined by the Respondent counsel and in the cross examination the witness WW1 states:-

"I applied in response to an advertisement issued by the bank and my name was included in the panel of 1992 non-messengers. .... Further, witness states, *The panels were prepared basing upon the number of days of service put in by the temporary employees. The temporary employees who were included in the panel were given regular appointment as per settlements in order of their seniority ....* Further witness states, *"I am not having any documents to show that any of my juniors are continuing in service."*

Thus, from the above statement of the Workman witness WW1 it is clear that the panel was prepared in terms of various settlements entered into between Staff Federation of State Bank of India and State Bank of India and it was prepared on the basis of number of days of work put in by the temporary employees. Further, the Workman herself admitted that some of the temporary employees whose names were included in the panel were given regular appointment in the bank in order of their seniority in the panel and she is not having any document to show that any person who worked for less number of days than the Workman was given appointment in the bank. Therefore, the allegation of the Workman that the regular appointment has been made by the bank from the panel list in breach of the terms of the settlement and violation of seniority of panel list is not proved by this evidence of WW1. Thus, there is no evidence on record that bank has given the appointment to the temporary employees as well as daily wagers from the panel list 1989 and 1992 in breach of seniority of the temporary employees in the list. There is no evidence of jumbling in the panel list to make appointment of any permanent Workman in breach of the seniority. Therefore, I am constrained to hold that the Respondent Management has appointed the workmen from panel list in order of seniority and there is no jumbling of workmen in the panel list before it got lapsed on 31.3.1997.

40. However, Workman has taken the plea that the panels of Workmen for absorption in the employment of the Respondent banks (panels of temporary employees and daily wagers) has been lapsed on 31.3.1997 in contravention of terms of settlement as the object of preparing the entire empanelment of temporary and daily wagers was to provide them permanent employment and till the both the panel lists exhausted the panel list cannot be lapsed on 31.3.1997 and the date of lapsing of the panel on 31.3.1997 has been fixed by the Respondent arbitrarily without any authority.

41. In this context, the perusal of Settlement dated 30.7.1996 reveals that the 5th Settlement dated 30.7.1996 was entered under Section 2(p) and 18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Dispute (Central) Rules 1957. This settlement has been entered into by the competent parties and in this settlement parties thereto agreed that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees will lapse on 31.3.1997. Thus the date of lapse of panel was fixed by both the parties with consensus under the settlement dated 30.7.1996 and same is binding upon the Workman under the provision of Section 18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947. Moreover, this issue of binding force of the settlement dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988 and 9.1.1991 has already been discussed, decided at finding in Point No.I of this award. However, the legality and validity of the aforementioned settlement has not been challenged by the Workman before any competent forum. Thus, claim of Workman that the date of lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997 has been fixed arbitrarily by the Respondent bank is untenable. As regard the claim of Workman for her absorption to the permanent post it is settled law that the Workman can not claim her regularization to permanent post merely on the basis of number of working days.

42. In this context the reference of the decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Oil and Natural Gas Corporation vs Krishan Gopal 2020(3) SCALE 272, date of decision 7.2.2020** is relevant

therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have has laid down principle regarding regularization of the Workman on permanent posts. Hon'ble Supreme Court have laid down the prepositions of regularization of the workmen to permanent post is as under:-

"*(i) Wide as they are, the powers of the Labour Court and the Industrial Court cannot extend to a direction to order regularisation, where such a direction would in the context of public employment offend the provisions contained in Article 14 of the Constitution;*

(ii) The statutory power of the Labour Court or Industrial Court to grant relief to workmen including the status of permanency continues to exist in circumstances where the employer has indulged in an unfair labour practice by not filling up permanent posts even though such posts are available and by continuing to employ workmen as temporary or daily wage employees despite their performing the same work as regular workmen on lower wages;

(iii) The power to create permanent or sanctioned posts lies outside the judicial domain and where no posts are available, a direction to grant regularisation would be impermissible merely on the basis of the number of years of service;

(iv) Where an employer has regularised similarly situated workmen either in a scheme or otherwise, it would be open to workmen who have been deprived of the same benefit at par with the workmen who have been regularised to make a complaint before the Labour or Industrial Court, since the deprivation of the benefit would amount to a violation of Article 14; and

(v) In order to constitute an unfair labour practice under Section 2(ra) read with Item 10 of the Vth Schedule of the ID Act, the employer should be engaging workmen as badlis, temporaries or casuals, and continuing them for years, with the object of depriving them of the benefits payable to permanent workmen.

Thus, in view of the principles laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court as discussed above, in the instant matter the Workman utterly failed to prove her claim by adducing any documentary or oral evidence that the employer has indulged in unfair labour practice by not filling the permanent posts even though such posts are available and by continuing to employ workmen as temporary or daily wage employees despite their performance was the same work, as regular workmen on lower wages.

43. Respondent has contended that all the vacancies exist and arise upto 31.3.1997 has been filled up from the panel list in order of seniority and no vacancy exists or arises as on 31.3.1997 remained unfilled. Further, it is contended that as per terms of settlement the life of panel lists has been lapsed on 31.3.1997, hence, there is no occasion to extend the life of panel lists beyond 31.3.1997. However, the workman failed to prove contrary by any evidence to the aforesaid contention of the Respondent that the vacancies were existing as on 31.3.1997 and the workman was not given absorption to the permanent post in order of her seniority. It is settled law that the power to create permanent or sanctioned post lies outside the judicial domain and where no posts are available, a direction to grant regularization would be impermissible merely on the basis of the number of years of service. Therefore, the claim of the workman on this ground also not acceptable.

44. Further, as per the of settlement, panel was prepared for absorption of the workmen on the permanent posts has already been lapsed on 31.3.1997 and the vacancies existing and arising upto 31.12.1994 and upto 31.3.1997 as settlement dated 30.7.1996 has been filled up from the panel by appointing the workmen as per seniority in the panel list. Workman witness WW1 in her cross examination has herself admitted this fact that, some of the temporary employees whose names were included in the panel were given regular appointment in the bank in order of their seniority in the panel. The Workman

failed to show that there was any breach of terms of settlement has been committed by the Respondent in appointment to permanent post from aforesaid panel list.

45. As discussed in preceding paragraph of this Award, the life of the panel has not been extended beyond 31.3.1997, by any further settlement hence, the panel list in which name of the Workman was included got expired on 31.3.1997. It is not the case of the Workman that Respondent has regularized similarly situated workmen either in the scheme or otherwise and the Workman has been deprived of same benefit on par with those workmen or the vacancies remained unfilled on the date of lapse of panels i.e., 31.3.1997, Industrial Tribunal has no jurisdiction to extend the date of lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997. This Tribunal can not order for regularization of workmen to the permanent post in contravention of the provision of Article 14 of the Constitution of India.

In the case of **Mahboob Deepak vs. Nagar Panchayat Gajraula & Anr, Civil Appeal No.5875/2007 date of judgement 13.12.2007,** Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

"8. Respondent is a Local Authority. The terms and conditions of employment of the employees are governed by a statute and statutory rules. No appointment can be made by a Local Authority without following the provisions of the recruitment rules. Any appointment made in violation of the said rules as also the constitutional scheme of equality as contained in Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India would be a nullity.

9. Due to some exigency of work, although recruitment on daily wages or on an ad hoc basis was permissible, but by reason thereof an employee cannot claim any right to be permanently absorbed in service or made permanent in absence of any statute or statutory rules. Merely because an employee has completed 240 days of work in a year preceding the date of retrenchment, the same would not mean that his services were liable to be regularized."

Therefore, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, the claim of the Workman for absorption merely on the basis of number of day of work in the Respondent bank Branch is not acceptable. As regard plea of the Workman that the Workman should have been given employment even after 31.3.1997 as temporary Workman, it is the discretion of Respondent to engage the Workman depending upon availability of work and this Tribunal can not direct the Respondent to engage the Workman in the absent of such rule/scheme.

46. In view of principle laid down by Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above, in the instant matter Workman utterly failed to establish the fact of rendering continuous service for a period of 240 days of service within a period of 12 calendar months commencing and coming backward from relevant date i.e., the date of retrenchment, if has she would be denied to be in continuous service for a period of one year. Therefore, the provision contained under Sec.25F of retrenchment is not applicable to Workman.

Counsel for Workman has relied upon number of decisions of Hon'ble High Court and Hon'ble Supreme Court and few of them are discussed herein:-

In the case of **F.C.I., vs. Kamdhenu Cattle Feed Industries 1993 (1) SCC 71,** therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

"7. In contractual sphere as in all other State actions, the State and all its instrumentalities have to conform to Article 14 of the Constitution of which non-arbitrariness is a significant facet. There is no unfettered discretion in public law: A public authority possesses powers only to use them for public good. This impose the duty to act fairly and to adopt a procedure which is `fairplay in action'. Due observance of

this obligation as a part of good administration raises a reasonable or legitimate expectation in every citizen to be treated fairly in his interaction with the State and its instrumentalities, with this element forming a necessary component of the decision making process in all State actions. To satisfy this requirement of non- arbitrariness in a State action, it is, therefore, necessary to consider and give due weight to the reasonable or legitimate expectations of the persons likely lo be affected by the decision or else that unfairness in the exercise of the power may amount to an abuse or excess of power apart from affecting the bona fides of the decision in a given case. The decision so made would be exposed to challenge on the ground of arbitrariness. Rule of law does not completely eliminate discretion in the exercise of power, as it is unrealistic, but providers for control of its exercise by judicial review."

In the case of **State Bank of India, R.O., Vijayawada vs. Industrial Tribunal, Hyderabad WP No.193/1997,** therein Hon'ble High Court have held,

"*Sri Krovvidi Narasimham, the learned counsel for the 2nd respondent contends, supporting the award that it was a permanent vacancy and even though the 2nd respondent was appointed on temporary basis, his services were not liable to be terminated and he was to be regularised into service on permanent basis. Shastry award warrants that no temporary appointment can be made to a permanent post. But the matter is now covered by two division bench judgements dated 28.11.1986 in W.A. No.791 of 1986 and 25.8.1987 in W.A. No.270 of 1982. The ratio decided in the two judgements is to the effect that there cannot be any mandate to appoint employees on permanent basis when the requirement was for appointment on temporary basis. But it is held in the said judgements that when a temporary appointee is ousted from service and not for misconduct and, if again temporary appointment is to be made, then, the case of such temporary appointee who was ousted, has got to be considered in accordance with Sec. 25-H of the Act."*

In the case of **State of Haryana and others vs. Piara Singh and others. 1992 (4) SCC 118,** therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

" 49. If for any reason an adhoc or temporary employee is continued for a fairly long spell, the authorities must consider his case for regularization provided he is eligible and qualified according to the rules and his service record is satisfactory and his appointment does not run counter to the reservation policy of the state."

In the above cited judgements by the Workman the facts of the case are different hence do not apply to instant case of Workman.

47. On the other hand, in support of his contention Respondent has examined witness MW1 and MW1 in chief examination states that, Settlements i.e., on 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988, 9.1.1991 were entered into between the SBI and SBI Staff Federation for filling up of the vacancies that arise up to 1994 for those temporary employees who has worked on scale wages. Further, MW1 states that two different panels for messengers and non-messengers as per the eligibility criteria prescribed by the bank. There are four modules in Andhra Pradesh and they are Hyderabad, Tirupathi, Vijayawada and Visakhapatnam. MW1 states that the temporary employees so empanelled were given permanent absorption depending upon the vacancies so arise strictly in terms of the settlement. MW1 states that on 9.6.1995 conciliation proceeding was held before the RLC(C), Hyderabad and in said proceedings it was decided that the panels will be kept live up to 31.3.1997 and vacancies will be filled from both the lists concurrently. A copy of the said minutes of proceedings is Ex.M5. Further, MW1 states that on 30.7.1996 another settlement was entered between the SBI and All India SBI Staff Federation providing for filling up of the vacancies arising up to December 1994 in respect of subordinate cadre and daily wage /casual wage employees out of panel

so prepared were to be considered against vacancies arising from January 1995 to December 1996, thereafter the said panels lapse. MW1 states that it was also agreed that all the non- messenger positions in subordinate cadre including part time attendants specially provided as leave reserve will be filled before 31.3.1997 and as regards to non-messengerial positions it is agreed that all such posts sanctioned and fallen vacant up to 31.3.1997 shall be filled before the empanelled list is allowed to lapse. Thus in both the cases empanelled list were lapsed on 1.4.1997. Ex.M6 is the copy of the settlement dated 30.7.1996. Further, witness states that on 27.2.1997 a memorandum of understanding was reached between the SBI and SBI Staff Federation providing that both the panels above mentioned will lapse on 31.3.1997. Ex.M7 is the copy of the memorandum of understanding and Ex.M8 is the copy of the statements giving the particulars of 1989 non-messenger panel, Ex.M9 is the copy of the statement of 1989 non- messenger panel, Ex.M10 is the copy of statement of 1992 panel. Further, witness states that petitioner was included in the 1989 panel. As the existing vacancies at that time were exhausted and her turn did not come she could not be given permanent employment in the bank as per the agreements. All the appointments were made strictly in accordance with the settlements reached from time to time between SBI and SBI staff federation and as per seniority, number of days of temporary service put in by them in the bank in the given period. Further, MW1 states petitioner was not sponsored by any employment exchange she did not undergo the regular process of selection required for appointment as a regular non-messenger the petitioner has not worked for 240 days in any year in her entire temporary service in the bank. The petitioner and other temporary employees were terminated from service by the bank. Further, MW1 states that the vacancies were filled up on regular basis with the temporary employees from the panels and these panels were expired in terms of the settlements so reached and there were no vacancies to absorb such employees. Thus, witness MW1 has proved the documents Ex.M1 to Ex.M12 and also contentions made in the counter. However, MW1 was cross examined by the Petitioner Counsel. But nothing has been elicited in his cross examination so as to discredit the testimony of the witness MW1 as regards the date of lapse of both the panels on 31.3.1997 and reasons assigned for non-absorption of the Petitioner from the panel list to the permanent post. Moreover the witness MW1 was re-examined by the Respondent and the witness MW1 states that panels were expired in terms of the settlements and absorptions to the extent of the available vacancies were made. There was no termination of any temporary messenger as such but their services were not utilized after the cut off date as the available vacancies were already filled up and most of these Petitioners were not in the service of the bank as on the date of the expiry date of the panels. Therefore, in view of the aforesaid testimony of the MW1 in re-examination in the absence of cross examination remained uncontraverted, the claim of the Workman that she was entitled for absorption in permanent post in the branch of Respondent Management on the basis of panel list is found not established.

This point is answered against the Workman.

48. **Point No.IV**:- In view of the discussion and finding given at Point Nos. I, II and III, the Workman is not entitled for any relief and claim statement of Workman sans merit and liable to be dismissed.

This Point is answered accordingly.

AWARD

In view of the fore gone discussion, it is held that the action of the Respondent bank in terminating the services of Smt. Lal Bee, Ex. Messenger by way of oral orders w.e.f. 31.3.1997 is justified. Hence, the Petitioner is not entitled for any relief as prayed for. The claim statement filed by Workman sans merit, hence, dismissed. Reference is answered accordingly.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, Personal Assistant, transcribed by her, corrected and signed by me on this the 7th day of May, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner	Witnesses examined for the Respondent
WW1: Smt. Lal Bee	MW1: Sri Aluru Rama Rao

Documents marked for the Petitioner

Ex.W1:	Photocopy of notification
Ex.W2:	Photocopy of interview call letter
Ex.W3:	Photocopy of panel list
Ex.W4:	Photocopy of service certificate
Ex.W5:	Photocopy of Service certificate

Documents marked for the Respondent

Ex.M1:	Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.17.11.87
Ex.M2:	Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.16.7.88
Ex.M3:	Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.27.10.1988
Ex.M4:	Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.9.1.1991
Ex.M5:	Photocopy of conciliation proceedings before the Regional Labour Commissioner(C) dt.9.6.1995
Ex.M6:	Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.30.7.1996
Ex.M7:	Photocopy of Memorandum of understanding dt. 27.1.1997
Ex.M8:	Photocopy of statements giving the particulars of 1989 messenger panel.
Ex.M9:	Photocopy of statement of 1989 Non-messenger panel
Ex.M10:	Photocopy of statement of 1992 panel
Ex.M11:	Photocopy of order of Hon'ble High Court in WA No.86/98 dt. 1.5.98
Ex.M12:	Photocopy of order in SLP No.11886-11888 of 1998 dated 10.8.98

नई दिल्ली, 29 जुलाई, 2026

का.आ. 1633.—औघोगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार **सेंट्रल ऑर्डनेन्स डिपो** के प्रबंधतत्र, संबद्ध नियोजको और **जनरल सेक्रेटरी सेंट्रल ऑर्डनेन्स डिपो कर्मचारी यूनियन** के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औघोगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औघोगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय **कानपूर** के पंचाट **(70/2015)** प्रकाशित करती है।

[सं. एल-14011/16/2015-आई.आर (बी- II)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 29th July, 2026

S.O. 1633.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award **(Ref. 70/2015*)*** of the ***Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court Kanpur*** as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of **Central Ordnance Depot** and **The General Secretary COD Karamchari Union.**

[No. L-14011/16/2015–IR (B-II)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT,

KANPUR

ID Case No. 70 of 2015

Present Shri Rajendra Prasad Srivastava, H.J.S (Retd.)

Between:-

The General Secretary COD Karamchari Union,

C.O.D., G.T.Road,

Kanpur(U.P.) - 208013 ……Workman

AND

1. The Commandant,

   Central Ordnance Depot(COD),

   G.T.Road, Kanpur(U.P.) - 208013

2. The Principal,

   Controller of Defence Accounts,

   Cantt., Kanpur(U.P.) - 208004

……Management

Award

09.06.2026

Central Government, MOL, vide notification no. L-14011/16/2015 - IR(DU) dated 11/09/2015 has referred the Industrial Dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication. This award arises in response to the reference made by Government of India, Ministry of Labour department in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub section (2A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947(14 of 1947) the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Kanpur. The Reference is stated as follows:-

'Whether the action of the management of Central Ordnance Depot, Kanpur in not granting equal pay of Shri Arvind Kumar Sharma with retrospective effect i.e. from the date his junior Shri S.C. Mishra has been drawing higher pay is just fair & legal? If not, to what relief the workman concerned is entitled to?'

The averments made by claimant in his claim statement are summarized as follows:-

Claimant workman was initially appointed as a 'Mazdoor' in COD Kanpur on 03/12/1983 in the pay scale of Rs.196-232 payable to the category of Mazdoor. The workman concerned was thereafter elevated for the post of 'Store Keeper', consequent on passing the qualifying All India Competition Test in the scale of Rs.3050-75-3950-80-4590 vide AOC Records Secunderabad Letter No.29884/S.K./AKS/KND/CA-6 dated 01st May 1998. That one of the employee named Shri S. C. Mishra was appointed as a 'Mazdoor' in the scale of Rs.196-232 in the year 1983 and later on he was reclassified to the rank of 'Store Keeper' w.e.f. 16/11/2001 and his scale of pay of Rs. 3050-75-3950-80-4590 and his pay was fixed as on the date Rs.3500 per month. That the workman concerned was promoted to the rank of 'Senior Store Keeper' w.e.f. 01/01/2007 whereas his counterpart Junior Shri S. C. Mishra was promoted as 'Senior Store Keeper' w.e.f. 01/11/2007. The pay of the workman concerned on reclassification was fixed at Rs.7300+2400 Grade Pay while. The pay of Shri S. C. Mishra on his reclassification w.e.f. 01/11/2007 was fixed at Rs.8020+2400 Grade Pay which is much more than what was payable to the workman concerned. It would thus be evident that 'Senior Store Keeper Shri S. C. Mishra who was Junior by 3 Years 6 Months to the workman concerned was drawing more pay than the workman. Therefore, there was an anomaly created in the fixation of pay of the workman concerned due to reason best known to the Opposite Parties. That the workman concerned has thus been discriminated in grant to pay equal to his junior, accordingly the same was violative of Articles 14 & 16 of the Constitution of India, which guaranteed equality and equal opportunity in the matter of public employment. That the workman concerned has been representing his case for removal of anomaly by stepping up his pay equal to that of his Junior many times. The Opposite Party turned down the case on flimsy grounds and has denied justice to the workman. That despite repeated applications, the opposite party have not granted justice to the workman concerned. The workman concerned continues to suffer financially and socially due to failure of the statutory duty of the Opposite Party in removing the anomaly and granting of equal pay to the workman to that of his Junior. Inspite of the fact that the workman concerned was Senior to him. That the workman concerned is entitled to get atleast equal pay to that of his Junior if not more than him though both were performing the same duties. That there was an anomaly in existence dispute between the workman

concerned and his junior counterpart workers in the opposite parties within the meaning of Industrial Dispute Act, 1947, which merits to be removed by this Hon'ble Tribunal by fixing the pay of 'Senior Store Keeper'. Finally Claimant workman/union prayed that this Hon'ble Tribunal be pleased to pass an award against the Opposite Parties and in favour of the workman concerned to remove the anomaly in granting to equal pay to the workman with retrospective effect from i.e. w.e.f. 11/05/1998 .

O.P management in his written statement has submitted respectfully which are as follows:-

1. The claimant/ plantiff abused the legal process and facts presented in claim statement are fabricated and misleading and based on concocted story. Hence case of plaintiff has no legal value.

2. Further O.P management stated that there was no discrimination was done or irregularity of any kind in the pay fixation of Shri Arvind Kumar Sharma by the respondent establishment. The claimant, Shri S.C. Mishra was appointed to the post of Laborer on January 31, 1983, whereas Shri Arvind Kumar Sharma was appointed to the post of Laborer on December 03, 1983. Hence, it is obvious that Shri S.C. Mishra is senior to Shri Arvind Kumar Sharma.

4. That Shri Arvind Kumar Sharma is working in the respondent establishment on the post of Senior Material Assistant and accordingly supervises the work of subordinate employees, gets work done by them, and submits reports of their work to his superior officers. Since, the nature of work of Shri Arvind Kumar Sharma is supervisory hence he does not fall within the definition of a workman.

5. That the Central Administrative Tribunal (C.A.T) has been established for the resolution of service-related disputes of the supervisory employees of the respondent establishment. In such a situation the case fall outside the ambit of this Tribunal and have no jurisdiction to hear and decide this dispute.

6. The claimant Arvind Kumar Sharma had joined the establishment as a labourer on 3.12.1983. Later in May, 1998 under re- classification he was promoted to store keeper from Labour and his salary fixed as 3125/- as per pay scale of 3050-4590. He failed to avail benefits of ACP, came into force from 09.08.1999 which an employee availed after completion of service of 12 and 24 years, as claimant already promoted to the post of store Keeper as with his agreement . On 1 January 2007 he promoted to senior store Keeper and his salary was fixed to Rs 4000/- as per pay scale of 4000-100-6000. On 1 July 2014 was promoted to post of store superintendent and as per present pay scale of 9300-34800+Grade pay 4200 his salary was fixed to 11460+Pay Grade 4200= 15660.

9. The appointment of Shri S.C. Mishra was made on the post of Laborer on January 31, 1983 in the respondent establishment. At completion of 12 years of continuous service, he was given the benefit of the 1st ACP with effect from January 01, 2000, under which his salary was fixed at ₹3300 in the pay scale of 2650-65-3300-70-4000. Whereas on January 01, 2001, Shri S.C. Mishra was made a Store Keeper from Laborer. Accordingly, his salary was fixed at ₹3425/- under the pay scale of 3050-4590. On November 1, 2007, he was promoted from the post of Store Keeper to the post of Senior Store Keeper, and re-fixing his salary, his salary was fixed at ₹7780 + Grade Pay ₹1900 = ₹9680 under the pay scale of 4000-1000-6000, which was later changed to ₹8070 + Grade

Pay ₹2400 = ₹10470. On January 31, 2013, Shri S.C. Mishra was given the benefit of Financial Upgradation under the 3rd MACP as per government orders, under which his salary was fixed from ₹9770 + Grade Pay ₹2400 = ₹12170 to ₹10520 + Grade Pay ₹2800 = ₹13320. At present, the salary of Shri S.C. Mishra is ₹11770 + Grade Pay ₹2800 = ₹14570, and Shri Mishra is working on the post of Material Assistant.

10. That the present Grade Pay of Shri Arvind Kumar Sharma is fixed at ₹4200/-, whereas the Grade Pay of Shri Mishra is fixed at ₹2800/- only. From this, it is crystal clear that the pay scale of Shri Mishra is less than that of Shri Sharma.

11. O.P management humbly requested that on the basis of the facts stated above, the reference under question may kindly be dismissed.

The main question in this reference is as follow:-

'Whether the action of the management of Central Ordnance Depot, Kanpur in not granting equal pay of Shri Arvind Kumar Sharma with retrospective effect i.e. from the date his junior Shri S.C. Mishra has been drawing higher pay is just fair & legal? If not, to what relief the workman concerned is entitled to?'

From record filed by claimant workman/union, it is found out that claimant joined O.P establishment in year 03/12/1983 as mazdoor. Later on 1st May 1998 he promoted to store Keeper. Claimant petitioner alleged a junior Shri S.C Mishra who is junior by 3 years and 6 month than claimant is drawing more salary than him. Therefore, there was an anomaly created in the fixation of pay of the workman concerned. Further It is alleged by claimant that O.P establishment discriminated in grant to pay equal to his junior and prayed to this tribunal removal of anomaly.

While O.P management in his written statement stated that claimant service is of managerial nature hence his case should not be entertained by this tribunal. It also mentioned that present salary of claimant is 42000 and while the salary of Shri SC Mishra is 28000/- hence it is very clear that there is not any discrepancy and hence his case should be dismissed.

On perusal of record it is found that claimant was given several opportunities to file the rejoinder but he failed to appear on mentioned dates. On 20.03.2026 he was given one last opportunity to appear and file rejoinder and date is fixed for 9/06/2026. On 9.06.2026 he failed to appear and case is reserved for award.

Because applicant is not coming to court for long time as discussed above. He failed to file rejoinder or any documentary written/oral evidence in support of his claim.

In view of foregoing above discussions and findings, answered in the negative.

Answered Accordingly.

Parties are left to bear their respective costs.

Date: 09.06.2026 RAJENDRA PRASAD SRIVASTAVA, H.J.S. (Retd.), Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 29 जुलाई, 2026

का.आ. 1634.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एस बी आई भारत का के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजको और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में **केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण–सह–श्रम न्यायालय,** हैदराबाद के पंचाट **(सन्दर्भ संख्या 147/2002)** को प्रकाशित करती है,

[सं. एल-12012/48/2000-आई.आर (बी- I)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 29th July, 2026

S.O. 1634.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Reference. I.D. No. 147/2002) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Hyderabad as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the Management of SBI of India and their workmen,

[No. L-12012/48/2000–IR (B-I)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

In The Central Government Industrial Tribunal Cum Labour Court At Hyderabad

Present: **Sri IRFAN QAMAR**

Presiding Officer

Dated the 11th day of May, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. 147/2002

[Old ID No.59/2000 of Industrial Tribunal No.I, Hyderabad]

Between:

Sri N. Yerranna,

S/o Laxmaiah,

Mettupalli (PO)

OWK(Mandal),

Dist. Kurnool(A.P)

… Petitioner

And

The General Manager,

State Bank of India,

Local Head Office,

Bank Street,

Hyderabad.

Appearances:

For the Petitioner : Sri Macherla Rangaiah, Advocate

For the Respondent: Sri Y. Ranjeeth Reddy, Advocate

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-12012/48/2000-IR(B.I) dated 13.07.2000 referred the following dispute under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 to Industrial Tribunal No.I, Hyderabad for adjudication and later the same has been transferred to this Tribunal bearing ID No.59/2000, as per orders of Central Government vide Lr.No.H-11026/1/2001-IR(C.II) dated 18.10.2001, requiring this forum to decide the question:

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of State Bank of India, Banaganpalle Branch in terminating Sri N. Yerranna, Messenger, from the services of the Bank by way of oral orders w.e.f. 31.3.1997 is justified? If not, what relief he is entitled to?"

After receipt of the reference, it was numbered as ID No. 147/2002 and notices were issued to both the Workman and the management.

2. Before unfolding the factual matrix of the instant industrial dispute it would be apposite to have a bird eye view of a chequered history of the instant industrial dispute. Earlier instant industrial dispute along with the batch cases was decided by this Tribunal vide common award dated 17.5.2005 and the reference was answered in favour of the Respondent and against the Workman. That said common award dated 17.5.2005 was challenged by the aggrieved Workmen in various Writ petition No.6470/2014 along with batch of writ petitions before the Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh and Hon'ble High Court vide its' judgement dated 23.6.2014 allowed all batch of writ petitions and set aside the common award dated 17.5.2005 passed in ID No.222 of 2001 and other batch of ID cases by Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad and the Respondent management of State Bank of India was directed to reengage the Writ Petitioners in position, which they have been occupying prior to their termination and further directed to consider their cases for regularization as and when the substantive vacancy arises. This judgement dated 23.6.2014 of Hon'ble High Court of AP, passed in WP No.6470/2014 and batch petitions was challenged by Respondent management before the Hon'ble High Court in Writ Appeal No. 1268 of 2014. The aforesaid Writ Appeals No.1268/2014 and other Writ Appeals were decided by Division Bench of High Court of Andhra Pradesh by a common judgement dated 20.3.2019. Hon'ble High Court in aforesaid Writ Appeal was pleased to pass the order which is extracted as below:-

" 7. Hearing the learned senior counsel for the SBI and the learned senior counsel for the contesting unofficial Respondents, we see that while the learned single Judge was justified in setting aside the award af the Tribunal, the proper course to be adopted was to remit all the cases to the Tribunal. This we say for reasons more than one. Firstly, in such matters, claims have to be decided on individual basis, as different persons have different claims as to the length of officiation or discharge of duties and functions; quality of engagement, drawings, accounting of the post for each one of them, who have worked etc. AIl these issues will not be the same in all the cases. Therefore, each case ought to have been directed to be decided by the Tribunal afresh on individual basis. The second and most important aspect is the learned single Judge has in one go ordered re-employment of all the workmen. This is not a relief that could have been granted

without answering the individual issues; each issue relating to each case could not have been decided by the writ Court within the format of its adjudication procedures and scope. The adjudicating body, which has to do that activity, is the Industrial Tribunal. Therefore, we are of the view that while we would sustain the order of the learned singe Judge insofar as it interfered and sets aside the award of the Tribunal, the further findings and directions, issued through the impugned order have to go and the individual cases have to be sent back for consideration of the Tribunal. Such further procedure before the Tribunal will have to be carried forward with the materials already on record and also by affording an opportunity to the persons, who have claims as well as the management to place their rival contentions and further material before the Tribunal. The learned counsel appearing for the workmen are justified in pointing out that enormous delay has already happened and further action by the Tribunal in this line may be expedited.

9. In the result, these writ appeals are ordered;

(1) affirming the impugned common order of the learned single Judge to the extent it sets aside the common award dated 17.05.2005 of the Industrial Tribunal;

(2) the further findings and directions issued through the impugned common order are vacated:

(3) all the matters shall be remitted to the Industrial Tribunal with a direction to dispose of them within an outer limit of five (5) months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order; and,

(4) the parties to make appearance before the Tribunal on the given date."

Thus, in view of the above direction of Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh in W.A.No.1268 of 2014 and batch cases. This Tribunal has taken up the matter of industrial dispute for hearing and deciding it afresh in view of the aforesaid guidelines laid down by the Hon'ble High Court in Writ Appeal No.1268/2014 vide judgement dated 20.3.019.

3. The factual matrix of instant industrial dispute as narrated by the Workman in his claim statement are that, the Workman joined in the service of the management institution as Messenger from 1988 to 1997, and has rendered unblemished service spreading over a period of about 10 years. The Respondent has terminated services of Workman by oral orders with effect from 1.4.1997. Further, it is submitted that the management of Respondent bank decided to give a chance to temporarily employed personnel "found suitable for permanent appointment" by wait- listing them by offering permanent appointment or waitlisting till such opportunity arises.

4. That on 17.11.1987 a settlement was reached between All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and the Management of State Bank of India - settlement one, under this settlement three categories of employees were listed. That is, A) those who have completed 240 days in 12 months or less after 1.7.1975. B) those who have completed 270 days in any continuous block of 36 calendar months after 1.7.1975. C) (i) those who have completed minimum of 30 days aggregate temporary service in any calendar year after 1.7.1975 or (ii) 70 days aggregate temporary service in continuous block of 36 months after 1.7.1975.

5. The persons who satisfied in all the above 4 categories were to be interviewed by a selection committee and the said selection committee would determine the suitability of the said candidate for permanent appointment. Therefore, the bank prescribed certain qualifications and from among the candidates satisfying the qualifications the suitable candidates were enlisted by a selection committee. The Clause 7 of the said agreement provided with the selected candidate would be wait listed in order of their

respective categorization and the selected panel would be valid upto December, 1991. Clause 10 of the settlement specifically provided that henceforth. "there will be no temporary appointments in the subordinate cadre", except on a restrictive basis in the specified category, "from amongst empanelled candidates as per existing guidelines of the bank". The Workman further submits that consequent upon the said agreement and the draft, a notification was issued in the newspapers. The last date for responding to the advertisement was 30.8.1988. A written examination followed by viva-voce in May, 1989 was held. A selected panel was prepared, as per Clause 7 of the agreement, ie. Settlement No.1, the selected panel was to be valid upto December, 1991, the Workman submits that circular was issued on 26.4.91 by the said letter it is mentioned that the terms of the agreement dated 17.11.87 was modified vide second agreement dated 16.7.88 was entered into between the parties. In terms of the said agreement a chance was to be given, "to all eligible temporary employees for permanent appointments. The appointments were against the vacancies likely to arise during the years 1995-96, circular made it clear that in view of the enormity of the problem an extension of the currency of the panel, eligible temporary employees who have been empanelled could not appear in the earlier interviews and have been pursuing their cases thereafter, "will be given another chance to appear for interview".

6. Workman submits that there were total five settlements. The settlement dated 17.11.87 is the 1st settlement (Ex M1), settlement dated 16.7.88 is 2nd settlement (Ex M2), settlement dated 27.10.88 is the 3rd settlement (Ex M3), then settlement dated 9.1.91 is 4th settlement and settlement dated 30.7.96 is 5th settlement (Ex M6). In between there is minutes of conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.95 marked as Ex M5. That due to all these settlements which were extended by subsequent settlements thereby created reasonable expectations in the list of the selected candidates arose with that it's a question of time their appointments or services would be regularized in the services of the bank. The Workman was working with the bank on temporary basis was under the bonafide hope that sooner his services will be regularized with the bank. He is thereby closed all his options elsewhere. It is needless to point out that employing person to whom hope of employment in substantial terms was made is a facet of Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

7. Further Workman submits that the Government of India issued Circular No. F-3/3/104/87-IR, dated 16.8.1990. Under said circular the chief Executives of all public sector banks including the Management herein were specifically instructed that until the problem of existing temporary employees is fully resolved, no bank is permitted to make any permanent appointments. That some of the persons similarly situated like this Workman aggrieved by the inaction on the part of the management of the bank is not regularizing their services from out of the selected panel and not clearly focusing the vacancy position, filed W.P. No. 4194/97 before Hon'ble High court of A.P.. It is specifically averred in the said writ petition that the Management of the bank had failed to implement the settlement and that it violates the various fundamental rights guaranteed under the constitution of India. The Hon'ble High court of A.P .. by order dated 5.3.97 directed the bank to implement the settlement as amended from time to time. It also directed the bank to carry out the terms of settlement before the expiry of March, 1997. The Hon'ble High Court also recorded finding that the Bank cannot escape its liability of enforcement of the Settlement. In view of the directions given by the High Court all candidates whose names appeared in the select panels prepared on the basis of the agreement entered into on 17.11.87 under which the panel was valid upto December, 1991, and on the basis of a settlement dated 27.10.1988 whereby the panels were made alive upto 31.3.1997 under which the panel was valid upto December, 1999. The other agreement dated 16.7.1988 under which the panel was valid upto 1992 and on the basis of the settlement dated 27.10.1998 whereby the panels were made alive upto 31.3.1997 were under the bonafide impression that their cases

will be considered for regularization and were living on the basis of the said reasonable expectation. Unfortunately, contrary to the aforesaid directions given by the High Court and contrary to the settlements entered into between the parties, the bank issued proceedings dated 25.3.1997, dated 27.3.1997 and 31.3.1997 instructing the various authorities of the Management not to continue the temporary employees those who are in services of the bank from 1.4.97. The said order was followed by the Management. Aggrieved by the said action the Workman herein and similarly situated candidates have filed a writ petition before the Hon'ble High Court and by way of Writ Petition No.9206/97 seeking a declaration that the proceedings issued by the Deputy General Manager and the Assistant General Manager (Respondents 3,4 and 5 therein) on 25.3.97, 27.3.97 and 31.3.97 as illegal and also non-continuance of the Workmen therein in service by absorbing them in the services of the bank as violative of Section 2(p) and 18(1) read with Rule 58 of Central Rules and sought for specific direction to the bank to absorb them in service.

8. Further, Workman submits that in the counter affidavit filed in Writ Petition No.9206/97, the bank has submitted that it has about 805 branches in Andhra Pradesh alone. It has stated that due to exigencies of circumstances and on account of the urgent need in its banks, it employed temporary employees in subordinate cadre. It is pertinent to mention that it does not state the urgent or need or the nature of temporary employees that it had engaged. Enquiry into the same would reveal that the stand taken by the bank either on the ground of urgent need or of temporary employees is a façade to perpetuate unfair labour practice. It is designed to on the one hand, keep the employed in the erroneous zone of hope and on the other to ensure that benefits that a model employer will extend under various statutes to its employees is not required to be borne out by the bank. A reading of the counter affidavit would show that the bank would opines that being just fair and reasonable are which obviously is reprehensible and is a facet of unfair labour practice.

9. The Workman submits that the bank had referred in its counter affidavit to three settlements dated 17.11.87, 16.7.88 and 27.10.88. The bank in the guise of extending the benefits of the circular of Government dated 16.8.90 stated in its counter affidavit that as follows:

"Government of India, vide its letter dated 16.8.1990, issued guidelines to all the public sector banks with regard to recruitment and absorption of temporary employees in public sector banks. The said guidelines were issued to implement on the lines of the approach paper on the issue provided by a committee constituted in this regard. The Government of India guidelines made it clear that all the public sector banks may follow the provisions laid down in the approach paper.

The approach paper specified that the cases of temporary employees who had put in not less than 240 days of temporary service in 12 consecutive Months and who are entitled to benefit of Section 25-F may be decided by entering into a settlement with the representative union. In respect of temporary employees who had put in less than 240 days of service in 12 consecutive months or less, a settlement could be avoided and however if the Management so desired, they could enter into a conciliation settlement with the representative union. Para 6(h), it is mentioned that only those temporary employees who had put in temporary service of 90 or more days after 1.1 1982 would be eligible for considering under the scheme. Although the Government guidelines envisaged for a settlement in respect of employees who had put in temporary service of 90 or more days, the bank by way of further concession entered into settlements Even in respect of those who had put in less than 90 days. As such, it could be Seen that the settlements are more beneficial to the temporary employees concerned. The approach paper also specify at para 6(c) that the banks would provide one time opportunity to all the temporary employees and for that purpose temporary employees worked in the bank on or after 1.1.1982 could be considered for re-employment in terms of the

scheme. The Respondents have gone further wherein even persons working after 1975 were also considered.

As could be seen from the above, there was a genuine effort on the part of the Respondent bank to provide permanent employment for as many as possible subject to availability of the vacancies.

It is further submitted that at para 6(k) of the approach paper, it was made clear that this would be one time exercise in full and final settlement of all the aims and disputes for the past period in respect of temporary workmen covered by the settlement. This would mean that the Government of India guidelines would cover only those persons who were temporarily employed for the period specified therein and not otherwise. As such, it is submitted that the Respondents have not only followed the Government of India guidelines but in fact covered cases of the employees who had worked for less than 90 days. As such, question of violation does not arise and in any case those were only broad guidelines and not directives".

10. The Workman submits that the bank also referred a subsequent settlement dated 9.1.1991 wherein there is a clause to the effect- that the panel of temporary employees and the panel of daily wage employees will be operated to a particular period. Therefore, their cases will not be considered. The Management herein relying upon this settlement in their impugned action. It is submitted that even the settlement dated 9.1.1991 will not empower the management to terminate the services of the temporary employees who are working in the bank services like the Workman herein as it does not specify the termination of the employees. In fact there are so many vacancies wherein the Management has engaged several new persons as temporary messengers/ attendars/ sweepers etc., even after the judgment of Hon'ble High Court without considering the cases of the similarly situated candidates like the Workman herein. It is submitted inspite of engaging fresh candidates as is now being done by the Management they would have continued the similarly situated candidates like the Workman herein in the services of the bank and consider their cases for absorption in view of the circulars issued by Central Government as well as the directions of this Hon'ble Court in Writ Petition No.4194/97, dated 5.3.97. In view of the circulars issued by the Central Government, the Management should not have relied upon the settlement dated 9.1.1991. Hence, the impugned action of the Management is illegal, unjust, violative of fundamental rights such as Articles 14,16 and 21 of the Constitution of India.

11. The Workman submits that in W.P. No.4194/97 filed by the union of temporary employees where in they have complained about the non- implementation of the settlements arrived between the parties and sought for absorption. Such employees in the bank services on permanent basis before the date fixed for carrying out the terms of settlement, the Court held that the members of the union had been empanelled in the list, they were not regularized and the time was going to run out to the near future and the Respondent bank and its officers cannot escape from the liability of enforcing the settlement which has been reached and therefore directed that the bank and the officers shall implement the settlement dated 17.11.87 as amended from time to time before the expiry of 31.3.97.

12. Further, it is submitted that in the clause of Settlement it is specifically mentioned that the workmen to be absorbed/appointed in the bank prohibiting any temporary appointments subsequent to the date of settlement even the authorities want to make temporary appointments that should be made only from among the empanelled can be appointed either for temporary vacancy or permanent vacancy except from among the empanelled candidates like the Workman and that should be continued till they are absorbed. The management committed unfair labour practices and terminated the services of the candidates with effect from 1.4.1997 which is arbitrary, discriminatory, contrary to their own guidelines

and violative of the constitutional provisions which are guaranteed in Chapter-III of the Constitution of India.

13. The Workman submits that it is strange as to how the panels were allowed to lapse by a so-called Memorandum of Understanding dated 25.2.1997, that the action of terminating such employees like the Workman by virtue of an impugned oral proceedings without implementing the settlement would be illegal and unfair labour practice which cannot be allowed to be perpetuated. That the discontinuance of the Workman after 31.3.97 who had served in the bank in any capacity amounts to retrenchment. It could not have been done without any notice and it violates Sec.25FF of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and the said action is violative of principles of natural justice guaranteed under Chapter III of the Constitution of India. This amounts to retrenchment without one month's notice and taken in view of such notice. Thus, the main proceedings issued by the Respondent is without jurisdiction and is arbitrary, illegal and therefore liable to be quashed. That the alleged Memorandum of Understanding dated 27.2.97, Ex.M5 does not own any legal entity, as the said Memorandum of Understanding is not published anywhere to brought to the notice of the Workman whose rights are being affected. It is submitted that Management did not adhere to the procedure envisaged by the Central Government in its' instructions dated 16.8.90 in the year 1995. The same was not followed in the year 1997 despite there being vacancies.
The management has followed the procedure of calling candidates through Employment exchange instead of giving chance to the empanelled candidates like the Workman here. It is pertinent to mention here that the Respondent Management sent letters to the all similarly situated candidates like the Workman in the month of June, 1997, subsequent to the passing of impugned termination orders. After knowing the facts that the candidates are litigating, the Management refused to engage these candidates. It is once again reiterated that the panels are meant for absorption but not for termination. It was the duty of the Management to engage the empanelled candidates like the Workman even in temporary vacancies till they are absorbed permanently in regular vacancies. Hence, the action of the Respondent Management terminating the services of the Workman by oral order dated 31.3.97 is unjust, illegal, violative of principles of natural justice and hence, the Management be directed to reinstate and absorb the Workman and to grant all incidental and consequential benefits.

14. Per contra, Respondent had filed counter and made a contentions that the reference is not tenable and contrary to the provisions of I.D. Act, 1947. Respondent submitted that to tide over severe sub-ordinate staff constraints which arose out of leave vacancies, exigencies, etc., and also owning to the restrictions imposed by the Government of India/Reserve Bank of India on intake of staff, the Respondent bank used to engage sub-ordinate staff like messengers, sweepers, sweeper cum water boys, etc., depending on the availability of work on purely temporary basis for the smooth and uninterrupted functioning of the branches. It is submitted that the All India State Bank of India Staff Federation which represents majority of the employees in the State Bank of India comprising about 98% of the work force as its' members espoused the cause of temporary employees who have put in less than 240 days of temporary service in 12 calendar months in the bank and who were ineligible for any protection under Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 to give a chance for being considered for absorption and permanent appointments.

15. Discussions were held and on 17.11.1987 an agreement was signed between the federation and the Management bank under Sec. 2(p) read with Sec 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules 1957. A copy of the said settlement dated 17.11.87 which may be herein after referred as first settlement is filed and 4 categories were made as it has already been mentioned in the claim statement above, it need not be repeated here. In the first settlement, it was agreed

that the temporary employees as categorized would be given a chance for being considered for permanent appointment in the bank's service against the vacancies which are likely to arise during the period 1987 to 1991. On 16.7.88 second settlement was arrived between the Federation and the Bank whereby it was agreed to substitute the period of consideration of vacancies as 1987 to 1992 in place of 1987 to 1991 as contemplated under the first settlement dated 17.11.1987. This is the second settlement. A 3rd settlement was entered into on 27.10.88 and it was agreed that the bank's service against the vacancies likely to arise from 1988 to 1992 was to be considered. Government of India vide its letter dated 16.8.90 issued guidelines to all the public sector banks with regard to recruitment and absorption of temporary employees in public sector banks. The said guidelines were issued to implement on the lines of approach paper on the issue provided by a committee constituted in this regard. Government of India guidelines made it clear that all the public sector banks may follow the provisions laid down in the approach paper. The approach paper specified that the cases of temporary service in 12 consecutive months and who are entitled to benefit of Sec.25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 may be decided by entering into a settlement with the representative union. In respect of temporary employees who had put in less than 240 days of service in 12 consecutive months or less, a settlement could be avoided and however if the Management so desired they could enter into a conciliation settlement with the representative union. In para. 6(h) it is mentioned that only those temporary employees who had put in temporary service of 90 days or more days after 1.1.82 would be eligible for considering under the scheme. Although the Government guidelines envisaged for a settlement in respect of employees who had put in temporary service of 90 days or more days, the bank by way of a further concession entered into settlements. Even in respect of those who had put in less than 90 days and also the bank went a step further and said those persons who are working after 1975 were also considered. Hence, there was a genuine effort on the part of the Respondent bank to provide as many as possible jobs subject to the availability of the vacancies. However, para 6 (k) of the approach paper made it clear that it is a one time, exercise in full and final, settlement of all the claims and disputes for the past period, in respect of temporary workmen covered by the settlement. Another settlement was entered on 9.1.91 herein after referred as 4th settlement and the time limit was extended upto 1994 and separate panel was prepared for temporary employees, casual/daily wagers. It was agreed that while vacancies arising between 1988 to 1994 in respect of temporary employees and in respect of casual/daily wagers, they can be considered for the vacancies arising between 1995-96 only.

16. It is submitted that the administrative set up of the Hyderabad Local Head Office comprises of four Zonal Offices (Zones) at Hyderabad, Vijayawada, Visakhapatnam and Tirupathi covering all the Districts of Andhra Pradesh. In terms of the settlement the Management after following the procedure laid down therein prepared the panels of qualified candidates of temporary employees denoted as 1989 panel and also panel of casual/daily wagers denoted as 1992 panel for giving a chance for being considered for permanent absorption. These panels were prepared zone-wise separately for messengers and non-messengers in the descending order of temporary service put in by the candidates during the stipulated period i.e., 1.7.1975 to 31.7.1988. That the Federation approached the Regional Labour Commissioner(C) for implementation of bi-partite settlement in respect of absorption of temporary employees. The Regional Labour Commissioner(C) conducted conciliation proceedings and an agreement was arrived between the Federation and the bank. It was agreed that it would be kept alive upto March, 1997. A copy of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.2.1995 signed by the parties is filed as material paper. A settlement was arrived at and an agreement was signed between the Federation and the Management bank on 30.7.1996 under Sec.2 (p) read with Sec.18(1) of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957, which is hereinafter called as 5th settlement. That on 27.2.1997 a Memorandum of understanding was also signed by the

federation's affiliate and the bank Management recording the fact that the exercise of identifying the messengerial vacancies as on 31.12.1994 has since been completed by Central Office and thereby 403 messengerial vacancies were sanctioned . It was agreed that these vacancies may be filled from 1989 panel of temporary employees after effecting conversion from full time non-messengerial staff in the usual manner and the agreement was reached accordingly. It was agreed between the Federation's affiliate and the Management bank that in terms of the settlement dated 30.7.1996 both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees would lapse on 31.3.1997. That as agreed upon vacancies were filled from the panels. The Workman who has put in an aggregate temporary service of less than 240 days in a continuous block of 12 months period during 1.7.1975 to 31.7.1988 has no right to seek a direction to consider his candidature for absorption in the Management bank under any rule/law except under the settlement entered into thereon.

17. Respondent contended that, in fact, the case of the Workman can be considered under all the five settlements having got his case considered under provisions of these settlements. All the other provisions and terms of the settlements are also binding on him/her. The Management bank has not violated any of the provisions of the terms of the said settlement. That the very preparation and maintenance of panel is in compliance of the terms agreed under these settlements. These settlements were time bound and they ceased to exist on 31.3.1997. That the bank has never promised that all the candidates in the panel will be absorbed. In the advertisement itself it was made clear that candidates will be considered for absorption in the vacancies that may arise upto 1992. Keeping alive the panels after 31.3.1997 is contrary to the settlements arrived between the State Bank of India Staff Federation and the Management bank. That the settlements are binding on the parties. The Workman is also bound under the terms of the said settlement. The settlement does not suffer from any ambiguity as their language is very clear. The right under the settlements is to give them a chance to be considered for future appointment in the bank's services against the vacancies likely to arise. The settlements were effected to balance the expectations of the temporary employees to be absorbed in permanent service as against the constitutional rights for all eligible persons to be considered for employment every time a vacancy arises. That the alleged dispute including the demand for reinstatement has to be decided in this context. It is submitted that the period of panel list got expired on 31.3.97 and it is an integral term of the settlement and cannot be modified in any proceedings under the law. These temporary employees who unfortunately could not be accommodated for want of vacancies have no further rights to be considered for regularization. That the Hon'ble High Court in WP No.12964/94, held as follows, "It is needless to state that the settlement arrived at between the All India State Bank of India Staff Federation which, is the majority union and the bank Management is binding on the Workmen also. It is not at all the case of the Workman that any of the terms of the settlement has been violated by the bank's Management. If the Workman had worked in the bank on part-time basis before 31.5.94, that itself would not vest in him a right to claim that his services should be regularized on permanent basis against a full time cadre post. The claim put forth by the Workman in the present petition is therefore misconceived and not tenable. However, it is open to the Workman to claim any right which flows from the settlement between the union and the bank Management. As already pointed out that it is not the grievance of the Workman that some right which has flown from the settlement in favour of the Workman has been denied by the bank Management. Therefore, I do not find any ground, let alone substantial ground, to grant the kind of relief sought for by the Workman. Writ Petition fails and is accordingly dismissed. No costs."

18. Further, it is contended that if the panels were not lapsed at the end of designated period and allowed to be continued it would result in making the contracts of temporary employment indirectly

permanent through back door entry, which would not only be contrary to the settlements but also to Articles 14 and 16 of Constitution of India and deprive the chances of original claimants who would Come through proper recruitment procedure. As their rights have been crystallized by operation of the settlements. Hence, there is no question of any Legitimate expectation being violated.

19. Similarly placed ex-employees filed WP No.9206/1995 and the batch before the Hon'ble High Court of A.P. and the learned Single Judge allowed the Writ Petitions. Aggrieved by the same WA No.86/98 and the batch was filed and the Division Bench set aside the order of the Single Judge. Thereafter the ex-temporary employees filed Special Leave Petition No.11886-11888 of 1998 before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India also dismissed the SLP. Therefore, reference to the Judgement of the Learned Single Judge in WP No.9206/97 is of no consequences as the same has already been set aside. The observations made in the Judgements cannot be relied upon for any purpose what so ever. The question of operation of Sec.25F would not come into play. Further the issue is covered by various Judgements of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India and various Hon'ble High Courts. Hence, the reference may be ordered that the Workman is not entitled for any relief.

20. In order to fortify his claim Workman has examined himself as WW1 and also filed documents in evidence which has been exhibited as Ex.W1 to W8. Further, the Workman has filed photocopies of documents in support of his claim which are discussed as under:-

Ex. W1 is the Service Certificate. Ex.W2 is the Notification. Ex.W3 is the Interview call letter. Ex.W4 is the Panel list. Ex.W5 is the service certificate. Ex.W6 is the service certificate. Ex. W7 is the letter to Employment Exchange by Respondent. Ex. W8 is the circular letter 14.07.1999.

21. On the other hand, Respondent has examined witness MW1 Sri Aluru Rama Rao and this witness has exhibited 12 documents, marked as Ex.M1 to M12. The details of these documents are as follows:-

Ex.M.1 is the Settlement dated 17.11.1987. Ex.M2 is the Settlement dated 16.7.1988. Ex.M3 is the Settlement dated 27.10.1988. Ex.M4 is the Settlement dated 9.1.1991. Ex.M5 is the Minutes of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.1995. Ex.M6 is the Settlement dated 30.7.1996. Ex.M7 is the Memorandum of Understanding dt. 27.2.1997. Ex.M8 is the Particulars of 1989 Messengerial Panel. Ex.M9 is the Particulars of 1989 Non-Messengerial Panel. Ex.M10 is the Particulars of 1992 General Attendant Panel. Ex.M11 is the Judgment of Hon’ble High Court of A.P. in Writ Appeal No.86/98 dt.1.5.1998. Ex.M12 is the Judgment of Hon’ble Supreme Court of India in SLP No. 11886-11888 of 1998 dt.10.8.1998.

22. Apart from afore mentioned documents, Learned Counsel for Workman has also filed a long list of various judgements of Hon’ble Supreme Court as well as Hon’ble High Court, which we will discuss at appropriate place in this Award.

23. Heard the argument of Learned Counsel for Workman as well as for Respondent.

24. On the basis of rival pleadings of both the parties and submissions made by the Learned Counsel for both the parties, following points arise for determination in the industrial dispute :-

I. Whether the 1st settlement dated 17.11.1987, 2nd settlement dated 16.7.1988, 3rd settlement dated 27.10.1988, 4th settlement dated 9.1.1991 and 5th settlement dated 30.7.1996 entered into between State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and also Memorandum of Understanding are binding upon both the parties?

II. Whether the action of State Bank of India, Banaganepalle branch in terminating the services of Workman Sri N. Yerranna, a Messenger with effect from 31.3.1997 is justified?

III. Whether the Workman is entitled for absorption on permanent post in the Branch of Respondent management as per averments made by him in the claim statement?

IV. To what relief if any the Workman is entitled for?

Findings:-

25. **Point No.I**:- Undisputedly settlements dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988, 9.1.1991 and 30.7.1996, minutes of conciliation proceedings and memorandum of understanding dated 27.2.1997 were executed between the State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation under section 2(p) and 18 (1) of I.D. Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Disputes (Central Rules), 1957.

Section 2(p) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 as follows:-

(p) *"settlement" means a settlement arrived at in the course of conciliation proceeding and includes a written agreement between the employer and workmen arrived at otherwise than in the course of conciliation proceeding where such agreement has been signed by the parties thereto in such manner as may be prescribed and a copy thereof has been sent to an officer authorised in this behalf by the appropriate Government and the conciliation officer;*

Section 18(1) provides as follows:-

18. Persons on whom settlements and awards are binding.

- [(1) A settlement arrived at by agreement between the employer and Workman otherwise than in the course of conciliation proceeding shall be binding on the parties to the agreement.

Therefore, in view of the provision contained u/s.18 (1) I.D. Act, 1947, terms and conditions enumerated in the aforesaid settlements are binding on the parties to the agreement. The Learned Counsel for Workman has argued that the Workman after going through the selection procedure has successfully been listed in the panel for appointment on the permanent basis in the Respondent management and the empanelled list has to be valid till last person in the empanelled list is appointed on permanent basis. But the impugned order dated 25.3.97, 27.3.97 and 31.3.97, has been issued by Respondent management thereby the services of the Workman has been terminated and the said order is not in consonance of the terms of the agreement entered into between the parties. Further, Workman submits that the Respondent in the 5th settlement has mentioned the date i.e., 31.3.1997 for lapse of empanel list which is illegal and that is not binding upon the Workman. The condition of lapse of empanelment list on 31.3.97 incorporated in the aforesaid 5th settlement, is arbitrary and illegal.

26. The perusal of the impugned order dated 25.3.1997 goes to reveal that the Chief/Branch Manager, SBI Zonal Office has issued the letter to all the branches with regard to the subject not to make any temporary appointments in the Branch in messengerial category from 1.4.1997. The extract of the said letter is given below:-

"We have been advised by the Deputy General Manager, Zonal Office, Hyderabad that as both the panels of temporary employees of 1989 and daily wagers/casual labours of 1992 will lapse by 31.3.1997, it has been decided by Central Office not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial category from 1.4.1997."

Thus, from the contents of the aforesaid letter, it manifest that Head Office of State Bank of India vide letter dated 25.3.1997 has issued direction to all its branches not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial category from 1.4.1997 due to reason of lapse of both panels i.e., 1989 & 1992 on 31.3.1997 as per terms of settlements entered into by both parties. Further, the contents of the subsequent letter dated 27.3.1997 issued by Respondent Management is also direction to Branch Manager, State Bank of India not to make any temporary messengerial category appointment with effect from 1.4.1997 and it has also been communicated to all concerned that the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers maintained by Zonal offices stand lapsed from 31.1.1997. Further, office order dated 31.3.1997 has been issued by Respondent management that goes to reveal that the said office order has been issued to this effect that, "Consequent on absorption of temporary employees in permanent cadre, it has been decided by the competent authority that no one onwards, no further daily labour or temporary employees/appointments should be resorted to/engaged/employed." Therefore, it reflects from the contents of the aforesaid orders that the temporary appointment in messengerial category and daily labour has been stopped by the Respondent management with effect from 1.4.1997 because of the lapsed of panel of temporary workers and daily wagers by 31.3.1997. The agreement for lapse of both the panels on 31.3.1997 is contained in the 5th settlement which has been arrived at between the parties on dated 30.7.1996 with the consensus of both the parties. Therefore, Workman can not challenge the terms and conditions contained in settlement dated 30.7.1996 regarding lapse of panel on 31.3.1997 as agreed between State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation. As per provision contained u/s.18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 the said Agreement dated 30.7.1996 is binding on both the parties.

In the case of **Allied Sales Corporation Secunderabad vs.The Authority Under Andhra Pradesh..... 1990 II LLJ 510 AP para 414, Hon'ble Court have held:-**

"*4. There was a settlement between the Management and the workmen under* Section 18(1) *of the Industrial Disputes Act on 25th April 1983 under which the age of superannuation of the workmen was fixed at 55 years. The settlement was to be in force upto 30th June 1986 and the next settlement, incorporating practically the same terms, was again entered into on 4th February 1987 under* Section 18(1) *of the Industrial Disputes Act. There is no dispute that these settlements are under* Section 18(1).

14. Now the Authority constituted under Section 41(1) *of the Act is an authority with very limited jurisdiction. It can only decide in the first appeal whether a termination by the management is valid or not and is within the parameters of* Section 40 *of the Act. The said Authority, in our view, has absolutely no jurisdiction to decide whether a settlement entered into under* Section 18(1) *of the Industrial Disputes Act between the representatives of the Workmen and of the Management, is vitiated by undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion on the part of the Management. The Authority, namely, the Assistant Commissioner of Labour, was never intended by the A.P. Legislature to have jurisdiction to go into the question of the validity of a settlement arrived at under* Section 18 *of the Industrial Disputes Act by an Industrial Court. That Parliament has, in fact, constituted Industrial Courts under the* Industrial Disputes Act, *with extensive powers cannot be disputed. What we mean to say is that the Authority under Section 41(1) of the A.P. Act has no jurisdiction what-so-ever either to question or to decide about the validity of any such settlements. If parties to a settlement have a grievance about the validity of a settlement, it is for them to agitate the matter before the appropriate forum and they cannot ask an Authority constituted under* Section 41(1) *of the A.P. Shops and Establishments Act, 1966 with limited jurisdiction, to go into any such question and, that too, incidentally while deciding whether retirement as per the contract of employment, is legal or not."*

It is not the case of Workman that aforesaid settlements are vitiated by undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion on the part of the management. If the Workman feeling aggrieved by any terms of settlement/ agreement on the aforementioned grounds then he can challenge of settlement before a competent authority under the Act, 1947. But here in the instant matter it is not a case of Workman that aforementioned settlement has been entered into between the parties on the ground of undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion. Therefore, Workman is barred to raise any objection in respect of fixing the date of lapse of both panels on 31.3.1997 as agreed between both the parties and Workman can not challenge any terms of said Agreement.

Further in the case of **Herbertsons Limited Vs. Workmen of Herbertsons Limited and Ors, 1977 AIR 322,** Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

The Tribunal thought that the question of the quantum of membership of the 2nd Respondent did not call for a finding at all in view of 1his Court's order. As observed above that was not a correct assumption. On the other hand, we feel that this view of the Tribunal has led it to approach the matter in an entirely erroneous manner. The Tribunal is, rightly enough, conscious that under section 18 (1) *of the Industrial Disputes Act the settlement was binding on the company and the members of the 3rd Respondent union. Even so, the Tribunal devoted nearly half of its order in scanning the evidence given by the company and Respondent No. 3 to find out whether the terms of the settlement had been explained by the President of the union to the workmen or not and whether the workers voluntarily accepted the settlement knowing all the "consequences". This to our mind is again an entirely wrong approach.*

"When a recognised union negotiates with an employer the workers as individuals do not come into the picture. It is not necessary that each individual worker should know the implications of the settlement since a recognised union, which is expected to protect the legitimate interests of labour, enters into a settlement in the best interests of labour. This would be the normal rule. We cannot altogether rule out exceptional cases where there may be allegations of mala fides, fraud or even corruption or other induce- ments. Nothing of that kind has been suggested against the President of the 3rd Respondent in this case. That being the position, prima facie, this is a settlement in the course of collective bargaining and, therefore, is entitled to due weight and consideration.

It is not possible to scan the settlement in bits and pieces and hold some parts good and acceptable and others bad. Unless it can be demonstrated that the objectionable portion is such that it completely outweighs all the other advantages gained the Court will be slow to hold a settle- ment as unfair and unjust. The settlement has to be accepted or rejected as a whole and we are unable to reject it as a whole as unfair or unjust. Even before this Court the 3rd Respondent representing admittedly the large majority of the workmen has stood by this settlement and that is a strong factor which it is difficult to ignore. As stated elsewhere in the judgment, we cannot also be oblivious of the fact that all workmen of the company have accepted the settlement. Besides, the period of settlement has since expired and we are informed that the employer and the 3rd Respondent are negotiating another settlement with further improvements. These factors, apart from what has been stated above, and the need for industrial peace and harmony when a union backed by a large majority of workmen has accepted a settlement in the course of collective bargaining have impelled us not to interfere with this settlement. That being the position, we unhold the settlement as fair and just and order that the award of the Tribunal shall be substituted by the settlement dated October 18, 1973. The said settlement shall be the substituted award. The appeal is disposed of accordingly. There will be no order as to costs."

Therefore, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above, the contention of the Workman that the date fixed for lapse of empanelled list on 31.3.1997 for appointment to the permanent post vide 5th Settlement dated 30.7.1996 is arbitrary, illegal is not untenable. The recognized union of Workmen has negotiated with the Respondent Bank Management representing large number of Workmen and the Workman as individual do not come into picture. Workman in the instant case has work as temporary Workmen in the Respondent Branch and in response of Notification he had applied for inclusion of his name in the panel and he was selected for inclusion his name in the panel list to be utilized for absorption of such Workman to permanent post in order of their seniority in the list. The Settlement dated 30.7.1996 between State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation under Sec.2(p) and Sec.18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 has clearly provided as regard non-messengerial position and it is agreed that all such posts sanctioned fallen vacant upto 31.3.1997 shall be filled before empanel list is allowed to lapse. Thus, in view of law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, in the instant case, Agreement dated 30.7.1996 was entered into between both the parties in respect of lapsing of the both the panels on 31.3.1997 and absorption of the Workmen from panel list was subject to availability of vacancy of post likely to arise upto 31.3.1997, have a binding force on Workman as well as management of State Bank of India in view of provision contained under section 18 (1) of I.D. Act, 1947.

Thus, Point No.I is answered against the Workman and in favour of the Respondent.

27. **Point No.II**:- Firstly, it is submitted on behalf of the Workman that the Respondent has terminated his services by oral order on 31.3.1997 without issuing any notice or paying any salary or compensation in lieu thereof. Therefore, the termination order of the Workman from service is in violation of provision contained Under Section 25 F of I.D. Act, 1947. Therefore, the order is liable to be set aside.

28. On the other hand, Respondent counsel contended that Workman has not worked for 240 days in any preceding calendar year. Therefore, reference of the industrial dispute is not relevant. In this context, the Workman has examined himself as WW1 who has reiterated that Workman has been terminated from service by Respondent on 31.3.1997 without notice of salary or compensation in lieu thereof. Before examining the claim of the Workman on merit it would be apposite to reproduce the provision contained under section 25 F:-

Section 25F provides:-

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].

Compensation to workmen in case of transfer of undertakings.

Section 25B defines the term continuous service which provides

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 authorized 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;

In order to prove the fact of 240 days of service within 12 months of a calendar year just preceding from the date of termination, the initial burden of proof lies upon the Workman and the Workman has to prove this factum by adducing his oral as well as documentary evidence in support of his claim.

Further, how to calculate 240 days of service by the Workman in a calendar year. In this context the reference of decisions of Hon'ble Supreme Court is relevant and the same are discussed below:-

In Rajasthan State Ganganagar S. Mills Ltd. v. State of Rajasthan and Anr. (2004) Apex Court held:

"*It was the case of the Workman that he had worked for more than 240 days in the year concerned. This claim was denied by the appellant. It was for the claimant to lead evidence to show that he had worked for 240 days in the year preceding the date of his termination. He has filed an affidavit. It is statement which is in his favor and that cannot be regarded as sufficient evidence for any Court or Tribunal to come to the conclusion that in fact the claimant had worked for 240 days in a year These aspects were highlighted in Range Forest Officer v. S.T. Hadimani (2002 (3) SCC 25. No proof of receipt of salary or wages for 240 days or order or record in that regard was produced. Mere non-production of the muster roll for a particular period was not sufficient for the Labour Court held that the Workman had worked for 240 days as claimed.*"

In Municipal Corporation, Faridabad v. Siri Niwas (2004 (8) SCC 195), held "*the burden was on the Workman to show that he was working for more than 240 days in the preceding one year prior to his alleged retrenchment." In M.P. Electricity Board v. Hariram (2004 (8) SCC 246) the position was again reiterated in paragraph 11 as follows: "The above burden having not been discharged and the Labour Court having held so, in our opinion, the Industrial Court and the High Court erred in basing an order of reinstatement solely on an adverse inference drawn erroneously ..*"

In the case of Manager, RBI, Bangalore vs. S Mani (2005) SCC Page 100, the 3 Judges Bench of the Apex Court held that "*the initial burden of proof was on the Workman to show that he had completed 240 days of service."*

Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of Mohan Lal vs Management BEL 1981 SCC page 225 has laid down the principle that how to count 240 days of service within one year it is held: *"Clause (2)(a) provides for a fiction to treat a Workman in continuous service for a period of one year despite the fact*

that he has not rendered uninterrupted service for a period of one year but he has rendered period of 240 days during the period of 12 calendar service for months counting backwards and just preceding the relevant date being the date of retrenchment. In other words, in order to invoke the fiction enacted in clause (2)(a) it is necessary to determine first the relevant date, ie the date of termination of service which is complained of as retrenchment. After that date is ascertained. move backward to a period of 12 months just preceding the date of retrenchment and then ascertain whether within the period of 12 months, the Workman has rendered service for a period of 240 days. If these three facts are affirmatively answered in favor of the Workman pursuant to the deeming fiction enacted in clause (2)(a) it will have to be assumed that the Workman is in continuous service for a period of one year and he will satisfy the eligibility qualification enacted in Section 25-F"

"14. We have already extracted section 25B since its amendment and the change in language is the legislative exposition of which note must be taken. In fact, we need not further dilate upon this aspect because in Surendra Kumar Verma and Ors. v. Central Government Industrial-cum-Labour *Court, New Delhi and Anr., Chinnappa Reddy. J., after noticing the amendment and referring to the decision in* Sur Enamel and Stamping Works (P) Ltd *case, held as under:*

"These changes brought about by Act 36 of 1964 appear to be clearly designed to provide that a Workman who has actually worked under the employer for not less than 240 days during a period of twelve months shall be deemed to have been in continuous service for a period of one year whether or not he has in fact been in such continuous service for a period of one year. It is enough that he has worked for 240 days in a period of 12 months, it is not necessary that he should have been in the service of the employer for one whole year."

In a concurring judgment Pathak J. agreed with this interpretation of section 25B(2). Therefore, both on principle and on precedent it must be held that section 25B(2) comprehends a situation where a Workman is not in employment for a period of 12 calendar months, but has rendered service for a period of 240 days within the period of 12 calendar months commencing and counting backwards from the relevant date, i.e. the date of retrenchment. If he has, he would be deemed to be in continuous service for a period of one year for the purpose of section 25B and Chapter VA."

Thus, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above the initial burden of proof lies upon the Workman to show that he has completed 240 days of the service with the Respondent just preceding from the date of his termination. Further, in respect of the employment of calculating the 240 days service in view of the contents of Section 25-F read with Section 25-B of the I.D. Act, 1947.

29. Now, in view of the provision contained under Section 25 F and law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, we have to examine whether the Workman has discharged his initial burden of proof in respect of his claim of 240 days continuous service in a calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination i.e., 31.3.1997.

In this context, WW1 in his cross examination has stated that,

"I was not sponsored by any employment exchange. I did not undergo the regular process of selection before my engagement as temporary Messenger in the branch."

"It is true that I did not work for 240 days in any year in my entire service in the bank in any branch."

Thus, it is clear from the testimony of WW1 that the Workman had not worked for 240 days continuously in any 12 months of a calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination in the Respondent bank. Therefore, Workman failed to establish his plea by his oral and documentary evidence that he had worked for 240 days continuously in calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination i.e., 31.3.1997. Thus, the claim of the Workman that he has been terminated by oral order without issuing notice or payment in lieu after termination, in contravention of Section 25 F of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is not tenable. However the documents filed by the Workman in support of his claim, number of days worked with the Respondent goes to reveal that the Workman had worked intermittently as daily wager depending upon availability of work in branch. Workman did not file any document of appointment letter or salary slips in support of his claim for appointment as a non-messenger in the Respondent branch on temporary basis.

30. Per contra, the Learned Counsel for Respondent has submitted the allegation of Workman that he was terminated from services is not correct. As the vacancies were filled up on regular basis in order of their respective seniority the non-engagement of the Workman does not amount to termination. Further, Respondent contended that no law provide that even though there is no work temporary employee should be continued in the bank work as the very engagement of Workman was subject to availability of work. Therefore, the allegation that the bank has indulged in unfair labour practice is incorrect.

31. Thus, in view of the fore gone discussion and contentions made by the Respondent, I find the force in the argument advanced by the Respondent that in the instant matter, Workman was not terminated from service by order dated 31.3.1997 rather he was disengaged in view of the non-availability of the work in the branch. Further, there was direction issued by the Head Office of the Respondent authority not to engage any daily wager Workman/ temporary Worker w.e.f. 1.4.1997. Thus, such disengagement of Workman does not amount to termination. Moreover, the Workman failed to prove his claim that he was terminated in contravention of provision of Sec.25F of the I.D. Act, 1947 as he failed to establish his plea by any oral or documentary evidence that he had worked for 240 days continuously in a twelve months of calendar year just preceding from date of termination i.e., 31.3.1997.

32. Further, perusal of the order dated 25.3.1997 goes to reveal that the Chief Branch Manager, State Bank of India has issued the letter to Zonal Office with direction to all its branches to this effect that they have been advised by the DGM, Zonal Office, Hyderabad that as both the panel of temporary employees of 1989 and daily wagers/casual labour of 1992 will lapse on 31.3.1997 it has been decided by central office not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial cadre from 1.4.1997, therefore it was directed to issue suitable instructions not to make temporary appointments from 1.4.1997. There is no mention in this order that the Workman herein has been terminated from service by this order.

33. Further, the circular dated 27.3.1997 was issued by DGM, SBI to all branches in commercial network in respect of the non-appointment of temporary employees in subordinate cadre and it has directed not to make any temporary employment in the subordinate cadre with effect from 1.4.97 and further, it has directed to ensure that no temporary/casual/daily basis appointment of the petty cash. Further, it is directed to all Branch Managers that any deviation in this regard will be viewed seriously. Thus, these circulars do not reflect that the Workman has been terminated from service by this order.

34. Similarly, office order dated 31.3.1997 is simply a direction to all branches of the Respondent bank by DGM that no further daily labour should be engaged or employed. Therefore, the plea of the Workman that he has been terminated by the aforesaid order dated 25.3.1997, 27.3.1997 and 31.3.1997 from the service by the Respondent is not acceptable. The evidence adduced by the Workman clearly goes

to reveal that he had worked as a daily wager for which he has been paid wages according to number of working days. As there was an order for prohibition for engaging temporary workmen, in the bank, therefore, Workman could not be engaged by the Respondent for work from 1.4.1997 and there after. It is settled law that the daily wagers are engaged by the employer depending upon the availability of work and as the work was not available the Workman was not engaged further by the Respondent management. Therefore, the Workman on the ground of number of days he had worked in the Respondent bank cannot claim any right to reinstate him into the employment. As the Workman failed to prove the mandatory condition of 240 days of continuous service as required under Sec.25F of I.D. Act, 1947. Therefore, the disengagement of Workman from work can not be termed in contravention of provision contained under Sec.25F and 25 B of the I.D. Act, 1947.

Thus, this point is answered against the Workman and in favour of Respondent.

35. **Point No.III**:- In this context, the Workman has contended that the management failed to implement the selected panels during its valid tenure. The management adopted the back door methods contrary to the settlements and filled up the vacancies. The same is evident from the proceedings dated 18.11.1993 a copy of the same is filed in the material papers and the same may be read as part of the claim statement. Further, it is submitted that management has to adhere the procedure issued by the Central Government, the instructions dated 16.8.1990 in the year 1995, but same was not followed in the year 1997 despite there being vacancies. The management has followed the procedure of calling candidates through employment exchange instead of giving chance to the empanelled candidates like the Workman herein. The management sent call letters to the similarly situated candidates like the Workman in the month of June 1997 subsequent to issuance of impugned termination orders. After knowing the fact that they are litigating the issue by way of dispute, the management has refused to engage those candidates, the copies of call letters issued are filed herein along with claim petition. The Workman herein reiterates that the panels are meant for absorption but not for termination. In view of the same a duty is cast upon the Respondent management to engage the empanelled candidates like the Workman herein even in temporary vacancies till they are absorbed permanently in regular vacancies.

36. On the other hand, Respondent has contended that the Federation approached Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) for implementation of bipartite settlement in respect of the absorption of temporary employees. The Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) conducted conciliation proceedings and agreement was arrived at between the Federation and the Management bank. It is submitted that it was agreed between the Federation and the Management that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers /casual labour would be kept alive upto March, 1997 and the vacancies as agreed to under the afore set out settlements will be filled from both the lists concurrently. A copy of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.1995 signed by the parties to the dispute is filed as a material paper. Further, it is submitted that the settlement was arrived at and an agreement was signed between the Federation and the Management bank on 30.7.1996 under Section 2(p) read with Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules 1957 which is binding on the parties. A copy of this agreement which hereinafter may be referred to as 5th settlement for brevity, is also filed as a material paper. The 5th settlement dated 30.7.1996 whereunder the earlier four settlements dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988 and 9.1.1991 were also referred, it was agreed to, by the Federation and the Management bank that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees will be kept alive upto March, 1997 for filling the vacancies existing/arrived at as on 31.12.1994 as per the norms agreed to between the bank and Federation and that thereafter the said panels would lapse. It was also agreed that within the framework of the above

settlements the modalities about drawing names from either the panel of temporary employees or the panel of daily wagers and casual labour would be decided administratively on circle to circle basis depending upon the local requirements in consultation with the Federation's affiliate by the Circle management. It was further agreed that all messenger real vacancies/positions in the subordinate cadre including part-time attendants specifically provided as leave reserve will be filled by the end of 31.3.1997. Further, Respondent contended that on 27.2.1997 a memorandum of understanding was also signed between the Federation's affiliate and the bank management regarding the fact that the exercise of identifying the messengerial vacancies as on 31.12.1994 has since been completed by central office and thereby 403 messengerial vacancies were sanctioned to the circle of the Management bank and it was agreed that these vacancies may be filled from 1989 panel of temporary employees after effecting conversion from full time non-messengerial staff in the usual manner and the agreement was reached upon. Further, it was agreed between the Federations affiliate and the management bank that in terms of the settlement dated 30.7.1996 both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers /casual employees would lapse on 31.3.1997.

37. The Workman has contended that the empanelled list prepared by the Respondent management for appointment of temporary and daily wage Workers to the permanent post cannot lapse unless until it is exhausted by appointing all the empanelled persons and it should continue even after 31.3.1997, i.e., the date fixed for the lapse of panel. It is undisputed that the date of lapse of empanelled list of Workmen has been fixed to 31.3.1997 as mentioned in the settlement dated 30.7.1996, and agreed between the parties. It is settled law that and once the life of panel list lapses on the date as agreed between the parties it cannot be extended beyond that date. In the instant case the panel list of the workmen was valid upto 31.3.1997 in view of the terms and conditions enumerated in the 5th Settlement entered into between the parties. As the lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997 has been agreed by State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation through 5th Settlement, the Workman is not competent to challenge the same.

In this context I would like to take reference of the decision of the apex court in the case of **Syndicate Bank and Ors vs. Shankar Paul and Ors , AIR 1997 SC 3091, therein the Hon'ble Apex Court** have held:-

"Till 1982, the branches of the appellant Bank in Calcutta region were recruiting persons locally to work as temporary attenders in leave vacancies. In view of the revised procedure prescribed by the Government of India in respect of such temporary appointments, the Calcutta regional office of the appellant Bank issued a circular to all of its branches on 14.8.1982, instructing all the branches under it to discontinue the old practice from 1.6.1982 and appoint only empanelled candidates. The regional office was to prepare a panel of eligible candidates, after calling names from the local/district employment exchange, and split it up branch-wise. Following that new procedure yearly panels were prepared thereafter. Names of the Respondents were for the first time included in the panel prepared for the period 7.2.1987 to 6.2.1988. By its letter dated 7.2.1987 the Bank had informed the Respondents that the panel was valid for one year only and that inclusion of their names in the panel was not to confer on them any right to seek permanent appointment in the service of the bank. Considering the object with which the panel was prepared and the fact that it was an yearly panel expiring on 6.2.1988, we are of the opinion that the Respondents did not get any right, because of inclusion of their names in the said panel, for permanent absorption in the service of the Bank. Whatever conditional right they had came to an end with the expiry of the panel. The claim of the Respondents, as contained in the writ petition was thus misconceived and therefore the learned single Judge and the Division Bench, when it first decided the appeal, were right in dismissing the writ petition and the appeal respectively."

Thus, in view of the above law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court and in view of the terms and conditions of the 5th Settlement the contention of the Workman that empanelled list should continue even after 31.3.1997 till the last Workman in the panel is absorbed is not tenable. The contention of the Workman is baseless in view of recital in the settlement. Therefore, in view of the fore gone discussion and finding given at Point No. I regarding binding nature of Settlements and terms and conditions enumerated therein, in view of the provision contained u/s.18(1) of the I.D. Act, 1947, I am of the considered view that life of panels lapsed on 31.3.1997 in view of terms of settlement dated 30.7.1996 and plea of Workman that the panel shall continue even after 31.3.1997 till last man absorbed has no legal force and same is untenable.

38. Undisputedly, settlement agreement dated 30.7.1996 was executed between the State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation and in that settlement it was agreed that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/ casual employees will be used for filling vacancies existing as on 31.12.1994 as per the norms agreed between the bank and the Federation. These empanelled workmen were to be given a chance for permanent appointment in the bank against vacancies arising up to December 1994 whereas the daily wagers/ casual employees were to be considered against the vacancies arise from January 1995 to December 1996, whereby the said panel would lapse. It was agreed that the vacancies falls upto 31.3.1997 shall be filled before the empanelled list is allowed to lapse. Thus, the claim of the Workman to the post of permanent non-messenger in the Respondent management was subject to the availability of the sanctioned post and vacancies arising upto 31.3.1997. The workmen given chance to the permanent post were seniors in number of working days in panel list and Workman herein was junior to those workmen. Therefore, Workman could not be given absorption to permanent post being junior to other workmen in the panel list.

39. In this context the Workman witness WW1 was cross examined by the Respondent counsel and in the cross examination the witness WW1 states:-

"I applied for appointment as Messenger, in response to the advertisement issued by the bank and the union in the year 1989,…. Further, witness states*, "The panel was prepared basing upon the number of days of service, put in by the temporary employees. Some of the temporary employees whose names were included in the panel were given regular appointment in the bank in order of their seniority in the panel….* Further witness states*, "It is true that I am not having any documents to show that any of my juniors are continuing in service in the bank."*

Thus, from the above statement of the Workman witness WW1 it is clear that the panel was prepared in terms of various settlements entered into between Staff Federation of State Bank of India and State Bank of India and it was prepared on the basis of number of days of work put in by the temporary employees. Further, the Workman himself admitted that some of the temporary employees whose names were included in the panel were given regular appointment in the bank in order of their seniority in the panel and he is not having any document to show that any person who worked for less number of days than the Workman was given appointment in the bank. Therefore, the allegation of the Workman that the regular appointment has been made by the bank from the panel list in breach of the terms of the settlement and violation of seniority of panel list is not proved by this evidence of WW1. Thus, there is no evidence on record that bank has given the appointment to the temporary employees as well as daily wagers from the panel list 1989 and 1992 in breach of seniority of the temporary employees in the list. There is no evidence of jumbling in the panel list to make appointment of any permanent Workman in breach of the seniority. Therefore, I am

constrained to hold that the Respondent Management has appointed the workmen from panel list in order of seniority and there is no jumbling of workmen in the panel list before it got lapsed on 31.3.1997.

40. However, Workman has taken the plea that the panels of Workmen for absorption in the employment of the Respondent banks (panels of temporary employees and daily wagers) has been lapsed on 31.3.1997 in contravention of terms of settlement as the object of preparing the entire empanelment of temporary and daily wagers was to provide them permanent employment and till the both the panel lists exhausted the panel list cannot be lapsed on 31.3.1997 and the date of lapsing of the panel on 31.3.1997 has been fixed by the Respondent arbitrarily without any authority.

41. In this context, the perusal of Settlement dated 30.7.1996 reveals that the 5th Settlement dated 30.7.1996 was entered under Section 2(p) and 18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Dispute (Central) Rules 1957. This settlement has been entered into by the competent parties and in this settlement parties thereto agreed that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees will lapse on 31.3.1997. Thus the date of lapse of panel was fixed by both the parties with consensus under the settlement dated 30.7.1996 and same is binding upon the Workman under the provision of Section 18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947. Moreover, this issue of binding force of the settlement dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988 and 9.1.1991 has already been discussed, decided at finding in Point No.I of this award. However, the legality and validity of the aforementioned settlement has not been challenged by the Workman before any competent forum. Thus, claim of Workman that the date of lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997 has been fixed arbitrarily by the Respondent bank is untenable. As regard the claim of Workman for his absorption to the permanent post it is settled law that the Workman can not claim his regularization to permanent post merely on the basis of number of working days.

42. In this context the reference of the decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Oil and Natural Gas Corporation vs Krishan Gopal 2020(3) SCALE 272, date of decision 7.2.2020** is relevant therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have has laid down principle regarding regularization of the Workman on permanent posts. Hon'ble Supreme Court have laid down the prepositions of regularization of the workmen to permanent post is as under:-

"*(i) Wide as they are, the powers of the Labour Court and the Industrial Court cannot extend to a direction to order regularisation, where such a direction would in the context of public employment offend the provisions contained in Article 14 of the Constitution;*

(ii) The statutory power of the Labour Court or Industrial Court to grant relief to workmen including the status of permanency continues to exist in circumstances where the employer has indulged in an unfair labour practice by not filling up permanent posts even though such posts are available and by continuing to employ workmen as temporary or daily wage employees despite their performing the same work as regular workmen on lower wages;

(iii) The power to create permanent or sanctioned posts lies outside the judicial domain and where no posts are available, a direction to grant regularisation would be impermissible merely on the basis of the number of years of service;

(iv) Where an employer has regularised similarly situated workmen either in a scheme or otherwise, it would be open to workmen who have been deprived of the same benefit at par with the workmen who have been regularised to make a complaint before the Labour or Industrial Court, since the deprivation of the benefit would amount to a violation of Article 14; and

(v) In order to constitute an unfair labour practice under Section 2(ra) read with Item 10 of the Vth Schedule of the ID Act, the employer should be engaging workmen as badlis, temporaries or casuals, and continuing them for years, with the object of depriving them of the benefits payable to permanent workmen.

Thus, in view of the principles laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court as discussed above, in the instant matter the Workman utterly failed to prove his claim by adducing any documentary or oral evidence that the employer has indulged in unfair labour practice by not filling the permanent posts even though such posts are available and by continuing to employ workmen as temporary or daily wage employees despite their performance was the same work, as regular workmen on lower wages.

43. Respondent has contended that all the vacancies exist and arise upto 31.3.1997 has been filled up from the panel list in order of seniority and no vacancy exists or arises as on 31.3.1997 remained unfilled. Further, it is contended that as per terms of settlement the life of panel lists has been lapsed on 31.3.1997, hence, there is no occasion to extend the life of panel lists beyond 31.3.1997. However, the workman failed to prove contrary by any evidence to the aforesaid contention of the Respondent that the vacancies were existing as on 31.3.1997 and the workman was not given absorption to the permanent post in order of his seniority. It is settled law that the power to create permanent or sanctioned post lies outside the judicial domain and where no posts are available, a direction to grant regularization would be impermissible merely on the basis of the number of years of service. Therefore, the claim of the workman on this ground also not acceptable.

44. Further, as per the of settlement, panel was prepared for absorption of the workmen on the permanent posts has already been lapsed on 31.3.1997 and the vacancies existing and arising upto 31.12.1994 and upto 31.3.1997 as settlement dated 30.7.1996 has been filled up from the panel by appointing the workmen as per seniority in the panel list. Workman witness WW1 in his cross examination has himself admitted this fact that, some of the temporary employees whose names were included in the panel were given regular appointment in the bank in order of their seniority in the panel. The Workman failed to show that there was any breach of terms of settlement has been committed by the Respondent in appointment to permanent post from aforesaid panel list.

45. As discussed in preceding paragraph of this Award, the life of the panel has not been extended beyond 31.3.1997, by any further settlement hence, the panel list in which name of the Workman was included got expired on 31.3.1997. It is not the case of the Workman that Respondent has regularized similarly situated workmen either in the scheme or otherwise and the Workman has been deprived of same benefit on par with those workmen or the vacancies remained unfilled on the date of lapse of panels i.e., 31.3.1997, Industrial Tribunal has no jurisdiction to extend the date of lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997. This Tribunal can not order for regularization of workmen to the permanent post in contravention of the provision of Article 14 of the Constitution of India.

In the case of **Mahboob Deepak vs. Nagar Panchayat Gajraula & Anr, Civil Appeal No.5875/2007 date of judgement 13.12.2007,** Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

"8. Respondent is a Local Authority. The terms and conditions of employment of the employees are governed by a statute and statutory rules. No appointment can be made by a Local Authority without following the provisions of the recruitment rules. Any appointment made in violation of the said rules as also the constitutional scheme of equality as contained in Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India would be a nullity.

9. Due to some exigency of work, although recruitment on daily wages or on an ad hoc basis was permissible, but by reason thereof an employee cannot claim any right to be permanently absorbed in service or made permanent in absence of any statute or statutory rules. Merely because an employee has completed 240 days of work in a year preceding the date of retrenchment, the same would not mean that his services were liable to be regularized."

Therefore, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, the claim of the Workman for absorption merely on the basis of number of day of work in the Respondent bank Branch is not acceptable. As regard plea of the Workman that the Workman should have been given employment even after 31.3.1997 as temporary Workman, it is the discretion of Respondent to engage the Workman depending upon availability of work and this Tribunal can not direct the Respondent to engage the Workman in the absent of such rule/scheme.

46. In view of principle laid down by Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above, in the instant matter Workman utterly failed to establish the fact of rendering continuous service for a period of 240 days of service within a period of 12 calendar months commencing and coming backward from relevant date i.e., the date of retrenchment, if has he would be denied to be in continuous service for a period of one year. Therefore, the provision contained under Sec.25F of retrenchment is not applicable to Workman.

Counsel for Workman has relied upon number of decisions of Hon'ble High Court and Hon'ble Supreme Court and few of them are discussed herein:-

In the case of **F.C.I., vs. Kamdhenu Cattle Feed Industries 1993 (1) SCC 71,** therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

"7. In contractual sphere as in all other State actions, the State and all its instrumentalities have to conform to Article 14 *of the Constitution of which non-arbitrariness is a significant facet. There is no unfettered discretion in public law: A public authority possesses powers only to use them for public good. This impose the duty to act fairly and to adopt a procedure which is `fairplay in action'. Due observance of this obligation as a part of good administration raises a reasonable or legitimate expectation in every citizen to be treated fairly in his interaction with the State and its instrumentalities, with this element forming a necessary component of the decision making process in all State actions. To satisfy this requirement of non- arbitrariness in a State action, it is, therefore, necessary to consider and give due weight to the reasonable or legitimate expectations of the persons likely lo be affected by the decision or else that unfairness in the exercise of the power may amount to an abuse or excess of power apart from affecting the bona fides of the decision in a given case. The decision so made would be exposed to challenge on the ground of arbitrariness. Rule of law does not completely eliminate discretion in the exercise of power, as it is unrealistic, but providers for control of its exercise by judicial review."*

In the case of **State Bank of India, R.O., Vijayawada vs. Industrial Tribunal, Hyderabad WP No.193/1997,** therein Hon'ble High Court have held,

"*Sri Krovvidi Narasimham, the learned counsel for the 2nd respondent contends, supporting the award that it was a permanent vacancy and even though the 2nd respondent was appointed on temporary basis, his services were not liable to be terminated and he was to be regularised into service on permanent basis. Shastry award warrants that no temporary appointment can be made to a permanent post. But the matter is now covered by two division bench judgements dated 28.11.1986 in W.A. No.791 of 1986 and 25.8.1987 in W.A. No.270 of 1982. The ratio decided in the two judgements is to the effect that there cannot be any mandate to appoint employees on permanent basis when the requirement was for appointment on*

temporary basis. But it is held in the said judgements that when a temporary appointee is ousted from service and not for misconduct and, if again temporary appointment is to be made, then, the case of such temporary appointee who was ousted, has got to be considered in accordance with Sec. 25-H of the Act."

In the case of **State of Haryana and others vs. Piara Singh and others. 1992 (4) SCC 118,** therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

" 49. If for any reason an adhoc or temporary employee is continued for a fairly long spell, the authorities must consider his case for regularization provided he is eligible and qualified according to the rules and his service record is satisfactory and his appointment does not run counter to the reservation policy of the state."

In the above cited judgements by the Workman the facts of the case are different hence do not apply to instant case of Workman.

47. On the other hand, in support of his contention Respondent has examined witness MW1 and MW1 in chief examination states that, Settlements i.e., on 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988, 9.1.1991 were entered into between the SBI and SBI Staff Federation for filling up of the vacancies that arise up to 1994 for those temporary employees who has worked on scale wages. Further, MW1 states that two different panels for messengers and non-messengers as per the eligibility criteria prescribed by the bank. There are four modules in Andhra Pradesh and they are Hyderabad, Tirupathi, Vijayawada and Visakhapatnam. MW1 states that the temporary employees so empanelled were given permanent absorption depending upon the vacancies so arise strictly in terms of the settlement. MW1 states that on 9.6.1995 conciliation proceeding was held before the RLC(C), Hyderabad and in said proceedings it was decided that the panels will be kept live up to 31.3.1997 and vacancies will be filled from both the lists concurrently. A copy of the said minutes of proceedings is Ex.M5. Further, MW1 states that on 30.7.1996 another settlement was entered between the SBI and All India SBI Staff Federation providing for filling up of the vacancies arising up to December 1994 in respect of subordinate cadre and daily wage /casual wage employees out of panel so prepared were to be considered against vacancies arising from January 1995 to December 1996, thereafter the said panels lapse. MW1 states that it was also agreed that all the non-messenger positions in subordinate cadre including part time attendants specially provided as leave reserve will be filled before 31.3.1997 and as regards to non-messengerial positions it is agreed that all such posts sanctioned and fallen vacant up to 31.3.1997 shall be filled before the empanelled list is allowed to lapse. Thus in both the cases empanelled list were lapsed on 1.4.1997. Ex.M6 is the copy of the settlement dated 30.7.1996. Further, witness states that on 27.2.1997 a memorandum of understanding was reached between the SBI and SBI Staff Federation providing that both the panels above mentioned will lapse on 31.3.1997. Ex.M7 is the copy of the memorandum of understanding and Ex.M8 is the copy of the statements giving the particulars of 1989 non-messenger panel, Ex.M9 is the copy of the statement of 1989 non- messenger panel, Ex.M10 is the copy of statement of 1992 panel. Further, witness states that petitioner was included in the 1989 panel. As the existing vacancies at that time were exhausted and his turn did not come he could not be given permanent employment in the bank as per the agreements. All the appointments were made strictly in accordance with the settlements reached from time to time between SBI and SBI staff federation and as per seniority, number of days of temporary service put in by them in the bank in the given period. Further, MW1 states petitioner was not sponsored by any employment exchange he did not undergo the regular process of selection required for appointment as a regular non-messenger the petitioner has not worked for 240 days in any year in his entire temporary service in the bank. The petitioner and other temporary employees were terminated from service by the bank. Further, MW1 states that the

vacancies were filled up on regular basis with the temporary employees from the panels and these panels were expired in terms of the settlements so reached and there were no vacancies to absorb such employees. Thus, witness MW1 has proved the documents Ex.M1 to Ex.M12 and also contentions made in the counter. However, MW1 was cross examined by the Petitioner Counsel. But nothing has been elicited in his cross examination so as to discredit the testimony of the witness MW1 as regards the date of lapse of both the panels on 31.3.1997 and reasons assigned for non-absorption of the Petitioner from the panel list to the permanent post. Moreover the witness MW1 was re-examined by the Respondent and the witness MW1 states that panels were expired in terms of the settlement send absorptions to the extent of the available vacancies were made. There was no termination of any temporary messenger as such but their services were not utilized after the cut off date as the available vacancies were already filled up and most of these Petitioners were not in the service of the bank as on the date of the expiry date of the panels. Therefore, in view of the aforesaid testimony of the MW1 in re-examination in the absence of cross examination remained uncontraverted, the claim of the Workman that he was entitled for absorption in permanent post in the branch of Respondent Management on the basis of panel list is found not established.

This point is answered against the Workman.

48. **Point No.IV**:- In view of the discussion and finding given at Point Nos. I, II and III, the Workman is not entitled for any relief and claim statement of Workman sans merit and liable to be dismissed.

This Point is answered accordingly.

ORDER

In view of the fore gone discussion, it is held that the action of the Respondent bank in terminating the services of Sri N. Yerranna, Ex. Messenger by way of oral orders w.e.f. 31.3.1997 is justified. Hence, the Petitioner is not entitled for any relief as prayed for. The claim statement filed by Workman sans merit, hence, dismissed. Reference is answered accordingly.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation to Smt. K. Phani Gowri, Personal Assistant, transcribed by her, corrected and signed by me on this the 11th day of May, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner	Witnesses examined for the Respondent
WW1: Sri N. Yerranna	MW1: Sri Aluru Rama Rao

Documents marked for the Petitioner

Ex.W1:	Photocopy of Service Certificate
Ex.W2:	Photocopy of Notification
Ex.W3:	Photocopy of Interview call letter
Ex.W4:	Photocopy of Panel list
Ex.W5:	Photocopy of Service certificate
Ex.W6:	Photocopy of service certificate

Ex.W7: Photocopy of letter to employment exchange by the Respondent

Ex.W8: Photocopy of circular letter dated 14.07.1999

Documents marked for the Respondent

Ex.M1: Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.17.11.87

Ex.M2: Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.16.7.88

Ex.M3: Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.27.10.1988

Ex.M4: Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.9.1.1991

Ex.M5: Photocopy of conciliation proceedings before the Regional Labour Commissioner(C) dt.9.6.1995

Ex.M6: Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.30.7.1996

Ex.M7: Photocopy of Memorandum of understanding dt. 27.1.1997

Ex.M8: Photocopy of statements giving the particulars of 1989 messenger panel.

Ex.M9: Photocopy of statement of 1989 Non-messenger panel

Ex.M10: Photocopy of statement of 1992 panel

Ex.M11: Photocopy of order of Hon'ble High Court in WA No.86/98 dt. 1.5.98

Ex.M12: Photocopy of order in SLP No.11886-11888 of 1998 dated 10.8.98

नई दिल्ली, 30 जुलाई, 2026

का.आ. 1635.—औघोगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार **सेंट्रल बैंक ऑफ इंडिया** के प्रबंधतत्र, संबद्ध नियोजको और **श्री मुकेश कुमार** के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औघोगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औघोगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय **कानपूर** के पंचाट **(46/2012)** प्रकाशित करती है।

[सं. एल-12012/98/2011-आई.आर (बी- II)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 30th July, 2026

S.O. 1635.— In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award **(Ref. 46/2012*)*** of the ***Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court Kanpur*** as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of **Central Bank of India** and **Shri Mukesh Kumar.**

[No. L-12012/98/2011–IR (B-II)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, KANPUR

Shri Mukesh Kumar S/o Shri Babu Lal,

RO Talabpura, Post Office Chirgaon,

Distt. Jhansi,

Jhansi.

Workman

Vs.

The Regional Manager,

Central Bank of India, Regional Office,

372/18A, Civil Line,

Jhansi.Management

(JUDGMENT)

(Passed on this 13rd day of January, 2026)

As per letter dated 24/05/2012 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-12012/98/2011 (IR(B-II) dt. 24.05.2012. The dispute under reference relates to:

> *"Whether the action of the management of Central Bank of India, Jhansi in terminating the services of Shri Mukesh Kumar S/o Shri Babu Lal w.e.f. 01.12.2009 without complying with mandatory provisions of ID Act, 1947 is legal and justified? To what relief the concerned workman is entitled?"*

Claimant/workman Mukesh Kumar (hereinafter stated as the claimant) has filed the statement of claim with averments which may be concisely stated as hereunder:

1. The petitioner was appointed to the post of Peon at the respondent establishment, M/s Central Bank of India, Chirgaon Branch, District Jhansi, in the year 2000.
2. The petitioner's duties as a Peon included arriving at the branch at 9:30 AM when it opened, cleaning the counters, and placing a glass of water on each table and he performed tasks such as filing, moving documents from one place to another, and other duties as instructed by the manager or bank staff.
3. The position the applicant held was a permanent one, and the post was vacant. At the time of recruitment, the branch manager requested an application, which the applicant submitted in writing.
4. The applicant belongs to a Scheduled Caste and also had to work at the manager's house. The manager repeatedly assured him that he would be made permanent.
5. The applicant's payment was made through payment vouchers. This payment was made monthly, but the vouchers were prepared weekly by the bank.

6. The payment was less than the minimum wage, which the applicant complained about verbally to the manager several times, but the manager refused to increase his salary.

7. Due to the low salary, the applicant was unable to support his family, so he took a loan from the bank and opened an electrical goods shop, which he would open in the morning and sit there. When he was not there, his family members would run the shop.

8. He requested a loan from the branch manager. The branch manager told him that since he was employed at the bank, he would not be eligible for a Scheduled Caste loan. He advised him that if he applied as unemployed, he would get the loan easily.

9. In last applicant prayer for declare the termination order dated 1.12.2009 as illegal and grant wages and other benefits for the period of unemployment with continuity of service from the date of appointment to the date of reinstatement.

Respondent side has submitted the written statement with averments which may be summarized as stated below:

1. Present Industrial Dispute has been raised by the claimant to misuse & abuse of provisions of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947[14 of 1947]. It is humbly submitted that for creating illegal pressure upon the answering party bank, Regional Manager Central Bank of India, Jhansi has deliberately arrayed as party in the instant matter. Moreover it is specifically stated that material facts have been concealed/suppressed by the applicant thus it is cleared that his claim is not tenable in the eyes of law & hence is deserved to be rejected forthwith by the Hon'ble Court.

2. By reference dated 24.05.2012 Ministry of Labour, New Delhi Chas referred following dispute to the Hon'ble Tribunal for adjudication on the basis of F.O.C. report dated 04.07.2021 sent by RLC(C), Kanpur.

3. It is necessary to plead here that after bare perusal of the claim as filed before the R.L.C.[C], Kanpur it is humbly urged that no case for termination w.e.f. 01.12.09 was raised by the claimant before the above named authority & this fact is clearly apparent/evident from the F.O.C. report so that reference is bad in the eyes of law. To enrich our contentions it is specifically added on behalf of the bank that services of Shri Mukesh Kumar was not terminated by the management of the bank, claim is not maintainable & liable to be dismissed prima facie by the Hon'ble Presiding Officer.

4. Moreover, it is stated that applicant was not an employee as appointed under the prescribed procedure of the bank & relation of employer & employee between the rival parties does not exist. It is not an industrial dispute. Hence it is clearly submitted that demand of the in did sot applicant is liable to be rejected by the Hon'ble Court.

5. It is clearly mentioned here that plea of termination has only been raised by the claimant to get sympathy of the Hon'ble Court. It is settled law of land that burden of proof is on applicant to show that he was appointed by the bank otherwise claim is deserved to be dismissed forthwith.

6. In addition to referred objections it is clearly pleaded here that mother of the applicant was a permanent part time sweeper at our Chirgaon branch & she had retired from bank's service on 31.12.10. It is specifically narrated here that applicant had not worked 240 days in one year as

bank's employee under the provisions of section 25 B hence provisions of 25 F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 do not attract in the present matter.

7. It is specifically stated here that claimant was/is running an electric shop after obtaining loan Rs. 70000/-under P.M.R.Y. scheme from our Chirgaon Branch in the year 2007 & on that point of time he has produced a certificate dated 10.04.05 issued by Akhilesh Electricals that he used to work in the said electric shop for period as given in the certificate. It is necessary to submit here that a bank employee cannot run his business simultaneously in the light of his service conditions. It is material to highlight here that he did not pay loan amount as well as interest & to create illegal pressure present claim has been filed. Plea as raised by the applicant that he was employee of the bank has no force of law. Applicant is not entitled to get any benefit from the Hon'ble Tribunal.

After filing of above written statement, rejoinder is also filed by applicant.

In rejoinder, the applicant denied the averments of the written statement but admitted that he had taken a loan from the Bank for running an electrical shop. He stated that he worked in the morning and evening, while his family members managed the shop during the daytime.

The main question is in this reference whether the action of management of Central Bank of India is legal and justified about terminating of the service of Shri Mukesh Kumar S/o Shri Babu Lal?

Applicant file our statement of claim and state that his appointment was done in above bank in year of 2000 in the post of Peon and he worked as a Peon and that post was permanent vacant and on demand of Branch Manager he applied for that post.

His payment was done by monthly voucher but it was made weekly, his wages was paid less than minimum wages and he complained repeatedly but opposite party denied for that.

He worked in said bank from 2000 to 2009 near about ten years which is more than 240 days.

On above claim statement opposite party filed our written statement and stated that applicant was not an employee as appointed under the prescribed procedure of the bank and relation of employer and employee and also said it is not industrial dispute and further stated that mother of applicant was a permanent part time sweeper at our branch and she had retired from bank service on 31.12.2010. Applicant had not worked 240 days in one year as bank employee under the provisions of 25 B of the Act. Hence the provision of 25 F of the ID Act do not attract in the present matter.

Opposite party further stated that claimant was running an electric shop after obtaining a loan of Rupees 70,000/- under P.M.R.Y. scheme.

In last he said that the applicant contents are wrong, baseless and misconceived because appointment letter has not been placed by applicant before this Tribunal in support of his claim statement, also said that the vacancy of peon was not existed at Chirgaon branch in the year of 2000. Hence branch manager has no power to appoint any person.

After written statement, applicant was filed our rejoinder and he denied written statement contents but he admitted our rejoinder in para 6 that he taken loan from bank but he worked in morning and evening and in day time his family members are sitting in a shop.

In support of claim statement, applicant filed documentary evidence by paper number 8/1 which are as under:

(1) Sent by the said bank to the applicant for receiving a letter on April 2, 2004.

(2) Sent by the said bank, Chirgaon branch, for collecting materials on June 20, 2007.

(3) Sent by the bank, Chirgaon branch, to the claimant for collecting stationery at Jhansi on December 17, 2007.

(4) Sent by the bank, Chirgaon branch, for collecting the savings account passbook on July 3, 2008.

(5) Sent by the bank, Chirgaon branch, to the applicant in Jhansi for collecting stationery on July 29, 2008.

(6) Plaintiff's attendance.

(7) Plaintiff's attendance.

(8) Plaintiff's attendance.

And in oral evidence he himself examined in support of our claim statement.

Opposite party filed documentary evidence by paper number 16/1 is as under:

(1) Attested copy of payment voucher dated 06.09.2008.

(2) Attested copy of payment voucher dated 14.06.2008.

(3) Attested copy of payment voucher dated 07.06.2008.

(4) Attested copy of labour charge dated 31.05.2008.

(5) Attested copy of labour charge dated 31.05.2008.

(6) Attested copy of water charge dated 29.05.2008.

(7) Attested copy of water charge dated 03.05.2008

As applicant version that he is an employee of said bank but his services was terminated by bank hence it is mandatory that he worked as an employee or not? In this context section 25B of Industrial Dispute Act is important to quote here:

"*25B of Industrial Disputes Act 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 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 calcula-tion 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 calcula-tion 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."

In our documentary evidence applicant was filed some photocopies which shows some papers has been shown but upon those papers not any seal of the said bank is found, by paper number 8/1 he filed our attendance register, attendance sheet in that Friday and Saturday attendance is shown only.

In our oral evidence/chief, he support our version of claim statement but in cross he said:

My mother Late Lachcho was permanent part time sweeper in Cetral Bank of India branch at Chirgaon in Jhasni. Late Lachcho retired in 2012. I do agree that I have filed statement of claim and rejoinder found in the word with my signatures. I had issue the letter dated 11.08.2006(at paper no. 10/4). I did not receive any appointment letter. During my tenure from 2000 upto 2009 my mother was permanent part time sweeper in Chirgaon branch of Central Bank of India. I had never worked in Regional office in Jhansi. I had availed loan from Chirgaon branch for running electric shop. I am aware that there rules and procedure for appointment in subordinate cadre. I do not agree that there was no employer and employee relationship between the bank and myself. I have not filed any voucher in respect of payment of wages.

By the opposite party filed a loan clearance certificate in said paper there is no loan and no dues certificate is issued and some receipt was filed of about so many dates and said money.

Further written argument is also filed by applicant in support of our claim statement, the bank was examined m.w.1 of Shri Mahendra Nath Chaudhary and he in our chief examine and said that he is working as Branch Manager in Bansathi Branch, Kanpur Nagar, I have gone through Material papers and fully aware about entire facts of the case. In our cross-examination he said that:

I do agree that I have not specifically stated in my examination in chief that claimant Mukesh Kumar had never worked in Chirgaon Branch. In the written statement it has averred that the claimant had not worked for 240 days in the Bank in any post. I do agree that it has not been specifically averred in the written statement that Mukesh Kumar had not worked in Chirgaon Branch. Management of the bank issues the letter of appointment.

I do agree that all the vouchers relating to payment of wages from 2000 to 2009 issued by the Bank have not been filed. I do agree that in the written statement it has not been stated the number of days the claimant worked in the Bank. I cannot say as to who was working as messenger or peon from the year 2000 to 2005 in the Bank. I do not agree that Mukesh Kumar was working in the Bank as peon from 2000 to 2005. In 2007 bank issued loan to Mukesh Kumar in 2011 the loan was cleared. I do agree that prior to termination no notice pay nor retrenchment compensation was paid to Mukesh Kumar. The witness volunteers there was no legal necessity of payment of notice pay or retrenchment compensation. I do agree that in 2007 Mukesh Kumar had availed loan from the Central Bank Chirgaon Branch.

Applicant is said that he is an employee of said bank and opposite party said that he is not employee of my bank. As per provisions of 25B of the Industrial Disputes Act no any documentary evidence was filed by applicant that shows he is employee of said bank and no any payment certificate is filed by applicant that he get salary or wages by said bank and also he said that he had taken loan from above bank for doing business and this fact is admitted by the applicant that he taken and also prove from documentary evidence of apposite party and also this fact establish that his mother is employee of above bank and she is retired from said bank. Opposite party alleged that applicant is never employee as a peon because there is no post of peon at that time and

There is also procedure of appointment of any employee is first advertisement then procedure of interview letter or examination was conducted by bank, applicant is not filed any as such documents that he was appointed as peon and he get salary and he admitted that in our cross-examination, I did not get any appointment letter, my attendance was not recorded or marked in any register.

Hence, it is clear applicant was not received any appointment letter from opposite party and also cleared that his attendance was not marked any register.

So it is clear that he had not received any appointment letter from bank and also stated that during his tenure 2000 to 2009, my mother was permanent part time sweeper, he had never worked in Regional Office in Jhansi, I had availed loan from the Chirgaon Branch for running electric shop from above cross-examination of applicant it is proved he never work in Regional Office Jhansi.

Documentary evidence by paper number 8/2 he filed some paper photocopies in that challan was issued by Regional Office, Central Bank of India, 372/18-B, Civil Lines, Gwalior Road, Jhansi- 284001.

And he said in his cross-examination he never worked in Jhansi then he how claim his appointment and work on those documentary papers he never file any documents that shows he worked in continuous 240 days in said bank.

As per question of voucher or payment receipt applicant filed an application upon that my predecessor is order on date 09.09.2016 is read as under:

> *"If any and cash payment regular for the period preceding two years of alleged date of transactions i.e. 01.12.2009 for management."*

The date was mentioned of terminating in reference letter on 01.12.2009 but bank said he never employee our bank so there is no any question of termination.

In view of the foregoing discussion and findings, the reference is answered **in the negative**. The applicant has failed to establish that he was an employee of the management. Accordingly, the reference stands disposed of with a **'Nil' Award**.

Parties are left to bear their respective costs.

Date: 13.01.2026 RAJENDRA PRASAD SRIVASTAVA, H.J.S. (Retd.), Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 30 जुलाई, 2026

का.आ. 1636.—औघोगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार **स्टेट बैंक ऑफ इंडिया** के प्रबंधतत्र, संबद्ध नियोजको और **श्री सुरेश शुक्ला** के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औघोगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औघोगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय **कानपूर** के पंचाट **(59/2013)** प्रकाशित करती है।

[सं. एल-12012/123/2012-आई.आर (बी- II)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 30th July, 2026

S.O. 1636.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award **(Ref. 59/2013*)*** of the ***Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court Kanpur*** as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of **State Bank of India** and **Shri Suresh Shukla.**

[No. L-12012/123/2012–IR (B-II)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, KANPUR

ID Case No. 59 of 2013

Present Shri Rajendra Prasad Srivastava, H.J.S. (Retd.)

Shri Suresh Shukla,

S/o Shri B.D. Shukla,

C/o Shri O.P. Mathur,

117/K-36, Sarvodaya Nagar,

Kanpur (U.P.)- 208025

…….Workman

Vs.

1. The General Manager,
   State Bank of India,
   LHO Moti Mahal, Hazratganj,
   Lucknow.
2. The Zonal Manager,
   State Bank of India,
   Mall Road,

Kanpur (U.P.)

……..Management

(JUDGMENT)

(Passed on this 23rd day of February, 2026)

As per reference letter dated 08/05/2013 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-12012/123/2012 IR(B-I) dt. 08.05.2013. The dispute under reference relates to:

" Whether the action of the management of State Bank of India in terminating the services of Shri Suresh Shukla S/o Shri B.D. Shukla workman with effect from 23.12.1981 and not considering his name for reemployment while reemploying others including the recruitment of fresh hands is just fair & legal? If not, to what relief the workman concerned is entitled to?"

Claimant/workman Shri Suresh Shukla (hereinafter stated as the claimant) has filed the statement of claim with averments which may be concisely stated as hereunder:

1. The applicant was employed under the Zonal Office, State Bank of India Kanpur in Industrial Estate Branch in subordinate cadre. The service of the applicant was terminated on 23.12.1981 in violation of the provisions of Industrial disputes Act 1947 (Central). After the termination of the service of the applicant new hands have been employed in place of the applicant in violation of Section 15 H of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947.

2. The action of the employer in terminating the service of the applicant is illegal and is unfair labour practice because the applicant was working on the permanent post, but after termination of the applicant new hands had been employed. This is also against the principles of natural justice.

3. Employer has done this type of unfair labour practice and illegal work and exploitation i.e. engaging one workman and terminating his service after few days and then again engaging another person and again terminating his services is being done with hundreds of persons. The applicant along with number of such other victimised persons started agitation by staging Dharna, demonstrations etc. against the illegal, unfair and unjust action of the State Bank of India.

4. Thereafter due to protest of the workmen, the State Bank of India decided to hold tests/interview so that regular and permanent appointment may be given to workmen who have already worked in the Bank.

5. The action of the Bank in holding test/interview was illegal because under the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947 the applicant was a retrenched employee and he was to be given appointment in the Bank not on the basis of any test/interview. But directly by the Bank as provided under Section 25 H of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947.

6. The termination of the applicant is retrenchment as defined in the Industrial Disputes act 1947. The employer has not given appointment to the applicant as per provision of section 25 H of

the Act while hundreds of persons have been appointed. The action of the employer is illegal and unjust and the applicant is entitled to be reinstated with continuity of service and back wages.

7. After the termination of the applicant so many new hand have been appointed by the Bank. As such the action of the Bank is illegal and unjust and the applicant is entitled to be reinstated with continuity of service and full back wages.

8. The name of the applicant was within 20 of the waiting list of 1991. The applicant has not been given appointment but all most all the persons from the said waiting list have been appointed. As such the action of the Bank is illegal and unjust and the applicant is entitled to be reinstated with continuity of service and full back wages.

9. It is, therefore, humbly prayed that in the interest of justice the

   (i) Hon'ble Tribunal be pleased to give the following relief to the applicant.

   (ii) The applicant be reinstated in service with continuity of service.

   (iii) The applicant be given full back wages and other attending benefits.

   (iv) Any other suitable relief which the Hon'ble Tribunal may deem fit under the circumstances of the case.

   (v) Suitable cost of the case may please also be awarded to the applicant.

Respondent has submitted the written statement with averments which may be summarized as stated below:

1. It is essential to mention here that to abuse/misuse of the provisions of the I. D. Act 1947[14 of 1947] instant industrial dispute has been raised by the applicant regarding his alleged termination from 23.12.1981, which is not tenable in the eyes of law. On this alone ground case is liable to be dismissed at the very outset by the Hon'ble tribunal.

2. The alleged disengagement being of 1981 & more than 30 years have passed since then the industrial dispute cannot be said to have survived & a stale alleged dispute cannot be allowed be raised now.

3. It is specific to state that to create illegal pressure upon the bank's management General Manager, Lucknow as well as Zonal Manager, Kanpur have knowingly been made party by the claimant in the present dispute whereas claimant never worked for a day in both offices. It is made clear that relationship of employer & employee between the rival parties never existed at the relevant point of time. In the light of above given facts claim is legally not maintainable & is deserved to be rejected forthwith by the hon'ble court.

4. Assertions brought by the applicant in paragraphs 1, 2 & 3 of the claim are only stretch of his imaginations. Pleas of employment of new hands in his place as well as unfair labour practice are without basis & not found trustworthy hence clearly denied by the opposite party bank.

5. The facts of interview of temporary/daily wagers as mentioned in paragraph 4 of the claim are not made disputed but remaining pleas of this para are misleading & not found correct thus not admitted by the bank.

6. in reply to assertions of paragraphs 13 & 14 of the claim it is submitted here that claimant was never appointed in bank hence question of his alleged retrenchment did/does not arise. It is stated that even if the self serving allegation of the claimant is accepted that he has worked and that subsequently during the process of giving chance of absorption, he was invited for interview, the said process of holding interview conducted in terms of settlements constitutes compliance of section 25 H of the I.D. Act as has been held by the Hon'ble Supteme Court in Regional Manager S.B.I. V. Rakesh Kumar Tiwari AIR 2006 S.C. 839. Also even if the self serving statement of the claimant is further accepted that his name was included in the panel of candidates wait listed for appointment against future vacancies but he is not found entitled to get claimed relief in the light of view taken by Hon'ble Apex Court that wait listed candidates cannot have a valid claim to any post upon the lapse of the wait list panel. Thus even the cooked up allegations of the claimant cannot stand on its feet and the claimant cannot have any claim to post after lapse of panel. It is re-submitted that present case is out of ambit of continuous service as defined in section 25 B of the act therefore provisions of section 25 F as well as 25 H do not attract in the instant matter & applicant is not entitled to get claimed relief from the Hon’ble Tribunal in the light of previous paras of this reply.

7. The prayer made in claim statement is mere reiterations. It is clearly submitted that applicant is not entitled to get relief claimed from the Hon'ble court. In the light of afore-mentioned true facts claim has no force of law & on the face of given reply demand may be turned down by the Hon'ble tribunal.

8. It is therefore kindly prayed from the Hon'ble court that after considering preliminary objections as well as reply on merits award may be passed in favour of bank & against the claimant in the interest of justice.

After filing of above written statement by opposite party, rejoinder is also filed by applicant. In rejoinder, the applicant denied the averments of the written statement filed by opposite party is stated that:

1. The contents of Para No. 1 of the written statement of the employer is wrong, baseless and against the provision of Law hence are not admitted. In reply it is submitted that the services of the applicant has been illegally and unjustly terminated by the employer. The termination of the applicant is retrenchment. The employer has appointed new hands but has not given chance to the applicant as required under section 25 H of the Industrial Dispute Act 1947. The Labour Law is for the welfare and protection from the exploitation of workmen i.e. weaker section of the society. Therefore the law makers, i.e the Parliament of the country, keeping all these facts and circumstances in mind and past experienced did not mention any time limit for reemployment of retrenched workers in section 25 H of the Industrial Dispute Act 1947. In view of these submissions no one including all court of the country can and should not impose any time limit for raising such dispute in the name of old cases or belated case. As Such the objection is baseless and misconceived and is liable to be rejected.

2. The contents of Para No. 2 of the written statement of the employer are wrong, baseless and misconceived hence are not admitted. In reply it is submitted that the case is for illegal termination and also for not considering for reemployment in future vacancies as provided under Section 25 H of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947, Therefore the question of stale dispute or belated dispute does not arise. These are imaginary objections of the exploiting employers while there is no such provision in the Act as such are liable to be rejected out rightly.

3. The contents of Para No. 3 of the written statement of the employer are wrong and misconceived hence are not admitted. The opposite party is the employer as provided in the Act.

4. The contents of Para No. 4 of the written Statement of the employer are wrong, baseless and misconceived hence are not admitted. In reply it is submitted that no citation of the Hon'ble Apex Court has been given by the employer as such no proper reply can be submitted. However it is submitted that there are number of rulings that for delay a reference cannot be rejected by the Court and it should give relief to the workers. The ruling will be submitted during arguments.

5. Applicant/ workman reiterated his claim statement.

As per reference the main question is Whether the action of the management of State Bank of India in terminating the services of Shri Suresh Shukla S/o Shri B.D. Shukla workman with effect from 23.12.1981 and not considering his name for reemployment while reemploying others including the recruitment of fresh hands is just fair & legal? If not, to what relief the workman concerned is entitled to?

In our claim statement applicant is requested that applicant was employed under the Zonal Office, State Bank of India in Industrial Estate Branch in subordinate cadre and the applicant was terminated on 23.12.1981 in violation of the provisions of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. And further says when we protest then the State Bank of India decided to hold test interview so that regular and permanent appointment may be given to workmen who have already worked in the bank.

In accordance to that bank in holding test/interview was illegal because under the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. The applicant was a retrenched employee and he was to be given appointment in the Bank not on the basis of any test/interview.

Due to malafide reasons bank did not give permanent appointment to the applicant. It came to the knowledge of the applicant that he have passed the interview and his name within 20 of the waiting list for giving permanent appointment in the bank. In that list almost candidates have been appointed by the bank but the bank has not given appointment to the applicant and with other facts in last requested that in the interest of justice Hon’ble Tribunal be pleased to give the following relief read as under:

1. Reinstate in service with continuity of services and given full back wages and other attending benefits.

2. Any other suitable relief which the Hon’ble Tribunal may deem fit under the circumstances and suitable cost of the case may please also be awarded.

In reply of above claim statement bank filed written statement and in his written statement preliminary objection is raised that applicant regarding his alleged termination from 23.12.1981, which is not tenable in the eyes of law because above referred date of termination has not found place in claim statement & rejoinder statement filed by the claimant before the conciliation officer.

Further in para stated that to create a legal pressure upon the bank's management have knowingly been made parties by the claimant in the present dispute whereas claimant never worked for a day in both offices. It is made clear that relationship of employer & employee does not exist between the rival parties.

Further in para 6 stated that claimant was not engaged in the bank against any post and further stated interview letter was not placed along with claim statement by the claimant before conciliation officer to prove his case.

After filing of above written statement, rejoinder is also filed by applicant.

Main question in this reference that applicant is employee in said bank as stated by him.

After perusal of order sheets it shows that so many date has been fixed for the documents/evidence of applicant but applicant not produce any evidence.

So, this is clear there is no any documentary or oral evidence is filed by applicant to prove his case such as appointment letter, interview letter, waiting list etc.

Accordingly, it is not proved that applicant is employee in said bank as stated by him in claim statement.

Hence in the given circumstance the reference stands disposed of as of 'Nil' award.

Parties are left to bear their respective costs.

Date: 23.02.2026 RAJENDRA PRASAD SRIVASTAVA, H.J.S. (Retd.), Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 30 जुलाई, 2026

का.आ. 1637.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एयर इंडिया के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजको और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में **केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण–सह–श्रम न्यायालय नं0 II** नई दिल्ली के पंचाट (आई डी नम्बर **150 / 2015**) को प्रकाशित करती है,

[सं. एल-11012/48/2014-आई.आर (सीएम- I)]

जयदीप यादव, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 30th July, 2026

S.O. 1637.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award **(ID No. 150/2015*)*** of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court N0. II, New Delhi** as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the Management of **Air India** and their workmen,

[No. L-11012/48/2014–IR (CM-I)]

JAIDEEP YADAV, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

BEFORE CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM – LABOUR COURT NO. II, NEW DELHI

I.D. No. 150/2015

Sh. Khushi Ram & 5 Ors. vs. Air India and Anr.

Khushi Ram and 5 Other Workmen ... **Workmen/Claimants**

Through:
All India General Mazdoor Trade Union (Regd.) – AITUC
170, BalmukundKhand, Giri Nagar, Kalkaji, New Delhi – 110019

Versus

1. **The Chairman and Managing Director,**
   M/s Air India Ltd.
   Registered Office: Airlines House,
   113, GurudwaraRakabGanj Road,
   New Delhi – 110001.

2. **The Managing Director,**
   M/s Livewell Aviation Services Pvt. Ltd.
   8/02, Mehram Nagar,
   Opposite Palam Airport,
   New Delhi – 110010. ... **Managements/Respondents**

Counsels:

For Applicants/ Claimants*:*

Sh. Anil Rajput, Ld. AR.

For Managements/ Respondents*:*

Sh. GautamDutta and Ms. Shalini Gupta, Ld. ARs for management-1 (Air India).

Management-2 (M/s. Livewell Aviation Pvt. Ltd.) was proceeded ex-parte vide order dated 30.03.2026.

Award

25.06.2026

In exercise of powers conferred under clause (d) of Sub-section (1) and Sub-section (2A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Government of India, through the Ministry of Labour and Employment, vide its Order NO-L-11012/48/2014- IR(CM-I) dated 23.09.2015 has been pleased to refer the following dispute between workmen and managements for adjudication by this Tribunal in the following terms:

> *"Whether termination of employment of Sh. Khushi Ram and five others (as per list enclosed) without making payment of legitimate dues etc. is just, fair & legal? If not, what relief the workmen concerned are entitled to?'*

The case of the workmen, is that the six claimants, namely, Khushi Ram, Jeet Lal Yadav, Surendra Kumar Dika, Dinesh Kumar, Sushil Kumar and Shailendra Mahto, were employed as Helpers and their work was cleaning of aircrafts of Management No.1, M/s Air India Ltd., through Management No.2, M/s Livewell Aviation Services Pvt. Ltd. Their respective dates of appointment and last drawn wages were as

S. No.	Name of Workman	Designation	Date of Appointment	Last Drawn Wages
1	Khushi Ram	Helper	03.08.2004	Rs. 7,400/- p.m.
2	Jeet Lal Yadav	Helper	12.04.2004	Rs. 7,500/- p.m.
3	Surendra Kumar Dika	Helper	01.04.2004	Rs. 7,500/- p.m.
4	Dinesh Kumar	Helper	01.07.2004	Rs. 7,500/- p.m.
5	Sushil Kumar	Helper	06.06.2006	Rs. 7,000/- p.m.
6	Shailendra Mahto	Helper	20.10.2003	Rs. 7,800/- p.m.

follows:

It is stated that throughout their service tenure the workmen discharged their duties diligently and honestly and no complaint was ever made against them. The workmen further stated that the managements failed to provide them with various statutory and service benefits, including appointment letters, annual uniforms, equal pay for equal work, overtime wages, wage revisions, salary slips, ESI, PF and other statutory facilities provided to regular employees of Air India Ltd. According to the workmen, despite repeated demands made by them orally, the managements did not grant the said benefits.

It is stated that the claimants sent a demand notice dated 16.05.2012 through Registered post. However, despite receipt of the demand notice, the managements neither replied to the said notice nor provided them with the demanded facilities. Instead, they allegedly started to threaten the claimants to terminate their services and obtained their signatures on blank papers and vouchers.

It is the specific case of the workmen that during the pendency of proceedings before the Assistant Labour Commissioner (Central), the managements without obtaining permission illegally terminated their services on 01.05.2013, in violation of section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. According to them, no reason was assigned for their termination, no prior notice was given and their earned wages for the period from 01.04.2013 to 30.04.2013, were not paid to them.

The workmen further averred that they sent another demand notice dated 16.05.2013 demanding reinstatement in service and payment of earned wages and other dues, but the managements neither responded to the said notice nor reinstated them and new employees were engaged in their place.

The workmen have also alleged that before terminating their services the managements neither issued any charge-sheet nor conducted any domestic enquiry, nor paid notice pay, retrenchment compensation, earned wages or other statutory dues. According to them, the termination was illegal, unjustified and in violation of Section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. They have stated that since the date of termination they have remained unemployed, and therefor , they have prayed for reinstatement in service with continuity of service, full back wages and consequential benefits.

In response, management No. 1 filed its written statement taking a preliminary objection that no relationship of employer and employee ever existed between it and the claimants. It denied that the claimants were ever employed by Management No. 1 or any wages were due upon the claimants. According to Management No. 1, the claimants were admittedly employees of Management No. 2, **M/s Livewell Aviation Services Pvt. Ltd.**, which was engaged in the field of ground handling services, including aircraft cleaning activities. It was further stated that by way of present industrial dispute, the claimants were in fact seeking regularization and absorption with Management No. 1 despite the fact that there was no employer-employee relationship between them.

Management No. 1 further stated that it had entered into agreements with various domestic and foreign airlines for providing services at **Indira Gandhi International Airport, New Delhi** and had awarded a contract for deep cleaning, cargo aircraft cleaning, polishing and exterior cleaning of aircrafts at IGI Airport to Management No. 2 through a service agreement dated 01.07.2010. The said contract was later extended and remained in operation till 30.04.2013. It was the stand of Management No. 1 that the arrangement between the two managements was an independent commercial contract executed on a principal-to-principal basis and not a contractor-principal employer arrangement as alleged by the claimants.

Management No. 1 further asserted that under the terms and conditions of the agreement, Management No. 2 was responsible for recruitment, deployment, supervision and control of its employees and for compliance with all statutory requirements, including payment of wages, provident fund, ESI and other statutory benefits. It was further statedthat the claimants had nowhere stated that the contract between the two managements was sham, bogus or merely a camouflage and, therefore, no liability can be imposed upon management-1. According to it, the contract between Management No. 1 and Management No. 2 came to an end on 30.04.2013 and if the services of the claimants were discontinued thereafter, the same was a matter between the claimants and Management No. 2. On these grounds, Management No. 1 prayed for dismissal of the claim in its entirety, contending that no cause of action had been disclosed against it and that no relief could be granted to the claimants against Management No. 1.

In response, management No. 2 also filed its written statement. It was submitted that Management No. 2 had been awarded a contract by Management No. 1 for deep cleaning, polishing and cleaning of cargo aircrafts and allied works at IGI Airport, New Delhi. According to Management No. 2, the claimants had been engaged purely on contractual basis for execution of the said contract after being informed about the terms and conditions of their engagement. It was further submitted that the claimants were aware that their services were liable to come to an end upon expiry of the contract. Management No. 2 asserted that during the existence of the contract all wages and other dues were duly paid to the claimants and no complaint was ever raised by them. It was further stated that the contract between the managements came to an end on 30.04.2013, thereafter the claimants were requested to surrender their airport entry passes and collect their dues. On these ground, management-2 sought dismissal of the present claim.

Rejoinder had been filed by the claimants where they denied the averments made by the managements in their written statement and affirmed the averments in made in the claim statement.

From the pleadings of the parties, the following issues were framed for adjudication:

1. Whether termination of employment of Sh. Khushi Ram and Five others (as per list enclosed) without making payment of legitimate dues etc. is just, fair and legal? If so, its effect?

2. Whether there was any employer and employee relationship between management-1 and workmen? If so, its effect?

3. To what relief the workman is entitled to and from which date?

In order to prove their case, all of the claimants barring Sh. Sushil Kumar filed their affidavits of evidence to substantiate their claim and reiterated the facts as stated in the claim statement. The contents of their affidavits were mostly identical. The claimants deposed that they had been working as Helpers in connection with aircraft cleaning operations through Management No. 2 for Management No. 1 and had rendered continuous service to the satisfaction of the managements without any complaint. They further deposed that despite repeated demands, the managements failed to provide them with various statutory and service benefits such as appointment letters, uniforms, overtime wages, salary slips, ESI, PF and other legal facilities.

The claimants further deposed that upon raising demands for statutory benefits, the managements adopted unfair labour practices by threatening them with termination, compelling them to submit resignation letters and obtaining their signatures on blank papers and vouchers. According to them, while the dispute regarding their demands was pending before the labour authorities, their services were terminated on 01.05.2013 without notice, charge-sheet, or payment of earned wages and other legal dues. They further deposed that despite service of demand notices and complaints before the labour authorities, the managements neither reinstated them nor paid their dues. The claimants also stated that since their termination they had remained unemployed despite making efforts, and therefore, they claimed reinstatement with continuity of service, full back wages and all consequential benefits.

The claimants relied upon the following documents:

1. Complaint/application dated 10.05.2013 filed under Section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act before the Assistant Labour Commissioner – **Ex. WW1/1**.

2. Demand notice dated 16.05.2013 issued to the managements seeking reinstatement and payment of earned wages and other dues – **Ex. WW1/2**.

3. Registered postal receipt in respect of service of demand notice upon Management No. 1– **Ex. WW1/3**.

4. Speed Post receipt in respect of service of demand notice upon Management No. 1 – **Ex. WW1/4**.

5. Acknowledgement card/receipt evidencing service upon Management No. 1 – **Ex. WW1/5**.

6. Registered postal receipt in respect of service of demand notice upon Management No. 2 – **Ex. WW1/6**.

7. Speed Post receipt in respect of service of demand notice upon Management No. 2 – **Ex. WW1/7**.

8. Application/representation dated 16.05.2013 submitted before the Assistant Labour Commissioner – **Ex. WW1/8**.

9. Statement of claim/dispute raised before the labour authorities on 30.05.2013 – **Ex. WW1/9**.

10. Representation/application dated 10.03.2014 submitted by the claimants before the Regional Labour Commissioner – **Ex. WW1/10**.

During cross-examination by management-1, the claimants deposed that they did not possess any documentary evidence to establish their employment with Management No. 1. They stated that they had initially come to know about the availability of work through informal sources and were thereafter engaged through Management No. 2, **M/s Livewell Aviation Services Pvt. Ltd.** The claimants admitted that they had no document to show that their services were terminated by Management No. 1 and further admitted that Management No. 1 had never issued any appointment letter or service-related documents to them during their tenure. They also admitted that they had never submitted any representation to Management No. 1 seeking their absorption in service.

They also admitted that they had no documentary proof of any employer-employee relationship with Management No. 1. The claimants, denied that there existed no relationship of employer and employee between them and Management No. 1 and deposed that the managements had terminated their services illegally.

Subsequently, management-2's right to cross-examine the claimant was closed due to its continued non-appearance and it was proceeded ex-parte.

In support of its defence, Management No. 1 examined Ms. Rachna Arya, Manager, as MW-1, who tendered her affidavit in evidence. She reiterated the averments made in the written statement that there never existed any relationship of employer and employee between Management No. 1 and the claimants and that the claimants were employees of Management No. 2, which was engaged in the field of ground handling services, including aircraft cleaning operations. According to the witness, the arrangement between Management No. 1 and Management No. 2 was purely on a principal-to-principal basis and Management No. 2 was responsible for recruitment, deployment, supervision and control of its workforce as well as compliance with all applicable labour laws. She further deposed that under the terms of the agreement, employees engaged by Management No. 2 could not be treated as employees of Management No. 1. The witness further stated that the claimants, having been engaged by Management No. 2, could not claim any employer-employee relationship with Management No. 1.

The witness relied upon the following documents:

- Authority Letter in favour of MW-1 – **Ex. MW1/1**.
- Agreement dated 01.07.2010 executed between Management No. 1 and Management No. 2 – **Mark A**.
- Extension Letter dated 30.03.2012 – **Mark B**.

During her cross-examination, MW-1 admitted that the claimants were working in the premises of Management No. 1, though according to her they were under the control and supervision of the contractor to whom the work had been awarded from time to time. She stated that she was not aware whether the claimants had been working since the year 2004 or whether they were working as Helpers. She further stated that Management No. 1 had not maintained any salary record pertaining to the claimants or she was not aware whether the claimants had raised any dispute seeking regularization or claiming equal pay for equal work against Management No. 1.

The witness further deposed that she did not know the name of the contractor engaged prior to 01.07.2010 and was not aware about the duty hours of the claimants. She admitted that the work of cleaning and sanitation was of a permanent nature, though no permanent employees had been appointed by

Management No. 1 for carrying out such work. The witness denied that Management No. 1 had supervision and control over the claimants and management No. 1 was involved in terminating services of the claimants on 01.05.2013.

I have heard the arguments at bar and gone through the pleadings and evidence adduced by both parties, and my findings on the issues are as follows. For the sake of convenience, Issue No. 2 is taken up first. The whole of the argument of the workmen is centred around the fact that they had been working with Management No. 1 through Management No. 2 since the dates mentioned in their claim statement, and that their services had been terminated illegally by the managements. While the case of Management No. 1 is that it had entered into a contract/agreement dated 01.07.2010 with Management No. 2, and the contract had continued for ground handling services, including aircraft cleaning activities. Their contract had come to an end on 30.04.2013 with Management No. 2 and this fact had been admitted by the claimants in their cross-examination that they were employed through Management No. 2 and were getting their salaries etc. from Management No. 2, therefore, the claim qua Management No. 2 is not maintainable. Moreover, it has been stated by Management No. 2 in its written statement that it had explained the terms of appointment to the workmen that their employment would be subject to the continuance of its contract with Management No. 1.

Since it is an admitted position and has been conceded by the claimants that their claims are qua Management No. 2, and the reference itself has been made by the Appropriate Government while sending the same for adjudication to this Tribunal that an industrial dispute exists between the claimants and Management No. 2 (M/s Livewell Aviation Services Pvt. Ltd., 8/141, Mehram Nagar, Ground Floor, Opp. Palam Airport, New Delhi-110010), therefore, it has been proved on record that no relationship of employer and employee existed between Management No. 1 and the claimants. Hence, Issue No. 2 goes in favour of Management No. 1.

Admittedly, the above-mentioned workmen are employees of Management-2, which has also been admitted in its written statement. However, its stand is that the claimants had been explained the nature of their jobs and were told that their employment would be subject to the continuation of the contract with Management-1.

Now the question arises whether Management-2 fulfilled any condition before retrenching these claimants.

Before proceeding further, the language of Section 2(oo), which defines the term 'retrenchment', and Section 25F of the Act, which sets out the conditions to be complied with by an employer before retrenching a workman, is required to be reproduced herein:

> ***[(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;]

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 2 [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 3 [or such authority as may be specified by the appropriate Government by notification in the Official Gazette].

From the perusal of the above sections, it is clear that in industrial law, there is no absolute protection given to the claimant/workman against retrenchment under the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. An employee can be retrenched by an employer if certain conditions are fulfilled. The first exception has been provided within the definition itself, namely when a workman is terminated by way of disciplinary action. Other exceptions include voluntary retirement, superannuation as per contract, non-renewal or termination of a contract on its expiry, and termination due to continued ill-health.

Management No. 2 has not brought any evidence in rebuttal nor has it cross-examined the workmen in this respect that it had explained the terms to the workmen that their services would continue only till the continuance of his contract with management-1, nor has any document been annexed therewith regarding the conditions of employment. Therefore, the conditions enumerated in Section 2(oo) that their services came to an end after the expiry of the contract are not fulfilled. Therefore, it has been proved that the workmen were retrenched from service.

Now, the next question that arises for consideration is whether the services of the claimants were retrenched lawfully. Admittedly, Management No. 2 failed to bring any evidence nor did it examine any witness to the effect that it complied with the provisions set out in Section 25F of the Act by giving one month's notice or wages in lieu of notice and by paying retrenchment compensation to the claimants at the time of termination. Non-compliance with the mandatory conditions prescribed under Section 25F renders the retrenchment illegal and unjustified. Accordingly, the termination of all workmen barring Sh. Sushil Kumar (as he did not contest the claim) is held to be illegal and unjustified. Since the workmen have not brought any evidence to the effect that they worked with Management No. 2 since their respective dates of appointment, therefore, it is assumed that they worked for the period from 01.07.2010 to 30.04.2013 with Management No. 2.

Further, the question that arises is with regard to the relief to which the claimants are entitled to. As a general rule, where termination is declared illegal, the appropriate relief is **reinstatement with full back wages.** However, it has been held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in **Employers, Management of central P & D Inst. Ltd. vs. Union of India & Another, AIR 2005 Supreme Court 633** that it is not always mandatory to order reinstatement even where the termination is held illegal and compensation can be granted instead by the industrial adjudicator. Similar views were expressed by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in Indian Hydraulic Industries Pvt. Ltd. vs. Kishan Devi and Bhagwati Devi &Ors., wherein it was held that even if the termination is found to be illegal, the relief of reinstatement with full back wages need not be granted automatically and the relief may be moulded according to the facts and circumstances of each case, including grant of compensation in lieu of reinstatement and back wages. The same principle has been reiterated by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Maharashtra State Road Transport Corporation vs. Mahadeo Krishna Naik (2025 (INSC) 218)**, wherein it was held that reinstatement with full back wages is not an automatic relief and, in appropriate cases, lump sum compensation may be a more suitable relief.

Considering the facts and circumstances of the present case and the prolonged litigation faced by the claimants, lump-sum compensation of Rs. 2,00,000/- (Rupees Two Lakhs Only) to each of the claimants (barring Sh. Sushil Kumar) is considered an appropriate relief in lieu of reinstatement. Accordingly, a lump-sum compensation of Rs. 2,00,000/- (Rupees Two Lakhs Only) is awarded to each of the claimants in lieu of reinstatement and back wages. Management No. 2 (M/s Livewell Aviation Services Pvt. Ltd.) is directed to pay the said amount within two months from the date of publication of this Award, failing which the amount shall carry interest @ 8% per annum from the date of the Award till its realization.

A copy of this Award be sent to the Appropriate Government for notification under Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. The file be consigned to the Record Room.

Dated 25.06.2026 ATUL KUMAR GARG, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 30 जुलाई, 2026

का.आ. 1638.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एयर इंडिया के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजको और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में **केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण–सह–श्रम न्यायालय नं0 II,** नई दिल्ली के पंचाट **(आई डी नम्बर** 151/2015) को प्रकाशित करती है,

[सं. एल-11012/47/2014-आई.आर (सीएम- I)]

जयदीप यादव, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 30th July, 2026

S.O. 1638.— In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award **(ID No. 151/2015)** of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court N0. II, New Delhi** as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the Management of **Air India** and their workmen,

[No. L-11012/47/2014–IR (CM-I)]

JAIDEEP YADAV, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

BEFORE CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM – LABOUR COURT NO. II, NEW DELHI

I.D. No. 151/2015

Sh. Pramod Kumar and 08 Ors.v. Air India and Anr.

Sh. Pramod Kumar and 08 other workmen ... **Workmen/Claimants**

Through:
All India General Mazdoor Trade Union (Regd.) – AITUC
170, BalmukundKhand, Giri Nagar, Kalkaji, New Delhi – 110019

Versus

1. **The Chairman and Managing Director,**
   M/s Air India Ltd.
   Registered Office: Airlines House,
   113, GurudwaraRakabGanj Road,
   New Delhi – 110001.

2. **The Managing Director,**
   M/s Livewell Aviation Services Pvt. Ltd.
   8/02, Mehram Nagar,
   Opposite Palam Airport,
   New Delhi – 110010. ... **Managements/Respondents**

Counsels:

For Applicants/ Claimants*:*

Sh. Anil Rajput, Ld. AR.

For Managements/ Respondents*:*

Sh. GautamDutta and Ms. Shalini Gupta, Ld. ARs for management-1 (Air India).

Management-2 (M/s. Livewell Aviation Pvt. Ltd.) was proceeded ex-parte vide order dated 30.03.2026.

Award

25.06.2026

In exercise of powers conferred under clause (d) of Sub-section (1) and Sub-section (2A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Government of India, through the Ministry of Labour and Employment, vide its Order NO-L-11012/47/2014- IR(CM-I) dated 23.09.2015 has been pleased to refer the following dispute between workmen and managements for adjudication by this Tribunal in the following terms:

"Whether termination of employment of Sh. Pramod Kumar and 08 others (as per list enclosed) without making payment of legitimate dues etc. is just, fair & legal? If not, what relief the workmen concerned are entitled to?'

The case of the workmen is that the nine claimants were employed as Utility Hand and their work was cleaning of aircrafts of Management No.1, M/s Air India Ltd., through Management No.2, M/s Livewell Aviation Services Pvt. Ltd. Their respective dates of appointment and last drawn wages were as follows:

S. No.	Name of Workman	Designation	Date of Appointment	Last Drawn Wages
1	Pramod Kumar	Utility Hand	06.01.2007	Rs. 6,000/- p.m.
2	Deep Chand	Utility Hand	13.02.2004	Rs. 6,500/- p.m.
3	RatanLal Gupta	Utility Hand	16.01.2004	Rs. 6,500/- p.m.
4	Ajay Kumar	Utility Hand	23.03.2004	Rs. 6,500/- p.m.
5	Dal Chand	Utility Hand	20.06.2005	Rs. 6,200/- p.m.
6	Anil Kumar Sharma	Utility Hand	03.08.2004	Rs. 6,500/- p.m.
7	Vijendra Singh	Utility Hand	28.05.2004	Rs. 6,500/- p.m.
8	Dhirendra Kumar Rana	Utility Hand	26.07.2007	Rs. 6,000/- p.m.
9	UmeshYadav	Utility Hand	23.03.2004	Rs. 6,500/- p.m.

It is stated that throughout their service tenure the workmen discharged their duties diligently and honestly and no complaint was ever made against them. The workmen further stated that the managements failed to provide them with various statutory and service benefits, including appointment letters, annual uniforms, equal pay for equal work, overtime wages, wage revisions, salary slips, ESI, PF and other statutory facilities provided to regular employees of Air India Ltd. According to the workmen, despite repeated demands made by them orally, the managements did not grant the said benefits.

It is stated that the claimants sent a demand notice dated 16.05.2012 through Registered post. However, despite receipt of the demand notice, the managements neither replied to the said notice nor provided them with the demanded facilities. Instead, they allegedly started to threaten the claimants to terminate their services and obtained their signatures on blank papers and vouchers.

It is the specific case of the workmen that during the pendency of proceedings before the Assistant Labour Commissioner (Central), the managements without obtaining permission illegally terminated their services on 01.05.2013, in violation of section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. According to them, no reason was assigned for their termination, no prior notice was given and their earned wages for the period from 01.04.2013 to 30.04.2013, were not paid to them.

The workmen further averred that they sent another demand notice dated 16.05.2013 demanding reinstatement in service and payment of earned wages and other dues, but the managements neither responded to the said notice nor reinstated them and new employees were engaged in their place.

The workmen have also alleged that before terminating their services the managements neither issued any charge-sheet nor conducted any domestic enquiry, nor paid notice pay, retrenchment

compensation, earned wages or other statutory dues. According to them, the termination was illegal, unjustified and in violation of Section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. They have stated that since the date of termination they have remained unemployed, and therefore , they have prayed for reinstatement in service with continuity of service, full back wages and consequential benefits.

In response, management No. 1 filed its written statement taking a preliminary objection that no relationship of employer and employee ever existed between it and the claimants. It denied that the claimants were ever employed by Management No. 1 or any wages were due upon the claimants. According to Management No. 1, the claimants were admittedly employees of Management No. 2, **M/s Livewell Aviation Services Pvt. Ltd.**, which was engaged in the field of ground handling services, including aircraft cleaning activities. It was further stated that by way of present industrial dispute, the claimants were in fact seeking regularization and absorption with Management No. 1 despite the fact that there was no employer-employee relationship between them.

Management No. 1 further stated that it had entered into agreements with various domestic and foreign airlines for providing services at **Indira Gandhi International Airport, New Delhi** and had awarded a contract for deep cleaning, cargo aircraft cleaning, polishing and exterior cleaning of aircrafts at IGI Airport to Management No. 2 through a service agreement dated 01.07.2010. The said contract was later extended and remained in operation till 30.04.2013. It was the stand of Management No. 1 that the arrangement between the two managements was an independent commercial contract executed on a principal-to-principal basis and not a contractor-principal employer arrangement as alleged by the claimants.

Management No. 1 further asserted that under the terms and conditions of the agreement, Management No. 2 was responsible for recruitment, deployment, supervision and control of its employees and for compliance with all statutory requirements, including payment of wages, provident fund, ESI and other statutory benefits. It was further stated that the claimants had nowhere stated that the contract between the two managements was sham, bogus or merely a camouflage and, therefore, no liability can be imposed upon management-1. According to it, the contract between Management No. 1 and Management No. 2 came to an end on 30.04.2013 and if the services of the claimants were discontinued thereafter, the same was a matter between the claimants and Management No. 2. On these grounds, Management No. 1 prayed for dismissal of the claim in its entirety, contending that no cause of action had been disclosed against it and that no relief could be granted to the claimants against Management No. 1.

In response, management No. 2 also filed its written statement. It was submitted that Management No. 2 had been awarded a contract by Management No. 1 for deep cleaning, polishing and cleaning of cargo aircrafts and allied works at IGI Airport, New Delhi. According to Management No. 2, the claimants had been engaged purely on contractual basis for execution of the said contract after being informed about the terms and conditions of their engagement. It was further submitted that the claimants were aware that their services were liable to come to an end upon expiry of the contract. Management No. 2 asserted that during the existence of the contract all wages and other dues were duly paid to the claimants and no complaint was ever raised by them. It was further stated that the contract between the managements came to an end on 30.04.2013, thereafter the claimants were requested to surrender their airport entry passes and collect their dues. On these ground, management-2 sought dismissal of the present claim.

Rejoinder had been filed by the claimants where they denied the averments made by the managements in their written statement and affirmed the averments in made in the claim statement.

From the pleadings of the parties, the following issues were framed for adjudication:

1. Whether termination of employment of Sh. Pramod Kumar and 08 others without making payment of legitimate dues etc. is just, fair and legal? If so, its effect?
2. Whether there was any employer and employee relationship between management-1 and workmen? If so, its effect?
3. To what relief the workman is entitled to and from which date?

In order to prove their case, five out of nine of the claimants, Sh. Deepchand, Sh. RatanLal, Sh. Pramod Kumar, Sh. Ajay Kumar and Sh. Vijendra kumar filed their affidavits of evidence to substantiate their claim and reiterated the facts as stated in the claim statement. The contents of their affidavits were mostly identical. However, only three out of these five claimants, Sh. Deep Chand, Sh. Ratan Lal and Sh. Pramod Kumar entered the witness box.

The claimants relied upon the following documents:

- Letter issued by the Vice President of All India General Mazdoor Trade Union – **Ex. WW1/1**.
- Postal receipt – **Ex. WW1/2**.
- Postal receipt – **Ex. WW1/3**.
- Demand letter dated 16.05.2012 – **Ex. WW1/4**.
- Industrial dispute addressed to the Regional Labour Commissioner – **Ex. WW1/5** (objected to by the management).
- Dispute/complaint submitted before the Assistant Labour Commissioner – **Ex. WW1/6** (objected to by the management).
- Office copy of representation dated 10.03.2014 addressed to the Regional Labour Commissioner – **Ex. WW1/7**.
- Office copy of registered letter addressed to the Chairman-cum-Managing Director, Air India – **Ex. WW1/8** (objected to by the management).
- Postal receipts evidencing dispatch of communications to various authorities of Air India – **Ex. WW1/9 to Ex. WW1/13**.
- **WW2/1 (colly)** is a copy of EPF scheme showing contribution of **WW2 RatanLal**for period of 2006-07 made by management-2 as well as the pay-slip for the month of January, 2012 issued by management-2.
- **WW3/1 (colly)** is a copy of the ESI card and salary slip of January 2012 issued by management-2 to WW3 Sh. Pramod Kumar.

During his cross-examination by the AR for Management No. 2, **Deep Chand (WW1)** deposed that he had passed Senior Secondary and was presently working as a helper electrician, though he did not have any document to establish the same. He stated that he had been issued an entry pass by Management No. 2, Livewell Aviation, and claimed that he could produce the same if directed. The witness admitted that his name did not appear in Ex. WW1/1 and that he had not filed any document to prove his

membership of the Union. He further admitted that the documents exhibited as Ex. WW1/2, Ex. WW1/3 and Ex. WW1/9 to Ex. WW1/13 had not been personally dispatched by him and that he had no personal knowledge regarding the contents of the envelopes sent under the said postal receipts. He also admitted that the original of Ex. WW1/8 was not available with him.

During his cross-examination by the AR for Management No. 1, the witness deposed that he had come to know about the vacancy of Utility Hand in the year 2004 and thereafter started working with Management No. 2, Livewell Aviation. He admitted that he possessed no document to establish that his services had been terminated by Management No. 1. The witness further admitted that he was never under the employment of Management No. 1, Air India, and that the demands had been raised only against Management No. 2.

During his cross-examination by the AR for Management No. 1, **WW2 RatanLal** deposed that he did not possess any document to establish his employment with Management No. 1. He stated that in the year 2004, he came to know about vacancies for Utility Hands and after submitting his biodata, he started working with Management No. 2, and an entry pass had also been issued to him. The witness further admitted that he had no document to prove that his services had been terminated by Management No. 1. He admitted that he was never under the employment of Management No. 1, Air India, and that the demands had been raised only against Management No. 2. He further admitted that he was a subscriber of ESI and Provident Fund during his employment with Management No. 2. He admitted that after becoming a member of the Union, he had never raised any demand through the Union regarding ESI or PF benefits.

During his cross-examination by the AR for Management No. 1, **WW3 Pramod Kumar** deposed on the same lines as WW2 Ratan Lal. He admitted that he did not possess any document to establish his employment with Management No. 1 and stated that he had started working with Management No. 2, after he came to know about vacancies for Utility Hands. He further admitted that he had never made any representation to Air India seeking absorption in service and that he had no document to establish that his services had been terminated by Management No. 1.

The witness also admitted that he was never under the employment of Management No. 1, Air India, and the demands had been raised only against Management No. 2. He further admitted that he was a subscriber of ESI and Provident Fund during his employment with Management No. 2.

Management No. 2 cross-examined only one of the claimants, namely, WW-1 Sh. Deep Chand. The remaining claimants were not cross-examined by Management No. 2. Thereafter, Management No. 2 stopped appearing before the Tribunal despite opportunities afforded to it and was consequently proceeded ex parte vide order dated 27.03.2025. Accordingly, the evidence led by WW-2 Sh. Ratan Lal and WW-3 Sh. Pramod Kumar remained unrebutted and unchallenged with regard to management-2.

In support of its defence, Management No. 1 examined Ms. Rachna Arya, Manager, as MW-1, who tendered her affidavit in evidence. She reiterated the averments made in the written statement that there never existed any relationship of employer and employee between Management No. 1 and the claimants and that the claimants were employees of Management No. 2, which was engaged in the field of ground handling services, including aircraft cleaning operations. According to the witness, the arrangement between Management No. 1 and Management No. 2 was purely on a principal-to-principal basis and Management No. 2 was responsible for recruitment, deployment, supervision and control of its workforce as well as compliance with all applicable labour laws. She further deposed that under the terms of the agreement, employees engaged by Management No. 2 could not be treated as employees of Management

No. 1. The witness further stated that the claimants, having been engaged by Management No. 2, could not claim any employer-employee relationship with Management No. 1.

The witness relied upon the following documents:

- Authority Letter in favour of MW-1 – **Ex. MW1/1**.
- Agreement dated 01.07.2010 executed between Management No. 1 and Management No. 2 – **Mark A**.
- Extension Letter dated 30.03.2012 – **Mark B**.

During her cross-examination, MW-1 admitted that the claimants were working in the premises of Management No. 1, though according to her they were under the control and supervision of the contractor to whom the work had been awarded from time to time. She stated that she was not aware whether the claimants had been working since the year 2004 or whether they were working as Helpers. She further stated that Management No. 1 had not maintained any salary record pertaining to the claimants and that she was not aware whether the claimants had raised any dispute seeking regularization or claiming equal pay for equal work against Management No. 1.

The witness further deposed that she did not know the name of the contractor engaged prior to 01.07.2010 and was not aware about the duty hours of the claimants. She admitted that the work of cleaning and sanitation was of a permanent nature, though no permanent employees had been appointed by Management No. 1 for carrying out such work. The witness denied that Management No. 1 had supervision and control over the claimants and management No. 1 was involved in terminating services of the claimants on 01.05.2013.

I have heard the arguments at bar and gone through the pleadings and evidence adduced by both parties, and my findings on the issues are as follows. For the sake of convenience, Issue No. 2 is taken up first. The whole of the argument of the workmen is centred around the fact that they had been working with Management No. 1 through Management No. 2 since the dates mentioned in their claim statement, and that their services had been terminated illegally by the managements. While the case of Management No. 1 is that it had entered into a contract/agreement dated 01.07.2010 with Management No. 2, and the contract had continued for ground handling services, including aircraft cleaning activities. Their contract had come to an end on 30.04.2013 with Management No. 2 and this fact had been admitted by the claimants in their cross-examination that they were employed through Management No. 2 and were getting their salaries etc. from Management No. 2. Therefore, the claim qua it is not maintainable. Moreover, it has been stated by Management No. 2 in its written statement that it had explained the terms of appointment to the workmen that their employment would be subject to the continuance of its contract with Management No. 1.

Since it is an admitted position and has been conceded by the claimants that their claims are qua Management No. 2, and the reference itself has been made by the Appropriate Government while sending the same for adjudication to this Tribunal that an industrial dispute exists between the claimants and Management No. 2 (M/s Livewell Aviation Services Pvt. Ltd., 8/141, Mehram Nagar, Ground Floor, Opp. Palam Airport, New Delhi-110010), therefore, it has been proved on record that no relationship of employer and employee existed between Management No. 1 and the claimants. Hence, Issue No. 2 goes in favour of Management No. 1.

Now the question arises whether the claimants have proved their relationship with management-2. For this, evidence and provisions of retrenchment are required to be looked into.

Before proceeding further, the language of Section 2(oo), which defines the term 'retrenchment', and Section 25F of the Act, which sets out the conditions to be complied with by an employer before retrenching a workman, is required to be reproduced herein:

[(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;]

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 2 [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 3 [or such authority as may be specified by the appropriate Government by notification in the Official Gazette].

From the perusal of the above sections, it is clear that in industrial law, there is no absolute protection given to the claimant/workman against retrenchment under the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. An employee can be retrenched by an employer if certain conditions are fulfilled. The first exception has been provided within the definition itself, namely when a workman is terminated by way of disciplinary action. Other exceptions include voluntary retirement, superannuation as per contract, non-renewal or termination of a contract on its expiry, and termination due to continued ill-health.

Coming to the claim of WW-1 Sh. Deep Chand, he has failed to discharge the burden of proving his employment with Management No. 2. No documentary evidence has been placed on record to establish that he worked under Management No. 2. None of the documents exhibited by him, namely Ex. WW1/1 to Ex. WW1/10 establish his appointment, payment of wages, attendance, identity, ESI, provident fund or any other service record with Management No. 2. The said documents are only related to the industrial dispute raised by him before the labour authorities after the alleged termination.

Furthermore, during his cross-examination, WW-1 stated that he did not possess any document to establish his employment with Management No. 1 and also admitted that he was not under the employment

of Management No. 1. So his claim against Management No. 1 is liable to fail on his own admission. So far so Management No. 2 is concerned, except for his bald assertion, there is no evidence on record to prove the relationship of employer and employee. It is well settled that the initial burden to prove the employee-employer relationship lies upon the workman. Since WW-1 has failed to establish the relationship of employer and employee with either of the managements in his evidence, he is not entitled to any relief. Accordingly, the claim of WW-1 Sh. Deep Chand stands dismissed.

Coming to the claims of WW-2 Sh. RatanLal and WW-3 Sh. Pramod Kumar, both the claimants were cross-examined by Management No. 1. During their cross-examination, they admitted that they had no documentary evidence to establish any employer-employee relationship with Management No. 1. Thus, they have failed to establish that they were employees of Management No. 1 and, therefore, no relief can be granted against Management No. 1.

However, Management No. 2 did not cross-examine WW-2 and WW-3. Thereafter, it stopped appearing in the proceedings and was proceeded ex parte vide order dated 27.03.2025. Consequently, the testimony of WW-2 and WW-3 against Management No. 2 remained unrebutted and unchallenged to the effect that they were the employees of management-2. Ex. WW2/1 (colly) and Ex. WW3/1 (colly) which is document of EPF contributions and ESIC I.D. card showing names of the employer as management-2, has buttressed the fact that they were the employees of management-2. It did not bring any evidence in rebuttal nor did it cross-examine the workmen in this respect that it had explained to the workmen that their services would continue only till the continuance of the contract, nor has any document been annexed therewith regarding the conditions of employment. Therefore, the conditions enumerated in Section 2(oo) that their services came to an end after the expiry of the contract are not fulfilled. Therefore, it has been proved that the workmen namely Sh. Ratan Lal and Sh. Pramod Kumar were retrenched from services by management-2.

Now, the next question that arises for consideration is whether the services of the claimants were retrenched lawfully. Admittedly, Management No. 2 failed to bring any evidence nor did it examine any witness to the effect that it complied with the provisions set out in Section 25F of the Act by giving one month's notice or wages in lieu of notice and by paying retrenchment compensation to the claimants at the time of termination. Non-compliance with the mandatory conditions prescribed under Section 25F renders the retrenchment illegal and unjustified. Accordingly, the termination of WW-2 Sh. Ratan Lal and WW-3 Sh. Pramod Kumar is held to be illegal and unjustified. Since the workmen have not brought any evidence to the effect that they worked with Management No. 2 since their respective dates of appointment, therefore, it is assumed that they worked for the period from 01.07.2010 to 30.04.2013 with Management No. 2.

So far as the remaining claimants are concerned, they did not enter the witness box or lead any evidence in support of their respective claims. In the absence of any oral or documentary evidence, their claims are hereby dismissed.

Now, the question that arises is with regard to the relief to which the claimants are entitled to. As a general rule, where termination is declared illegal, the appropriate relief is **reinstatement with full back wages.** However, it has been held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in **Employers, Management of central P & D Inst. Ltd. vs. Union of India & Another, AIR 2005 Supreme Court 633** that it is not always mandatory to order reinstatement even where the termination is held illegal and compensation can be granted instead by the industrial adjudicator. Similar views were expressed by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in Indian Hydraulic Industries Pvt. Ltd. vs. Kishan Devi and Bhagwati Devi &Ors., wherein it was

held that even if the termination is found to be illegal, the relief of reinstatement with full back wages need not be granted automatically and the relief may be moulded according to the facts and circumstances of each case, including grant of compensation in lieu of reinstatement and back wages. The same principle has been reiterated by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Maharashtra State Road Transport Corporation vs. Mahadeo Krishna Naik (2025 (INSC) 218)**, wherein it was held that reinstatement with full back wages is not an automatic relief and, in appropriate cases, lump sum compensation may be a more suitable relief.

Considering the facts and circumstances of the present case and the prolonged litigation faced by the claimants, lump-sum compensation of Rs. 2,00,000/- (Rupees Two Lakhs Only) to Sh. RatanLal and Sh. Pramod is considered an appropriate relief in lieu of reinstatement. Accordingly, a lump-sum compensation of Rs. 2,00,000/- (Rupees Two Lakhs Only) is awarded to both claimantsin lieu of reinstatement and back wages. Management No. 2 (M/s Livewell Aviation Services Pvt. Ltd.) is directed to pay the said amount within two months from the date of publication of this Award, failing which the amount shall carry interest @ 8% per annum from the date of the Award till its realization.

A copy of this Award be sent to the Appropriate Government for notification under Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. The file be consigned to the Record Room.

Dated 25.06.2026 ATUL KUMAR GARG, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 30 जुलाई, 2026

का.आ. 1639.—औघोगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार **सेंट्रल ऑर्डनेन्स डिपो** के प्रबंधतत्र, संबद्ध नियोजको और **जनरल सेक्रेटरी COD मज़दूर पंचायत** के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औघोगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औघोगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय **कानपूर** के पंचाट **(108/2018)** प्रकाशित करती है।

[सं. एल-14011/13/2018-आई.आर (बी-II)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 30th July, 2026

S.O. 1639.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award **(Ref. 108/2018*)*** of the ***Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court Kanpur*** as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of **Central Ordnance Depot** and **The General Secretary COD Mazdoor Panchyat.**

[No. L-14011/13/2018–IR (B-II)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, KANPUR

Present Shri Rajendra Prasad Srivastava, H.J.S. (Retd.)

ID Case No. 108 of 2018

The General Secretary,
COD Mazdoor Panchayat,
C1/51- Gulmohar Vihar, W-Block,
Keshav Nagar, Kanpur Nagar- 208014.

…….Workman

Vs.

The Commandant,
Central Ordnance Depot,
Kanpur Nagar- 208014.

……Management

(JUDGMENT)

(Passed on this 1st day of April, 2026)

As per letter dated 20/11/2018 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-14011/13/2018-IR (DU) dt. 20.11.2018. The dispute under reference relates to:

> *"Whether the action of the Commandant, COD Kanpur by way of adopting unfair labour practise victimization/ harassment of workmen and not redressing the welfare related issues raised from time to time by the Union and also whether management has violated provisions of Sec 33 during the pendency of conciliation proceedings the by the management is just, fair and legal? If not, to what relief the union concerned is entitled to?"*

Claimant/workman Union has filed the statement of claim with averments which may be concisely stated as hereunder:

1. COD Mazdoor Panchayat is the first Union in Kanpur which was established way back in 1949 and since then it has been espousing the causes of employees of Central Ordinance Depot (in short COD). It is because of its significant strength, popularity amongst employees and their faith and trust in the Union, the Government of India/Ministry of Defence has given the status of recognized union to COD Mazdoor Panchayat and it is maintaining the said status for last so many years.

2. In order to verify the strength of the Unions and their influence on employees, Government of India conduct requisition through secret ballot amongst the employees, So far three such requisition have been got conducted through secret ballot and on all these three occasions Mazdoor Panchayat has proved its substantial membership. When such last exercise was conducted through secret ballot, Mazdoor Panchayat secured support of 29.5% of employees. Thus, it got confirmed and recognized that amongst employees who took part in voting process, 29.5% of them are members of Mazdoor Panchayat.

3. As per existing rule, a union has to prove through secret ballot that it has membership of more than 15% of the employees. If the membership of any union falls below 15% during the exercise of membership verification through secret ballot, it becomes disentitled to acquire the status of recognized union and if it happened to be a recognized union, it losses the said status and its recognition gets cancelled. At present three unions have been shown as unions recognized by Government of India/Ministry of Defence. Out of these three Unions, COD Mazdoor Panchayat and COD Karamchari Union have proved their eligibility by securing much more than 15% votes but the third Union COD Mazdoor Union could not secure minimum 15% votes for being eligible to attain status of Recognized Union and as such its status of being recognized union ought to have been cancelled as per rules.

4. Sri P. K. Srivastava has been an activist of the Trade Union movement espousing the causes of employees of Central Ordinance Depot in particular and employees of other organisation in general. It is because of his popularity amongst employees that he has always acquired significant positions in trade unions. He has been General Secretary of COD Mazdoor Panchayat since long time. In the last elections held, he has been elected as President of the Mazdoor Panchayat. He is also Vice-president of Indian National Trade Union Congress, U. P. to which COD Mazdoor Panchayat is affiliated. At times, he has raised his strong voice against the corruption and some of the executives and in the process; he has to bear the ire of the brunt of the executives.

5. it is pertinent to bring to your kind notice that said COD Karamchari Union who has been beneficiary of favoritism, partiality and granting favor by the Commandant did not follow its bye laws in the matter of elections and did not file annual return before the Registrar. of Trade Unions. As a result, Registrar Trade Unions deregistered COD Mazdoor Union vide Order dated 15.06.2018. As a result, said COD Mazdoor Union became disentitled for any facility or espousing the causes of employees still Sri S. S. Mishra, Commandant continued to take interest in COD Karamchari Union clearly showing partiality and granting favor to this union. A copy of Order dated 15.06.2018 passed by the Registrar.

6. In view of what is stated herein above, it is most respectfully prayed that reference may very kindly be adjudicated in favour of the Union and against the management by:

    a. Ordering to extend all such facilities to the Union including providing room for Union Activities in accordance with the instructions issued by Integrated Head Quarter for recognised unions.

    b. Ordering the management to conduct and hold bilateral discussions with the Unions for redressing the grievances of the members and welfare related issues.

    c. Order the management to cancel the malafide Transfer of Sri Rajendra Kumar Gupta by transferring him back to the same department from where he has been transferred and further ordering to withdraw charge sheet served upon him.

    d. Order the management to make payment of Transport Allowance to Sri Mahesh Shankar Dwivedi from the date it has been stopped along with interest at a rate find justified and reasonable by Hon'ble Presiding Officer.

    e. Order the management not to violate the fixed norms of work in respect of Sri Anil Kumar Pal.

    f. Order the management to recognize Sri P. K. Srivastava as duly and validly elected President of the Union in accordance with the Certificate issued by Registrar of Trade Unions by accepting his name for inclusion in JCM and further directing the management to allow him to enter into the premises of the COD to interact with the members and carry out his trade Union activities with further direction to negotiate and discuss with him the grievances of the members.

g. Order the management to permit periodical gate meetings to interact with employees of COD.

h. Order the management to ban the union activities of management sponsored union whose registration has been cancelled by registrar of trade unions.

i. Any other relief deem fit and proper by the Hon'ble Presiding Officer in view of the facts and circumstances of the case.

After filing of claim statement, several opportunities has been given to respondent for filing of written statement, but written statement did not filed by opposite party. Hence, vide order dated 19/01/2024 opportunity of filing written statement by opposite party is closed and filed is put up for evidence.

The case has been called out repeatedly today for the Claimant/ Union evidence. However, despite sufficient opportunities, no one has appeared on behalf of the Claimant/Union. Furthermore, no Affidavit in Evidence or documentary proof has been filed by the Union to substantiate the allegations of harassment, illegal transfer, or non-payment of allowances mentioned in the Statement of Claim.

It is a settled position of law that the burden of proving the existence of an industrial dispute and the facts alleged therein lies squarely upon the party raising the dispute (the Claimant). In the absence of any oral or documentary evidence, the Tribunal cannot presume the truth of the averments made in the Statement of Claim, even if the Management is proceeding ex-parte.

Since the Claimant has failed to appear and has led no evidence to prove the reference, the opportunity for the Claimant to lead evidence is hereby closed.

Conclusion: As there is no evidence on record to adjudicate the points of reference in favour of the workmen, it is held that the Union has failed to prove that the actions of the Management were unjust or illegal. Consequently, the Union is not entitled to any relief.

Accordingly, the reference is answered in the **negative**. The claimant is not entitled to any relief. A **'Nil'** Award is hereby passed.

Parties are left to bear their respective costs.

Date: 01.04.2026 RAJENDRA PRASAD SRIVASTAVA, H.J.S. (Retd.), Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 30 जुलाई, 2026

का.आ. 1640.—औघोगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार **स्टेट बैंक ऑफ इंडिया** के प्रबंधतत्र, संबद्ध नियोजको और **श्री अनिल कुमार दीक्षित** के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औघोगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औघोगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय **कानपूर** के पंचाट **(33/2021)** प्रकाशित करती है।

[सं. एल-39025/01/2026-आई.आर (बी-II)-70]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 30th July, 2026

S.O. 1640.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award **(Ref. 33/2021*)*** of the ***Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court Kanpur*** as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of **State Bank of India** and **Shri Anil Kumar Dixit.**

[No. L-39025/01/2026–IR (B-II)-70]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, KANPUR

Present ShriRajendra Prasad Srivastava, H.J.S. (Retd.)

ID Case No. 33 of 2021

Shri Anil Kumar Dixit S/o Late Uma Shanker Dixit,

C/o Shri O.P. Mathur, 117/95, E-1, Sidhi Enclave,

Purana Kakadeo, Kanpur- 208025

…….Workman

Vs.

1. **The Branch Manager, State Bank of India, Kakadeo Branch, Kanpur- 208025.**
2. **The Regional Manager, State Bank of India, Region 1, Regional Office, Mall Road, Kanpur- 208001.**
3. **The Zonal Manager, State Bank of India, Zonal Office, Mall Road, Kanpur- 208001.**

……Management

(JUDGMENT)

(Passed on this 21st day of April, 2026)

As per letter dated 20.07.2021 by the Dy. Chief Labour Commissioner (Central) Government of India, Ministry of Labour & Employment, the reference has been made to this Tribunal under Section-10 of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (in short the 'Act') as per Notification No. K-10/2-1/2021- IR dt. 20.07.2021. The dispute under reference relates to:

> *"Whether the action of the management of State Bank of India, Kanpur over alleged illegal termination of the services of Shri Anil Kumar Dixit S/o Late Uma Shanker Dixit, Messenger w.e.f. 01.07.2020, is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled to and from which date?"*

Claimant/workman Anil Kumar Dixit (hereinafter stated as the claimant) has filed the statement of claim with averments which may be concisely stated as hereunder:

1. The applicant was employed as messenger in State Bank of India, Industrial Estate Branch, Kanpur under the Deputy General Manager, State Bank of India, Kanpur w.e.f. 11.08.1986 to 08.11.1986, thereafter opposite party State Bank of India employed the applicant in Swaroop Nagar Branch Kanpur in the year 1987.

2. The opposite party Bank in order to give permanent appointment to its employees held an interview. The applicant also appeared in the interview held on 31.07.1991 and passed. The name of the applicant was at serial number 02 of the list of successful candidates. The Bank instead of giving permanent appointment prepared a list of employees who passed in the interview. The Bank did not deliberately publish the list nor gave any intimation in writing to any employee who passed in the interview. However on enquiry the officers told to the applicant that my name is at serial number 2 of the waiting list.

3. According to the result of the interview the opposite Party Bank employed the applicant in Kakadeo Branch from 1991 as a Messenger.

4. The applicant was doing all work of messenger like as delivery of Dak, bringing of files, ledgers and keeping them at proper places. The applicant was also doing the work of handling cash box, going to treasury for the Bank work. These works are of subordinate cadre in the opposite party Bank. Beside the above work the Bank was also taking the work of stitching vouchers and entries thereon, work of day book etc.

5. The employer Bank deliberately did not give appointment letter to the applicant nor issued any pay slips etc. so that the applicant may not have any proof of employment and the employer may continue his exploitation without any break or hindrance. The employer was giving very meager salary to the applicant and no other benefits which are applicable to the Bank employees were given to the applicant. This is not only melafide but extreme exploitation of poor employees and high hindrances of the employer.

6. The employer was paying salary upto 2012 by transferring in the Bank Account of the applicant and thereafter paying through pay order.

7. The applicant is a hard worker. But the employer was paying very less salary and no benefits were given to the employee. As such the applicant was unable to pull on his family during these hard days. The repeated demands of the applicant to increase the salary annoyed the employer and they arbitrarily terminated the service of the applicant w.e.f. 01.07.2020 in violation of the mandatory provision of Section 25 (n) of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947.

8. It is, therefore humbly prayed that this Hon'ble Tribunal be pleased to award the following relief to the applicant.

   (a) The applicant be reinstated in the service of opposite party Bank.

   (b) The applicant be paid full back wages and all other attending benefits applicable to the Bank employees.

   (c) The continuity of service be granted to the applicant.

   (d) Any other suitable relief which the Tribunal may deem fit may also be granted to the applicant.

   (e) Suitable cast be also awarded to the applicant.

Respondent side has submitted the written statement with averments which may be summarized as stated below:

1. The relationship of employer and employee does not exist between the rival parties hence claim is not maintainable in the eyes of law thus present matter is liable to be rejected at the very outset.

2. It is worth mentioning that burden of proof lies on applicant that he has continuously worked more than 240 days as messenger {sub-staff} in a calendar year prior to his alleged termination of service w.e.f. 01.07.2020. It is material to narrate here that this burden has not been exhausted by the claimant hence matter is deserved to be turned down by the Hon'ble Court.

3. It is specific to mention here that after going through the relevant records it is made clear that applicant has worked as job worker/labour on daily wages for watering in plants & for one hour work, remuneration Rs 1000/- per month was paid to him & thereafter it was enhanced from November 2019. It is further submitted that as per para 16.9 of Desai award job worker has been excluded from operation of above referred award. Moreover it is urged that branch manager has no power/right to engage any person and it is settled law of land that backdoor entry is not permitted in the eyes of law.

4. In addition, it is pointed out here that due to Covid-19 pandemic, profit & income of bank was affected badly, in current situation to curtail expenses there was no need to call job worker/labour on daily wages. It is said that for lack of any dispute present matter is liable to be rejected by the Hon'ble Court.

5. He was employed as messenger in Kakadeo Branch, Kanpur, in the year 1991 are found to be false. It is clearly repeated that he used to work as job worker/labour on daily wages, for which, payment was accordingly made by the then branch manager. Since he was not appointed by bank hence question to give appointment letter pay slip etc. does not arise at all. It is crystal clear from the bank's record that subordinate staff viz. Shri Uday Narain Bajpai & thereafter Dev Narain Verma was posted permanently in Kakadeo Branch, Kanpur hence contentions of applicant is only afterthought.

6. In response to the pleas as narrated in point no. 9 & 10 of the claim in question, it is not made disputed that remuneration Rs 1000/- per month for one hour work was paid to him for job work & thereafter it was enhanced from November 2019 but remaining contents of referred points are without basis as well as have no substance in the eyes of law of the land for want of material evidence.

7. In rebuttal to point no. 11 & 12 of the claim in question, it is apparently clear that facts brought in both points are false, which has only been put at this stage to get sympathy of the conciliation officer but on the face of records there is no room for any sympathy in the light of various laws laid down by Hon'ble Apex Court as well as several High Courts. Moreover provisions of section 25[B] as well as 25[F] of I.D. Act do not attract in this matter because he has not worked more than 240 days in a calendar year as bank employee.

8. During the course of conciliation, as per suggestions of learned conciliation officer, an offer was given to engage him through agency but he refused to accept aforesaid offer.

After filing of above written statement by opposite party, rejoinder is also filed by applicant. In rejoinder, the applicant denied the averment of the written statement filed by opposite party is stated that:

1. It is submitted that applicant has passed test/interview held in 1991 and his position was II in successful list of the candidates. In view of these facts the applicant is entitled to relief claimed which may be allowed in the interest of justice.

2. Bank is a Government financial institutions and has to keep its records preserved and update. The Bank has each and every record with it. But for melafide intentions, unfair labour practice and exploitation by officers of the Bank, the records are concealed by the Bank. These days all big frauds are being done by officers of the Bank. It is further submitted that the contention of the Bank, that to support no documentary evidence has been filed by the applicant is totally false because the applicant has filed number of documents in support of his contentions alongwith statement of claim. It is further submitted that the applicant was not a member of any union or federation, therefore any settlement by federation is illegal and not applicable. It is also submitted that list of successful candidates have never been published by the bank.

3. It is submitted that when Bank can give work to applicant through Agency then why they cannot give work to the applicant directly. The humble request of the applicant to give direct work and reinstate me was refused-by the Bank. It is further submitted that the Bank has to pay commission to agency also then giving employment to the applicant is economical.

After that applicant filed some documents which is read as under:

1. Service certificate of Industrial Estate Branch.
2. Service certificate of Swaroop Nagar Branch.
3. Interview Letter issued by the State Bank of India.
4. Bankers Cheque.
5. Letter of the Bank to Post Office.
6. Payment of conveyance..
7. Copy of Pass book.
8. Vouchers Slips.
9. Roster (Day Book)
10. Roster for checking of Reports Register Day Book/VVR Register of State Bank of India, Kakadeo Branch, Kanpur.
11. Bank Register dated 10.06.2006 to 29.11.2008.

In rebuttal respondent filed documents which are read as under:

1. Attested copy of Bank's charges control register w.e.f. 01.04.2019 till 01.07.2020.
2. Copy of settlement dated 17.11.1987.
3. Copy of settlement dated 27.10.1988.
4. Copy of settlement dated 09.01.1991.
5. Copy of settlement dated 09.06.1995.
6. Copy of Claim filed before ALC (C), Kanpur.

7. Copy of bank's reply filed before ALC(C), Kanpur.
8. Copy of account statement from 01.01.2019 till 09.10.2020.
9. Copy of payment dated 01.07.2020 towards purchase of Soil etc.
10. Copy of bank's letter dated 14.07.2020.
11. Copy of record retention procedure.

As per reference the main question is Whether the action of the management of State Bank of India, Kanpur over alleged illegal termination of the services of Shri Anil Kumar Dixit S/o Late Uma Shanker Dixit, Messenger w.e.f. 01.07.2020, is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled to and from which date?

The applicant said in our statement of claim that after completing all the formalities, the applicant was employed as Messenger in State Bank of India. In order to give permanent appointment to its employees held an interview he appeared and passed and the name of applicant is at serial number 2 in the list of successful candidates. But the bank did not deliberately publish the list nor gave any intimation in writing to any employee who passed the interview. However, An enquiry the officer told to the applicant that his name is at serial number 2 of the waiting list. Accordingly, the result of the interview at the opposite party bank employed the applicant in the Kakadeo branch did not issue any pay slip. Hence the applicant may not have any proof of employment, the employer was paying salary upto 2012 by transferring into the account of the applicant continued from 1991 till 01.07.2020. He is very hardworking. He requested the employer for full salary as applicable to the employees of the bank. The bank gave assurance but did not give they did not increase the salary of the applicant and annoyed the employer and they arbitrarily terminated the services of the applicant on 01.07.2020.

Against that in our written statement, the opposite party bank stated that the relation of employer and employee does not exist between the rival parties. The burden of proof lies on the applicant that he has continuously worked more than 240 days as Messenger (sub staff) in a calendar year of to his alleged termination of service w.e.f. 01.07.2020. There is a procedure of appointment in subordinate cadre applicant worked as job worker/labour on daily wages for watering plants for one hour work, remunertation was Rupees 1000/- per month was paid to him & thereafter it was enhanced from November, 2019. In Covid pandemic, profit and income of bank was affected badly, there was no need to call worker/labour on daily wages. The claim in question that he was employed as Messenger in Kakadeo Branch, Kanpur, in the year 1991 are found to be false. It is clearly repeated that he used to work as job worker/labour on daily wages, for which payment was accordingly made by the then Branch Manager. He was not appointed by the bank hence there is no question to give appointment letter pay slip etc. also stated that from the bank record that subordinate staff Shri Uday Narain Bajpai and thereafter Dev Narain Verma was posted permanently in Kakadeo Branch, Kanpur hence contention of applicant is only afterthought.

Applicant said that he was appointed as Messenger and work since 1991 to 2020. Opposite party said that he work as labour daily wages hence to decide above question the evidence of parties are important.

In claim statement, by paper number 3 which is mentioned above. First paper is 3/6 in this paper as temporary labour on daily wages during 11.08.1986 to 08.11.1986. Further he filed an interview letter and after that bankers cheque is filed from 3/9 to 3/23 in that cheque he received 1000 and 2000 rupees per month. In paper number 3/25, 3/26 and 3/27 is fare of rikshaw. After that in paper number 3/28 to 3/53 passbook and entries which is discussed later on. Some voucher is also filed form paper number 3/54 to

3/81 about so many persons. After that roster for checking of report register is filed from paper number 3/82 to 3/149. Some papers are filed by applicant which is numbered as 17/1 onwards but as per order of predecessor on 02.08.2022 which is read as under:

> *After hearing the parties and referring to the earlier order sheet dated 04/05/2022 it is crystal clear that at one stage the O.P. side was called upon to cause production of the original documents but O.P. side declined to produce the documents and production the documents by the O.P. was disposed of with observation that Xerox copy already produced by the claimant workman side shall be dealt in accordance with the spirit of section 164 of the Indian Evidence Act. Though the Xerox copies sought to be admitted by the claimant side from page 1 to page 158 have been filed at very belated stage admitting the same into evidence will otherwise create confusion. Needless to say the claimant workman had not produced the Xerox copies from page 1 to page 156 before adducing evidence. The claimant had already adduced oral evidence and has availed of the opportunity of proving his stand by relying on other documents. In the scenario, the documents from page, 1 to page 158 which are entries in the register from 10/06/2006 onwards till 29/11/2008 will not the Tribunal to further extent. There appears no reasonable ground to admit the documents filed by claimant workman belatedly into evidence to permit the claimant workman to file the supplementary evidence.*
>
> *Prayer of the claimant workman stands rejected.*
>
> *Proceeding is fixed to 01/09/2022 for evidence of the parties.*

Some original papers are on record which is filed by applicant.

Opposite party is also our documentary evidence from paper number 9. In paper 9/2 and 9/3 and 9/4 to 9/25 is charges control register and copy of settlement. And also one paper is filed by opposite party by paper number 16/2. Copy of claim filed by applicant before ALC Central Kanpur in paper number 16/3 to 16/ 7 and after that in paper number 16/8 to 16/14 Bank reply before the ALC Central, Kanpur and after that in paper number 16/15 to 16/26 statement of bank account of the applicant Anil Kumar Dixit.

Before going discussion, the oral evidence of the parties is important. In our oral evidence applicant examined himself as W.W.1 he supported our claim statement in our chief examination and he said in our cross-examination that I have raised this industrial dispute as SBI Kakadeo branch removed me from employment on 01.07.2020. In 1991 I was engaged in SBI Kakadeo branch as Messenger. The then Regional Manager of Regional Office, Mall road Kanpur has issued appointment letter to me which was adduced to the Branch Manager Kakadeo Branch. Medical examination in respect of health was conducted by a doctor. Verification in respect of my antecedments was conducted. I do not remember if character certificates from the local gentlemen with regard to my character were produced. I have not procured copy of the appointment letter as the same was submitted to the Branch Manager. In 1991 in interview I got thorugh and I joined in Kakadeo branch but I cannot say about posting of other candidates. I sought for copy of the appointment letter from the Branch Manager Kakadeo but he refused to provide copy of the appointment letter. I did not produce copy from the Regional Office. I did not apply for copy of the appointment letter by registered post. I was working in the Kakadeo branch and I did not feel necessity of procuring copy of the letter of appointment. I did not put my signature in attendance register for permanent employees as I was not allowed to sign in the attendance register for permanent register. No acknowledgement of receipt of my letter was issued by any Branch Manager. No letter of confirmation was

issued to me after six months of joining. No provident fund number was allotted in my favour. I was not aware that provident fund number was allotted in favour of the messenger of the bank. No separate salary account was opened. I was receiving salary in my saving bank account number 10404771630. I was not allowed scale wages by employer bank. Casual leave, medical leave and other leave were not allowed in my favour. Leave fare concession was not allowed to me. Overdraft facility allowed to the other employees was not permitted in my favour. No medical benefit was allowed by the bank to me. No education scholarship was allowed to me. I never worked in the office of the Zonal Manager, Kanpur and Regional Manager, Kanpur. I have filed the certificate issued by the State Bank of India showing that worked from 11.08.196 up to 08.11.1986 as stated in the certificate 12.11.1986. I have submitted copy of the certificate dated 18.05.1991 showing my engagement as Messenger/ Farash/ water boy on daily wage for 89 days. I did not raise any industrial dispute demanding appointment letter scale wages, privileges allowed to other prior to this proceeding my name was at serial number 2 in the list of successful candidates as shown by Mr. Tiwari an officer of the Zonal Office at Mall Road Kanpur. The list was prepared towards last part of 1991 on early party of 1992. I cannot say the names of the candidates who had served 1st and 3rd positions. I do not agree that I was engaged on daily wage for watering the plants inside the premises of the SBI Kakadeo branch. At the time of disengagement I was getting two thousand rupees per month as wages. From November, 2019 my wages was increased to two thousand rupees from earlier wages of one thousand per month. From 1991 onwards till October 2019 I was getting wage of rupees one thousand per month I did not institute any case under Minimum Wages Act and Payment of wages Act against the Bank. I do not accept authenticity of the contents of the statement of account from 12.04.2019 onwards that I was paid wages for watering the plants. I have produced my Adhar Card in which my date of birth is 11.04.1968. I do agree that copy of my statement of account dated 07.06.2011, 09.07.2011, 01.08.2011, 06.09.2011, 03.10.2011, 10.10.2012 I received Rupees 1000/- on each account towards labour charges. I do agree that my statement of account dated 13.12.2011, 20.01.2012 I received rupees one thousand each as labour and watering charges respectively 25.01.2012. On 15.03.2012 Rupees 100000/- was deposited in my account. I was not member of any Union. I do agree that my statement of account dated 04.12.2012, 25.02.2012, 05.03.2012, 04.04.2012, 03.05.2012 I had received Rupees One thousand each towards labour charges. I do agree that my statement of account dated 19.11.2010, 25.04.2011, 28.03.2011, 09.04.2011 cash deposits Rs. 7000/- , Rs. 5000/-, Rs. 14500/- respectively were deposited in my account. On 14.11.2011 Rs. 8000/- was deposited in my account Rs. 15000/- was deposited in my account on handwriting paper 8/1 onwards 9/68. I do not agree that the making of entire voucher slips and Roster checking register are not included in duty assignment of Messenger. I do not agree that my name is not mentioned in paper 8/1 onwards 9/68. There was no work of watering in branch and as such I treat the bank papers charges control register as manipulated. I do not accept authenticity of the entry. I did submit in writing protesting labour and watering.

Against that as per question of oral evidence opposite party examined as MW1 Mr. Mohd. Amir. In his chief examination he supported our written statement and in cross examination he said that from 12/06/2020 I have been serving in SBI Kakadeo branch Kanpur. Prior to 12/06/2020 I have not worked in Kakadeo branch of SBI. On 01/07/2020 | instructed Anil Kumar Dixit not to work. Outside our branch there are five to six plants grown in plant tubs. I do not agree that those plants are beside the road and those plants have been planted by the Kanpur Nagar Nigam. I do not agree that those plants have been planted on the land of Nagar Nigam. I cannot say the exact date on which those plants were planted. I do agree that no

paper with regard to purchase of tubs and purchase of plants by the SBI has been filed. I do agree that till now any direction issued by any higher authority for plantation and for beautification with plants has not been filed (the witness volunteers I can produce). I do not have any knowledge or any record showing that claimant Anil Kumar Dixit worked in Industrial Estate Branch or in Swaroop Nagar Branch of the SBI. I cannot say that one interview of temporary and casual workers was held by the State Bank of India in between 1989 and 1991 the witness clarifies from the Regional Office I could get information that one list of successful candidates was published and successful persons were appointed and the said list already stood exhausted long ago. I cannot say the exact date of publication of the said list of successful candidates by the management. I cannot give clear reply to the question that the said list was deliberately suppressed or published. I cannot give clear version with regard to the publication of that list by the management. To my knowledge no service record of Anil Kumar Dixit was maintained in the office of the bank. I do not accept the authenticity and genuineness of the service certificate purporting to have been issued by the State Bank of India Industrial Branch at paper no. 146. I do not accept genuineness and authenticity of the paper no. 144 purporting call letter for interview. From the Regional Office Mall Road, Kanpur from the HR Section I could get oral information about lack of authenticity of the paper no. 144 purporting call letter for interview and paper no. 146 but I cannot say the name of the officials toward furnished the information. After verification of the bank records genuineness of the Banker's Cheques can be properly stated. I do agree that in my examination in chief date of joining of claimant workman has not been mentioned. The witness clarifies Anil Kumar Dixit was not working on any permanent post and there was no occasion of mentioning any date of joining. I do agree that in my examination chief specifically I have not narrated the exact nature of work assigned to claimant Anil Kumar Dixit (The witness volunteers in the written statement submitted under my signature I have stated the work assigned to the claimant). After referring to the rules the time period of preservation of the waiting list of the successful candidates was to be preserved can be correctly stated. During the Covid period one circular was receives for curtailing unnecessary expenses and since it came to my notice that the claimant was engaged for watering the five plants which could be managed by the sub staffs of the bank I disengaged him. I do agree that the circular issued by the management stating period of preservation of the documents has not been produced. I can produce the said circular if directed by the Tribunal. I can produce the circular issued by the management for curtailment for expenditure if directed by the Tribunal. I cannot say the exact period for which watering of the plants was continuing. I cannot say if the circular for beautification with plants was issued to all the branches of Kanpur. I do not agree that there was no plant to be watered. Two persons on outsourcing from SIS Security Agency have been engaged at our branch. To Tribunal those two persons have been engaged for cleaning and for canteen purpose. One of the persons works on full time and the other on part time. The witness clarifies Accountant is an officer of the bank and he is vested with authority to release funds up to 1.5 Lakhs under his signature. I do not agree that the Branch Manager approves the salaries to be disbursed. The witness clarifies under automated HRMS System only withholding of the salaries can be done by electronic communications. No notice pay was released in favour of the claimant.

Now, the question is arise whether the applicant is employee of the opposite party as stated by applicant in our claim statement and rejoinder and our evidence. First the documentary evidence as mentioned above by 3/6 he is temporary labour on daily wages and next paper 3/7 wages paid per day as mentioned and he worked in the year 1987 for 89 days, original copy of those documents is also filed as 19/1 to 19/3.

Hence, it is clear that he first employed by the bank as Temporary labour on daily wages. After that as per his claim statement in order to give permanent appointment to our employees of the bank held an interview. Applicant appeared in the interview on 31.07.1991, interview letter was also filed by paper number 3/8. He said he passed and his name is serial number 2 of the waiting list but no such documents has been filed by applicant. According to the result of interview he employed in opposite party organization from 1991 but it is clear as his oral statement which is mentioned above and his para 6 of the claim statement there is no appointment or any pay slip is issued to him and as per result of the interview posted as bank employee then without any appointment letter how he work.

He also said in our claim statement, applicant may not have any proof of employment. Upon this question his oral evidence is important. In our cross-examination he said that the Regional Manager of Regional Office, Mall Road Kanpur issued appointment letter to me and further also said that I sought for copy of the appointment letter from the Branch Manager, Kakadeo but he refused to provide copy of the appointment letter. I did not procure copy form Regional Office, I did not apply for copy of the appointment letter by register post. I did not feel necessity of the procuring copy of the letter of appointment. I did not put any signature in attendance for permanent employees as I was not allowed to give attendance register for permanent register and further said leave concession was not allowed to me. Overdraft facilities allowed to the other employees was not permitted in my favour. No medical benefit was allowed by the bank to me.

Applicant said in our claim statement and further in our evidence that he appeared in interview on 31.07.1991. On an enquiry the officer told to the applicant that my name is as serial number 2 of the waiting list. No name of the officer is opened in our claim statement and onwards other pleadings. Further said on the result of interview he employed at Kakadeo branch from 1991 and he doing all work of the bank.

Opposite party bank in our support of written statement filed the copy of claim statement before ALC (C), Kanpur. In para 1 applicant said that he was the employee of the opposite party and he appointed after completion of all formalities and he said in our para 3 after interview his name was in the list of successful candidates but he further said in our above claim statement in para 12 that he work from long time and he is entitled for regular and other benefits and full wages from opposite party. In para 8 said that opposite party paid to him Rs. 1000/- till December, 2019 and after that paid Rs. 2000/- per month. And in para 14 and 15 he also said that he always said for permanent and other benefits of the bank employees but they terminated from services from 01.07.2020.

Before the ALC (C), Kanpur claim statement was filed by the applicant and he requested to opposite party for permanent and other benefits. Before this Tribunal in our claim statement he said that he appointed as Messenger, he have no appointment letter, he have no any pay slip and he also admitted no benefits is given by opposite party which is given to permanent employees. Before the ALC (C), Kanpur is filed on 28.08.2020 and in this Tribunal he filed claim statement on 10.09.2021.

As mentioned above by me, some documents bank statement of the applicant is mentioned as labour charge and labour bill in every payment of the applicant. Opposite party bank filed charges control register in paper number 9/2 there is mention is as under:

SI. No.	Bill No.	Bill Date	Date of payment	Particulars of items purchase	Bill Amount
01	1	01.04.2019	12.04.2019	Watering in plants April, 2019	1000/-
02	2	01.05.2019	06.06.2019	Watering in plants May, 2019	1000/-
03	3	01.07.2019	05.07.2019	Watering in plants June, 2019	1000/-
04	4	01.08.2019	09.08.2019	Watering in plants July, 2019	1000/-
05	05	01.09.2019	09.09.2019	Watering in plants August, 2019	1000/-
06	06	01.10.2019	09.10.2019	Watering in plants September, 2019	1000/-
07	07	01.11.2019	05.12.2019	Watering in plants October, 2019	1000/-
08	08	07.12.2019	07.12.2019	Watering in plants November, 2019	2000/-
09	09	01.01.2020	02.01.2020	Watering in plants December, 2019	2000/-
10	10	01.02.2020	12.02.2020	Watering in plants January, 2020	2000/-
11	12	01.03.2020	04.02.2020	Watering in plants February, 2020	2000/-

In his bank account statement specifically written labour charge and charges control register is also mention watering in plants and applicant is also admitted that he always efforts and requested to opposite party for regularization and other benefits of the bank. He worked in the bank and he knows the benefits of the other employees after that he worked continuation of above wages as mentioned above by me till 01.07.2020. He said in our claim statement and other pleadings and evidence that after the completion of all formalities he appointed but why he not procured appointment letter, he admitted in our claim statement that bank deliberately did not give appointment letter or any pay slip.

Applicant documentary evidence as discussed above. First he worked in bank for 70 days as Temporary Labour after that wages paid per day and after that on an amount of Rs. 1000/- and thereafter he paid Rs. 2000/- per month. Applicant submitted Roster checking report register and requested that these documents also established he worked as a Messenger but above all documents are not proved by giving any evidence. Applicant start work from 11.08.1986 and as per his statement as given in his cross-examination his date of birth is 11.04.1968. When he is start work he is below than 21 year.

Against that opposite party said in our statement and further our evidence that he is job worker labour on daily wages. In our documentary evidence by the bank as mentioned/ discussed above all payments specially mentioned labour charge for watering plants.

Opposite party witness Mr. Mohd. Amir in our cross-examination said that to my knowledge no service record of Shri Anil Kumar Dixit was maintained in the office of the bank. He is presently working as Branch Manager in Kakadeo Branch, it means there is no any service record of the applicant. It came to my notice that applicant was engaged for watering the plants which could be managed by sub staff of the bank I disengaged him.

As per question of reinstatement there is mandatory to a sanction post about above sanction post opposite party said in our written statement that Shri Uday Narain Bajpai and thereafter Dev Narain Verma was posted permanently in Kakadeo Branch and worker/labour on daily wages does not create any right to be permanent.

After perusal of the para 11 of the written statement, it is clear that some person is working in permanently in that branch. No other sanction post is there and against sanction post somebody is working and applicant is worked as labour work as watering in plants.

Upon this subject in the case of ***G.M. BSNL and others Vs. Mahesh Chand reported in 2008 (117) FLR 573*** Hon'ble Apex Court is held that:

> ***Award-Of reinstatement-In absence of any sanctioned post of 'Safaiwala'-Part-time nature of work and uncertain period of work-There was no order of appointment-Therefore award of reinstatement cannot be sustained.***
>
> *The work that was being done by the respondent was also being done by his wife and his mother. Sometimes, no order of appointment was admittedly issued to the respondent. This fact is misconceived. In view of the aforesaid factual scenario, the award made by the Tribunal as affirmed by learned Single Judge and the Division Bench cannot be sustained.*

Hon'ble Apex Court is also held in the case of ***National Fertilizers Ltd. And others Vs. Somvir Singh reported in 2006 (110) FLR 211*** that:

> ***Regularisation-Respondents were appointed without any advertisements and without any intimation to the employment exchange-Appointments oymade at instance of two Officers--Appointments of respondents are illegal-They do not have any legal right to continue in service.***

Applicant filed some case law in support of his case:

In the case of ***Punjab Land Development vs. Presiding Officer, Labour Court reported in 1990 SCR (3) 111, 1990 SCC (3) 682*** and in the case of ***State Bank of India vs. Shri N. Sundara Money reported in 1976 AIR 1111*** and in the case of ***Ajaib Singh vs. Sirhind Coop reported in 1999(6) SCC 82*** and in the case of ***State Bank of India vs. CGIT cum Labour Court, Bhubaneswar***.

As per the question of benefits of ID Act Section 25-B and 25-H is as read as under:

> ***[25-B. Definition of continuous service-*** *For the purpose of this Chapter-*
>
> *(1) a workmen 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; [25-B. Definition of continuous service*
>
> *(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.

25-H. 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 to the retrenched workmen who are citizens of India to offer themselves for re-employment, and such retrenched workmen] who offer themselves for re-employment shall have preference over other persons.*

Now the question whether the applicant is employee of opposite party no 1. As per the question of the employer and workman in the ID Act, there is a workman definition in section 2 (s) is read as under:

*"**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 [one thousand rupees] per menses 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.

And employer definition is given in section 2 (g) is read as under:

***"employer"** means-*

(i) in relation to an industry carried on by or under the authority of any department of '[the Central Government or a State Government] the authority prescribed in this behalf, or where no authority is prescribed, the head of the department;

(ii) in relation to an industry carried on by or on behalf of a local authority, the chief executive officer of that authority;

After discussion of all above facts applicant is failed to prove as stated in our claim statement that he is employee as he said in our claim statement.

From perusal of the documentary evidence and pleadings of the parties it is clear that he worked in the bank from 1991 to 01.07.2020. Whether he is entitled for any compensation in it?

Learned counsel of the opposite party filed case law on behalf of the bank ***WRIT C No. 24610 of 2007 Assistant General Manager, State Bank of India vs. Presiding Officer C.G.I.T.-Cum Labour Court 1179 & Another*** passed by Hon'ble High Court of Allahabad dated 21.07.2014.

In above case law Hon'ble High Court is read as under:

> *The workman examined himself as WW-I in support of his claim. However, no evidence was adduced by the authorised representative of the Management. The workman before the labour court in the arguments took a plea that he was considered for regularization of his service and after interview he was kept in the panel prepared for regularisation but appointment was not given to him and his services were terminated with effect from 17.4.1993 without any notice or retrenchment compensation.*
>
> *The authorised representative of the Management pleaded that the workman was interviewed on 1.8.1991 and his name figured in the select list, but he could not be given appointment as his turn did not come and the select list exhausted. It was asserted that the workman had not completed 241 days preceding one year from date of his termination and as such he was not entitled for any relief. The labour court found that the workman had worked continuously from 4.8.88 to 16.4.1993 with wages. There was no break in the service as such he would be deemed to be in continuous service within the meaning of section 25-B of the Act, and, therefore, he was entitled for protection of Section 25-F of the Act. His disengagement clearly falls within the ambit of retrenchment as defined under section 2(il) of the Act. No evidence was led by the management to establish that there was a break in the service of the workman from 4.8.1988 to 16.4.1993, hence workman was entitled for reinstatement with full back wages with continuity of service and all consequential benefits attached with the post.*
>
> *Challenging the award, learned for the petitioner Shri Satish Chaturvedi submits that in the written statement filed by the bank details of the period of working of the respondent no.1 workman was given. It was categorically stated that the workman did not work for more than 240 days in one calendar months preceding the date of termination. So far as his absorption is concerned, no such dispute was raised before the labour court in the claim petition. As the said dispute was note raised for adjudication, therefore, the labour court did not address the said plea taken by the workman during the arguments. As the workman did not complete 240 days in one calendar months, there was no violation of provision of section 25-F of the Act.*
>
> *Lastly he submits that even assuming that the workman had worked for more than 240 days, he was merely a daily wager employee. His appointment was neither on any sanctioned post nor by adopting the regular procedure. In view thereof he had no lien on any post and cannot continue in the service of the bank. His services were not required with effect from 16.4.1993 and as such he was rightly disengaged So far as the panel is concerned, it was prepared for absorption of the employees who were admittedly the daily wage employees of the bank under a Bipartite settlement arrived between the State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation. The said panel prepared was the waiting list of daily wagers to be absorbed in due course as per guidelines against the permanent post as and when the same would have fallen vacant initially till 3.12.1994 and thereafter till 31.9.1007. The panel /wait list prepared by the selection board after*

interview remained operative till 31.3.1997. The workman's name did not come up for absorption till 31.3.1997. consequently he had not been absorbed in the Bank's service. Moreover no such claim was made by the workman before the labour court, so it cannot be raised for the first time in the present petition.

Now the question arises as to what relief can be granted to the respondent no.2 at this stage. The present writ petition was filed in the year 2007. The operation of the award passed by the labour court was stayed by order dated 23.5.2006 subject to compliance of section 17-B of the Act. It was also directed in the order that the petitioner may reinstate the respondent workman from the date of award on the wages last drawn by him or continue to pay wages last drawn with effect from the date of award. Both the parties admitted that respondent- workman did not present himself before the bank for reinstatement pursuant to the interim order and hence he was never reinstated. In the result, the respondent-workman is out of service since 17.4.1993 i.e. for a period of more then 20 years.

Learned counsel for parties also agree to the fact that the bank had complied the provisions of section 17-B of the Act and payment is being duly made to the workman.

The law with regard to reinstatement is well settled in a catena of decision of the Apex Court. The Apex court has held that even in the case of wrong dismissal on non-compliance of the provision of section 25-F of the Act, the labour court should not award reinstatement with full back wages in a routine manner. The mode and manner of the appointment has to be seen as discussed in case of Assistant Engineer, Rajasthan Development Corporation and another(Supra) relied upon by the petitioner, it has been held that where the length of engagement as daily. wager has not been long, award of reinstatement should not follow and rather compensation should be directed to be paid. A distinction has been drawn between a daily wager and an employee holding the regular post for the purposes of consequential relief.

And also upon opposite party authorized representative filed case law ***Jaipur Development Authority Vs. Ram Sahai and Ors. reported in Civil Appeal No. 4626 of 2006 passed by Hon'ble Apex Court***. In the case of ***U.P. State Road Transport Corporation vs. Man Singh reported in 2006 (111) FLR 323(SC),*** the service of the respondent, who was appointed on temporary basis, was terminated. The industrial dispute referred to the Labour Court culminated with the termination of the workman being set aside, in view of Section 25-F of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947, not being complied with. However, the workman was granted only back wages. The Hon'ble Supreme Court, on considering the fact that there was nothing to show that the workman had been appointed in accordance with the Recruitment Rules for filling up a vacancy, in terms of Article 14 and 16 of the Constitution, besides the fact that the dispute was raised after 12 years, the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that the interest of justice would be sub-served, if the Corporation was made to pay a sum of Rs. 50,000/- to the workman.

In the case of ***Nand Kumar vs. State of Bihar and others reported in (2014) 5 SCC 300***, the Hon'ble Supreme Court considered the judgment of the Constitution Bench in the case of ***State of Karnataka vs. Uma Devi reported in (2006) 4 SCC 1***, where it had held that while directing the appointments, temporary or casual, be regularized or made permanent, the Courts are swayed by the fact that the concerned person had worked for some time. It is not as if the person who accepts an engagement either temporary or casual in nature, is not aware of the nature of his employment. He accepts the employment with eyes open. It may

be true that he is not in a position to bargain since he might have been searching for some employment so as to eke out his livelihood and accepts whatever he gets. But on that ground alone, it would not be appropriate to jettison the constitutional scheme of appointment and to take the view that a person who has temporarily or casually got employed should be directed to be continued permanently. By doing so, it would be creating another mode of public appointment which is not permissible. (see also ***State of Orissa vs. MamataMohanty reported in (2011) 3 SCC 436)***.

Hence, taking into all facts and circumstances of the case claimant is entitled for a compensation only.

In lieu of all claim statement, he is entitled to Two Lakh Rupees only as compensation be paid to the respondent. The opposite party bank shall make the payment of Rupees Two Lakh Rupees within three months form the date of award failing which same shall be paid with interest @ 9 % per annum.

Accordingly, the reference is answered.

Parties are left to bear their respective costs.

Date: 21.04.2026 RAJENDRA PRASAD SRIVASTAVA, H.J.S. (Retd.), Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 30 जुलाई, 2026

का.आ. 1641.—औघोगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार **स्टेट बैंक ऑफ इंडिया** के प्रबंधतत्र, संबद्ध नियोजको और **श्री दिनेश कुमार सिंह** के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औघोगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औघोगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय **कानपूर** के पंचाट **(53/2023)** प्रकाशित करती है।

[सं. एल-39025/01/2026-आई.आर (बी-II)-69]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 30th July, 2026

S.O. 1641.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award **(Ref. 53/2023*)*** of the ***Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court Kanpur*** as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of **State Bank of India** and **Shri Dinesh Kumar Singh.**

[No. L-39025/01/2026–IR (B-II)-69]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, KANPUR

ID Case No. 53 of 2023

Present Shri Rajendra Prasad Srivastava, H.J.S (Retd.)

Between:-

Shri Dinesh Kumar Singh S/o Shri Daya Ram, C/o Shri O.P Mathur, Hind Mazdoor Sabha, U.P, 117/95 E. 1, Sindhi Enclave, Kakadeo, Kanpur-208025

……Workman

AND

Dy. General Manager State Bank of Inda, Zonal Office, Mail Road, Kanpur-208001.

……Management

Award

22.04.2026

Office of the Dy. chief labour commissioner (central), vide order no. K-10/27/2023-IR dated 15.03.2023 has referred the Industrial Dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication.

This award arises in response to the reference made by the Office of the DY. Chief Labour Commissioner(Central) in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section(5) of Section 12 read with sub-section (2A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947(14 of 1947) on the Central Government and Delegated to the undersigned in pursuance of the Notifications of the Government of India, in the Ministry of Labour & Employment published in the Gazette of India, Extraordinary Part II, Section 3, Sub-Section (ii) vide S.O 1262 (E) and 1263(E) both dated 17.03.2023 the Office of the Dy. Chief Labour Commissioner (Central) hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Kanpur. The Reference is stated as follows:-

"Whether the action of the management of State Bank of India in terminating the services of Shri Dinesh Kumar Singh S/o Shri Daya Ram w.e.f 08.08.1986 and not giving employment is legal and justified ? If not to what relief the concerned workman is entitled to and from which date?"

After receiving the reference the Tribunal issued notice on 02.08.2023 and fixed date for filling claim statement for 01.09.2023. On Perusal of the record it is found out the worker registered his presence on 12.10.2023 but failed to file claim statement. After that the workman was given several opportunities for filing claim statement by fixing dates such as 17.01.2024, 20.03.2024, 14.05.2024, 31.07.2024, 29.10.2024, 01.01.2025, 19.03.2025, 16.06.2025, 15.09.2025, 19.11.2025, 16.02.2026 and 22.04.2026 . Even after all these opportunities the workman failed to file claim statement and even workman failed to register his presence before the Tribunal.

On perusal of record it is found that claimant failed to submit claim statement being provided several opportunities. Hence in given circumstances it is presumable that claimant workman is not interested in contesting the Industrial dispute.

Hence in the given circumstances the reference stands disposed of as of 'NIL' award.

Answered Accordingly.

Parties are left to bear their respective costs.

Date: 22.04.2026 RAJENDRA PRASAD SRIVASTAVA, H.J.S. (Retd.), Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 31 जुलाई, 2026

का.आ. 1642.—औघोगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार **बैंक ऑफ बड़ोदा** के प्रबंधतत्र, संबद्ध नियोजको और उनके **कर्मकार** के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औघोगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औघोगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, **चंडीगढ़-II** के **पंचाट (01/2024)** प्रकाशित करती है।

[सं. एल-39025/01/2026-आई.आर (बी-I)-77]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 31th July, 2026

S.O. 1642.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the **Award (Ref. 01/2024*)*** of the ***Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court Chandigarh-II*** as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of **Bank of Baroda** and **their workman.**

[No. L-39025/01/2026–IR (B-I)-77]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

In the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court-II, Chandigarh.

Present: Mr. Kamal Kant, Presiding Officer.

ID No.01/2024

Registered on: - 15.05.2024

Miss. Shaphali Jain through United Forum of We Bankers, New MIG-53, Hemant Vihar, Barra-2, Kanpur-208027.

…Workman/Workers Union

Versus

Regional Manager, Bank of Baroda, Regional Office, Amritsar.

…Management

Present:- Sh. Kamlesh Chaturvedi, AR for workman.

Sh. B.B. Bagga, AR for management.

Award

Passed on:- 22.06.2026

Central Government vide Notification No.08(55)/2023/RLC/JMU dated 05.04.2024, under clause (d) of sub-section (1) and subsection 2(A) 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 The Chief General Manager, HRM, Bank of Baroda, Mumbai, Maharashtra-400051 and The Regional Manager, Bank of Baroda, Amritsar for not considering transfer request from Katra to Jammu and special leave w.e.f 20.08.2022 to its workman is legal and justified? If Not, then to what relief the concerned workmen are entitled to and from which date?"**

1. The brief facts of the case as per claim statement filed by the workman i.e. Miss Shaphali Jain (hereinafter called as workman) are that workman has joined the services of erstwhile Vijaya Bank (now Bank of Baroda) on 18.07.2018 and was posted at Katra. Vijay Bank was merged with Bank of Baroda w.e.f. 01.01.2019.

2. The mala fide and bad motive of the management is further proved from his subsequent act designating the workman as Head Cashier vide order dated 02.05.2022 (Annexure 2). While altering and changing the designation of the workman thereby overburdening her with enhanced workload full of enormous risk.

3. In the instant case, initial appointment of workman was for the post of Single Window Operator-A and accordingly, she has executed service contract with the bank at the time of her appointment in the bank for the said post of Single Window Operator-A. As such without offering the post of Head Cashier to workman and without providing her an opportunity to take a decision on such offer for the purpose of seeking her concurrence/consent/acceptance, the special pay carrying duties could not have been entrusted upon her.

4. At Katra, where the workman is posted, supply of electricity and providing of connectivity from Bank's server is mostly irregular and often staff members have to go Jammu for completion of day's work. It is on 18.08.2022, while travelling from Katra to Jammu along with an officer for completing the day's pending work and sustained injuries relating to spine. She was given first aid by a nearby doctor. After initial treatment, she was referred to a specialist Doctor. The attending Doctor diagnosed that she has become patient of severe spinal problem known as Bilateral L5-S1, Radiculopathy/seronegative in medical terminology and advised complete rest and regular treatment. The workman sent a communication dated 18.08.2022 (Annexure 3) to her Manager communicating about the factual position and her inability to perform duties.

5. The Branch Manager of Branch Office, Katra after coming to know about the incident wrote a letter dated 19.08.2022 (Annexure 4) to the Regional manager informing him about the ailment workman has suffered during the course of duty as also demanding substitute in place of workman keeping in view continuous long treatment and even recommending her transfer from Branch Office, Katra to Jammu for better treatment.

6. With regard to transfer request, specific provisions have been made in Para 20.17 of the Bipartite Settlement dated 19.10.1966 (Annexure 5), which reads as under:

> **"Any request by an employee for transfer on compassionate grounds will be considered sympathetically subject to exigencies and requirements of the Bank but such request will not be rejected only on the ground that he will have to be paid emoluments of the higher rates"**

7. The workman submitted a transfer request on 01.09.2022 (Annexure 6) through HRMS of the Bank immediately. The request of transfer of workman was got recorded in HRMS by Ms. Kaur Manpreet, HR Head and approved by Mr. Manhas Arun Singh on 03.09.2022 and 12.09.2022.

8. The need for emphasizing transfer to Jammu had arisen only when qualified Doctors at Katra advised in writing (Annexure 7) that Katra is not having satisfactory facilities. The authorities of the Bank did not consider the request on compassionate grounds. Subsequently, the parents of workman met Regional Manager on 29.09.2022 having power to order intra-region transfer orders within the

branches of the same region and explained to him the circumstances but on deaf ears. Workman submitted a representation to Zonal Manager, the higher authority.

9. The workman has submitted various requests and reminders (Annexure 10) apprising the Regional Manager about the circumstances she is placed in and requesting him to transfer her to Jammu for the purpose of proper treatment.

10. In view of law settled on the basis of time and motion theory, injuries sustained by the workman while travelling from Katra to Jammu due to Bank's work is required to be treated as injury sustained in the course of her duty.

11. Specific provisions have been made in Para 18 (iv) of the Bipartite Settlement dated 31.10.1979 (Annexure 13) for reimbursement of cost of medical treatment and entitlement of special leave for period of her absence required for the treatment. These provisions made Para 18(iv) of Bipartite Settlement dated 31.10.1979 (Annexure 13) which reproduce as under:

> **"18(iv) in case of injuries sustained by a workman in the course of his duty, he shall be fully reimbursed the medical cost and treatment and/or hospitalization over and above his normal entitlement. He shall also be treated on special leave for the period of his absence required for treatment."**

12. The Regional Manager, Regional Office, Amritsar disregarded and willfully violated the above mandatory provisions also inasmuch as that the Regional Manager has refused to sanction Special Leave to workman and taking undue advantage of the situation the workman was forced to submit leave applications on medical grounds. The cost of medical treatment has also not been reimbursed to her. It is prayed that the reference may be decided in favor of the workman.

13. Subsequent to filing of original statement of claim, an amended claim statement dated 02.09.2024 was filed by the workman maintaining therein that the Chief Medical Officer, Jammu (Jammu & Kashmir) has issued Disability Certificate dated 28.08.2024 (Annexure 14), certifying that workman is suffering with Locomotor Disability to the extent of 50%. Subsequently, amended corrigendum was received from the Deputy Chief Labour Commissioner (C), Chandigarh, which reads as under:

> **"Whether the action of the management of Bank of Baroda, Regional Office, Amritsar in not considering the transfer request made by workman Miss Shaphali Jain requesting to transfer from her Branch Office Katra of the Bank to any of the Branches of the Bank in Jammu City and not sanctioning the Special Leave w.e.f 20.08.2022 on account of injury sustained during the course of duty as per provisions made in Bipartite Settlement to its workman Miss Shaphali Jain is legal and justified? If not, then to what relief the concerned workman is entitled to and from which date?"**

14. A perusal of subject matter of pending industrial dispute i.e. transfer of workman from Katra to Jammu and sanctioning of special leave w.e.f. 20.08.2022 emanate from the incident dated 18.08.2022, which resulted in severe injuries to the workman. Further, it has transpired during the course of examination by panel of Medical Experts duly authorized and empowered by Government of India that injury dated 18.08.2022 was severe to such extent that made workman permanently disabled to the extent of 50%.

15. Thus, above development subsequent to filing of statement of claim is most significant and important from the point of view of adjudication of above terms of reference and has materially altered the facts, circumstances and has resulted in creation of new evidence in favour of workman.

16. Notice of the reference was given to the management, who filed reply thereof maintaining therein that the present dispute is raised with the intent to immunize the workman from the disciplinary proceedings against her on account of her unauthorized absence w.e.f. 27.10.2022 and that no leave application has been submitted by the workman after 27.10.2022. The claim of the workman cannot be subjected to any consideration by the management. The management has already issued letters dated 12.10.2023 and 21.10.2023 to the workman regarding her unauthorized absence without sanctioned leave.

17. The workman was appointed on 20.07.2018 in the clerical cadre and was posted in Branch Office, Katra (erstwhile Vijaya Bank), Jammu which was a branch of her choice and w.e.f. 02.05.2022, she was assigned the duties of Head Cashier, Category-II, at the said Branch, in terms of a settlement made by All India Bank of Baroda Employees Federation. As per Shastri Award and Bipartite Settlement, it is the discretion of the management to avail the services of an employee at the Branch where such services are required.

18. The management not only discharges their duties with utmost diligence within four corners of the Bank's Policy but also strongly stands for all legal and constitutional rights of its employees. The policy relating to staff strength of clerical cadre is duly and diligently followed by them. The issues relating to electrical outrageous at the Branch or connectivity of the bank server are not attributable to any deliberate or policy related act on their part. The mode and manner in the present appeal of describing the usual and normal events of electrical supply disruption and server connectivity issues to the medical problems of the workman is unjustified even on the parameters of ideal paradigms of employer-employee relations. However, every permissible accommodation is extended by them to the workman. It is prayed that the claim statement of workman may be dismissed.

19. Rejoinder was also filed by the workman to the reply filed by the management on 16.12.2024 and various other documents have been annexed with the same.

20. Parties were given opportunity to lead their evidence.

Evidence of Workman: -

21. In order to prove claim, the workman examined herself as WW1 who filed his affidavit Ex.WW1/A along with documents Ex.WW1/1 to Ex.WW1/5 and cross examined by the AR for management. Workman along with her AR closed the evidence on 18.05.2026.

List of documents:-

Sl. No.	Document	Date	Annexure/ Exhibit
1.	Office Memorandum	13.03.2002	Ex.WW1/1
2.	Office Memorandum	31.03.2014	Ex.WW1/2
3.	Equal Opportunity Policy		Ex.WW1/3
4.	Request to Branch Manager	02.03.2026	Ex.WW1/4
5.	Intervention application to Chief Liaison Officer	12.05.2025	Ex.WW1/5

22. Besides, this the workman has relied upon various Annexures enclosed with her claim petition/additional claim, the same have been referred in this award as Annexures and are as follows:

Sl. No.	Document	Date	Annexure
1.	Copy of Section 9A along with item no.11 of Fourth Schedule		Annexure 1
2.	Letter to Branch Manager, Katra by Regional Head	02.05.2022	Annexure 2
3.	Letter to Assistant Branch Manager by workman	18.08.2022	Annexure 3
4.	Letter to HRM Department by Branch Manger	19.08.2022	Annexure 4
5.	Copy of Para 20.17 of the Bipartite Settlement dated 19.10.1966		Annexure 5
6.	Employee transfer request	01.09.2022	Annexure 6
7.	OPD card	03.10.2023	Annexure 7
8.	Grievance at Baroda Samadhan	29.09.2023	Annexure 8
9.	Letter from General Manager	17.10.2022	Annexure 9
10.	Mails regarding transfer request on medical grounds	Various dates	Annexure 10
11.	Prescription slips from Doctors and other		Annexure 11
12.	Letter from Department of Financial Services	08.08.2014	Annexure 12
13.	Copy of Para 18(iv) of the Bipartite Settlement dated 31.10.1979		Annexure 13
14.	Disability Certificate issued by Chief Medical Officer, Jammu	28.08.2024	Annexure 14
15.	Letter to Regional Manager, Amritsar Region	07.12.2023	Annexure 20(1/2)
16.	Letter to Manager, Katra Branch	06.01.2024	Annexure 20(2/2)
17.	Email by Ms. Shaphali Jain on Bank of Baroda portal	06.05.2025	Annexure 22

Evidence of Management: -

23. Thereafter, management has examined Ms. Madhvi Saini, Senior Manager (HR), Bank of Baroda, Regional Office, Amritsar, who filed her affidavit as Ex.MW1/A along with documents Ex.M1 to Ex.M12. AR for management closed the evidence on behalf of management on 03.06.2026.

List of documents:-

Sr. No.	Document	Date	Annexure/Exhibit
1.	Leave request on medical grounds along with medical records	30.08.2022	Ex.M/1
2.	Leave request as per doctor recommendation along with medical records	31.08.2022	Ex.M/2
3.	Leave request on account of illness along with medical records	13.10.2022	Ex.M/3
4.	Leave request for health issues along with medical records	13.10.2022	Ex.M/4
5.	Leave request for health issues	01.11.2022	Ex.M/5
6.	Absence letter to workman	12.10.2023	Ex.M/6
7.	Absence letter to workman	21.10.2023	Ex.M/7
8.	Letter to Chief Medical Officer, Jammu	06.01.2024	Ex.M/8
9.	Letter to Chief Medical Officer, Jammu	04.04.2024	Ex.M/9
10.	HRM Department Instructions		Ex.M/10
11.	Leave records		Ex.M/11
12.	Transfer request	19.08.2022	Ex.M/12

24. During the course of argument, AR for both the parties made a statement that since transfer of the workman has already affected from Katra to Jammu. So, reference qua transfer has become infructuous. The statement of AR for both the parties is as follows:

> "In this matter transfer of workman had already been affected from Katra to Jammu. Hence, reference to this effect has become infructuous.
>
> Signed by
>
> Workman along with Sh. Kamlesh Chaturvedi, AR for workman.
>
> Signed by
>
> Sh. B.B. Bagga, AR for Management".

25. Now, the sole question which requires to be determined is whether the workman has suffered injury while on duty and she was entitled for special leave as per Para 18(iv) of the Bipartite Settlement dated 31.10.1979 (Annexure 13). As per aforesaid Para, workman first has to prove whether she suffered injury while on duty, consequently she is entitled for special pay.

Submissions of the workman:-

26. While arguing the case, AR for the workman contended that she was given charge of higher post of Head Cashier when one Sh. Kapoor Sumit Singh has been transferred vide letter dated 02.05.2022 (Annexure 2). He further contended that there was issue of connectivity of server at Katra Branch, so

she used to commute from Katra to Jammu with his Higher Officer to do connectivity of the Bank there. On 18.08.2022, she was accompanied by Assistant Branch Manager while travelling from Katra to Jammu and suffered injury and feel extreme pain which requires immediate treatment. She wrote a letter to the Assistant Branch Manager informing in this regard to the Branch Manager. Even thereafter, Branch Manager on 19.08.2022 (Annexure 4), wrote a letter to the Regional Manager that workman should be transferred to Jammu and substitute may be provided in her place. Even an email dated 06.05.2025 (Annexure 22) was also sent to Ms. Madhvi Saini in which workman has provided justification/remarks that "Absence due to injury on duty since 20.08.2022" and Ms. Madhvi Saini remarked the same as "checked the records of the employee and find no objection in enabling the email id of this employee".

27. However, even as per record vide letter dated 07.12.2023 (Annexure 20(1/2)), workman i.e., Ms. Shaphali Jain wrote a letter to the Branch Manager for giving her Special Medical Leave. Even in RLC proceedings, it is claimed by the workman that she is entitled for Special Leave. From the medical records it is proved that there was disability due to the injury.

28. Since, in the affidavit filed by the workman and proceedings before the RLC, no objection was raised that workman suffered injury while performing her duties. So, adverse inference should be drawn against the management and it is proved that she had suffered injuries while performing her duties. Hence, she is entitled for Special Leave as per Para 18(iv) of the Bipartite Settlement dated 31.10.1979 (Annexure 13).

29. During the course of arguments, AR for workman stated that workman was accompanied by Assistant Branch Manager from Katra to Jammu. Even, if the claim of the management is this that workman was daily commuting from Jammu to Katra, then she was allegedly violating the Service Rules and she should have been charge-sheeted on this account, but she has not been charge-sheeted. Thus, the plea of the management cannot be taken as true.

30. Moreover, medical reimbursement has been done by the management. However, Special Leave has not been granted. So, under these circumstances, the present claim has been filed by the workman.

31. AR for workman in support of its arguments, placed on record the judgment of Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court in LPA No.653 of 2010 (O&M) titled as "**Central Bank of India and others Vs. Krishan Gupta and others**" wherein it has been held that the petitioner is entitled for full medical reimbursement for the injury sustained by him while performing his duty.

32. And also placed on record judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Civil Appeal No.8 of 2008 titled as "**Bhagwan Dass & Anr. Vs. Punjab State Electricity Board**" wherein it has been held that a person is entitled for all benefits including injury suffered during the course of his/her duty in view of the provision under Section 47 of the Persons with Disabilities (Equal Opportunities, Protection of Rights and Full Participation) Act, 1995.

Submissions of management:-

33. On the other hand, AR for the management contended that no application for Special Leave has been moved by the workman in the bank. No disability is suffered by the workman while allegedly performing duty and her claim is based on assumptions and presumptions as she was already having problem due to daily commuting between Jammu and Katra as she was residing in Jammu. There was no official duty to be performed at Jammu at any point of time.

34. She was treated as unauthorized absentee and proceedings before the Regional Labour Commissioner resulted as failure. Moreover, disability certificate is dated 28.04.2024 (Annexure 14).

35. AR for management in support of his arguments placed on record judgment of the **Hon'ble Supreme Court in Civil Appeal No.3852 of 2006 titled as "L and T Komatsu Ltd. Vs. N. Udayakumar"** wherein it has been alleged that:

> ***"8. So far as the question whether habitual absents means the gross violation of discipline, it is relevant to note of what was stated this Court in Burn & Co. Ltd. Vs. Their Workmen and Ors. MANU/SC/0238/1960: (1960) IILLJ261SC***
>
> ***There should have been an application for leave but Roy thought that he could claim as a matter of right leave of absence though that might be without permission and though there might not be any application for the same. This was gross violation of discipline. Accordingly, if the company had placed him under suspension that was in order. On these findings, it seems to us that the Tribunal erred in holding that it could not endorse the Company's decision to dispense with the services altogether. In our opinion, when the Tribunal upheld the order of suspension it erred in directing that Roy must be taken back in his previous post of employment on the pay last drawn by him before the order of suspension."***

36. He further contended that under these circumstances, the workman cannot be treated on duty while commuting from Katra to Jammu and back and as such she is not entitled for any Special Casual Leave and there is no violation of Para 18(iv) of the Bipartite Settlement dated 31.10.1979 (Annexure 13).

Findings:-

37. I have given due consideration to the arguments advanced by the Sh. Kamlesh Chaturvedi, AR for the workman union and Sh. B.B. Bagga, AR for management.

38. It is pertinent to mention here that in this case the first question which requires to be determined is whether the workman suffered injury during the course of her duty and in case she suffered injury during the course of her duty, she is entitled for special leave for the period of her absence as per Para 18(iv) of the Bipartite Settlement dated 31.10.1979 (Annexure 13). In this regard, workman has claimed that she commutes from Katra to Jammu with his Higher Officer to do connectivity work of the bank as there was no connectivity in Branch at Katra. On 18.08.2022, she was accompanied by Assistant Branch Manager, Katra and suffered injury relating to spine and in this regard, she wrote a letter dated 18.08.2022 (Annexure 3) to the Assistant Branch Manager and even thereafter, Mr. Arun Singh Manhas, Branch Manager, Katra on 19.08.2022 (Annexure 4), wrote a letter to the Regional Manager, Katra that workman should be transfer to Jammu Branch and substitute should be provide in her place.

39. So far as letter dated 18.08.2022 (Annexure 3), is concerned the said letter is written by the workman to the Assistant Branch Manager, Bank of Baroda, Katra. The receipt of said letter is disputed by MW1-Ms. Madhvi Saini, Senior Manager, HR Bank of Baroda, Regional Office Amritsar in her cross-examination and she has specifically stated that the letter dated 18.08.2022 (Annexure 3) was not received by their office and there is no receiving by the Branch Head on the said letter. It clearly shows that the said letter was not received in the bank. A perusal of the said letter made it ample

clear that no receipt of the same is on it and the workman has not called the record of receipt of aforesaid letter dated 18.08.2022 (Annexure 3) from the bank to prove it. Moreover, it is not specified who was the Assistant Branch Manager, Bank of Baroda to whom the aforesaid letter was written and handed-over by the workman.

40. Further, in order to prove that the workman has gone from Katra to Jammu to perform her duty, it was incumbent upon her to examine the concerned Assistant Branch Manager with whom she had gone to Jammu for connectivity work. The concerned Assistant Branch Manager was the most important witness who could have support the version of the workman that she had gone to Jammu due to the non-connectivity at Katra Branch. The statement made by the workman in this regard cannot be believed.

41. Moreover, if an employee has to leave his/her station, it is incumbent upon him/her to take permission from the Higher Authority. No such permission has been placed on record by the workman. However, it is an admitted fact that Mr. Arun Singh Manhas, Branch Manager, Katra wrote a letter dated 19.08.2022 (Annexure 4) to the Regional Manager stating therein that the workman has recently got injury on her back due to prolonged travel from Jammu-Katra-Jammu. However, it is not mentioned that she received injury on 18.08.2022. Thus, it appears that a fabricated letter dated 18.08.2022 (Annexure 3) has been created by the workman to link with letter dated 19.08.2022 (Annexure 4) written by Sh. Arun Singh Manhas, Branch Manager, Katra to the Regional Manager for deputing one staff at the branch as her replacement. He has specifically stated in his letter dated 19.08.2022 (Annexure 4) maintaining therein that

> **"Earlier also the matter was severe and she could not join the office for almost 6 months and has to go on LOP (Leave without Pay)"**.

Thus, from the letter dated 19.08.2022 (Annexure 4) it emerges that the workman was habitual in travelling from Katra to Jammu frequently for the reason best known to her despite of the fact that she was having no permission to travel from Katra to Jammu. Further, she has also taken leave without pay and not joined the office for almost 6 months due to severe conditions. This fact that she was suffering from injury on spine prior to the alleged injury dated 18.08.2022 is also proves from the documents Ex.M1 i.e., leave on medical grounds submitted by the workman along with following prescriptions/medical records:

i. Test report relating to X-ray LS Spine AP & LAT Views dated 04.05.2021 of Nidaan Diagnostics, Jammu.

ii. Prescription dated 05.05.2021 of Dr. Kameshwar D. Sharma clinic.

iii. Diagnostic Report dated 15.05.2021 of SRL Diagnostics, Jammu.

iv. Prescription from Dr. Kameshwar D. Sharma clinic dated 17.05.2021.

v. Prescription dated 31.05.2021 of Dr. Hashash Singh Ishar, Assistant Professor, Dept. of Medicine, ASCOMS, Jammu.

vi. Test Report relating to HLA B 27 dated 04.06.2021 of Nidaan Diagnostics, Jammu.

vii. Prescription dated 09.06.2021 of Dr. Hashash Singh Ishar, Assistant Professor, Dept. of Medicine, ASCOMS, Jammu.

viii. Certificate dated 17.06.2021 from Dr. Hashash Singh Ishar, Assistant Professor, Dept. of Medicine, ASCOMS, Jammu.

ix. Prescription dated 18.07.2021 of Dr. Hashash Singh Ishar, Assistant Professor, Dept. of Medicine, ASCOMS, Jammu.

x. OPD Card dated 12.08.2021 of Acharya Shri Chander College of Medical Sciences and Hospital, Jammu.

xi. Prescription dated 19.08.2022 of Dr. Hashash Singh Ishar, Assistant Professor, Dept. of Medicine, ASCOMS, Jammu.

xii. Certificate dated 30.08.2022 from Dr. Hashash Singh Ishar, Assistant Professor, Dept. of Medicine, ASCOMS, Jammu

42. From the perusal of the aforesaid records and evidence discussed as above, it is ample clear that workman was suffering with injury relating to spine since long and was travelling unauthorizedly without any permission from Higher Officer/Authority for travelling from Jammu-Katra-Jammu and had made a concocted story that the she was accompanying Assistant Branch Manager as she has not examined the said Assistant Branch Manager to substantiate her case.

43. Certificate issued on 17.06.2021 by Dr. Hashash Singh Ishar is very important and is reproduced below:

> **"This is to certify that Shaphali Jain 28 years old female is a case of Bilateral L5-S1 radiculopathy with Seronegative Spondyloarthropathy (HLA B27 +ve). Patient is having severe radicular pain with numboners & paraesthenas and is unable to do activities of daily living C needs weight leaning and excessive walking and travel patient needs bed-rest & avoiding exertion as travelling is precipitating her problem. Regular travelling should be abandoned."**

A perusal of the aforesaid certificate made it ample clear that she was specifically advised not to regular travel. However, she was travelling without any prior permission of the Higher Authority and this certificate is dated 17.06.2021 and her alleged injury is of 18.08.2022. Thus, it appears that she is trying to take benefit of her earlier injury by showing that it has been caused on 18.08.2022.

44. Further, it is added here that the workman has applied for medical leave on various dates from 20.08.2022 to 26.10.2022 and as per Ex.M11 (leave records) she was granted sick leave from 20.08.2022 to 19.09.2022. However, thereafter she remained absent from 27.10.2022 to 29.04.2025. As per the workman, she sustained injury on 18.08.2022 (Annexure 3) and rejoined the bank on 29.04.2025 after a total period of 985 days and as per Ex.M1, she took sick leave from 20.08.2022 to 29.08.2022, on the ground that there was no treatment available at Katra. Thereafter, she approached the RLC attending the conciliation and participate in Tribunal proceedings. However, she has not applied for the Special Casual Leave during this period. Thereafter, she joined at Jammu Branch in terms of the order dated 21.02.2025 passed by this Tribunal on 27.06.2025.

45. Workman has tried to built up her case by quoting numerous documents. So far as, the argument advanced by AR for workman that the workman has applied for Special Casual Leave vide letter dated 07.12.2023 (Annexure 20 (1/2)) mentioning therein that she is entitled for Special Leave due

to suffering of injury and applied for the leave from 27.10.2022 to 26.12.2023 due to her ongoing medical treatment is concerned, it is nowhere mentioned in it that she has applied for special leave.

46. However, vide another letter dated 06.01.2024 (Annexure 20 (2/2)), she started claiming that she sustained injury on 18.08.2022 while on duty and further claimed special leave, seems to be created document and this letter has been written after a gap of about 16 months of the date of injury and seems to be an afterthought document.

47. It is also argued by the AR for the workman that in the affidavit filed by the workman and proceedings before the RLC no question was raised that the workman suffered injury while performing her duty. So, adverse inference should be drawn against the management. The said argument of the AR for workman is highly not maintainable in view of the fact that workman should have proved her case by cogent evidence and she cannot built her case on the weakness of the case of management. Hence, she has miserably failed to prove that she was on duty on 18.08.2022 when she suffered alleged injury. Moreover, the workman was already having problem relating to spine.

48. It is also added here that management has written letter dated 12.10.2023 (Ex.M6) and letter dated 21.10.2023 (Ex.M7) to the workman regarding her unauthorized absence from duty prior to her returning on duty on 29.04.2025, but she has not responded to them, which also proves that the workman has created vague story regarding her sustaining injury while on duty and claiming special causal leave. Thus, she is not entitled for any benefit as per Para 18(iv) of Bipartite Settlement dated 31.10.1979 (Annexure 13) as claimed by her.

49. So far as, the case law titled as "**Central Bank of India and others Vs. Krishan Gupta and others (supra)"** and "**Bhagwan Dass & Anr. Vs. Punjab State Electricity Board (supra)"** referred by the AR for workman are concerned, the preposition of law stated therein is not at all disputed, but in the present case the question involved is whether the workman was on duty on the date of receiving injury or not. Hence, the said prepositions of law are not attracted to the case of the workman.

50. As regards, the case law titled as "**L and T Komatsu Ltd. Vs. N. Udayakumar (supra)"** referred by the AR for management is concerned, the said case law fully support the case of management, as in the said case it is held that leave cannot be claimed as a matter of right. Admittedly, in this case the workman has not applied for Special Leave immediately after getting injury and remained absent for a long time which was a gross violation of discipline.

51. In view of the above circumstances, the reference in question including Corrigendum as reproduced above is declined and is answered against the workman.

52. 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, 31 जुलाई, 2026

का.आ. 1643.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार **कार्यकारी निदेशक, भारत हेवी इलेक्ट्रिकल लिमिटेड, रानीपेट** के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और **सचिव, अनाइथु ओप्पांधा थोझिलालर संगम, रानीपेट,** कर्मचारी के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद **केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण- सह- श्रम न्यायालय, चेन्नई** पंचाट(संदर्भ संख्या-**18/2024**) को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है।

[सं. एल-42025/07/2026/17-आई.आर (डीयू)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 31th July, 2026

S.O. 1643.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award **(**Ref. No.**18/2024)** of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Chennai** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the **The Executive Director, Bharat Heavy Electrical Ltd ,Ranipet** and **The Secretary ,Anaithu Oppandha Thozhilalar Sangam,Ranipet,** workman**.**

[No. L-42025/07/2026/17–IR (DU)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL- CUM - LABOUR COURT

CHENNAI

ID No. 18/2024

Present: SUSHIL KUMAR-II, PRESIDING OFFICER

Date: 05-02-2026

The Secretary,

Anaithu Oppandha Thozhilalar Sangam,

C/o, M/s. Bharat Heavy Electrical Ltd.,

BAP, Ranipet-632 406. : 1st Party/Petitioner

AND

The Executive Director,

Bharat Heavy Electrical Ltd,

BAP, Ranipet-632 406 : 2nd Party / Respondent

Appearance:

For the 1st Party/Petitioner : None

For the 2nd Party/ 2nd Respondent : M/s. A. V. Arun, Adv

AWARD

The Central Government, Ministry of Labour& Employment vide its Order No. 8/25/2021/300020994/B3/ADJ/A1, dated 22.03.2024 referred the following Industrial Dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication.

The schedule mentioned in that order is:

Whether the demand of the contract workman represented by the General Secretary, Anaithu Oppandha Thozhilalar Sangam, Ranipet against the management of M/s. Bharat Heavy Electricals Limited, Ranipet to continue the payment of ad-hoc allowance is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the union is entitled to?

ID No.18/2024

2. On receipt of the above reference dated 22.03.2024 from the appropriate Government, the dispute was registered as ID No. 18/2024 and due notices were issued to both the parties for their appearance fixing the case to 14.06.2024. Neither the Petitioner nor any Counsel / Authorized Representative turned up resulting further adjournments to 26.08.2024, 29.10.2024, 30.12.2024, 03.03.2025, 26.05.2025, 17.07.2025, 03.092025, 30.10.2025, 30.12.2025. The Petitioner did not turn up whereas the Respondent filed Vakalat Nama. It reveals from the body of reference that while the appropriate Govt. sent the reference dated 22.03.2024 to this Tribunal for adjudication, copies of the reference were sent to the Petitioner and all the opposite parties. It is therefore well presumed that both parties must have received the reference. Even then, in the interest of justice, the Petitioner was once again directed to appear and to file claim statement fixing the case to 05.02.2026. The Petitioner did not turn up nor was any authorized representative of the counsel on his behalf present. The claim statement was not furnished in any manner by the Petitioner. It reveals the Petitioner, despite of sufficient opportunity choose not to appear or to file claim statement and documents.

3. In the circumstance it deems proper not to re-list the case for the same purpose to any other date which would be wastage of the valuable time of this Tribunal.

4. In view of the discussion held supra, it is crystal clear that the petitioner has got no interest to proceed with the case. Thus, the Tribunal is not in a position to adjudicate the dispute as referred by the Appropriate Government, as there exists no Industrial Dispute for adjudication as per the reference.

5. In the result the reference is answered against the petitioner.

An Award is passed accordingly.

SUSHIL KUMAR-II, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 31 जुलाई, 2026

का.आ. 1644.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार **लाइफ इंश्योरेंस कॉर्पोरेशन ऑफ़ इंडिया** के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और **श्रीमती प्रिया मुले** के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट **केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय-1, मुंबई, पंचाट (रिफरेन्स न.- 1/2023)** को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 31.07.2026 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. जेड-16025/03/2026-आई.आर (एम)-78]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 31st July, 2026

S.O. 1644.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award **(Reference No. 1/2023)** of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court-1, Mumbai** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **Life Insurance Corporation of India** and **Mrs. Priya Mulay** which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 31.07.2026.

[No. Z-16025/03/2026–IR (M)-78]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT NO.1 AT MUMBAI

PRESENT

(JUSTICE ARVIND KUMAR MISHRA)

PRESIDING OFFICER

Complaint No. CGIT-1/1 of 2023

Mrs. Priya Mulay

Represented through the Insurance Employees Union,

Pune Jeevan Prakash, LIC of India,

Shivaji Nagar, Pune – 411005. …Complainant/Workman

VERSUS

Life Insurance Corporation of India

Represented by Sr. Divisional Manager,

Jeevan Prakash Building, Vidyapeeth Marg,

Pune – 411005. …Respondent/Management

AWARD

1. The present complaint came to be filed by the complainant under Section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 alleging contravention of Section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act by the respondent-management during the pendency of industrial dispute proceedings.

2. The case of the complainant, in brief, was that the respondent-management had allegedly not maintained the transfer roster properly in respect of Class III and Class IV employees and had acted in a discriminatory and prejudicial manner while considering transfer requests of employees including the complainant Mrs. Priya Mulay.

3. It was contended by the complainant that despite her seniority and personal circumstances including medical difficulties and family conditions, her request for transfer to a branch near Bavdhan, Pune was not considered appropriately and instead she was transferred to Hadapsar/Pune Camp area. It was further

alleged that the respondent-management issued Office Order dated 07.07.2022 during pendency of conciliation proceedings and thereby violated the provisions of Section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

4. Upon notice being issued, the respondent-management appeared before this Tribunal and contested the complaint by filing its written statement/reply denying the allegations made by the complainant.

5. During the pendency of the proceedings, the complainant/workman through the Union filed an application under Order XXIII Rule 1 of the Code of Civil Procedure seeking permission to withdraw the present complaint/reference. In the said application, it has been specifically stated that:

* the matter has remained pending for a considerable period;

* the complainant has already attained the age of superannuation in July 2026;

* because of prolonged litigation, age, personal, financial and health-related reasons, the complainant does not wish to prosecute the matter further;

* the application is filed voluntarily and without coercion.

6. The respondent-management filed its reply to the withdrawal application and submitted that it has no objection if the complaint is withdrawn absolutely and finally without liberty to institute fresh proceedings on the same cause of action.

7. Today the matter was called out. The complainant/workman and representative of the Union are present. Learned representative for the respondent-management is also present. The complainant confirms before this Tribunal that she does not wish to proceed further with the present complaint and seeks unconditional withdrawal of the same.

8. This Tribunal has carefully considered the withdrawal application filed by the complainant as well as the reply filed by the respondent-management. Since the complainant herself has voluntarily expressed unwillingness to continue the proceedings and seeks withdrawal of the complaint, no useful purpose would be served in keeping the matter pending.

9. It is well settled that where the complainant/workman seeks withdrawal of proceedings voluntarily and without any allegation of coercion before the Court, permission can be granted for withdrawal of the proceedings.

10. In view of the submissions made and considering the overall facts and circumstances of the case, this Tribunal is satisfied that the request for withdrawal is voluntary and genuine.

ORDER

Hence, the following order is passed:

1. The application filed by the complainant/workman under Order XXIII Rule 1 of the Code of Civil Procedure seeking withdrawal of Complaint No. CGIT-1/1 of 2023 is hereby allowed.

2. Complaint No. CGIT-1/1 of 2023 filed under Section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 stands dismissed as withdrawn.

3. The withdrawal shall operate as final withdrawal of the present complaint and no liberty is granted to institute fresh proceedings on the same cause of action.

4. Pending applications, if any, stand disposed of accordingly.

5. No order as to costs.

JUSTICE ARVIND KUMAR MISHRA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 31 जुलाई, 2026

का.आ. 1645.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार **मेसर्स एसीसी गग्गल सीमेंट वर्क्स** के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और **श्री सुरजीत शाही** के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट **केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय-1, चंडीगढ़, पंचाट (रिफरेन्स न.- 73/2022)** को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 31.07.2026 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. जेड-16025/04/2026-आई.आर (एम)-110]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 31st July, 2026

S.O. 1645.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award **(Reference No. 73/2022)** of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court-1, Chandigarh** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **M/s. ACC Gaggal Cement Works** and **Shri Surjit Shahi** which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 31.07.2026.

[No. Z-16025/04/2026–IR (M)-110]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

In the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court-I, Chandigarh

(Present:- Mr. Kamal Kant, PO-cum-Link Officer).

ID No.73/2022

Registered on – 12.01.2022

Surjit Shahi S/o Sh. Dal Bahadur Shahi, EPF No. HPS ML/4795/127 C/o Parkash Chand near Akshya General Store, Village & P.O. Barmana, Tehsil Bilaspur Distt. Bilaspur, (HP) 1744013, Mob. No.8350862501.

….. Workman

Versus

1. Director Plant/General Manager, ACC Gaggal Cement Works Barmana, Tehsil: Sadar, Distt. Bilaspur (HP).
2. M/s B.G. Dass Contractor through M/s. ACC Gaggal Cement Works, Barmana, Tehsil: Sadar, Distt. Bilaspur (HP).

…...Respondents

Present:- None for Workman

Sh. Saurabh Gautam, AR for Respondent No.1.

None for Respondent No.2.

Award : 02.07.2026

1. Workman has filed the present claim petition under Section 2A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter called the Act) against his termination w.e.f. 01.01.2019 claiming reinstatement into service along with full back wages.

2. The case was fixed for filing correct address of Respondent No.2 since 13.03.2023. However, the workman has neither produced the correct address of respondent No.2 nor appeared before this Tribunal from the last two dates since 27.11.2025.

3. Under these circumstances it appears that the workman is not interested in pursuing the case. Therefore, this Tribunal is left with no choice, except to pass a 'No Claim Award'. Accordingly, 'No Claim Award' is passed in the present Industrial Dispute.

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

KAMAL KANT, PO-Cum-Link Officer

नई दिल्ली, 31 जुलाई, 2026

का.आ. 1646.—औघोगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार **केनरा बैंक** के प्रबंधतत्र, संबद्ध नियोजको और उनके **कर्मकार श्री अरुण कालोत्रा** के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औघोगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औघोगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, **चंडीगढ़-II** के **पंचाट (69/2023)** प्रकाशित करती है।

[सं. एल-39025/01/2026-आई.आर (बी-I)-78]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 31st July, 2026

S.O. 1646.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the **Award (Ref. 69/2023*)*** of the ***Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court Chandigarh-II*** as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of **Canara Bank** and **Sh. Arun Kalotra.**

[No. L-39025/01/2026–IR (B-I)-78]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

In the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court-II, Chandigarh

(Presided over by Mr. Kamal Kant, Presiding Officer).

ID No.69/2023

Registered on:-11.01.2024

Arun Kalotra S/o Sh. Krishan Lal Kalotra, R/o H. no.283, Shiv Mandir, Sarwal, Rehari, Jammu, J & K 180005.

-------- Workman

Versus

1. Canara Bank, Branch Bakshi Nagar, Jammu, District Jammu, Jammu & Kashmir 180001 through its Branch Manager.
2. Canara Bank, A Banking Corporation, Head Office 112, JC Road, Bangalore-260002, Karnataka, represented by its Managing Director and Chief Executive Officer.
3. Canara Bank, Circle Office 34A, Chandigarh-160022.

----Respondents

Present:- None for Workman.

Sh. Kumar Nikshep, AR for respondent no.1 to 3.

Award :13.04.2026

1. Central Government Vide Notification No.8(53)/2023/ RLC/Jmu dated 03.01.2024, 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 management of The Managing Director, Canara Bank, JC Road, Bangaluru, Karnataka-56000, The Circle Head, Canara Bank, Bakshi Nagar, Jammu, UT of Jammu and Kashmir and the Regional Manager, Canara Bank, Jammu, UT of Jammu and Kashmir in terminating services of Shri Arun Kalotra S/o Sh. Krishan Lal Kalotra, R/o Near Shiv Mandir, Sarwal, Rehari, Jammu and Kashmir is legal and justified? If not, then to what relief the concerned workman is entitled to and from which date?"*

1. The case is fixed for filing rejoinder by workman. However, no one is turning up on behalf of workman from last four dates i.e. 27.01.2025, 17.03.2025, 28.07.2025 and 01.12.2025. On 01.12.2025, fresh notice was issued to the workman for 13.04.2026 for appearance as well as for filing replication and the same was duly delivered on the address of workman on 16.12.2025. However, no one turned up on behalf of workman despite service. The workman has been given sufficient opportunities for filing replication, but no one turned up on behalf of workman in spite of the opportunities afforded to him for filing replication, which shows that the workman is not interested in adjudication of the matter on merit.

2. Since no one is appearing for the workman, as such, 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, 31 जुलाई, 2026

का.आ. 1647.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार **एयरपोर्ट अथॉरिटी ऑफ़ इंडिया; मेसर्स अपशॉट यूटिलिटी सर्विस; लायन मैन पावर सॉल्यूशंस प्राइवेट लिमिटेड; अपडेटेड सर्विसेज़ प्राइवेट लिमिटेड; मेसर्स बीवीजी इंडिया लिमिटेड** के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और **श्री एम. वीरन** के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट **केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय, चेन्नई, पंचाट (रिफरेन्स न.- 21/2017)** को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 31.07.2026 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. जेड-16025/04/2026-आई.आर (एम)-111]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 31st July, 2026

S.O. 1647.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award **(Reference No. 21/2017)** of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Chennai** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **Airport Authority of India; M/s Upshot Utility Service; Lion Man Power Solutions Pvt. Ltd.; Updated Services Pvt. Ltd; M/s BVG India Limited** and **Shri M. Veeran** which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 31.07.2026.

[No. Z-16025/04/2026–IR (M)-111]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, CHENNAI

Date: 06-07-2026

Present: SUSHIL KUMAR-II,

PRESIDING OFFICER

I.D. No.21/2017

BETWEEN

Shri M. Veeran

42A, 5th Street, Adam Nagar,

Nagalkeni, chrompet,

Chennai-600 044.

AND

1. **Airports Authority of India,**

   Rep. by its Airport Director,

   Chennai Airport, Neenambakkam,

   Chennai-600027.

2. **Management**

   M/s.Upshot Utility Service

   H/20, Jeevanandam Salai, 13th Sector

   K.K.Nagar, Chennai-600 078.

3. Management

   Lion Man Power Solutions Pvt.Ltd

   No.10 3rd floor, L.S.C B-1 Vasant Kunj

   New Delhi-110 070.

4. Updated Services Pvt.Limited,

2/302A,UDS Salai,

Off Old Mahabalipuram Road,

Thorapakkam, Chennai-600 097

5. M/s BVG India Limited

BVG House, Premier Plaza,

Pune-Mumbai Road, Chinchwad, Pune-411 019,

Local Office:

3/230, Balaraman Garden Road,

Parthasarathy Nagar,

Manapakkam,Chennai-600 116. : 2n Party/Respondents

Appearance:

For the 1st Party/ Petitioner	:	M/s. Balan Haridas, Advocates
For the 2nd Party/ Respondent No.1	:	M/s.P.Parthiban, Advocates
For the 2nd Party/ Respondent No.2	:	None
For the 2nd Party/ Respondent No.3	:	None
For the 2nd Party/ Respondent No.4	:	M/s..S.Velusamy, Advocate

****

This is a claim petition filed by the Petitioner u/s.2A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 directly seeking the following relief:-

"The Hon'ble Court may be pleased to pass an Award holding that denial of employment to the Petitioner orally on and from 25.07.2016 by the 2nd Respondent is illegal, arbitrary and contrary to law and consequently set aside the same and direct the Respondents to reinstate the Petitioner with full back wages, continuity of service and all other attendant benefits.

2. It is submitted that the 1" Respondent was engaging employees on its rolls to do the house keeping work. However, gradually the 1st Respondent started engaging third parties to do the work of housekeeping under the guise of contract. The contract so entered is a sham and nominal one. The contract so engaged were all mere name lenders and the employees were working under the control and supervision of the 1st Respondent. There had been several contractors and they were utilized merely for disbursement of wages to the employees. Initially there was a contractor by the name Updated Services Private Limited and thereafter the 2nd Respondent was termed to be the Contractor from the year 2014. The Petitioner had been working from March 2012 onwards and he was termed to be Supervisor, however he had no supervisory or managerial functions and he was doing housekeeping work along with other workers. The very contract between the 1st and 2nd Respondent is only to evade the law and to deprive the employees engaged in the house keeping work from the benefits to which they are entitled as permanent employees of the 1st Respondent. The Petitioner was paid Rs.12000/- per month. The Petitioner has worked for more than 480

days within a period of 24 calendar months and their work is being allocated and supervised by the officials of the 1st Respondent, as such the 2nd Respondent was only a name lender.

3. The Petitioner joined Tamil Nadu General Workers Union Chennai Airport Contract Workers Unit and was chosen as the Secretary of the aforesaid Union. The said Union has raised dispute on 02.08.2016 with regard to the demands of the employees. The said dispute had been taken on file by this Authority as M.8/11/2016-B3. In order to victimize the Petitioner for his legitimate trade union activities, the 1st and 2nd Respondent have terminated the services of the petitioner orally on and from 25.07.2016.

4. After terminating the services of the petitioner, the 3rd Respondent was inducted and termed to be the contractor from 08.09.2016 and this is being done with sole intention to make the dispute raised by the Union otiose and keep the employees high and dry. The respondents further with an intention to dilute the Union and to instill fear in the minds of other employees, without any reasons and without any justification terminating the services of the Petitioner on and from 25.07.2016 orally. However from 01.01.2017 the 3rd Respondent has been replaced by the 4th Respondent in the domestic airport and the employees are continuing. As far as the International Airport is concerned, the 3rd Respondent is replaced by the 5th Respondent and the employees are continuing. Thus the contractors keep changing and the employees are continued in employment. It is submitted that the Petitioner has worked for more than 240 days within a period of 12 calendar months. The termination of service of the petitioner orally on 25.07.2016 amounts to retrenchment. However no retrenchment compensation has been paid to the petitioner. Thus the termination is in violation of Section 25F of the I.D. Act, 1947. It is further submitted that the Respondents are engaging more than 100 employees and consequently covered under Chapter VB of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. However the Respondents have not taken prior permission under Section 25N of the I.D. Act, 1947 while terminating the services of the petitioner. Therefore the termination of the services of the petitioner is void ab initio. It is further submitted that Petitioner is without employment from the date of illegal termination. The employees on the rolls of 1st Respondent are being paid salary in time scale of pay with various other service benefits and perquisites.

5. In reply, the 1st Respondent Airports Authority of India submits that as per policy of Airport Authority of India, it can award the job contract for housekeeping and it is neither core service nor prohibited by any means. The contract between the 3rd party and the Airport Authority of India in order to clean the domestic as well as International Airport, a tender was called for and the successful bidder was the 2nd respondent herein viz. Upshot Utility Services. The 2nd respondent was awarded the contract dated 26.08.2014 and an agreement was entered between the 2nd respondent and Airport Authority of India on 04.09.2014 and the duration of the contract was from 12.09.2014 to 11.09.2016 for a period of two years. The entire agreement entered between the 2nd respondent and the Airport Authority of India has been filed before this Hon'ble Court and the necessary important clauses in the agreement are extracted in the counter statement.

6. It is submitted that all agreements were entered between the contractor and the Respondent give the clear details of the cleaning work and the space to be cleaned. It is the duty of the contractor to utilise the man power in order to clean the space which was specifically stated in the agreement. The claim of the Petitioner that he has been working for 15 years is totally a false statement because these building were commissioned in 2012 and 2013 only. The 1st respondent submits that the agreement entered between the Contractor and the Airport Authority of India is not a nominal Contract nor mere name lender. These contractors are expert and specialized agencies in the facility management services

industries selected with proper tender process under Quality and Cost Based System (QCBS) having a proper agreement for services including machinery, material and manpower. AAl is having no role in recruitment of their workmen and cannot force to recruit someone or terminate someone. It is specifically stated in the agreement also that all the Labour Laws are strictly followed by the Contractor. AAl has neither asked any employees to continue with the different agencies nor directed any agency to continue with these workmen. It is also submitted that AAI has no role in recruitment of the employees. The works being allotted and supervised by the contractors and the quality and quantity of the services are only measured by AAI.

7. The AAl has asked 2nd respondent to take necessary action against the referred employees on a complaint received from Mrs. Durga working with M/s. Assim Communication stating the referred employee forcing her to file a false complaint against AAl employee. The 2nd respondent has not terminated the referred employee, but he was re-deployed to the other site of 2nd respondent. After the same, it is a matter between the employee and his employer (2nd respondent) and AAI has nothing to do with the same. It is the continuous process of awarding new contract after the existing contract is expired. It it the new contractor's discretion to continue the services of workmen working under the previous contractor and AAI has no role in recruitment or termination of the workmen who were working with previous contractor. As per terms of contract, it is the sole discretion of the contractor to engage employees as required to meet contractual obligations. The Petitioner prayed to pass an award that denial of employment to the Petitioner orally from 25,07.2016 by the 2nd Respondent is illegal, arbitrary and contrary to law and the relief sought for by the Petitioner is only against 2nd Respondent and is nothing to do with the AAI.

8. In the rejoinder statement, the Petitioner submitted that engaging contractor to do the housekeeping work itself is sham one. In reality, it is the 1st Respondent which is maintaining the upkeep of the Airports. Therefore the so called contractor is only an inter-mediatory. The contention that the 1st Respondent had awarded the contract for cleaning the Domestic and International Airport to the 2nd Respondent by an Agreement dated 04.09.2014 for the period from 12.09.2014 to 11.06.2016, is without substance. The agreement between the 1st and 2nd Respondent for housekeeping work is sham and nominal. Repeatedly, the so called contractors change but the employees remain the same. The contractor is only a name lender. The so called contractor does not come to the works spot. The work is assigned only by the officials of the 1st Respondent. The employees remain the same even the contractor change. Therefore in substance the Petitioner and other employees, are the employees of the 1st Respondent.

9. In the reply statement filed by the 4th Respondent , it is stated that the Hon'ble Labour Court does not have any jurisdiction to entertain the dispute raised by the petitioner under section 2 (A) (2) of the I.D.Act, as the petitioner, instead of raising his individual dispute, for his alleged dismissal/non employment against his actual employer, i.e., 3rd Respondent herein, seeks this Hon'ble Court to find out and declare who his employer is and for which there is no scope under the section 2(A) (2) of the I.D.Act. The petitioner is not entitled to convert the Jurisdiction of the Labour Court into a Civil Court. The 4th Respondent further submits that the Claim Petition filed by the Petitioner under Section 2(A) of the Industrial Disputes Act is not maintainable, as he is not a workman under Section 2 (s) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. The Respondent further submits that as admitted in his claim statement the Petitioner was working as a supervisory cadre and drawn the salary of Rs.12,000/- as monthly salary. Hence, this petition is not maintainable and liable to be dismissed as the same is without jurisdiction. Even assuming, without admitting that Petitioner is a workmen, the Respondent submits that this petition under Section

2(A) is totally not maintainable as against the 4th Respondent, as the petitioner has got no existing right to claim the reinstatement with back wages as he neither appointed nor terminated by the 4th Respondent. Hence, this petition is not at all maintainable against 4th Respondent and liable to be dismissed on this ground also.

10. The 4th Respondent is a Company registered under the Companies Act, 1956 and engaged in the business of providing manpower services for various companies and government undertakings under contract basis. The 4th Respondent has registered its establishment under the Contract Labour (Abolition and Regulation) Act, 1970. The 1st Respondent awarded a contract of "Mechanized Environmental Support Services (Up keeping)" of New Domestic Terminal building at Chennai Airport with effect from 01.01.2017. Based on the contract, the 4th Respondent deputed their workmen to fulfill the contractual Obligations stipulated in the Tender documents. Since the 4th Respondent company is having its own workforce, for shortage some of the workmen of erstwhile contractor has been appointed based on their individual applications. The 4th Respondent is not aware about the Petitioner and his termination as he was not an employee of the 4th Respondent. Based on the Notice received from this Hon'ble Court the 4th Respondent came to know about the present dispute and the alleged termination of the Petitioner herein.

11. During the Pendency of the dispute before this Hon'ble Court, the Petitioner sent a letter dated to the 4th Respondent for employment. The 4th Respondent sent a reply stating that we were willing to provide him employment opportunity in some other client's place, if available. In view of his request, he was advised to submit his resume along with testimonials to our Poonamallee Branch office to explore possibilities of providing employment opportunity in some other client's place. The allegation of the Petitioner that the contract between the 1st Respondent and its contractor is sham and nominal one and the all the contractors so engaged were merely used as a name lender and the employees are working under the control and supervision of the 1st Respondent are hereby denied. On other hand the 1st respondent awarding the contract by tender and by abiding the provisions of CLRA Act. The contractors are deputing their employees for fulfilling contractual obligations stipulated in tender documents. The workmen those who are deputed by the contractors are supervised and controlled by their own supervisors and managers. The 4th Respondent supervised and controlled its workmen directly and regularly paying the wages after deducting statutory contributions. In the absence of employer-employee relationship between the Petitioner and 4th Respondent, the claim of the Petitioner is not maintainable.

Witnesses Examined:

For the First Party Petitioner : WW1 Shri M.Veeran

For the 2nd Party/Management : MW1 Shri K.B.Kannan, AGM (Operations),AAI

Documents Marked:

On the Petitioner's side:

Ex.No.	Date	Description
Ex.W1		Copy of identity cards issued to the Petitioner
Ex.W2		Copy of Commendation letter issued to the Petitioner by 1st Respondent
Ex.W3		Salary slip of Petitioner for April, 2015 by M/s.Upshot Utility Services
Ex.W4	01.02.2017	Copy of letter of the Petitioner

Ex.W5	20.02.2017	Letter updated of Upshot Utility Service
Ex.W6	03.05,2017	Letter of the Petitioner
Ex.W7	18.05.2017	Letter of Upshot Utility Service
Ex.W8	01.08.2017	Letter of Upshot Utility Service
Ex.W9	02.08.2016	Dispute raised by the Union

Documents Marked:

On behalf of Respondent/Management

Ex.No.	Date	Description
Ex.M 1	04.09.2014	Copy of agreement entered between AAI and Upshot Utility Services, the 2nd Respondent
Ex.M 2	04.10.2016	Copy of agreement entered between AAI and M/s.Lion Man Power Solutions P.Ltd., the 3rd Respondent
Ex.M3	16.12.2016	Copy of agreement entered between AAI and M/s.Updated Services P.Ltd., the 4th Respondent
Ex.M4	19.12.2016	Copy of agreement entered between AAI and M/s.BVG India Ltd., the 5th Respondent

12. Heard the learned counsels appearing for either side and perused the records.

13. The question that arises for determination is whether the Petitioner was working for the Respondent No.1 and entitled to get reinstatement under the management of Respondent No.1; or

Whether the Petitioner has worked under the 2nd Respondent and if so, to what relief the Petitioner is entitled to?

14. To answer this question, I have to determine true nature of employee's employment. On a perusal of claim statement, it appears that the original contractor was replaced by another contractor i.,e, Respondent No.3. The 3rd Contractor was also replaced by Respondent No.4 & 5. Ex.W1 is a copy of identity card issued to the Petitioner by the Airport Authority of India i.e., valid to enter in cargo complex only. This document is not a document of employment issued to Petitioner by Airport Authority of India rather it is a licence issued by the authority to enter into the cargo complex. The documents placed at pages 3 & 4 of the paper book are issued by the contractor with code number. Ex.W2 is a commendation letter given by Assistant Manager HK of the 1st respondent to the Petitioner in appreciation of his work. This document does not reflect that the employee was working under the management of AAI. Ex.W3 is copy of salary slip issued by M/s.Upshot Utility Services to the Petitioner for April, 2015. This document establish the fact that the employee was working under the control of the contractor and it was the contractor who had paid salary to the employee. Ex.W4 is the letter written by the Petitioner to M/s.Upshot Utility Services and M/s. BVG India Ltd. informing that he was working in the international airport and his service was illegally terminated on and from 25.07.2016 and thereafter one M/s. Lion Man Power Solutions Ltd was termed to be contractor for housekeeping for both domestic and international airports. From January, 2017, M/s.Upshot Utility Services was termed to be contractor in International Airport for

housekeeping. Ex.W5 is answer given by M/s.Updater Services Pvt.Ltd to the Petitioner which runs as under:-

> "We have been appointed as a contractor in domestic airport, Chennai from January, 2017 and we are independent contractor and having separate entity.
>
> You claim to be an employee of M/s.Upshot Utility Services and your remedy lies with M/s.Upshot Utility Services only. Regarding your employment, you can make an application to us along with bio-data , back ground verification certificate, experience certificate and educational testimonials. Your employment will be considered as per our company's selection procedure, suitability and requirement and place of posting.

15. Thus, this letter clearly suggests that the Petitioner was working only under the contractor and not with the Airports Authority of India. Now, the point that arises for determination is to what relief the Petitioner is entitled from the 2nd Respondent?

16. Ex.W6 is the letter written by the Petitioner to M/s.Updated Services P.Ltd., whereby he mentioned that though the name lending contractor keep changing, the employees like me continued only on that basis people who had been working along with me are continuing to work now when you are termed to be the contractor. The employees do not given fresh application or bio-date when the name lender contractor changes. Ex.W7 is an answer given by Updates Services P.Ltd in the following terms:-

> " We hereby inform you that we have received notice from the Hon'ble Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Chennai in ID No.21 of 2017 which has been raised by you. During the pendency of above dispute before CGIT, we are unable to consider your letter dated 03.05.2017. However, without prejudice to our rights to contest the dispute before CGIT, we are willing to provide you employment opportunity in some other client's place if available.
>
> In view above, we advise you to submit your resume along with testimonials to our Poonamallee Branch Office, No 25, Judge Chellappa Naicker Street, Poonamallee, Chennai 56 on 25.05.2017 to explore possibilities of providing employment opportunity in some other client's place."

17. From the above communication, it suggests that the employee was working under an independent contractor and new contractor also willing to take the services of the employee, if he submits his bio-data and performed other formalities.

18. In his cross examination, the Petitioner has stated as under:-

" I am not issued with any appointment letter from first Respondent. I have seen advertisement of first Respondent inviting persons for loading and housekeeping. No application was invited for that. But the candidates were directly recruited in person by the first Respondent. It is a fact that my Affidavit is silent about these facts. It is not a fact that the salary and other benefits were paid by Second Respondent (M/s Upshot Utilities. …….

Two Wage Slips were issued, one from the Airport Authority and another from Second Respondent. ….

…I have fixed liabilities against Second Respondent since orally terminated me which is illegal, arbitrary and contrary to law…

The Second Respondent was ready to provide job after identifying the vacancy….

I did not receive any document in regard of my appointment from the First Respondent…

It is a fact that the Identify Card issued in my favour was issued by the Fourth Respondent…

Identify Card dated 07.09.2015 was issued by the Second Respondent, M/s Upshot Utilities. It is not a fact that the Reply Statement at Para-13 is contrary to the relief sought for in the last para of Claim Statement. It is a fact that except the Gate Pass. I have not received any document from the First Respondent from 1995 to 2016."

19. The above statements given by the Petitioner clearly suggest that the identity card was issued to facilitate the employee to enter into a particular premises of the Airports Authority of India. These statements also suggest that the Petitioner was not working under Airports Authority of India rather he worked under independent contractor. It is well known established that the Petitioner has filed the claim against the 2nd Respondent in the claim statement and he stated in the cross examination that he seeks claim against the 2nd Respondent. The above discussed evidence suggests that the contractor provided employment to the Petitioner was an independent contractor and the workman was employed only by the contractor. So the employer of the Petitioner is the contractor and not the Airports Authority of India . This is what the reason that workman seeks remedy against the contractor as I have mentioned in para 1 of this Award.

20. It is argued on behalf of the Petitioner that contract work given to the contractor is sham transaction or merely deprived to avoid the labour laws. The Airports Authority of India exercised effective control and supervision over the workman. It is replied on behalf of the respondent that the Petitioner failed to establish that Airports Authority of India was the real employer and it was the contractor alone who paid employee's wages for his work.

21. On perusal of records submitted by the Appellant, it appears that there was no second pay slip as he stated in the cross examination. There is only one pay slip available issued by the contractor. There is no document to show that employee was employed by the Airports Authority of India.

22. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the Appellant relied on the judgement of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in L.Robert DSouza Vs. Executive Engineer, Southern Railway (1982) AIR SC 854. In that case, the employee rendered continuous service for 26 years yet the railway administration denied status of temporary or regular workman and treated him as daily rated casual labourer. The Hon'ble Court held that termination of service in this case would constitute retrenchment and for not complying with pre-conditions to valid retrenchment, the order of termination would be illegal and invalid.

23. As per facts of that case, the employee was working under Southern Railway, but in the present case on hand, this fact is not established that the Petitioner was working under Airports Authority of India, He was working under the independent contractor.

24. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the Appellant relied on another case law in K.V.Anil Mithra & Another Vs. Sree Sankaracharya University of Sanskrit and another. On perusal of the case law, it is observed that the facts of this are totally different . In the case relied on, a scheme was formulated in compliance with the order of the Tribunal. The Hon'ble Supreme Court set aside the scheme being inconsistent with the direction issued by the Tribunal and directed to regularize the service of the Appellants and grant them permanent status w.e.f. 09.09.2010. Such direction cannot be issued against the

Respondent No.1. Although the Respondent No.2, who terminated the service of the Petitioner illegally may be taken in to consideration in the further part of this Award.

25. The Petitioner was appointed by the 2nd Respondent as per his affidavit and cross examination and worked for more than 240 days within a period of 12 calendar months. The Petitioner was appointed during March, 2012 and was removed from service orally on 25.07.2016. Such action of the 2nd Respondent comes under the category of retrenchment and the 2nd Respondent failed to comply with the provisions of section 25 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

26. The provisions of section 25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 runs as under:-

"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 service] (w.e.f. 19.12.1964).] 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."

27. Thus, section 25F of the Act deals with conditions precedent to retrenchment of workman and mandated that employer cannot retrench the workman, unless follow/comply with the mandatory steps provided under section 25F, which are as under:-

(i) One month notice (or wages in lieu thereof);

(ii) Retrenchment compensation i.e, equal to 15 days average pay for every completed year of service or any part thereof in excess of six months and this amount must be paid at the time of retrenchment.

AWARD

28. In view of the foregoing discussion, the claim petition is allowed against the 2nd Respondent M/s.Upshot Utility Service.

(i) The 2nd Respondent is directed to reinstate the Petitioner into service within a period of two months from the date of publication of this Award.

(ii) The 2nd Respondent is directed to pay 50% back wages to the Petitioner from the date of removal till the date of actual reinstatement into service.

(iii) On failure of the above direction, the 2nd Respondent is directed to pay a lump sum of Rs.5,00,000/- (Rupees Five lakhs only) as retrenchment compensation.

Ordered accordingly.

Record be consigned to the record room.

Place : CHENNAI SUSHIL KUMAR-II, Presiding Officer

Date : 06.07.2026

नई दिल्ली, 31 जुलाई, 2026

का.आ. 1648.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार **मेसर्स आंध्र सीमेंट्स लिमिटेड, जेपी ग्रुप, विशाखा सीमेंट वर्क्स; मेसर्स एज़टेक सर्विसेज़** के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और **श्री बालिरेड्डी अप्पाराव** के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट **केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद, पंचाट (रिफरेन्स न.- 28/2018)** को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 31.07.2026 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-29012/8/2017-आई.आर (एम)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 31st July, 2026

S.O. 1648.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award **(Reference No. 28/2018)** of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group, Visakha Cement Works; M/s Aztech Services** and **Sri Balireddy Apparao** which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 31.07.2026.

[No. L-29012/8/2017–IR (M)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD

Present: - **Sri IRFAN QAMAR**

Presiding Officer

Dated the 13th day of July, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. 28/2018

Between:

Sri Balireddy Apparao,

S/o Yernaidu,

Porlupalem (V), Pendurthi (M),

Dist.- Visakhapatnam (A.P.) – 531047 ….Petitioner

AND

1. The Senior Vice-President (Admn.) & Plant Head,
   M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group,
   Visakha Cement Woks, Porlupalem (Village),
   Post Durganagar, Visakhapatnam, (A.P.) – 530029.
2. M/s Aztech Services,
   Manpower Contractors, F-3,
   Sai Krishna Towers,
   Road No.3 Jagannadha Raju Nagar,
   Venkojipalam,
   Vishakhapatnam (A.P.) – 530022 …… Respondents

Appearances:

For the Petitioner : None

For the Respondent: None

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-29012/8/2017-IR(M) dated 12.01.2018 referred the following dispute under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for adjudication to this Tribunal between the management of M/s Andhra Cements Limited, and their workman. The reference is,

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Visakha Cement Works, Jaypee Group of company in not considering Sri Balireddy Apparao, S/o Yernaidu, workman in service in contravention of section 25(F) of the Industrial Disputes Act, or else in not paying legal benefits for the post services rendered to Andhra Cements Company is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled?"

The reference is numbered in this Tribunal as I.D. No 28/2018 and notices were issued to the parties concerned.

2. Notice sent to the Petitioner by registered post has been delivered, but none present for Petitioner side to pursue his case and no claim statement has been filed despite service of notice. It seems Petitioner is not interested to prosecute his case. Therefore, in absence of claim statement 'No Claim Award' award is passed.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, P.A., corrected and signed by me on this the 13th day of July, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner	Witnesses examined for the Respondent
NIL	NIL

Documents marked for the Petitioner

NIL

Documents marked for the Respondent

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 31 जुलाई, 2026

का.आ. 1649.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार **मेसर्स आंध्र सीमेंट्स लिमिटेड, जेपी ग्रुप, विशाखा सीमेंट वर्क्स; मेसर्स एज़टेक सर्विसेज़** के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और **श्री गोम्पा चेना मुसलाय्या** के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट **केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद, पंचाट (रिफरेन्स न.- 43/2018)** को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 31.07.2026 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-29012/3/2018-आई.आर (एम)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 31st July, 2026

S.O. 1649.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award **(Reference No. 43/2018)** of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group, Visakha Cement Works; M/s Aztech Services** and **Sri Gompa Chena Musalayya** which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 31.07.2026.

[No. L-29012/3/2018–IR (M)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD

Present: - **Sri IRFAN QAMAR**

Presiding Officer

Dated the 13th day of July, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. 43/2018

Between:

Shri Gompa Chena Musalayya,

S/o Venkanna, eppilivanipalam (V),

Chentagatla (Panchayati), Pendurthi (M),

Dist.- Vishakhapatnam (A.P.) – 531035 ….Petitioner

AND

1. The Senior Vice-President (Admn.) & Plant Head,

   M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group,

   Visakha Cement Woks, Porlupalem (Village),

   Post Durganagar, Visakhapatnam, (A.P.) – 530029.

2. M/s Aztech Services,

   Manpower Contractors, F-3, Sai Krishna Towers,

   Road No.3 Jagannadha Raju Nagar, Venkojipalam,

   Vishakhapatnam (A.P.) – 530022 …… Respondents

Appearances:

For the Petitioner : None

For the Respondent: None

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-29012/3/2018-IR(M) dated 22.01.2018 referred the following dispute under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for adjudication to this Tribunal between the management of M/s. Andhra Cements Limited, and their workman. The reference is,

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Andhra Cements Limited, Visakha Cement Works, Jaypee Group of company in not considering Shri Gompa Chena Musalayya, S/o Venkanna, workman in service in contravention of section 25(F) of the Industrial Disputes Act, or else in not paying legal benefits for the post services rendered to Andhra Cements Company is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled?"

The reference is numbered in this Tribunal as I.D. No 43/2018 and notices were issued to the parties concerned.

2. Notice sent to the Petitioner by registered post has been delivered, but none present for Petitioner side to pursue his case and no claim statement has been filed despite service of notice. It seems Petitioner is not interested to prosecute his case. Therefore, in absence of claim statement 'No Claim Award' is passed.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, P.A., corrected and signed by me on this the 13th day of July, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner	Witnesses examined for the Respondent
NIL	NIL

Documents marked for the Petitioner

NIL

Documents marked for the Respondent

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 31 जुलाई, 2026

का.आ. 1650.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार **मेसर्स आंध्र सीमेंट्स लिमिटेड, जेपी ग्रुप, विशाखा सीमेंट वर्क्स; मेसर्स एज़टेक सर्विसेज़** के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और **श्री रापर्थी डेमुडु** के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट **केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद, पंचाट (रिफरेन्स न.- 44/2018)** को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 31.07.2026 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-29012/2/2018-आई.आर (एम)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 31st July, 2026

S.O. 1650.— In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award **(Reference No. 44/2018)** of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group, Visakha Cement Works; M/s Aztech Services** and **Sri Raparthi Demudu** which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 31.07.2026.

[No. L-29012/2/2018–IR (M)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD

Present: - **Sri IRFAN QAMAR**

Presiding Officer

Dated the 13th day of July, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. 44/2018

Between:

Shri Raparthi Demudu,
S/o Somunaidu,
Porlupalem (V), Pendurthi (M),
Dist.- Vishakhapatnam (A.P.) – 531047 .....Petitioner

AND

1. The Senior Vice-President (Admn.) & Plant Head,
   M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group,
   Visakha Cement Woks, Porlupalem (Village),
   Post Durganagar, Visakhapatnam, (A.P.) – 530029.
2. M/s Aztech Services,
   Manpower Contractors, F-3, Sai Krishna Towers,
   Road No.3 Jagannadha Raju Nagar, Venkojipalam,
   Vishakhapatnam (A.P.) – 530022 …… Respondents

Appearances:

For the Petitioner : None

For the Respondent: None

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-29012/2/2018-IR(M) dated 22.01.2018 referred the following dispute under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for adjudication to this Tribunal between the management of M/s Andhra Cements Limited, and their workman. The reference is,

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Andhra Cements Limited, Visakha Cement Works, Jaypee Group of company in not considering Sri Raparthi Demudu, S/o Somunaidu, workman in service in contravention of section 25(F) of the Industrial Disputes Act, or else in not paying legal benefits for the post services rendered to Andhra Cements Company is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled?"

The reference is numbered in this Tribunal as I.D. No 44/2018 and notices were issued to the parties concerned.

2. Notice sent to the Petitioner by registered post has been delivered, but none present for Petitioner side to pursue his case and no claim statement has been filed despite service of notice. It seems Petitioner is not interested to prosecute his case. Therefore, in absence of claim statement 'No Claim Award' is passed.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, P.A., corrected and signed by me on this the 13th day of July, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner	Witnesses examined for the Respondent
NIL	NIL

Documents marked for the Petitioner

NIL

Documents marked for the Respondent

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 31 जुलाई, 2026

का.आ. 1651.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार **मेसर्स आंध्र सीमेंट्स लिमिटेड, जेपी ग्रुप, विशाखा सीमेंट वर्क्स; मेसर्स एज़टेक सर्विसेज़** के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और **श्री पी. संन्यासी** के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट **केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद, पंचाट (रिफरेन्स न.- 68/2018)** को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 31.07.2026 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-29012/13/2018-आई.आर (एम)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 31st July, 2026

S.O. 1651.— In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award **(Reference No. 68/2018)** of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group, Visakha Cement Works; M/s Aztech Services** and **Sri P. Sanyasi** which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 31.07.2026.

[No. L-29012/13/2018–IR (M)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD

Present: - **Sri IRFAN QAMAR**

Presiding Officer

Dated the 13th day of July, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. 68/2018

Between:

Sri P. Sanyasi, S/o P. Thatalu,
Amara Pinnavanipalem,
Peddagollelapalem, Sabbavarm (M),
District – Vishakatnam (A.P.) – 531035. .....Petitioner

AND

1. The Senior Vice-President (Admn.) & Plant Head,
   M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group,
   Visakha Cement Works, Porlupalem (Village),
   Post Durganagar, Visakhapatnam (A.P) – 530029.
2. M/s Aztech Services,
   Manpower Contractors, F-3, Sai Krishna Towers,
   Road No.3 Jagannadha Raju Nagar, Venkojipalam,
   Vishakhapatnam (A.P.) – 530022. …..Respondents

Appearances:

For the Petitioner : None

For the Respondent: None

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-29012/13/2018-IR(M)) dated 13.04.2018 referred the following dispute under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for adjudication to this Tribunal between the management of M/s Andhra Cements Limited, and their workman. The reference is,

SCHEDULE

"Whether there has been termination of the services of Sri P. Sanyasi, S/o P. Thatalu, supplied by M/s Aztech Services (contractor) by the management of Visakha Cement Works units of Andhra Cements Limited/Jaypee Group of company (principal employer) in October 2010 as alleged by Sri P. Sanyasi or Sri P. Sanyasi, S/o P. Thatalu supplied by M/s Aztec Services (contractor) has on their own suddenly stopped working on 01.10.2010 as alleged by the management of Visakha Cement Works, Andhra Cements Limited/Jaypee Group of company (principal employer)?

Whether the actin of the management Visakha Cement Works, Jaypee Group of company (principal employer) is not considering Sri P. Sanyasi, S/o P. Thatalu for services is fair, legal and justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled and what directions (if any) are necessary in this regard?

Whether the action of the Visakha Cement Works is not paying benefits for the past services rendered to Visakha Cement Works by Sri P. Sanyasi, S/o P. Thatalu is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled and what directions are necessary in this regard?"

The reference is numbered in this Tribunal as I.D. No 68/2018 and notices were issued to the parties concerned.

2. Notice sent to the Petitioner by registered post has been delivered, but none present for Petitioner side to pursue his case and no claim statement has been filed despite service of notice. It seems petitioner

is not interested to prosecute his case. Therefore, in absence of claim statement 'No Claim Award' is passed.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, P.A., corrected and signed by me on this the 13th day of July , 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner	Witnesses examined for the Respondent
NIL	NIL

Documents marked for the Petitioner

NIL

Documents marked for the Respondent

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 31 जुलाई, 2026

का.आ. 1652.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार **मेसर्स आंध्र सीमेंट्स लिमिटेड, जेपी ग्रुप, विशाखा सीमेंट वर्क्स; मेसर्स एज़टेक सर्विसेज़** के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और **श्री किल्लानी बंगरय्या** के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट **केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद, पंचाट (रिफरेन्स न.- 74/2018)** को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 31.07.2026 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-29012/19/2018-आई.आर (एम)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 31st July, 2026

S.O. 1652.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award **(Reference No. 74/2018)** of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group, Visakha Cement Works; M/s Aztech Services** and **Sri Killani Bangarayya** which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 31.07.2026.

[No. L-29012/19/2018–IR (M)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD

Present: - **Sri IRFAN QAMAR**

Presiding Officer

Dated the 13th day of July, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. 74/2018

Between:

Sri Killani Bangarayya,
S/o Late Venkappa,
Eppilivanipalam (V),
Chentagatla (Panchayat),
Pendurthi (M), Dist.
Vishakapatnam(A.P.) – 531035. …..Petitioner

AND

1. The Senior Vice-President (Admn.) & Plant Head,
   M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group,
   Visakha Cement Works, Porlupalem (Village),
   Post Durganagar, Visakhapatnam (A.P) – 530029.
2. M/s Aztech Services,
   Manpower Contractors, F-3, Sai Krishna Towers,
   Road No.3 Jagannadha Raju Nagar, Venkojipalam,
   Vishakhapatnam (A.P.) – 530022. ….Respondents

Appearances:

For the Petitioner : None

For the Respondent: None

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-29012/19/2018-IR(M)) dated 13.04.2018 referred the following dispute under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for adjudication to this Tribunal between the management of M/s Andhra Cements Limited, and their workman. The reference is,

SCHEDULE

"Whether there has been termination of the services of Sri Killani Bangarayya, S/o Late Venkappa, supplied by M/s Aztech Services (contractor) by the management of Visakha Cement Works units of Andhra Cements Limited/Jaypee Group of company (principal employer in October 2010 as alleged by Sri

Killani Bangarayya or Sri Killani Bangarayya, S/o Late Venkappa supplied by M/s Aztec Services (contractor) has on their own suddenly stopped working on 01.10.2010 as alleged by the management of Visakha Cement Works, Andhra Cements Limited/Jaypee Group of company (principal employer) ?

Whether the actin of the management Visakha Cement Works, Jaypee Group of company (principal employer) is not considering Sri Killani Bangarayya, S/o Late Venkappa for services is fair, legal and justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled and what directions (if any) are necessary in this regard?

Whether the action of the Visakha Cement Works in not paying benefits for the past services rendered to Visakha Cement Works by Sri Killani Bangarayya, S/o Late Venkappa is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled and what directions are necessary in this regard?"

The reference is numbered in this Tribunal as I.D. No 74/2018 and notices were issued to the parties concerned.

2. Notice sent to the Petitioner by registered post has been delivered, but none present for Petitioner side to pursue his case and no claim statement has been filed despite service of notice. It seems Petitioner is not interested to prosecute his case. Therefore, in absence of claim statement 'No Claim Award' is passed.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, P.A., corrected and signed by me on this the 13th day of July, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner	Witnesses examined for the Respondent
NIL	NIL

Documents marked for the Petitioner

NIL

Documents marked for the Respondent

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 31 जुलाई, 2026

का.आ. 1653.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार **मेसर्स आंध्र सीमेंट्स लिमिटेड, जेपी ग्रुप, विशाखा सीमेंट वर्क्स; मेसर्स एज़टेक सर्विसेज़** के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और **श्री गोलागनी अप्पा राव** के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट **केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद, पंचाट (रिफरेन्स न.- 75/2018)** को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 31.07.2026 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-29012/20/2018-आई.आर (एम)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 31st July, 2026

S.O. 1653.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award **(Reference No. 75/2018)** of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group, Visakha Cement Works; M/s Aztech Services** and **Sri Golagani Appa Rao** which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 31.07.2026.

[No. L-29012/20/2018–IR (M)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD

Present: - **Sri IRFAN QAMAR**

Presiding Officer

Dated the 13th day of July, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. 75/2018

Between:

Sri Golagani Appa Rao,
S/o Kannayya,
Eppilivanipalem (V),
Chentagatla (Panchayat),
Pendurthi (M),
Dist. Visakhapatnam (A.P.) – 531035 ….Petitioner

AND

1. The Senior Vice-President (Admn.) & Plant Head,
   M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group,
   Visakha Cement Woks, Porlupalem (Village),
   Post Durganagar, Visakhapatnam, (A.P.) – 530029.
2. M/s Aztech Services,
   Manpower Contractors, F-3, Sai Krishna Towers,
   Road No.3 Jagannadha Raju Nagar, Venkojipalam,
   Vishakhapatnam (A.P.) – 530022 …… Respondents

Appearances:

For the Petitioner : None

For the Respondent: None

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-29012/20/2018-IR(M) dated 13.04.2018 referred the following dispute under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for adjudication to this Tribunal between the management of M/s Andhra Cements Limited, and their workman. The reference is,

SCHEDULE

"Whether there has been termination of the services of Sri Golagani Appa Rao, S/o Kannayya, supplied by M/s Aztec services(contractor) by the management of Visakha Cement Works units of Andhra Cements Limited/Jaypee Group of company (principal employer) in October 2010 as alleged by Sri Golagani Appa Rao or Sri Golagani Appa Rao, S/o Kannayya, by M/s Aztec Services (contractor) has on their own suddenly stopped working on 01.10.2010 as alleged by the management of Visakha Cement Woks, Andhra Cements Limited/Jaypee Group of company (principal employer)?

Whether the action of the management of Visakha Cement Works, Jaypee Group of company (present principal employer) in not considering Sri Golagani Appa Rao, S/o Kannayya, or services is fair, legal and justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled and what directions (if any) are necessary in this regard?

Whether the action of the present management of Visakha Cement Works is no paying benefits for the past services rendered to Visakha Cement Works by Sri Golagani Appa Rao, S/o Kannayya, is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled and what directions are necessary in this regard?"

The reference is numbered in this Tribunal as I.D. No 75/2018 and notices were issued to the parties concerned.

2. Notice sent to the Petitioner by registered post has been delivered, but none present for Petitioner side to pursue his case and no claim statement has been filed despite service of notice. It seems Petitioner is not interested to prosecute his case. Therefore, in absence of claim statement 'No Claim Award' award is passed.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, P.A., corrected and signed by me on this the 13th day of July, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner	Witnesses examined for the Respondent
NIL	NIL

Documents marked for the Petitioner

NIL

Documents marked for the Respondent

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 31 जुलाई, 2026

का.आ. 1654.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार **मेसर्स आंध्र सीमेंट्स लिमिटेड, जेपी ग्रुप, विशाखा सीमेंट वर्क्स; मेसर्स एज़टेक सर्विसेज़** के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और **श्री गोम्पा सन्दाका कोटी** के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट **केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय,** हैदराबाद, **पंचाट (रिफरेन्स न.- 76/2018)** को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 31.07.2026 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-29012/22/2018-आई.आर (एम)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 31st July, 2026

S.O. 1654.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award **(Reference No. 76/2018)** of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group, Visakha Cement Works; M/s Aztech Services** and **Sri Gompa Sandaka Koti** which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 31.07.2026.

[No. L-29012/22/2018–IR (M)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD

Present: - **Sri IRFAN QAMAR**

Presiding Officer

Dated the 13th day of July, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. 76/2018

Between:

Sri Gompa Sandaka Koti,
S/o Chennodu,
Eppilivanipalem (V),
Chentagatla (Panchayat),
Pendurthi (M), Dist.
Visakhapatnam (A.P.) – 531035 ….Petitioner

AND

1. The Senior Vice-President (Admn.) & Plant Head,
M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group,
Visakha Cement Woks, Porlupalem (Village),
Post Durganagar, Visakhapatna, (A.P.) – 530029.

2. M/s Aztech Services,

Manpower Contractors, F-3, Sai Krishna Towers,

Road No.3 Jagannadha Raju Nagar, Venkojipalam,

Vishakhapatnam (A.P.) – 530022 …… Respondents

Appearances:

For the Petitioner : None

For the Respondent: None

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-29012/22/2018-IR(M) dated 13.04.2018 referred the following dispute under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for adjudication to this Tribunal between the management of M/s Andhra Cements Limited, and their workman. The reference is,

SCHEDULE

"Whether there has been termination of the services of Sri Gompa Sandaka Koti, S/o Chennodu, supplied by M/s Aztec services(contractor) by the management of Visakha Cement Works units of Andhra Cements Limited/Jaypee Group pf company (principal employer) in October 2010 as alleged by Sri Gompa Sandaka Koti or Gompa Sandaka Koti, S/o Chennodu, by M/s Aztec Services (contractor) has on their own suddenly stopped working on 01.10.2010 as alleged by the management of Visakha Cement Woks, Andhra Cements Limited/Jaypee Group of company (principal employer)?

Whether the action of the management of Visakha Cement Works, Jaypee Group of company (present principal employer) in not considering Sri Gompa Sandaka Koti, S/o Chennodu for services is fair, legal and justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled and what directions (if any) are necessary in this regard?

Whether the action of the present management of Visakha Cement Works is not paying benefits for the past services rendered to Visakha Cement Works by Sri Gompa Sandaka Koti, S/o Chennodu, is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled and what directions are necessary in this regard?"

The reference is numbered in this Tribunal as I.D. No 76/2018 and notices were issued to the parties concerned.

2. Notice sent to the Petitioner by registered post has been delivered, but none present for Petitioner side to pursue his case and no claim statement has been filed despite service of notice. It seems Petitioner is not interested to prosecute his case. Therefore, in absence of claim statement 'No Claim Award' award is passed.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, P.A., corrected and signed by me on this the 13th day of July, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner	Witnesses examined for the Respondent
NIL	NIL

Documents marked for the Petitioner

NIL

Documents marked for the Respondent

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 31 जुलाई, 2026

का.आ. 1655.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार **मेसर्स आंध्र सीमेंट्स लिमिटेड, जेपी ग्रुप, विशाखा सीमेंट वर्क्स; मेसर्स एज़टेक सर्विसेज़** के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और **श्री गोम्पा वेंकट राव** के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट **केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद, पंचाट (रिफरेन्स न.- 77/2018)** को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 31.07.2026 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-29012/23/2018-आई.आर (एम)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 31st July, 2026

S.O. 1655.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award **(Reference No. 77/2018)** of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group, Visakha Cement Works; M/s Aztech Services** and **Sri Gompa Venkata Rao** which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 31.07.2026.

[No. L-29012/23/2018–IR (M)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD

Present: - **Sri IRFAN QAMAR**

Presiding Officer

Dated the 13th day of July, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. 77/2018

Between:

Sri Gompa Venkata Rao,

S/o Appa Rao,

Eppilivanipalem (V),

Chentagatla (Panchayat),

Pendurthi (M),

Dist. Visakhapatnam (A.P.) – 531035. ……Petitioner

AND

1. The Senior Vice-President (Admn.) & Plant Head,

   M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group,

   Visakha Cement Woks, Porlupalem (Village),

   Post Durganagar, Visakhapatna, (A.P.) – 530022.

2. M/s Aztech Services,

   Manpower Contractors, F-3, Sai Krishna Towers,

   Road No.3, Jagannadha Raju Nagar,

   Venkojipalem, Vishakhapatnam (A.P.) - 530022. ….. Respondents

Appearances:

For the Petitioner : None

For the Respondent: None

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-29012/23/2018- IR(M)) dated 16.04.2018 referred the following dispute under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for adjudication to this Tribunal between the management of M/s Andhra Cements Limited, and their workman. The reference is,

SCHEDULE

"Whether there has been termination of the services of Sri Gompa Venkata Rao, S/o Appa Rao, supplied by M/s Aztec Services(contractor) by the management if Visakha Cement Works units of Andhra Cements Limited/Jaypee Group pf company (principal employer) in October 2010 as alleged by Sri Gompa Venkata Rao or Sri Gompa Vekata Rao, s/o Appa Rao by M/s Aztec Services (contractor) has on their own suddenly stopped working on 01.10.2010 as alleged by the management of Visakha Cement Woks, Andhra Cements Limited/Jaypee Group of company (principal employer)?

Whether the action of the management of Visakha Cement Woks, Jaypee Group of company (present principal employer) in not considering Sri Gompa Venkata Rao, S/o Appa Rao for services is fair, legal and justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled and what directions (if any) are necessary in this regard?

Whether the action of the present management of Visakha Cement €Works is no paying benefits for the past services rendered to Visakha Cement Works by Sri Gompa Venkata Rao, S/o Appa Rao is legal and justified ? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled and what directions are necessary in this regard?"

The reference is numbered in this Tribunal as I.D. No. 77/2018 and notices were issued to the parties concerned.

2. Notice sent to the Petitioner by registered post has been delivered, but none present for Petitioner side to pursue his case and no claim statement has filed despite service of notice. It seems Petitioner is not interested to prosecute his case. Therefore, in absence of claim statement 'no-claim' award is passed.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, P.A., corrected and signed by me on this the 13th day of July, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner	Witnesses examined for the Respondent
NIL	NIL

Documents marked for the Petitioner

NIL

Documents marked for the Respondent

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 31 जुलाई, 2026

का.आ. 1656.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार **मेसर्स आंध्र सीमेंट्स लिमिटेड, जेपी ग्रुप, विशाखा सीमेंट वर्क्स; मेसर्स एज़टेक सर्विसेज़** के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और **श्री बोट्टा सोमू नायडू** के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट **केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय,** हैदराबाद**, पंचाट (रिफरेन्स न.- 80/2018)** को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 31.07.2026 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-29012/26/2018-आई.आर (एम)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 31st July, 2026

S.O. 1656.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award **(Reference No. 80/2018)** of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group, Visakha Cement Works; M/s Aztech Services** and **Sri Botta Somu Naidu** which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 31.07.2026.

[No. L-29012/26/2018–IR (M)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD

Present: - **Sri IRFAN QAMAR**

Presiding Officer

Dated the 13th day of July, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. 80/2018

Between:

Sri Botta Somu Naidu,
S/o Muthyalu,
Eppilivanipalem (V),
Chentagatla (Panchayat),
Pendurthi (M),
Dist. Visakhapatnam (A.P.) – 531035 ….Petitioner

AND

1. The Senior Vice-President (Admn.) & Plant Head,
   M/s Andhra Cements Limited, Jaypee Group,
   Visakha Cement Woks, Porlupalem (Village),
   Post Durganagar, Visakhapatnam, (A.P.) – 530029.
2. M/s Aztech Services,
   Manpower Contractors, F-3, Sai Krishna Towers,
   Road No.3 Jagannadha Raju Nagar, Venkojipalam,
   Vishakhapatnam (A.P.) – 530022 …… Respondents

Appearances:

For the Petitioner : None

For the Respondent: None

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-29012/26/2018-IR(M) dated 13.04.2018 referred the following dispute under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for adjudication to this Tribunal between the management of M/s Andhra Cements Limited, and their workman. The reference is,

SCHEDULE

"Whether there has been termination of the services of Sri .Botta Somu Naidu, S/o. Muthyalu, supplied by M/s Aztec services(contractor) by the management of Visakha Cement Works units of Andhra Cements Limited/Jaypee Group of company (principal employer) in October 2010 as alleged by Sri Botta Somu Naidu or Sri Botta Somu Naidu, S/o. Muthyalu, by M/s Aztec Services (contractor) has on their own

suddenly stopped working on 01.10.2010 as alleged by the management of Visakha Cement Woks, Andhra Cements Limited/Jaypee Group of company (principal employer)?

Whether the action of the management of Visakha Cement Works, Jaypee Group of company (present principal employer) in not considering Sri Botta Somu Naidu, S/o. Muthyalu for services is fair, legal and justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled and what directions (if any) are necessary in this regard?

Whether the action of the present management of Visakha Cement Works is no paying benefits for the past services rendered to Visakha Cement Works by Sri Botta Somu Naidu, S/o. Muthyalu is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled and what directions are necessary in this regard?"

The reference is numbered in this Tribunal as I.D. No 80/2018 and notices were issued to the parties concerned.

2. Notice sent to the Petitioner by registered post has been delivered, but none present for Petitioner side to pursue his case and no claim statement has been filed despite service of notice. It seems Petitioner is not interested to prosecute his case. Therefore, in absence of claim statement 'No Claim Award' award is passed.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, P.A., corrected and signed by me on this the 13th day of July, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner	Witnesses examined for the Respondent
NIL	NIL

Documents marked for the Petitioner

NIL

Documents marked for the Respondent

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 31 जुलाई, 2026

का.आ. 1657.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार **एचपीसीएल** के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और **एचपीसीएल एम्प्लाइज यूनियन (सीटू)** के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट **केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय,** हैदराबाद**, पंचाट (रिफरेन्स न.- 15/2012)** को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 31.07.2026 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-30011/50/2011-आई.आर (एम)]
सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 31st July, 2026

S.O. 1657.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award **(Reference No. 15/2012)** of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **HPCL** and **HPCL Employees Union (CITU)** which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 31.07.2026.

[No. L-30011/50/2011–IR (M)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD

Present: - **Sri IRFAN QAMAR**

Presiding Officer

Dated the 13th day of July, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. 15/2012

Between:

The General Secretary,
HPCL Employees Union (CITU),
C/o Q. No. B-12, West, Yarada Park,
Srikaripuram, Visakhapatnam-11 ....Petitioner

AND

The Executive Director,
HPCL, Visakh Refinery,
P.B.No. 15, Malkpuram,
Visakhapatnam-530011 …..Respondent

Appearances:

For the Petitioner: M/s. K.N. Satyanarayana, Advocate

For the Respondent: M/s. G. Sai Baba & Srinivas, Advocates

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-30011/50/2011-(IR(M)) dated 21.05.2012 referred the following dispute under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for adjudication to this Tribunal between the management of M/s. HPCL Employees Union, and their workmen. The reference is,

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of HPCL, visakh Refinery, Visakhapatnam, in deducting 8 (eight) days wages from the salary of Shri B.N.R. Reddy, working President and shri K.N. Satyanarayana, General Secretary of HPCL Employees Union, Visakhapatnam in the month of October 2010 & November 2010 as penalty without following principles of natural justice, is legal and justified? what relief the workmen are entitled to?"

The reference is numbered in this Tribunal as I.D. No 15/2012 and notices were issued to the parties concerned.

2. On the date fixed, the parties has filed a copy of the memo with the averments that both the management of HPCL Visakha Refinery and the Petitioner union signed Memorandum of Settlement and according to that settlement management has completed our upgradation policy. Therefore, in view of the Memorandum of settlement the union prayed to withdraw the preference dispute. Therefore, the award is passed in view terms of the Memorandum of Settlement dated 23.5.2025 extend between both the parties.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, P.A., corrected and signed by me on this the 13th day of July, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner	Witnesses examined for the Respondent
NIL	NIL

Documents marked for the Petitioner

NIL

Documents marked for the Respondent

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 31 जुलाई, 2026

का.आ. 1658.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार **मेसर्स श्री फ़िरोज़ खान, पैकिंग प्लांट कॉन्ट्रैक्टर (सीमेंट की लोडिंग); सीमेंट कॉर्पोरेशन इंडिया** के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और **श्री अलीजान और तिरुपति और अन्य 14** के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट **केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय,** हैदराबाद**, पंचाट (रिफरेन्स न.- 98/2013)** को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 31.07.2026 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-29012/26/2013-आई.आर (एम)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 31st July, 2026

S.O. 1658.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award **(Reference No. 98/2013)** of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **M/s. Shri Feroz Khan, Packing Plant Contractor (Loading of Cement); Cement Corporation India** and **Shri Alijan and Tirupathi and other 14** which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 31.07.2026.

[No. L-29012/26/2013–IR (M)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD

Present: - **Sri IRFAN QAMAR**

Presiding Officer

Dated the 13th day of July, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. 98/2013

Between:

Shri Alijan and Tirupathi and other 14,

Pakers & Silo Operators,

CCI, Karankote, R/o H.No.10/68,

CCI labour Colony, TQ: Tandur, R.R.Distt.(AP), ...Petitioners

AND

1. M/s. Shri Feroz Khan,
   Packing Plant Contractor (Loading of Cement),
   Contractor CCI, Karankote,
   TQ: Tandur, R.R.Dist(AP).
2. The General Manager,
   Cement Corporation India,
   Karankote, TQ: Tandur, R.R.Distt.(AP), ..… Respondents

Appearances:

For the Petitioner: M/s. Ravindra Bharati & K. Ananth Rao, Advocates

For the Respondent: M/s. V. Uma Devi & N. Srinivas, Advocates

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-29012/26/2013-IR(M) dated 21.10.2013 referred the following dispute under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for adjudication to this Tribunal between the management of Shri Feroz Khan, Packing Plant (Loading of Cement) Contractor of M/s. CCI, Karankote, and their workmen. The reference is,

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Cement Corporation of India, Tandur and its contractor Shri Feroz Khan, Packing Plant Contractor (Loading of Cement) in denying V Grade Wage Board Pay Scale and increment to Shri Alijan and 15 others with retrospect effect from the contractor/Principle Employer, is legal and justified? what relief the contract workmen are entitled to?"

The reference is numbered in this Tribunal as I.D. No 98/2013 and notices were issued to the parties concerned.

2. Case is fixed for Petitioner evidence. No evidence produced by the Petitioner despite sufficient opportunity. The claim statement of the Petitioner is not substituted by any evidence. It appears Petitioner is not interested to pursue his case. Therefore, 'No Claim Award' is passed.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, P.A., corrected and signed by me on this the 13th day of July, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner	Witnesses examined for the Respondent
NIL	NIL

Documents marked for the Petitioner

NIL

Documents marked for the Respondent

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 31 जुलाई, 2026

का.आ. 1659.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार **मेसर्स ओएनजीसी लिमिटेड; मेसर्स श्री रामा ट्रेडर्स** के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और **ओएनजीसी लिमिटेड कॉन्ट्रैक्ट वर्कर्स यूनियन** के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट **केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद, पंचाट (रिफरेन्स न.- 106/2018)** को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 31.07.2026 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-30011/1/2018-आई.आर (एम)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 31st July, 2026

S.O. 1659.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award **(Reference No. 106/2018)** of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **M/s ONGC Limited; M/s Sri Rama Traders** and **ONGC Ltd. Contract Workers Union** which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 31.07.2026.

[No. L-30011/1/2018–IR (M)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD

Present: - **Sri IRFAN QAMAR**

Presiding Officer

Dated the 13th day of July, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. 106/2018

Between:

Sri. General Secretary,

ONGC Ltd. Contract Workers Union,

ONGC K.G. Basin, Rajahmundry Assest,

6-7-11/10, Adikarivari Street, Narsapur,

Pin Code – 534275, W.G.Distt. ....Petitioner

AND

1. The Executive Director/Asset Manager,
   M/s ONGC Limited, Base complex,
   Godavari Bhavan, Rajahmaundry-533106.
2. M/s Sri Rama Traders, Sri Y. Suresh Chowdsry,
   Contractor, D. No. 80-16-6/151, Sri Rama Nilayam,
   N.N. Road, Rajahmundry–533103,
   E.G.Distt. …..Respondents

Appearances:

For the Petitioner: M/s. K.V.B. Choudary & D. Guru Murthy, Advocates

For the Respondent: Sri Y. Ranjeeth Reddy, Advocate (for R-2)

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-30011/1/2018-IR(M) dated 31.10.2018 referred the following dispute under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for adjudication to this Tribunal between the management of M/s. ONGC Limited and other, and their workmen. The reference is,

SCHEDULE

"Whether the termination of the three contract workers Sri N. Suresh, Sri M. Malleswara Rao and Sri. J. Ramesh w.e.f. 01.07.2017 by M/s Sri Rama Traders, Rajahmundry (contractor) under ONGC, Rajahmundry is proper, legal and justified? If not, what relief the workmen are entitled to?"

The reference is numbered in this Tribunal as I.D. No 106/2018 and notices were issued to the parties concerned.

2. Petitioner has filed claim statement to set aside his termination order dated 13.06.2017 passed by Respondent No2. Despite sufficient opportunity Petitioner failed to adduce the evidence to substantiate the claim that the alleged termination order passed by R2 is illegal. Therefore, the claim of the Petitioner is not substantiated by any evidence. Hence, for want of evidence, 'No Claim Award' is passed.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, P.A., corrected and signed by me on this the 13th day of July, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner	Witnesses examined for the Respondent
NIL	NIL

Documents marked for the Petitioner

NIL

Documents marked for the Respondent

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 31 जुलाई, 2026

का.आ. 1660.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार **मेसर्स ओएनजीसी लिमिटेड; मेसर्स श्री चौ. एस प्रसाद** के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और **श्री शक वेंकट रामय्या और 5 अन्य** के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट **केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद, पंचाट (रिफरेन्स न.-118/2018)** को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 31.07.2026 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-30012/21/2017-आई.आर (एम)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 31st July, 2026

S.O. 1660.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award **(Reference No. 118/2018)** of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **M/s ONGC Limited; M/s Sri Ch. S. Prasad** and **Sri Saka Venkata Ramayya and 5 other** which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 31.07.2026.

[No. L-30012/21/2017–IR (M)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD

Present: - **Sri IRFAN QAMAR**

Presiding Officer

Dated the 13th day of July, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. 118/2018

Between:

Sri Saka Venkata Ramayya and 5 other,

S/o Sri Venkateswara Rao,

Door No. 10-53, Jaggaraju Peta,

Challapalli, Uppalaguptam,

East Godavari, Andhra Pradesh – 533222 .....Petitioner

AND

1. The Executive Director,
   M/s ONGC Limited, Base Complex,
   Rajahmundry, Andhra Pradesh.
2. The Dy. General Manager (Transport),
   M/s ONGC Limited, Base Complex,
   Rajahmundry, Andhra Pradesh.
3. Sri Ch. S. Prasad, Contractor,
   M/s Sri Venkateswara Transport,
   Flat No. 104, Vynatheya Apartments-1,
   Syamala Nagar, Rajahmundry – 533103 ..... Respondents

Appearances:

For the Petitioner : None

For the Respondent: None

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-30012/21/2017-IR(M) dated 26.11.2018 referred the following dispute under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for adjudication to this Tribunal between the management of M/s ONGC Limited, Rajahmundry and their workmen. The reference is,

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of management of M/s Sri Venkateswara Transports, Contractor in not paying Minimum wages, overtime allowance and bonus to Shri Saka Venkta Ramaiah and 5 others (list attached) is fair, legal and justified? If not, what relief the workmen are entitled to?"

The reference is numbered in this Tribunal as I.D. No 118/2018 and notices were issued to the parties concerned.

2. On the date fixed for filing claim statement Petitioner remained absent. Despite sufficient opportunities having been granted, the petitioner has failed to file the claim statement. In the absence of a claim statement, there is no material available to adjudicate the dispute. Accordingly, a No Claim Award is passed. The reference is answered accordingly.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, P.A., corrected and signed by me on this the 13th day of July, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner	Witnesses examined for the Respondent
NIL	NIL

Documents marked for the Petitioner

NIL

Documents marked for the Respondent

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 31 जुलाई, 2026

का.आ. 1661.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार **श्री वेंकटेश्वर ट्रांसपोर्ट्स; ऑयल एंड नेचुरल गैस कॉर्पोरेशन** के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और **ओएनजीसी कॉन्ट्रैक्ट वर्कर्स फेडरेशन (सीआईटीयू)** के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट **केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद, पंचाट (रिफरेन्स न.- 2/2026)** को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 31.07.2026 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. जेड-16025/04/2026-आईआर(एम)-113]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 31st July, 2026

S.O. 1661.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award **(Reference No. 2/2026)** of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **Sri Venkateswara Transports; Oil and Natural Gas Corporation** and **ONGC Contract Workers Federation (CITU)** which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 31.07.2026.

[No. Z-16025/04/2026–IR (M)-113]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD

Present: - **Sri IRFAN QAMAR**

Presiding Officer

Dated the day of July, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No.2/2026

Between:

ONGC Contract Workers Federation (CITU),

CPM Office, Deluxe Center, Rajahmundry,

District: East Godavari, Andhra Pradesh – 530051 …..Petitioner

AND

1. Sri Venkateswara Transports,

   Rep. by sri Ch. S. Prasad, Managing Partner,

   Flat No.1, Srilatha Enclave, Gandhipuram – 2,

   Rajahmundry-533103

2. The Executive Director,

   Oil and Natural Gas Corporation

   (ONGC)KG Basin,

   Rajahmundry Asset, Rajahmundry,

   Dist.: East Godavari, Andhra Pradesh533106 ….Respondents

Appearances:

For the Petitioner: Smt. Vedula Chitraleka, Ms. P. Namratha and Ms. V. Kiranmayi, Advocates

For the Respondent: M/s. Sundari. R. Pasupati, Advocate

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. 8/33/2025-B1 dated 27.10.2025 referred the following dispute under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for adjudication to this Tribunal between the management of Oil and Natural Gas Corporation (ONGC), Rajahmundry and contractor Sri Venkateswara Transports Rajahmundry and their workmen. The reference is,

SCHEDULE

1. "Whether the action of management of Oil and Natural Gas Corporation (ONGC), Rajahmundry and their contractor Sri Venkateswara Transports Rajahmundry in terminating the services of its workmen 1. M. Appa Rao, 2. Ch. Suresh, 3. Ch. Chinna Rao, 4. T. Venkateswara Rao, 5. P. Raja Kishore, 6. SK. Rehman, 7. K.V. Ramesh, 8. P. Mohan Rao, 9. Y. Ram Ganesh, 10. N. Mahesh Babu, 11. J. Ravi Kiran and 12. K.S.R. Murthy is justified? If not, what relief are the workmen entitled to? If yes, what terminal benefits are the workmen entitled to?

2. "Whether the action of management of Oil and Natural Gas Corporation (ONGC), Rajahmundry and their contractor Sri Venkateswara Transports Rajahmundry in terminating the services of the above mentioned workmen who had raised he dispute before the conciliation Officer, amount to victimization of the workmen entitled to and what legal action shall be taken against the contractor and the management of ONGC?"

The reference is numbered in this Tribunal as I.D. No 2/2026 and notices were issued to the parties concerned.

2. Both parties absent. Despite service of the notice, Petitioner did not appear and did not file claim statement till today. It seems that Petitioner do not want to prosecute his case. Therefore, in the absence of any claim statement from the Petitioner, a 'No Claim Award' is passed. Transmit.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, P.A., corrected and signed by me on this the day of July, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner	Witnesses examined for the Respondent
NIL	NIL

Documents marked for the Petitioner

NIL

Documents marked for the Respondent

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 31 जुलाई, 2026

का.आ. 1662.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार **मेसर्स एसएसवी क्रिएशन्स; सीमेंट कॉर्पोरेशन ऑफ़ इंडिया लिमिटेड** के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और **सीमेंट कॉर्पोरेशन ऑफ़ इंडिया कॉन्ट्रैक्ट एम्प्लॉईज़ यूनियन** के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट **केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद**, **पंचाट (रिफरेन्स न.- 184/2025)** को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 31.07.2026 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. जेड-16025/04/2026-आईआर(एम)-112]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 31st July, 2026

S.O. 1662.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award **(Reference No. 184/2025)** of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **M/s SSV Creations; Cement Corporation of India Ltd.** and **Cement Corporation of India Contract Employees Union** which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 31.07.2026.

[No. Z-16025/04/2026–IR (M)-112]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD

Present: - **Sri IRFAN QAMAR**

Presiding Officer

Dated the 13th day of July, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No.184/2025

Between:

The General Secretary,
Cement Corporation of India
Contract Employees Union,
D.No.17-44, CCI Labour Colony,
Karankote Village, Tandur (M),
Vikarabad (D), Telangana-501158

…..Petitioner

AND

1. The Managing Director,
   M/s. SSV Creations, Flat No.101,

Sri Rama Krishna Towers,

Besides Image Hospital,

Ameerpet, Hyderabad, Telangana.

2. The General Manager/Managing Director,

Cement Corporation of India Ltd.,

Tandur Cement Factory, CCI Tandur,

Vikarabad, Telangana. ….. Respondents

Appearances:

For the Petitioner: None

For the Respondent: Sri V. Thirupathi Reddy, Advocate (For R1)

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. 5/3/2025-B1 dated 24.07.2025 referred the following dispute under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for adjudication to this Tribunal between the management of M/s. SSV Creations, contractor at M/s. Cement Corporation of India, Tandur, Vikarabad and their workmen. The reference is,

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the contractor M/s. S.S.V. Creations in terminating the services of workers namely T. Sharanappa, Mahadev, K. Ram Babu, Ramchandar, Ram Reddy, Annumiya, Husenappa, Anandamma, Abdul Nabi and R. Ananth Kumar in the establishment of Cement Corporation of Inia Ltd (CCI), Tanur, Vikarabad is legal and justified? If not, what relief the workmen are entitled to?

"Whether the submission of Cement Corporation of Inia Ltd (CCI), Tanur, Vikarabad as a Principal Employer over the issue of retirement age for contract employees in the establishment of CCI is justified? If not, what relief the workmen are entitled to?"

The reference is numbered in this Tribunal as I.D. No 184/2025 and notices were issued to the parties concerned.

2. On the date fixed for filing of claim statement Petitioner called absent. Despite sufficient opportunity, the Petitioner has failed to file the claim statement. It appears that the Petitioner is not interested in prosecuting the case. Accordingly, for want of prosecution, a 'No Claim Award' is passed.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, P.A., corrected and signed by me on this the 13th day of July, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner	Witnesses examined for the Respondent
NIL	NIL

Documents marked for the Petitioner

NIL

Documents marked for the Respondent

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 31 जुलाई, 2026

का.आ. 1663.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार **आईओसीएल; मेसर्स एएसके एजेंसीज** के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और **श्रीमती एस. मुथुलक्ष्मी** के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट **केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय, चेन्नई, पंचाट (रिफरेन्स न.- 96/2011)** को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 31.07.2026 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-30012/28/2010-आई.आर (एम)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 31st July, 2026

S.O. 1663.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award **(Reference No. 96/2011)** of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Chennai** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **IOCL; M/s ASK Agencies** and **Smt. S. Muthulakshmi** which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 31.07.2026.

[No. L-30012/28/2010–IR (M)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM- LABOUR COURT, CHENNAI

ID No. 96/2011

Present: SUSHIL KUMAR, PRESIDING OFFICER

Date: 08-05-2026

Smt.S. Muthulakshmi,

No.72, Periyavettuvapalayam Post,

Perundhurai,

Erode : 1st Party/Petitioner

AND

1.The Plant Manager,

IOCL, Marketing Division,

Periyavettuvapalaym Post,

Sipcot, Perundhurai,

Erode : 2nd Party / 1st Respondent

2.M/s ASK Agencies,

Hotel Sri Murugan Building,

56, Devi & Co., Lane

Opp. Railway Station,

Coimbatore – 18 : 2nd Party / 2nd Respondent

Appearance:

For the 1st Party/Petitioner : M/s Ajoy Khose, Adv

For the Respondent No.1 : M/s Advit law Chamber, Adv

For the Respondent No.2 : M/s Chandrasekar, Adv

AWARD

The Central Government, Ministry of Labour & Employment vide its Order No. L-30012/28/2010-IR(M), dated 02.12.2011 referred the following Industrial Dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication.

The schedule mentioned in that order is:

"Whether the action of the Contractor's Management M/s ASK Agencies Coimbatore terminating the services of Housekeeping Worker Smt. S. Muthulakshmi is justified or not? What relief the workman is entitled to?"

ID 96/2011

On receipt of the above reference dated 02.12.2011 from the appropriate Government, the dispute was registered as ID No. 96/2011, and due notices were issued to both the parties for their appearance and file statements. Both sides filed their respective statements.

The case was listed for hearing on the IA petition from 29.08.2022 and subsequent dates till 05.08.2025, but the petitioner was not ready to contest the case, including the IA hearing. Ongoing through the order sheets as discussed above, it is crystal clear that despite of sufficient opportunities though made in favour of the Petitioner, there has been no progress in the proceeding was noticed for a substantial period almost approaching 3 ½ years. Since the Petitioner chose not to contest the case, including the IA, it is clear that the petitioner has no interest in proceeding. Accordingly, the case was reserved for Final Order as liable for dismissal for default.

In the fact and circumstance, it is held that that there exists, no dispute for adjudication in consonance to the reference.

In the result, the case stands dismissed for default.

An Award is passed accordingly.

SUSHIL KUMAR-II, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 31 जुलाई, 2026

का.आ. 1664.— औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार **मेसर्स डे एन डे सर्विसेज़ (प्रा.) लिमिटेड; मेसर्स मकीन एनर्जी इंडिया (प्रा.) लिमिटेड; इंडियन ऑयल कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड** के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और **श्री आर. अजय** के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट **केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय, चेन्नई, पंचाट (रिफरेन्स न.- 08/2025)** को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 31.07.2026 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. जेड-16025/04/2026-आईआर(एम)-114]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 31st July, 2026

S.O. 1664.— In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award **(Reference No. 08/2025)** of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Chennai** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **M/s Day N Day Services (P) Ltd; M/s Makeen Energy India P Ltd; Indian Oil Corporation Ltd.** and **Shri R. Ajay** which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 31.07.2026.

[No. Z-16025/04/2026-IR(M)-114]

SALONI, Dy. Director

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL

TRIBUNAL- CUM - LABOUR COURT

CHENNAI

ID No. 8/2025

Present: SUSHIL KUMAR, PRESIDING OFFICER

Date: 27-02-2026

Shri R. Ajay,
S/o Raj,
6/222, Colony Street,
Anaithaliyoor, Gangaikondan (PO),
Tirunelveli-627 352 : 1st Party/Petitioner

AND

The Managing Director,
M/s Day N Day Services (P) Ltd.,
No.1, Second Main Road,
Ramakrishna Nagar,
Mandaveli,
Chennai- 600 028 : 2nd Party / 1st Respondent

The Plant Incharge,
M/s Makeen Energy India P Ltd.,
Indian Oil Corporation Ltd.,
SIPCOT Industrial Growth Centre,
Gangaikodan,
Tirunelveli – 627 352 : 2nd Party / 2nd Respondent

The Plant Incharge,
Indian Oil Corporation Ltd.,
SIPCOT Industrial Growth Center,
Gangaikondan, Tirunelveli – 627 352 : 2nd Party / 3rd Respondent

Appearance:

For the 1st Party/Petitioner : None

For the Respondent No.1 : M/s P. Swaminathan, Adv

For the Respondent No.2 & 3 : None

AWARD

The Central Government, Ministry of Labour & Employment vide its Order No. 8/46/2024/RM/30008754/ADJ/A1, dated 18.12.2024 referred the following Industrial Dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication.

ID 8/2025

The schedule mentioned in that order is:

"Whether the action of M/s Day N Day Services Pvt Ltd., Chennai, Contractor of M/s Makeen Energy India Ltd., at Indian Oil Corporation Ltd., Gangaikondan, Tirunelveli in terminating the service of Shri R. Ajay, w.e.f. 18.4.2024 without following the principles of natural justice for termination is legal and justified? If not, what relief the petitioner is entitled to?"

2. Onreceipt of the above reference dated 18.12.2024 from the appropriate Government, the dispute was registered as ID No. 8/2025 and due notices were issued to both the parties for their appearance fixing the case to 04.06.2025. Neither the Petitioner nor any Counsel / Authorized Representative turned up resulting further adjournments to 04.08.2025, 17.09.2025, 12.11.2025 and 18.12.2025. The Petitioner did not turn up. It reveals from the body of reference that while the appropriate Govt. sent the reference dated 18.12.2024 to this Tribunal for adjudication, copies of the reference were sent to the Petitioner and all the opposite parties. It is therefore well presumed that both parties must have received the reference. Even then, in the interest of justice, the Petitioner was once again directed to appear and to file claim statement fixing the case to 17.02.2026. The Petitioner did not turn up nor was any authorized representative of the counsel on his behalf present. The claim statement was not furnished in any manner by the Petitioner. It reveals the Petitioner, despite of sufficient opportunity choose not to appear or to file claim statement and documents.

3. In the circumstance it deems proper not to re-list the case for the same purpose to any other date which would be wastage of the valuable time of this Tribunal. The case was reserved for Final Order.

4. In view of the discussion held supra, it is crystal clear that the petitioner has got no interest to proceed with the case. Thus, the Tribunal is not in a position to adjudicate the dispute as referred by the Appropriate Government, as there exists no Industrial Dispute for adjudication as per the reference.

5. In the result the reference is answered against the petitioner.

An Award is passed accordingly.

SUSHIL KUMAR-II, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 31 जुलाई, 2026

का.आ. 1665.— औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार **मेसर्स डे एन डे सर्विसेज़ (प्रा.) लिमिटेड; मेसर्स मकीन एनर्जी इंडिया (प्रा.) लिमिटेड; इंडियन ऑयल कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड** के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और **श्री के. पेरुमल** के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट **केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय, चेन्नई, पंचाट (रिफरेन्स न.- 09/2025)** को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 31.07.2026 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. जेड-16025/04/2026-आईआर(एम)-115]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 31st July, 2026

S.O. 1665.— In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award **(Reference No. 09/2025)** of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Chennai** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **M/s Day N Day Services (P) Ltd; M/s Makeen Energy India P Ltd; Indian Oil Corporation Ltd.** and **Shri K. Perumal** which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 31.07.2026.

[No. Z-16025/04/2026-IR(M)-115]

SALONI, Dy. Director

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL

TRIBUNAL- CUM - LABOUR COURT

CHENNAI

ID No. 9/2025

Present: SUSHIL KUMAR, PRESIDING OFFICER

Date: 25-02-2026

Shri K. Perumal,
S/o Kanagaraj,
No.21/250 A, Mupidathi Amman Koil Street,
Kakkan Nagar, Thimmarajapuram,
Palayamkottai,
Tirunelveli – 627 352 : 1st Party/Petitioner

AND

The Managing Director,
M/s Day N Day Services (P) Ltd.,
No.1, Second Main Road,
Ramakrishna Nagar,
Mandaveli,
Chennai- 600 028 : 2nd Party / 1st Respondent

The Plant Incharge,
M/s Makeen Energy India P Ltd.,
Indian Oil Corporation Ltd.,
SIPCOT Industrial Growth Centre,
Gangaikodan,
Tirunelveli – 627 352 : 2nd Party / 2nd Respondent

The Plant Incharge,
Indian Oil Corporation Ltd.,
SIPCOT Industrial Growth Center,
Gangaikondan, Tirunelveli – 627 352 : 2nd Party / 3rd Respondent

Appearance:

For the 1st Party/Petitioner : None
For the Respondent No.1 : M/s P. Swaminathan, Adv
For the Respondent No.2 & 3 : None

AWARD

The Central Government, Ministry of Labour& Employment vide its Order No. 8/44/2024/RM/300087425/ADJ/A1, dated 18.12.2024 referred the following Industrial Dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication.

ID 9/2025

The schedule mentioned in that order is:

"Whether the action of M/s Day N Day Services Pvt Ltd., Chennai, Contractor of M/s Makeen Energy India Ltd., at Indian Oil Corporation Ltd., Gangaikondan, Tirunelveli in terminating the service of Shri K. Perumal, w.e.f. 18.4.2024 without following the principles of natural justice for termination is legal and justified? If not, what relief the petitioner is entitled to?"

2. Onreceipt of the above reference dated 18.12.2024 from the appropriate Government, the dispute was registered as ID No. 9/2025 and due notices were issued to both the parties for their appearance fixing the case to 04.06.2025. Neither the Petitioner nor any Counsel / Authorized Representative turned up resulting further adjournments to 04.08.2025, 17.09.2025, 12.11.2025 and 18.12.2025. The Petitioner did not turn up. It reveals from the body of reference that while the appropriate Govt. sent the reference dated 18.12.2024 to this Tribunal for adjudication, copies of the reference were sent to the Petitioner and all the opposite parties. It is therefore well presumed that both parties must have received the reference. Even then, in the interest of justice, the Petitioner was once again directed to appear and to file claim statement fixing the case to 17.02.2026. The Petitioner did not turn up nor was any authorized representative of the counsel on his behalf present. The claim statement was not furnished in any manner by the Petitioner. It reveals the Petitioner, despite of sufficient opportunity choose not to appear or to file claim statement and documents.

3. In the circumstance it deems proper not to re-list the case for the same purpose to any other date which would be wastage of the valuable time of this Tribunal. The case was reserved for Final Order.

4. In view of the discussion held supra, it is crystal clear that the petitioner has got no interest to proceed with the case. Thus, the Tribunal is not in a position to adjudicate the dispute as referred by the Appropriate Government, as there exists no Industrial Dispute for adjudication as per the reference.

5. In the result the reference is answered against the petitioner.

An Award is passed accordingly.

SUSHIL KUMAR-II, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 31 जुलाई, 2026

का.आ. 1666.— औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार **आईओसीएल; मेसर्स एएसके एजेंसीज** के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और **भारतिया पोधु थोझिलालर संगम** के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट **केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय, चेन्नई, पंचाट (रिफरेन्स न.- 10/2025)** को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 31.07.2026 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. जेड-16025/04/2026-आईआर(एम)-116]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 31st July, 2026

S.O. 1666.— In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award **(Reference No. 10/2025)** of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Chennai** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **IOCL; M/s ASK Agencies** and **Bharathiya Podhu Thozhilalar Sangam** which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 31.07.2026.

[No. Z-16025/04/2026-IR(M)-116]

SALONI, Dy. Director

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL

TRIBUNAL- CUM - LABOUR COURT

CHENNAI

ID No. 10/2025

Present: SUSHIL KUMAR, PRESIDING OFFICER

Date: 26-02-2026

The General Secretary,
Bharathiya Podhu Thozhilalar Sangam,
Kesavarkudil,
No.5, Ranjgasayee Street,
Perambur,
Chennai – 600 011 : 1st Party/Petitioner

AND

1. The Proprietor,
M/s ASK Agencies,
Hotel Sri Murugan Building,
No.56, Devi & Co Lane,
Coimbatore – 641 081 : 2nd Party / 1st Respondent

2. The Chief General Manager,
M/s Indian Oil Corporation Ltd.,
Lube Complex,
Tondiarpet,
Chennai – 600 008. : 2nd Party / 2nd Respondent

3. The Executive Director (RS),
M/s Indian Oil Corporation Ltd (Marketing Division)
Tondiarpet,
Chennai – 600 008 : 2nd Party / 3rd Respondent

Appearance:

For the 1st Party/Petitioner : M/s Murali Krishnan, Adv
For the Respondent No.1 : M/s. V.S. Ravi, Adv
For the Respondent No.2 & 3: M/s. Advit Law Chambers, Adv

ID 10/2025

AWARD

The Central Government, Ministry of Labour& Employment vide its Order No. 8/54/2024/B4/300095777/ADJ/A1, dated 02.01.2025 referred the following Industrial Dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication.

The schedule mentioned in that order is:

"Whether the demand of Bharathiya Podhu Thozhilalargal sangam seeking reinstatement of Smt. A. Uma Maheswari, contract employee of M/s ASK Agencies through the Principal Employer M/s Indian Oil Corporation Ltd., Lube Complex, Tondiarpet, Chennai w.e.f. 01.04.2024 is legal and justified? If not, to what relief Smt. A. Uma Maheshwari represented by Bharathiya Podhu Thozhilalargal sangam is entitled to?"

2. Onreceipt of the above reference dated 02.01.2025 from the appropriate Government, the dispute was registered as ID No. 10/2025 and due notices were issued to both the parties for their appearance fixing the case to

03.04.2025. Neither the Petitioner nor any Counsel / Authorized Representative turned up resulting further adjournments to 04.06.2025, 04.08.2025, 17.09.2025, 12.11.2025 and 18.12.2025. The Petitioner did not turn up whereas the Respondents filed Vakalat Namas. It reveals from the body of reference that while the appropriate Govt. sent the reference dated 02.01.2025 to this Tribunal for adjudication, copies of the reference were sent to the Petitioner and all the opposite parties. It is therefore well presumed that both parties must have received the reference. Even then, in the interest of justice, the Petitioner was once again directed to appear and to file claim statement fixing the case to 17.02.2026. The Petitioner did not turn up nor was any authorized representative of the counsel on his behalf present. The claim statement was not furnished in any manner by the Petitioner. The Respondents (R1,R2 and R3) were present. It reveals the Petitioner, despite of sufficient opportunity choose not to appear or to file claim statement and documents.

3. In the circumstance it deems proper not to re-list the case for the same purpose to any other date which would be wastage of the valuable time of this Tribunal. The case was reserved for Final Order.

ID 10/2025

4. In view of the discussion held supra, it is crystal clear that the petitioner has got no interest to proceed with the case. Thus, the Tribunal is not in a position to adjudicate the dispute as referred by the Appropriate Government, as there exists no Industrial Dispute for adjudication as per the reference.

5. In the result the reference is answered against the petitioner.

An Award is passed accordingly.

SUSHIL KUMAR-II, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 3 अगस्त, 2026

का.आ. 1667.— औघोगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार स्टेट बैंक ऑफ़ इंडिया के प्रबंधतत्र, संबद्ध नियोजको और उनके कर्मकार के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औघोगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औघोगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद के **पंचाट** (14/2003) प्रकाशित करती है।

[सं. एल- 12025/01/2026- आई आर (बी-I)-153]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 3rd August, 2026

S.O. 1667.— In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the **Award (Ref. 14/2003*)*** of the ***Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court Hyderabad*** as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of **State Bank of India** and **their workman.**

[No. L-12025/01/2026-IR(B-I)-153]

SALONI, Dy. Director

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD

Present: - **Sri Irfan Qamar**

Presiding Officer

Dated the 12th day of June, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE L.C.No. 14/2003

[Old ID No. 280/99 of Labour Court, Guntur]

Between:

Sri Angalakurthi Chennaiah,

S/o Kotaiah,

Daivalaravuru,

Korsipadu Mandal,

Prakasam distt. ….. Petitioner

And

1. The Chairman,
   State Bank of India,
   Central office,
   Mumbai.
2. The Chief General Manager,
   (Personnel)
   State Bank of India,
   Bank Street
   Hyderabad.
3. The Branch Manager,
   State Bank of India A.D.B.,
   Addanki branch.
4. The Regional Manager,
   State Bank of India,
   Zonal Office,
   Tirupathi. …..Respondents

Appearances:

For the Petitioner : M/s. S. Prasada Rao, Advocates

For the Respondent : Sri Y. Ranjeeth Reddy, Advocate

AWARD

Sri Angalakurthi Chennaiah who worked as Messenger (who will be referred to as the workman) has filed this petition under Sec. 2A(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 against the Respondents State Bank of India seeking for reinstatement into service as Messenger duly granting all the consequential benefits such as continuity of service, back wages and all 82her attendant benefits etc., and such other reliefs as this court may deem fit. Earlier Petitioner has filed this dispute before the Labour Court, Guntur for adjudication and later the same has been transferred to this Tribunal bearing ID No. 280/99, as per orders of Central Government vide Lr.No.H-11026/1/2001-IR(C.II) dated 18.10.2001 and registered, numbered in this Tribunal as LC No. 14 /2003.

2. Before unfolding the factual matrix of the instant industrial dispute it would be apposite to have a bird eye view of a chequered history of the instant industrial dispute. Earlier instant industrial dispute along with the batch cases was decided by this Tribunal vide common award dated 17.5.2005 and the reference was answered in favour of the Respondent and against the Workman. That said common award dated 17.5.2005 was challenged by the aggrieved Workmen in various Writ petition No.6470/2014 along with batch of writ petitions before the Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh and Hon'ble High Court vide its' judgement dated 23.6.2014 allowed all batch of writ petitions and set aside the common award dated 17.5.2005 passed in ID No.222 of 2001 and other batch of ID cases by Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad and the Respondent management of State Bank of India was directed to reengage the Writ Petitioners in position, which they have been occupying prior to their termination and further directed to consider their cases for regularization as and when the substantive vacancy arises. This judgement dated 23.6.2014 of Hon'ble High Court of AP, passed in WP No.6470/2014 and batch petitions was challenged by Respondent management before the Hon'ble High Court in Writ Appeal No. 1268 of 2014. The aforesaid Writ Appeals No.1268/2014 and other Writ Appeals were decided by Division Bench of High Court of Andhra Pradesh by a common judgement dated 20.3.2019. Hon'ble High Court in aforesaid Writ Appeal was pleased to pass the order which is extracted as below:-

" 7. Hearing the learned senior counsel for the SBI and the learned senior counsel for the contesting unofficial Respondents, we see that while the learned single Judge was justified in setting aside the award af the Tribunal, the proper course to be adopted was to remit all the cases to the Tribunal. This we say for reasons more than one. Firstly, in such matters, claims have to be decided on individual basis, as different persons have different claims as to the length of officiation or discharge of duties and functions; quality of engagement, drawings, accounting of the post for each one of them, who have worked etc. All these issues will not be the same in all the cases. Therefore, each case ought to have been directed to be decided by the Tribunal afresh on individual basis. The second and most important

aspect is the learned single Judge has in one go ordered re-employment of all the workmen. This is not a relief that could have been granted without answering the individual issues; each issue relating to each case could not have been decided by the writ Court within the format of its adjudication procedures and scope. The adjudicating body, which has to do that activity, is the Industrial Tribunal. Therefore, we are of the view that while we would sustain the order of the learned singe Judge insofar as it interfered and sets aside the award of the Tribunal, the further findings and directions, issued through the impugned order have to go and the individual cases have to be sent back for consideration of the Tribunal. Such further procedure before the Tribunal will have to be carried forward with the materials already on record and also by affording an opportunity to the persons, who have claims as well as the management to place their rival contentions and further material before the Tribunal. The learned counsel appearing for the workmen are justified in pointing out that enormous delay has already happened and further action by the Tribunal in this line may be expedited.

9. In the result, these writ appeals are ordered;

(1) affirming the impugned common order of the learned single Judge to the extent it sets aside the common award dated 17.05.2005 of the Industrial Tribunal;

(2) the further findings and directions issued through the impugned common order are vacated:

(3) all the matters shall be remitted to the Industrial Tribunal with a direction to dispose of them within an outer limit of five (5) months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order; and,

(4) the parties to make appearance before the Tribunal on the given date."

Thus, in view of the above direction of Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh in W.A.No.1268 of 2014 and batch cases. This Tribunal has taken up the matter of industrial dispute for hearing and deciding it afresh in view of the aforesaid guidelines laid down by the Hon'ble High Court in Writ Appeal No.1268/2014 vide judgement dated 20.3.019.

3. The factual matrix of instant industrial dispute as narrated by the Workman in his claim statement are that, the Workman joined in the service of the management institution as Messenger from 1983 to 1985, and has rendered unblemished service spreading over a period of about 6 years. The Respondent has terminated services of Workman by oral orders with effect from 1985. Further, it is submitted that the management of Respondent bank decided to give a chance to temporarily employed personnel "found suitable for permanent appointment" by wait- listing them by offering permanent appointment or waitlisting till such opportunity arises.

4. That on 17.11.1987 a settlement was reached between All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and the Management of State Bank of India - settlement one, under this settlement three categories of employees were listed. That is, A) those who have completed 240 days in 12 months or less after 1.7.1975. B) those who have completed 270 days in any continuous block of 36 calendar months after 1.7.1975. C) (i) those who have completed minimum of 30 days aggregate temporary service in any calendar year after 1.7.1975 or (ii) 70 days aggregate temporary service in continuous block of 36 months after 1.7.1975.

5. The persons who satisfied in all the above 4 categories were to be interviewed by a selection committee and the said selection committee would determine the suitability of the said candidate for permanent appointment. Therefore, the bank prescribed certain qualifications and from among the candidates satisfying the qualifications the suitable candidates were enlisted by a selection committee. The Clause 7 of the said agreement provided with the selected candidate would be wait listed in order of their respective categorization and the selected panel would be valid upto December, 1991. Clause 10 of the settlement specifically provided that henceforth. "there will be no temporary appointments in the subordinate cadre", except on a restrictive basis in the specified category, "from amongst empanelled candidates as per existing guidelines of the bank". The Workman further submits that consequent upon the said agreement and the draft, a notification was issued in the newspapers. The last date for responding to the advertisement was 30.8.1988. A written examination followed by viva-voce in May, 1989 was held. A selected panel was prepared, as per Clause 7 of the agreement, ie. Settlement No.1, the selected panel was to be valid upto December, 1991, the Workman submits that circular was issued on 26.4.91 by the said letter it is mentioned that the terms of the agreement dated 17.11.87 was modified vide second agreement dated 16.7.88 was entered into between the parties. In terms of the said agreement a chance was to be given, "to all eligible temporary employees for permanent appointments. The appointments were against the vacancies likely to arise during the years 1995-96, circular made it clear that in view of the enormity of the problem an extension of the currency of the panel, eligible temporary employees who have been empanelled could not appear in the earlier interviews and have been pursuing their cases thereafter, "will be given another chance to appear for interview".

6. Workman submits that there were total five settlements. The settlement dated 17.11.87 is the 1st settlement (Ex M1), settlement dated 16.7.88 is 2nd settlement (Ex M2), settlement dated 27.10.88 is the 3rd settlement (Ex M3), then settlement dated 9.1.91 is 4th settlement and settlement dated 30.7.96 is 5th settlement (Ex M6). In between there is minutes of conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.95 marked as Ex M5. That due to all these settlements which were extended by subsequent settlements thereby created reasonable expectations in the

list of the selected candidates arose with that it's a question of time their appointments or services would be regularized in the services of the bank. The Workman was working with the bank on temporary basis was under the bonafide hope that sooner his services will be regularized with the bank. He is thereby closed all his options elsewhere. It is needless to point out that employing person to whom hope of employment in substantial terms was made is a facet of Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

7. Further Workman submits that the Government of India issued Circular No. F-3/3/104/87-IR, dated 16.8.1990. Under said circular the chief Executives of all public sector banks including the Management herein were specifically instructed that until the problem of existing temporary employees is fully resolved, no bank is permitted to make any permanent appointments. That some of the persons similarly situated like this Workman aggrieved by the inaction on the part of the management of the bank is not regularizing their services from out of the selected panel and not clearly focusing the vacancy position, filed W.P. No. 4194/97 before Hon'ble High court of A.P.. It is specifically averred in the said writ petition that the Management of the bank had failed to implement the settlement and that it violates the various fundamental rights guaranteed under the constitution of India. The Hon'ble High court of A.P .. by order dated 5.3.97 directed the bank to implement the settlement as amended from time to time. It also directed the bank to carry out the terms of settlement before the expiry of March, 1997. The Hon'ble High Court also recorded finding that the Bank cannot escape its liability of enforcement of the Settlement. In view of the directions given by the High Court all candidates whose names appeared in the select panels prepared on the basis of the agreement entered into on 17.11.87 under which the panel was valid upto December, 1991, and on the basis of a settlement dated 27.10.1988 whereby the panels were made alive upto 31.3.1997 under which the panel was valid upto December, 1999. The other agreement dated 16.7.1988 under which the panel was valid upto 1992 and on the basis of the settlement dated 27.10.1998 whereby the panels were made alive upto 31.3.1997 were under the bonafide impression that their cases will be considered for regularization and were living on the basis of the said reasonable expectation. Unfortunately, contrary to the aforesaid directions given by the High Court and contrary to the settlements entered into between the parties, the bank issued proceedings dated 25.3.1997, dated 27.3.1997 and 31.3.1997 instructing the various authorities of the Management not to continue the temporary employees those who are in services of the bank from 1.4.97. The said order was followed by the Management. Aggrieved by the said action the Workman herein and similarly situated candidates have filed a writ petition before the Hon'ble High Court and by way of Writ Petition No.9206/97 seeking a declaration that the proceedings issued by the Deputy General Manager and the Assistant General Manager (Respondents 3,4 and 5 therein) on 25.3.97, 27.3.97 and 31.3.97 as illegal and also non-continuance of the Workmen therein in service by absorbing them in the services of the bank as violative of Section 2(p) and 18(1) read with Rule 58 of Central Rules and sought for specific direction to the bank to absorb them in service.

8. Further, Workman submits that in the counter affidavit filed in Writ Petition No.9206/97, the bank has submitted that it has about 805 branches in Andhra Pradesh alone. It has stated that due to exigencies of circumstances and on account of the urgent need in its banks, it employed temporary employees in subordinate cadre. It is pertinent to mention that it does not state the urgent or need or the nature of temporary employees that it had engaged. Enquiry into the same would reveal that the stand taken by the bank either on the ground of urgent need or of temporary employees is a façade to perpetuate unfair labour practice. It is designed to on the one hand, keep the employed in the erroneous zone of hope and on the other to ensure that benefits that a model employer will extend under various statutes to its employees is not required to be borne out by the bank. A reading of the counter affidavit would show that the bank would opines that being just fair and reasonable are which obviously is reprehensible and is a facet of unfair labour practice.

9. The Workman submits that the bank had referred in its counter affidavit to three settlements dated 17.11.87, 16.7.88 and 27.10.88. The bank in the guise of extending the benefits of the circular of Government dated 16.8.90 stated in its counter affidavit that as follows:

"Government of India, vide its letter dated 16.8.1990, issued guidelines to all the public sector banks with regard to recruitment and absorption of temporary employees in public sector banks. The said guidelines were issued to implement on the lines of the approach paper on the issue provided by a committee constituted in this regard. The Government of India guidelines made it clear that all the public sector banks may follow the provisions laid down in the approach paper.

The approach paper specified that the cases of temporary employees who had put in not less than 240 days of temporary service in 12 consecutive Months and who are entitled to benefit of Section 25-F may be decided by entering into a settlement with the representative union. In respect of temporary employees who had put in less than 240 days of service in 12 consecutive months or less, a settlement could be avoided and however if the Management so desired, they could enter into a conciliation settlement with the representative union. Para 6(h), it is mentioned that only those temporary employees who had put in temporary service of 90 or more days after 1.1 1982 would be eligible for considering under the scheme. Although the Government guidelines envisaged for a settlement in respect of employees who had put in temporary service of 90 or more days, the bank by way of further concession entered into settlements Even in respect of those who had put in less than 90 days. As such, it could be Seen that the settlements are more beneficial to the temporary employees concerned. The approach paper also specify at para 6(c)

that the banks would provide one time opportunity to all the temporary employees and for that purpose temporary employees worked in the bank on or after 1.1.1982 could be considered for re-employment in terms of the scheme. The Respondents have gone further wherein even persons working after 1975 were also considered.

As could be seen from the above, there was a genuine effort on the part of the Respondent bank to provide permanent employment for as many as possible subject to availability of the vacancies.

It is further submitted that at para 6(k) of the approach paper, it was made clear that this would be one time exercise in full and final settlement of all the aims and disputes for the past period in respect of temporary workmen covered by the settlement. This would mean that the Government of India guidelines would cover only those persons who were temporarily employed for the period specified therein and not otherwise. As such, it is submitted that the Respondents have not only followed the Government of India guidelines but in fact covered cases of the employees who had worked for less than 90 days. As such, question of violation does not arise and in any case those were only broad guidelines and not directives".

10. The Workman submits that the bank also referred a subsequent settlement dated 9.1.1991 wherein there is a clause to the effect- that the panel of temporary employees and the panel of daily wage employees will be operated to a particular period. Therefore, their cases will not be considered. The Management herein relying upon this settlement in their impugned action. It is submitted that even the settlement dated 9.1.1991 will not empower the management to terminate the services of the temporary employees who are working in the bank services like the Workman herein as it does not specify the termination of the employees. In fact there are so many vacancies wherein the Management has engaged several new persons as temporary messengers/ attendars/ sweepers etc., even after the judgment of Hon'ble High Court without considering the cases of the similarly situated candidates like the Workman herein. It is submitted inspite of engaging fresh candidates as is now being done by the Management they would have continued the similarly situated candidates like the Workman herein in the services of the bank and consider their cases for absorption in view of the circulars issued by Central Government as well as the directions of this Hon'ble Court in Writ Petition No.4194/97, dated 5.3.97. In view of the circulars issued by the Central Government, the Management should not have relied upon the settlement dated 9.1.1991. Hence, the impugned action of the Management is illegal, unjust, violative of fundamental rights such as Articles 14,16 and 21 of the Constitution of India.

11. The Workman submits that in W.P. No.4194/97 filed by the union of temporary employees where in they have complained about the non- implementation of the settlements arrived between the parties and sought for absorption. Such employees in the bank services on permanent basis before the date fixed for carrying out the terms of settlement, the Court held that the members of the union had been empanelled in the list, they were not regularized and the time was going to run out to the near future and the Respondent bank and its officers cannot escape from the liability of enforcing the settlement which has been reached and therefore directed that the bank and the officers shall implement the settlement dated 17.11.87 as amended from time to time before the expiry of 31.3.97.

12. Further, it is submitted that in the clause of Settlement it is specifically mentioned that the workmen to be absorbed/appointed in the bank prohibiting any temporary appointments subsequent to the date of settlement even the authorities want to make temporary appointments that should be made only from among the empanelled can be appointed either for temporary vacancy or permanent vacancy except from among the empanelled candidates like the Workman and that should be continued till they are absorbed. The management committed unfair labour practices and terminated the services of the candidates with effect from 1985 which is arbitrary, discriminatory, contrary to their own guidelines and violative of the constitutional provisions which are guaranteed in Chapter-III of the Constitution of India.

13. The Workman submits that it is strange as to how the panels were allowed to lapse by a so-called Memorandum of Understanding dated 25.2.1997, that the action of terminating such employees like the Workman by virtue of an impugned oral proceedings without implementing the settlement would be illegal and unfair labour practice which cannot be allowed to be perpetuated. That the discontinuance of the Workman after 31.3.97 who had served in the bank in any capacity amounts to retrenchment. It could not have been done without any notice and it violates Sec.25FF of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and the said action is violative of principles of natural justice guaranteed under Chapter III of the Constitution of India. This amounts to retrenchment without one month's notice and taken in view of such notice. Thus, the main proceedings issued by the Respondent is without jurisdiction and is arbitrary, illegal and therefore liable to be quashed. That the alleged Memorandum of Understanding dated 27.2.97, Ex.M5 does not own any legal entity, as the said Memorandum of Understanding is not published anywhere to brought to the notice of the Workman whose rights are being affected. It is submitted that Management did not adhere to the procedure envisaged by the Central Government in its' instructions dated 16.8.90 in the year 1995. The same was not followed in the year 1997 despite there being vacancies. The management has followed the procedure of calling candidates through Employment exchange instead of giving chance to the empanelled candidates like the Workman here. It is pertinent to mention here that the Respondent Management sent letters to the all similarly situated candidates like the Workman in the month of June, 1997, subsequent to the passing of impugned termination orders. After knowing the facts that the candidates are litigating, the Management refused to engage these candidates. It is once again reiterated that the panels are meant for

absorption but not for termination. It was the duty of the Management to engage the empanelled candidates like the Workman even in temporary vacancies till they are absorbed permanently in regular vacancies. Hence, the action of the Respondent Management terminating the services of the Workman by oral order dated 31.3.97 is unjust, illegal, violative of principles of natural justice and hence, the Management be directed to reinstate and absorb the Workman and to grant all incidental and consequential benefits.

14. Per contra, Respondent had filed counter and made a contentions that the reference is not tenable and contrary to the provisions of I.D. Act, 1947. Respondent submitted that to tide over severe sub-ordinate staff constraints which arose out of leave vacancies, exigencies, etc., and also owning to the restrictions imposed by the Government of India/Reserve Bank of India on intake of staff, the Respondent bank used to engage sub-ordinate staff like messengers, sweepers, sweeper cum water boys, etc., depending on the availability of work on purely temporary basis for the smooth and uninterrupted functioning of the branches. It is submitted that the All India State Bank of India Staff Federation which represents majority of the employees in the State Bank of India comprising about 98% of the work force as its' members espoused the cause of temporary employees who have put in less than 240 days of temporary service in 12 calendar months in the bank and who were ineligible for any protection under Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 to give a chance for being considered for absorption and permanent appointments.

15. Discussions were held and on 17.11.1987 an agreement was signed between the federation and the Management bank under Sec. 2(p) read with Sec 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules 1957. A copy of the said settlement dated 17.11.87 which may be herein after referred as first settlement is filed and 4 categories were made as it has already been mentioned in the claim statement above, it need not be repeated here. In the first settlement, it was agreed that the temporary employees as categorized would be given a chance for being considered for permanent appointment in the bank's service against the vacancies which are likely to arise during the period 1987 to 1991. On 16.7.88 second settlement was arrived between the Federation and the Bank whereby it was agreed to substitute the period of consideration of vacancies as 1987 to 1992 in place of 1987 to 1991 as contemplated under the first settlement dated 17.11.1987. This is the second settlement. A 3rd settlement was entered into on 27.10.88 and it was agreed that the bank's service against the vacancies likely to arise from 1988 to 1992 was to be considered. Government of India vide its letter dated 16.8.90 issued guidelines to all the public sector banks with regard to recruitment and absorption of temporary employees in public sector banks. The said guidelines were issued to implement on the lines of approach paper on the issue provided by a committee constituted in this regard. Government of India guidelines made it clear that all the public sector banks may follow the provisions laid down in the approach paper. The approach paper specified that the cases of temporary service in 12 consecutive months and who are entitled to benefit of Sec.25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 may be decided by entering into a settlement with the representative union. In respect of temporary employees who had put in less than 240 days of service in 12 consecutive months or less, a settlement could be avoided and however if the Management so desired they could enter into a conciliation settlement with the representative union. In para. 6(h) it is mentioned that only those temporary employees who had put in temporary service of 90 days or more days after 1.1.82 would be eligible for considering under the scheme. Although the Government guidelines envisaged for a settlement in respect of employees who had put in temporary service of 90 days or more days, the bank by way of a further concession entered into settlements. Even in respect of those who had put in less than 90 days and also the bank went a step further and said those persons who are working after 1975 were also considered. Hence, there was a genuine effort on the part of the Respondent bank to provide as many as possible jobs subject to the availability of the vacancies. However, para 6 (k) of the approach paper made it clear that it is a one time, exercise in full and final, settlement of all the claims and disputes for the past period, in respect of temporary workmen covered by the settlement. Another settlement was entered on 9.1.91 herein after referred as 4th settlement and the time limit was extended upto 1994 and separate panel was prepared for temporary employees, casual/daily wagers. It was agreed that while vacancies arising between 1988 to 1994 in respect of temporary employees and in respect of casual/daily wagers, they can be considered for the vacancies arising between 1995-96 only.

16. It is submitted that the administrative set up of the Hyderabad Local Head Office comprises of four Zonal Offices (Zones) at Hyderabad, Vijayawada, Visakhapatnam and Tirupathi covering all the Districts of Andhra Pradesh. In terms of the settlement the Management after following the procedure laid down therein prepared the panels of qualified candidates of temporary employees denoted as 1989 panel and also panel of casual/daily wagers denoted as 1992 panel for giving a chance for being considered for permanent absorption. These panels were prepared zone-wise separately for messengers and non-messengers in the descending order of temporary service put in by the candidates during the stipulated period i.e., 1.7.1975 to 31.7.1988. That the Federation approached the Regional Labour Commissioner(C) for implementation of bi-partite settlement in respect of absorption of temporary employees. The Regional Labour Commissioner(C) conducted conciliation proceedings and an agreement was arrived between the Federation and the bank. It was agreed that it would be kept alive upto March, 1997. A copy of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.2.1995 signed by the parties is filed as material paper. A settlement was arrived at and an agreement was signed between the Federation and the Management bank on 30.7.1996 under Sec.2 (p) read with Sec.18(1) of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957, which is hereinafter called as 5th settlement. That on

27.2.1997 a Memorandum of understanding was also signed by the federation's affiliate and the bank Management recording the fact that the exercise of identifying the messengerial vacancies as on 31.12.1994 has since been completed by Central Office and thereby 403 messengerial vacancies were sanctioned . It was agreed that these vacancies may be filled from 1989 panel of temporary employees after effecting conversion from full time non-messengerial staff in the usual manner and the agreement was reached accordingly. It was agreed between the Federation's affiliate and the Management bank that in terms of the settlement dated 30.7.1996 both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees would lapse on 31.3.1997. That as agreed upon vacancies were filled from the panels. The Workman who has put in an aggregate temporary service of less than 240 days in a continuous block of 12 months period during 1.7.1975 to 31.7.1988 has no right to seek a direction to consider his candidature for absorption in the Management bank under any rule/law except under the settlement entered into thereon.

17. Respondent contended that, in fact, the case of the Workman can be considered under all the five settlements having got his case considered under provisions of these settlements. All the other provisions and terms of the settlements are also binding on him/her. The Management bank has not violated any of the provisions of the terms of the said settlement. That the very preparation and maintenance of panel is in compliance of the terms agreed under these settlements. These settlements were time bound and they ceased to exist on 31.3.1997. That the bank has never promised that all the candidates in the panel will be absorbed. In the advertisement itself it was made clear that candidates will be considered for absorption in the vacancies that may arise upto 1992. Keeping alive the panels after 31.3.1997 is contrary to the settlements arrived between the State Bank of India Staff Federation and the Management bank. That the settlements are binding on the parties. The Workman is also bound under the terms of the said settlement. The settlement does not suffer from any ambiguity as their language is very clear. The right under the settlements is to give them a chance to be considered for future appointment in the bank's services against the vacancies likely to arise. The settlements were effected to balance the expectations of the temporary employees to be absorbed in permanent service as against the constitutional rights for all eligible persons to be considered for employment every time a vacancy arises. That the alleged dispute including the demand for reinstatement has to be decided in this context. It is submitted that the period of panel list got expired on 31.3.97 and it is an integral term of the settlement and cannot be modified in any proceedings under the law. These temporary employees who unfortunately could not be accommodated for want of vacancies have no further rights to be considered for regularization. That the Hon'ble High Court in WP No.12964/94, held as follows, "It is needless to state that the settlement arrived at between the All India State Bank of India Staff Federation which, is the majority union and the bank Management is binding on the Workmen also. It is not at all the case of the Workman that any of the terms of the settlement has been violated by the bank's Management. If the Workman had worked in the bank on part-time basis before 31.5.94, that itself would not vest in him a right to claim that his services should be regularized on permanent basis against a full time cadre post. The claim put forth by the Workman in the present petition is therefore misconceived and not tenable. However, it is open to the Workman to claim any right which flows from the settlement between the union and the bank Management. As already pointed out that it is not the grievance of the Workman that some right which has flown from the settlement in favour of the Workman has been denied by the bank Management. Therefore, I do not find any ground, let alone substantial ground, to grant the kind of relief sought for by the Workman. Writ Petition fails and is accordingly dismissed. No costs."

18. Further, it is contended that if the panels were not lapsed at the end of designated period and allowed to be continued it would result in making the contracts of temporary employment indirectly permanent through back door entry, which would not only be contrary to the settlements but also to Articles 14 and 16 of Constitution of India and deprive the chances of original claimants who would Come through proper recruitment procedure. As their rights have been crystallized by operation of the settlements. Hence, there is no question of any Legitimate expectation being violated.

19. Similarly placed ex-employees filed WP No.9206/1995 and the batch before the Hon'ble High Court of A.P. and the learned Single Judge allowed the Writ Petitions. Aggrieved by the same WA No.86/98 and the batch was filed and the Division Bench set aside the order of the Single Judge. Thereafter the ex-temporary employees filed Special Leave Petition No.11886-11888 of 1998 before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India also dismissed the SLP. Therefore, reference to the Judgement of the Learned Single Judge in WP No.9206/97 is of no consequences as the same has already been set aside. The observations made in the Judgements cannot be relied upon for any purpose what so ever. The question of operation of Sec.25F would not come into play. Further the issue is covered by various Judgements of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India and various Hon'ble High Courts. Hence, the reference may be ordered that the Workman is not entitled for any relief.

20. In order to fortify his claim Workman has examined himself as WW1 and has filed photocopies of four documents in evidence, which are marked as Ex.W1 to W4. The details of the documents are as under:

Ex.W1 is the service certificate. Ex.W2 is the transfer certificate. Ex.W3 is the caste certificate. Ex.W4 is interview letter.

21. On the other hand, Respondent has examined witness MW1 Sri I.S. Appa Rao and this witness has exhibited 12 documents, marked as Ex.M1 to M12. The details of these documents are as follows:-

Ex.M.1 is the Settlement dated 17.11.1987. Ex.M2 is the Settlement dated 16.7.1988. Ex.M3 is the Settlement dated 27.10.1988. Ex.M4 is the Settlement dated 9.1.1991. Ex.M5 is the Minutes of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.1995. Ex.M6 is the Settlement dated 30.7.1996. Ex.M7 is the Memorandum of Understanding dt. 27.2.1997. Ex.M8 is the Particulars of 1989 Messengerial Panel. Ex.M9 is the Particulars of 1989 Non-Messengerial Panel. Ex.M10 is the Particulars of 1992 General Attendant Panel. Ex.M11 is the Judgment of Hon'ble High Court of A.P. in Writ Appeal No.86/98 dt.1.5.1998. Ex.M12 is the Judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in SLP No. 11886-11888 of 1998 dt.10.8.1998.

22. Apart from afore mentioned documents, Learned Counsel for Workman has also filed a long list of various judgements of Hon'ble Supreme Court as well as Hon'ble High Court, which we will discuss at appropriate place in this Award.

23. Heard the argument of Learned Counsel for Workman as well as for Respondent.

24. On the basis of rival pleadings of both the parties and submissions made by the Learned Counsel for both the parties, following points arise for determination in the industrial dispute :-

I. Whether the 1st settlement dated 17.11.1987, 2nd settlement dated 16.7.1988, 3rd settlement dated 27.10.1988, 4th settlement dated 9.1.1991 and 5th settlement dated 30.7.1996 entered into between State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and also Memorandum of Understanding are binding upon both the parties?

II. Whether the action of State Bank of India, Addanki Main branch in terminating the services of Workman Sri Angalakurthi Chennaiah, a Messenger with effect from 1985 is justified?

III. Whether the Workman is entitled for absorption on permanent post in the Branch of Respondent management as per averments made by him in the claim statement?

IV. To what relief if any the Workman is entitled for?

Findings:-

25. Point No.I:- Undisputedly settlements dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988, 9.1.1991 and 30.7.1996, minutes of conciliation proceedings and memorandum of understanding dated 27.2.1997 were executed between the State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation under section 2(p) and 18 (1) of I.D. Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Disputes (Central Rules), 1957.

Section 2(p) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 as follows:-

(p) "settlement" means a settlement arrived at in the course of conciliation proceeding and includes a written agreement between the employer and workmen arrived at otherwise than in the course of conciliation proceeding where such agreement has been signed by the parties thereto in such manner as may be prescribed and a copy thereof has been sent to an officer authorised in this behalf by the appropriate Government and the conciliation officer;

Section 18(1) provides as follows:-

18. Persons on whom settlements and awards are binding.

- [(1) A settlement arrived at by agreement between the employer and Workman otherwise than in the course of conciliation proceeding shall be binding on the parties to the agreement.

Therefore, in view of the provision contained u/s.18 (1) I.D. Act, 1947, terms and conditions enumerated in the aforesaid settlements are binding on the parties to the agreement. The Learned Counsel for Workman has argued that the Workman after going through the selection procedure has successfully been listed in the panel for appointment on the permanent basis in the Respondent management and the empanelled list has to be valid till last person in the empanelled list is appointed on permanent basis. But the impugned order dated 25.3.97, 27.3.97 and 31.3.97, has been issued by Respondent management thereby the services of the Workman has been terminated and the said order is not in consonance of the terms of the agreement entered into between the parties. Further, Workman submits that the Respondent in the 5th settlement has mentioned the date i.e., 31.3.1997 for lapse of empanel list which is illegal and that is not binding upon the Workman. The condition of lapse of empanelment list on 31.3.97 incorporated in the aforesaid 5th settlement, is arbitrary and illegal.

26. The perusal of the impugned order dated 25.3.1997 goes to reveal that the Chief/Branch Manager, SBI Zonal Office has issued the letter to all the branches with regard to the subject not to make any temporary appointments in the Branch in messengerial category from 1985. The extract of the said letter is given below:-

"We have been advised by the Deputy General Manager, Zonal Office, Hyderabad that as both the panels of temporary employees of 1989 and daily wagers/casual labours of 1992 will lapse by 31.3.1997, it has been decided by Central Office not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial category from 1985."

Thus, from the contents of the aforesaid letter, it manifest that Head Office of State Bank of India vide letter dated 25.3.1997 has issued direction to all its branches not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial category from 1985 due to reason of lapse of both panels i.e., 1989 & 1992 on 31.3.1997 as per terms of settlements entered into by both parties. Further, the contents of the subsequent letter dated 27.3.1997 issued by Respondent Management is also direction to Branch Manager, State Bank of India not to make any temporary messengerial category appointment with effect from 1985 and it has also been communicated to all concerned that the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers maintained by Zonal offices stand lapsed from 31.1.1997. Further, office order dated 31.3.1997 has been issued by Respondent management that goes to reveal that the said office order has been issued to this effect that, "Consequent on absorption of temporary employees in permanent cadre, it has been decided by the competent authority that no one onwards, no further daily labour or temporary employees/appointments should be resorted to/engaged/employed." Therefore, it reflects from the contents of the aforesaid orders that the temporary appointment in messengerial category and daily labour has been stopped by the Respondent management with effect from 1985 because of the lapsed of panel of temporary workers and daily wagers by 31.3.1997. The agreement for lapse of both the panels on 31.3.1997 is contained in the 5th settlement which has been arrived at between the parties on dated 30.7.1996 with the consensus of both the parties. Therefore, Workman can not challenge the terms and conditions contained in settlement dated 30.7.1996 regarding lapse of panel on 31.3.1997 as agreed between State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation. As per provision contained u/s.18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 the said Agreement dated 30.7.1996 is binding on both the parties.

In the case of **Allied Sales Corporation Secunderabad vs.The Authority Under Andhra Pradesh..... 1990 II LLJ 510 AP para 414, Hon'ble Court have held:-**

"*4. There was a settlement between the Management and the workmen under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act on 25th April 1983 under which the age of superannuation of the workmen was fixed at 55 years. The settlement was to be in force upto 30th June 1986 and the next settlement, incorporating practically the same terms, was again entered into on 4th February 1987 under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act. There is no dispute that these settlements are under Section 18(1).*

14. Now the Authority constituted under Section 41(1) of the Act is an authority with very limited jurisdiction. It can only decide in the first appeal whether a termination by the management is valid or not and is within the parameters of Section 40 of the Act. The said Authority, in our view, has absolutely no jurisdiction to decide whether a settlement entered into under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act between the representatives of the Workmen and of the Management, is vitiated by undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion on the part of the Management. The Authority, namely, the Assistant Commissioner of Labour, was never intended by the A.P. Legislature to have jurisdiction to go into the question of the validity of a settlement arrived at under Section 18 of the Industrial Disputes Act by an Industrial Court. That Parliament has, in fact, constituted Industrial Courts under the Industrial Disputes Act, with extensive powers cannot be disputed. What we mean to say is that the Authority under Section 41(1) of the A.P. Act has no jurisdiction what-so-ever either to question or to decide about the validity of any such settlements. If parties to a settlement have a grievance about the validity of a settlement, it is for them to agitate the matter before the appropriate forum and they cannot ask an Authority constituted under Section 41(1) of the A.P. Shops and Establishments Act, 1966 with limited jurisdiction, to go into any such question and, that too, incidentally while deciding whether retirement as per the contract of employment, is legal or not."

It is not the case of Workman that aforesaid settlements are vitiated by undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion on the part of the management. If the Workman feeling aggrieved by any terms of settlement/ agreement on the aforementioned grounds then he can challenge of settlement before a competent authority under the Act, 1947. But here in the instant matter it is not a case of Workman that aforementioned settlement has been entered into between the parties on the ground of undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion. Therefore, Workman is barred to raise any objection in respect of fixing the date of lapse of both panels on 31.3.1997 as agreed between both the parties and Workman can not challenge any terms of said Agreement.

Further in the case of **Herbertsons Limited Vs. Workmen of Herbertsons Limited and Ors, 1977 AIR 322,** Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

The Tribunal thought that the question of the quantum of membership of the 2nd Respondent did not call for a finding at all in view of 1his Court's order. As observed above that was not a correct assumption. On the other hand, we feel that this view of the Tribunal has led it to approach the matter in an entirely erroneous manner. The Tribunal is, rightly enough, conscious that under section 18 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act the settlement was binding on the company and the members of the 3rd Respondent union. Even so, the Tribunal devoted nearly half of its order in scanning the evidence given by the company and Respondent No. 3 to find out whether the terms of the settlement had

been explained by the President of the union to the workmen or not and whether the workers voluntarily accepted the settlement knowing all the "consequences". This to our mind is again an entirely wrong approach.

"When a recognised union negotiates with an employer the workers as individuals do not come into the picture. It is not necessary that each individual worker should know the implications of the settlement since a recognised union, which is expected to protect the legitimate interests of labour, enters into a settlement in the best interests of labour. This would be the normal rule. We cannot altogether rule out exceptional cases where there may be allegations of mala fides, fraud or even corruption or other induce- ments. Nothing of that kind has been suggested against the President of the 3rd Respondent in this case. That being the position, prima facie, this is a settlement in the course of collective bargaining and, therefore, is entitled to due weight and consideration.

It is not possible to scan the settlement in bits and pieces and hold some parts good and acceptable and others bad. Unless it can be demonstrated that the objectionable portion is such that it completely outweighs all the other advantages gained the Court will be slow to hold a settle- ment as unfair and unjust. The settlement has to be accepted or rejected as a whole and we are unable to reject it as a whole as unfair or unjust. Even before this Court the 3rd Respondent representing admittedly the large majority of the workmen has stood by this settlement and that is a strong factor which it is difficult to ignore. As stated elsewhere in the judgment, we cannot also be oblivious of the fact that all workmen of the company have accepted the settlement. Besides, the period of settlement has since expired and we are informed that the employer and the 3rd Respondent are negotiating another settlement with further improvements. These factors, apart from what has been stated above, and the need for industrial peace and harmony when a union backed by a large majority of workmen has accepted a settlement in the course of collective bargaining have impelled us not to interfere with this settlement. That being the position, we unhold the settlement as fair and just and order that the award of the Tribunal shall be substituted by the settlement dated October 18, 1973. The said settlement shall be the substituted award. The appeal is disposed of accordingly. There will be no order as to costs."

Therefore, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above, the contention of the Workman that the date fixed for lapse of empanelled list on 31.3.1997 for appointment to the permanent post vide 5th Settlement dated 30.7.1996 is arbitrary, illegal is not untenable. The recognized union of Workmen has negotiated with the Respondent Bank Management representing large number of Workmen and the Workman as individual do not come into picture. Workman in the instant case has work as temporary Workmen in the Respondent Branch and in response of Notification he had applied for inclusion of his name in the panel and he was selected for inclusion his name in the panel list to be utilized for absorption of such Workman to permanent post in order of their seniority in the list. The Settlement dated 30.7.1996 between State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation under Sec.2(p) and Sec.18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 has clearly provided as regard non-messengerial position and it is agreed that all such posts sanctioned fallen vacant upto 31.3.1997 shall be filled before empanel list is allowed to lapse. Thus, in view of law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, in the instant case, Agreement dated 30.7.1996 was entered into between both the parties in respect of lapsing of the both the panels on 31.3.1997 and absorption of the Workmen from panel list was subject to availability of vacancy of post likely to arise upto 31.3.1997, have a binding force on Workman as well as management of State Bank of India in view of provision contained under section 18 (1) of I.D. Act, 1947.

Thus, Point No.I is answered against the Workman and in favour of the Respondent.

27. **Point No.II**:- Firstly, it is submitted on behalf of the Workman that the Respondent has terminated his services by oral order on 1985 without issuing any notice or paying any salary or compensation in lieu thereof. Therefore, the termination order of the Workman from service is in violation of provision contained Under Section 25 F of I.D. Act, 1947. Therefore, the order is liable to be set aside.

28. On the other hand, Respondent counsel contended that Workman has not worked for 240 days in any preceding calendar year. Therefore, reference of the industrial dispute is not relevant. In this context, the Workman has examined himself as WW1 who has reiterated that Workman has been terminated from service by Respondent on 1985 without notice of salary or compensation in lieu thereof. Before examining the claim of the Workman on merit it would be apposite to reproduce the provision contained under section 25 F:-

Section 25F provides:-

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].

Compensation to workmen in case of transfer of undertakings.

Section 25B defines the term continuous service which provides

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 authorized 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;

In order to prove the fact of 240 days of service within 12 months of a calendar year just preceding from the date of termination, the initial burden of proof lies upon the Workman and the Workman has to prove this factum by adducing his oral as well as documentary evidence in support of his claim.

Further, how to calculate 240 days of service by the Workman in a calendar year. In this context the reference of decisions of Hon'ble Supreme Court is relevant and the same are discussed below:-

In Rajasthan State Ganganagar S. Mills Ltd. v. State of Rajasthan and Anr. (2004) Apex Court held:

"It was the case of the Workman that he had worked for more than 240 days in the year concerned. This claim was denied by the appellant. It was for the claimant to lead evidence to show that he had worked for 240 days in the year preceding the date of his termination. He has filed an affidavit. It is statement which is in his favor and that cannot be regarded as sufficient evidence for any Court or Tribunal to come to the conclusion that in fact the claimant had worked for 240 days in a year These aspects were highlighted in Range Forest Officer v. S.T. Hadimani (2002 (3) SCC 25. No proof of receipt of salary or wages for 240 days or order or record in that regard was produced. Mere non-production of the muster roll for a particular period was not sufficient for the Labour Court held that the Workman had worked for 240 days as claimed."

In Municipal Corporation, Faridabad v. Siri Niwas (2004 (8) SCC 195), held "*the burden was on the Workman to show that he was working for more than 240 days in the preceding one year prior to his alleged retrenchment." In M.P. Electricity Board v. Hariram (2004 (8) SCC 246) the position was again reiterated in paragraph 11 as follows: "The above burden having not been discharged and the Labour Court having held so, in our opinion, the Industrial Court and the High Court erred in basing an order of reinstatement solely on an adverse inference drawn erroneously ..*"

In the case of Manager, RBI, Bangalore vs. S Mani (2005) SCC Page 100, the 3 Judges Bench of the Apex Court held that "*the initial burden of proof was on the Workman to show that he had completed 240 days of service."*

Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of Mohan Lal vs Management BEL 1981 SCC page 225 has laid down the principle that how to count 240 days of service within one year it is held: *"Clause (2)(a) provides for a fiction to treat a Workman in continuous service for a period of one year despite the fact that he has not rendered uninterrupted service for a period of one year but he has rendered period of 240 days during the period of 12 calendar service for months counting backwards and just preceding the relevant date being the date of retrenchment. In other words, in order to invoke the fiction enacted in clause (2)(a) it is necessary to determine first the relevant date, ie the date of termination of service which is complained of as retrenchment. After that date is ascertained. move backward to a period of 12 months just preceding the date of retrenchment and then ascertain whether within the period of 12 months, the Workman has rendered service for a period of 240 days. If these three facts are affirmatively answered in favor of the Workman pursuant to the deeming fiction enacted in clause (2)(a) it will have to be assumed that the Workman is in continuous service for a period of one year and he will satisfy the eligibility qualification enacted in Section 25-F"*

"14. We have already extracted section 25B since its amendment and the change in language is the legislative exposition of which note must be taken. In fact, we need not further dilate upon this aspect because in Surendra Kumar Verma and Ors. v. Central Government Industrial-cum-Labour Court, New Delhi and Anr., Chinnappa Reddy. J., after noticing the amendment and referring to the decision in Sur Enamel and Stamping Works (P) Ltd case, held as under:

"These changes brought about by Act 36 of 1964 appear to be clearly designed to provide that a Workman who has actually worked under the employer for not less than 240 days during a period of twelve months shall be deemed to have been in continuous service for a period of one year whether or not he has in fact been in such continuous service

for a period of one year. It is enough that he has worked for 240 days in a period of 12 months, it is not necessary that he should have been in the service of the employer for one whole year."

In a concurring judgment Pathak J. agreed with this interpretation of section 25B(2). Therefore, both on principle and on precedent it must be held that section 25B(2) comprehends a situation where a Workman is not in employment for a period of 12 calendar months, but has rendered service for a period of 240 days within the period of 12 calendar months commencing and counting backwards from the relevant date, i.e. the date of retrenchment. If he has, he would be deemed to be in continuous service for a period of one year for the purpose of section 25B and Chapter VA."

Thus, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above the initial burden of proof lies upon the Workman to show that he has completed 240 days of the service with the Respondent just preceding from the date of his termination. Further, in respect of the employment of calculating the 240 days service provision contained under Section 25-F read with Section 25-B of the I.D. Act, 1947.

29. Now, in view of the provision contained under Section 25 F and law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, we have to examine whether the Workman has discharged his initial burden of proof in respect of his claim of 240 days continuous service in a calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination i.e., 1985.

In this context, WW1 in his cross examination has stated that,

" My service was for total no. of 181 days spread over with gaps from time to time during the period from 1984 to 1985 .....

I was not sponsored by any employment exchange. ..... It is not true to suggest that I never worked for 240 days in a year continuously and I was casual worker I am not entitled for any relief."

Thus, it is clear from the testimony of WW1 that the Workman had not worked for 240 days continuously in any 12 months of a calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination in the Respondent bank. Therefore, Workman failed to establish his plea by his oral and documentary evidence that he had worked for 240 days continuously in calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination i.e., 1985. Thus, the claim of the Workman that he has been terminated by oral order without issuing notice or payment in lieu after termination, in contravention of Section 25 F of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is not tenable. However the documents filed by the Workman in support of his claim, number of days worked with the Respondent goes to reveal that the Workman had worked intermittently as daily wager depending upon availability of work in branch. Workman did not file any document of appointment letter or salary slips in support of his claim for appointment as a non-messenger in the Respondent branch on temporary basis.

30. Per contra, the Learned Counsel for Respondent has submitted the allegation of Workman that he was terminated from services is not correct. As the vacancies were filled up on regular basis in order of their respective seniority the non-engagement of the Workman does not amount to termination. Further, Respondent contended that no law provide that even though there is no work temporary employee should be continued in the bank work as the very engagement of Workman was subject to availability of work. Therefore, the allegation that the bank has indulged in unfair labour practice is incorrect.

31. Thus, in view of the fore gone discussion and contentions made by the Respondent, I find the force in the argument advanced by the Respondent that in the instant matter, Workman was not terminated from service by order dated 1985 rather he was disengaged in view of the non-availability of the work in the branch. Further, there was direction issued by the Head Office of the Respondent authority not to engage any daily wager Workman/ temporary Worker w.e.f. 1985. Thus, such disengagement of Workman does not amount to termination. Moreover, the Workman failed to prove his claim that he was terminated in contravention of provision of Sec.25F of the I.D. Act, 1947 as he failed to establish his plea by any oral or documentary evidence that he had worked for 240 days continuously in a twelve months of calendar year just preceding from date of termination i.e., 1985.

32. Further, perusal of the order dated 25.3.1997 goes to reveal that the Chief Branch Manager, State Bank of India has issued the letter to Zonal Office with direction to all its branches to this effect that they have been advised by the DGM, Zonal Office, Hyderabad that as both the panel of temporary employees of 1989 and daily wagers/casual labour of 1992 will lapse on 31.3.1997 it has been decided by central office not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial cadre from 1985, therefore it was directed to issue suitable instructions not to make temporary appointments from 1985. There is no mention in this order that the Workman herein has been terminated from service by this order.

33. Further, the circular dated 27.3.1997 was issued by DGM, SBI to all branches in commercial network in respect of the non-appointment of temporary employees in subordinate cadre and it has directed not to make any temporary employment in the subordinate cadre with effect from 1.4.97 and further, it has directed to ensure that no temporary/casual/daily basis appointment of the petty cash. Further, it is directed to all Branch Managers that any

deviation in this regard will be viewed seriously. Thus, these circulars do not reflect that the Workman has been terminated from service by this order.

34. Similarly, office order dated 31.3.1997 is simply a direction to all branches of the Respondent bank by DGM that no further daily labour should be engaged or employed. Therefore, the plea of the Workman that he has been terminated by the aforesaid order dated 25.3.1997, 27.3.1997 and 31.3.1997 from the service by the Respondent is not acceptable. The evidence adduced by the Workman clearly goes to reveal that he had worked as a daily wager for which he has been paid wages according to number of working days. As there was an order for prohibition for engaging temporary workmen, in the bank, therefore, Workman could not be engaged by the Respondent for work from 1985 and there after. It is settled law that the daily wagers are engaged by the employer depending upon the availability of work and as the work was not available the Workman was not engaged further by the Respondent management. Therefore, the Workman on the ground of number of days he had worked in the Respondent bank cannot claim any right to reinstate him into the employment. As the Workman failed to prove the mandatory condition of 240 days of continuous service as required under Sec.25F of I.D. Act, 1947. Therefore, the disengagement of Workman from work can not be termed in contravention of provision contained under Sec.25F and 25 B of the I.D. Act, 1947.

Thus, this point is answered against the Workman and in favour of Respondent.

35. **Point No.III**:- In this context, the Workman has contended that the management failed to implement the selected panels during its valid tenure. The management adopted the back door methods contrary to the settlements and filled up the vacancies. The same is evident from the proceedings dated 18.11.1985 a copy of the same is filed in the material papers and the same may be read as part of the claim statement. Further, it is submitted that management has to adhere the procedure issued by the Central Government, the instructions dated 16.8.1990 in the year 1995, but same was not followed in the year 1997 despite there being vacancies. The management has followed the procedure of calling candidates through employment exchange instead of giving chance to the empanelled candidates like the Workman herein. The management sent call letters to the similarly situated candidates like the Workman in the month of June 1997 subsequent to issuance of impugned termination orders. After knowing the fact that they are litigating the issue by way of dispute, the management has refused to engage those candidates, the copies of call letters issued are filed herein along with claim petition. The Workman herein reiterates that the panels are meant for absorption but not for termination. In view of the same a duty is cast upon the Respondent management to engage the empanelled candidates like the Workman herein even in temporary vacancies till they are absorbed permanently in regular vacancies.

36. On the other hand, Respondent has contended that the Federation approached Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) for implementation of bipartite settlement in respect of the absorption of temporary employees. The Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) conducted conciliation proceedings and agreement was arrived at between the Federation and the Management bank. It is submitted that it was agreed between the Federation and the Management that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers /casual labour would be kept alive upto March, 1997 and the vacancies as agreed to under the afore set out settlements will be filled from both the lists concurrently. A copy of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.1995 signed by the parties to the dispute is filed as a material paper. Further, it is submitted that the settlement was arrived at and an agreement was signed between the Federation and the Management bank on 30.7.1996 under Section 2(p) read with Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules 1957 which is binding on the parties. A copy of this agreement which hereinafter may be referred to as 5th settlement for brevity, is also filed as a material paper. The 5th settlement dated 30.7.1996 whereunder the earlier four settlements dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988 and 9.1.1991 were also referred, it was agreed to, by the Federation and the Management bank that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees will be kept alive upto March, 1997 for filling the vacancies existing/arrived at as on 31.12.1994 as per the norms agreed to between the bank and Federation and that thereafter the said panels would lapse. It was also agreed that within the framework of the above settlements the modalities about drawing names from either the panel of temporary employees or the panel of daily wagers and casual labour would be decided administratively on circle to circle basis depending upon the local requirements in consultation with the Federation's affiliate by the Circle management. It was further agreed that all messenger real vacancies/positions in the subordinate cadre including part-time attendants specifically provided as leave reserve will be filled by the end of 31.3.1997. Further, Respondent contended that on 27.2.1997 a memorandum of understanding was also signed between the Federation's affiliate and the bank management regarding the fact that the exercise of identifying the messengerial vacancies as on 31.12.1994 has since been completed by central office and thereby 403 messengerial vacancies were sanctioned to the circle of the Management bank and it was agreed that these vacancies may be filled from 1989 panel of temporary employees after effecting conversion from full time non-messengerial staff in the usual manner and the agreement was reached upon. Further, it was agreed between the Federations affiliate and the management bank that in terms of the settlement dated 30.7.1996 both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers /casual employees would lapse on 31.3.1997.

37. The Workman has contended that the empanelled list prepared by the Respondent management for appointment of temporary and daily wage Workers to the permanent post cannot lapse unless until it is exhausted by appointing all the empanelled persons and it should continue even after 31.3.1997, i.e., the date fixed for the lapse of panel. It is undisputed that the date of lapse of empanelled list of Workmen has been fixed to 31.3.1997 as mentioned in the settlement dated 30.7.1996, and agreed between the parties. It is settled law that and once the life of panel list lapses on the date as agreed between the parties it cannot be extended beyond that date. In the instant case the panel list of the workmen was valid upto 31.3.1997 in view of the terms and conditions enumerated in the 5th Settlement entered into between the parties. As the lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997 has been agreed by State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation through 5th Settlement, the Workman is not competent to challenge the same.

In this context I would like to take reference of the decision of the apex court in the case of **Syndicate Bank and Ors vs. Shankar Paul and Ors , AIR 1997 SC 3091, therein the Hon'ble Apex Court** have held:-

"Till 1982, the branches of the appellant Bank in Calcutta region were recruiting persons locally to work as temporary attenders in leave vacancies. In view of the revised procedure prescribed by the Government of India in respect of such temporary appointments, the Calcutta regional office of the appellant Bank issued a circular to all of its branches on 14.8.1982, instructing all the branches under it to discontinue the old practice from 1.6.1982 and appoint only empanelled candidates. The regional office was to prepare a panel of eligible candidates, after calling names from the local/district employment exchange, and split it up branch-wise. Following that new procedure yearly panels were prepared thereafter. Names of the Respondents were for the first time included in the panel prepared for the period 7.2.1987 to 6.2.1988. By its letter dated 7.2.1987 the Bank had informed the Respondents that the panel was valid for one year only and that inclusion of their names in the panel was not to confer on them any right to seek permanent appointment in the service of the bank. Considering the object with which the panel was prepared and the fact that it was an yearly panel expiring on 6.2.1988, we are of the opinion that the Respondents did not get any right, because of inclusion of their names in the said panel, for permanent absorption in the service of the Bank. Whatever conditional right they had came to an end with the expiry of the panel. The claim of the Respondents, as contained in the writ petition was thus misconceived and therefore the learned single Judge and the Division Bench, when it first decided the appeal, were right in dismissing the writ petition and the appeal respectively."

Thus, in view of the above law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court and in view of the terms and conditions of the 5th Settlement the contention of the Workman that empanelled list should continue even after 31.3.1997 till the last Workman in the panel is absorbed is not tenable. The contention of the Workman is baseless in view of recital in the settlement. Therefore, in view of the fore gone discussion and finding given at Point No. I regarding binding nature of Settlements and terms and conditions enumerated therein, in view of the provision contained u/s.18(1) of the I.D. Act, 1947, I am of the considered view that life of panels lapsed on 31.3.1997 in view of terms of settlement dated 30.7.1996 and plea of Workman that the panel shall continue even after 31.3.1997 till last man absorbed has no legal force and same is untenable.

38. Undisputedly, settlement agreement dated 30.7.1996 was executed between the State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation and in that settlement it was agreed that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/ casual employees will be used for filling vacancies existing as on 31.12.1994 as per the norms agreed between the bank and the Federation. These empanelled workmen were to be given a chance for permanent appointment in the bank against vacancies arising up to December 1994 whereas the daily wagers/ casual employees were to be considered against the vacancies arise from January 1995 to December 1996, whereby the said panel would lapse. It was agreed that the vacancies falls upto 31.3.1997 shall be filled before the empanelled list is allowed to lapse. Thus, the claim of the Workman to the post of permanent non-messenger in the Respondent management was subject to the availability of the sanctioned post and vacancies arising upto 31.3.1997. The workmen given chance to the permanent post were seniors in number of working days in panel list and Workman herein was junior to those workmen. Therefore, Workman could not be given absorption to permanent post being junior to other workmen in the panel list.

39. Moreover, the Respondent management witness MW1 in chief statement has given the evidence that, "The Petitioner has not completed 240 days of service in a calendar year." Although this witness was cross examined by the Petitioner but the above statement of the management witness in chief remained uncontroverted, as the witness MW1 was not cross examined by Petitioner on this point. Therefore, the claim of the Petitioner that he has been removed from service by the management illegally is untenable. Further, witness MW1 in his chief statement has stated that, "The temporary messengers and Non-messengers were engaged by the bank in leave vacancies and for administrative exigencies. The Petitioner did not work continuously for 240 days in any year or over a period of 36 months." This statement of witness MW1 remained uncontroverted as the Petitioner did not cross examine the witness MW1 on this point. Therefore, the Petitioner Workman as per number of working days, failed to fulfil eligibility criteria of working days as required for regularisation. Therefore, he was not given regularisation in the employment of the Respondent. Therefore, in view of the statement of MW1, the claim of the Petitioner that he was refused regularization by the Respondent management illegally, is untenable.

40. However, Workman has taken the plea that the panels of Workmen for absorption in the employment of the Respondent banks (panels of temporary employees and daily wagers) has been lapsed on 31.3.1997 in contravention of terms of settlement as the object of preparing the entire empanelment of temporary and daily wagers was to provide them permanent employment and till the both the panel lists exhausted the panel list cannot be lapsed on 31.3.1997 and the date of lapsing of the panel on 31.3.1997 has been fixed by the Respondent arbitrarily without any authority.

41. In this context, the perusal of Settlement dated 30.7.1996 reveals that the 5th Settlement dated 30.7.1996 was entered under Section 2(p) and 18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Dispute (Central) Rules 1957. This settlement has been entered into by the competent parties and in this settlement parties thereto agreed that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees will lapse on 31.3.1997. Thus the date of lapse of panel was fixed by both the parties with consensus under the settlement dated 30.7.1996 and same is binding upon the Workman under the provision of Section 18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947. Moreover, this issue of binding force of the settlement dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988 and 9.1.1991 has already been discussed, decided at finding in Point No.I of this award. However, the legality and validity of the aforementioned settlement has not been challenged by the Workman before any competent forum. Thus, claim of Workman that the date of lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997 has been fixed arbitrarily by the Respondent bank is untenable. As regard the claim of Workman for his absorption to the permanent post it is settled law that the Workman can not claim his regularization to permanent post merely on the basis of number of working days.

42. In this context the reference of the decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Oil and Natural Gas Corporation vs Krishan Gopal 2020(3) SCALE 272, date of decision 7.2.2020** is relevant therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have has laid down principle regarding regularization of the Workman on permanent posts. Hon'ble Supreme Court have laid down the prepositions of regularization of the workmen to permanent post is as under:-

"*(i) Wide as they are, the powers of the Labour Court and the Industrial Court cannot extend to a direction to order regularisation, where such a direction would in the context of public employment offend the provisions contained in Article 14 of the Constitution;*

(ii) The statutory power of the Labour Court or Industrial Court to grant relief to workmen including the status of permanency continues to exist in circumstances where the employer has indulged in an unfair labour practice by not filling up permanent posts even though such posts are available and by continuing to employ workmen as temporary or daily wage employees despite their performing the same work as regular workmen on lower wages;

(iii) The power to create permanent or sanctioned posts lies outside the judicial domain and where no posts are available, a direction to grant regularisation would be impermissible merely on the basis of the number of years of service;

(iv) Where an employer has regularised similarly situated workmen either in a scheme or otherwise, it would be open to workmen who have been deprived of the same benefit at par with the workmen who have been regularised to make a complaint before the Labour or Industrial Court, since the deprivation of the benefit would amount to a violation of Article 14; and

(v) In order to constitute an unfair labour practice under Section 2(ra) read with Item 10 of the Vth Schedule of the ID Act, the employer should be engaging workmen as badlis, temporaries or casuals, and continuing them for years, with the object of depriving them of the benefits payable to permanent workmen.

Thus, in view of the principles laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court as discussed above, in the instant matter the Workman utterly failed to prove his claim by adducing any documentary or oral evidence that the employer has indulged in unfair labour practice by not filling the permanent posts even though such posts are available and by continuing to employ workmen as temporary or daily wage employees despite their performance was the same work, as regular workmen on lower wages.

43. Respondent has contended that all the vacancies exist and arise upto 31.3.1997 has been filled up from the panel list in order of seniority and no vacancy exists or arises as on 31.3.1997 remained unfilled. Further, it is contended that as per terms of settlement the life of panel lists has been lapsed on 31.3.1997, hence, there is no occasion to extend the life of panel lists beyond 31.3.1997. However, the workman failed to prove contrary by any evidence to the aforesaid contention of the Respondent that the vacancies were existing as on 31.3.1997 and the workman was not given absorption to the permanent post in order of his seniority. It is settled law that the power to create permanent or sanctioned post lies outside the judicial domain and where no posts are available, a direction to grant regularization would be impermissible merely on the basis of the number of years of service. Therefore, the claim of the workman on this ground also not acceptable.

44. Further, as per the of settlement, panel was prepared for absorption of the workmen on the permanent posts has already been lapsed on 31.3.1997 and the vacancies existing and arising upto 31.12.1994 and upto 31.3.1997 as settlement dated 30.7.1996 has been filled up from the panel by appointing the workmen as per seniority in the panel list. Workman witness WW1 in his cross examination has himself admitted this fact that, some of the temporary

employees whose names were included in the panel were given regular appointment in the bank in order of their seniority in the panel. The Workman failed to show that there was any breach of terms of settlement has been committed by the Respondent in appointment to permanent post from aforesaid panel list.

45. As discussed in preceding paragraph of this Award, the life of the panel has not been extended beyond 31.3.1997, by any further settlement hence, the panel list in which name of the Workman was included got expired on 31.3.1997. It is not the case of the Workman that Respondent has regularized similarly situated workmen either in the scheme or otherwise and the Workman has been deprived of same benefit on par with those workmen or the vacancies remained unfilled on the date of lapse of panels i.e., 31.3.1997, Industrial Tribunal has no jurisdiction to extend the date of lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997. This Tribunal can not order for regularization of workmen to the permanent post in contravention of the provision of Article 14 of the Constitution of India.

In the case of **Mahboob Deepak vs. Nagar Panchayat Gajraula & Anr, Civil Appeal No.5875/2007 date of judgement 13.12.2007,** Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

"8. Respondent is a Local Authority. The terms and conditions of employment of the employees are governed by a statute and statutory rules. No appointment can be made by a Local Authority without following the provisions of the recruitment rules. Any appointment made in violation of the said rules as also the constitutional scheme of equality as contained in Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India would be a nullity.

9. Due to some exigency of work, although recruitment on daily wages or on an ad hoc basis was permissible, but by reason thereof an employee cannot claim any right to be permanently absorbed in service or made permanent in absence of any statute or statutory rules. Merely because an employee has completed 240 days of work in a year preceding the date of retrenchment, the same would not mean that his services were liable to be regularized."

Therefore, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, the claim of the Workman for absorption merely on the basis of number of day of work in the Respondent bank Branch is not acceptable. As regard plea of the Workman that the Workman should have been given employment even after 31.3.1997 as temporary Workman, it is the discretion of Respondent to engage the Workman depending upon availability of work and this Tribunal can not direct the Respondent to engage the Workman in the absent of such rule/scheme.

46. In view of principle laid down by Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above, in the instant matter Workman utterly failed to establish the fact of rendering continuous service for a period of 240 days of service within a period of 12 calendar months commencing and coming backward from relevant date i.e., the date of retrenchment, if has he would be denied to be in continuous service for a period of one year. Therefore, the provision contained under Sec.25F of retrenchment is not applicable to Workman.

Counsel for Workman has relied upon number of decisions of Hon'ble High Court and Hon'ble Supreme Court and few of them are discussed herein:-

In the case of **F.C.I., vs. Kamdhenu Cattle Feed Industries 1985 (1) SCC 71,** therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

"7. In contractual sphere as in all other State actions, the State and all its instrumentalities have to conform to Article 14 of the Constitution of which non-arbitrariness is a significant facet. There is no unfettered discretion in public law: A public authority possesses powers only to use them for public good. This impose the duty to act fairly and to adopt a procedure which is `fairplay in action'. Due observance of this obligation as a part of good administration raises a reasonable or legitimate expectation in every citizen to be treated fairly in his interaction with the State and its instrumentalities, with this element forming a necessary component of the decision making process in all State actions. To satisfy this requirement of non- arbitrariness in a State action, it is, therefore, necessary to consider and give due weight to the reasonable or legitimate expectations of the persons likely lo be affected by the decision or else that unfairness in the exercise of the power may amount to an abuse or excess of power apart from affecting the bona fides of the decision in a given case. The decision so made would be exposed to challenge on the ground of arbitrariness. Rule of law does not completely eliminate discretion in the exercise of power, as it is unrealistic, but providers for control of its exercise by judicial review."

In the case of **State Bank of India, R.O., Vijayawada vs. Industrial Tribunal, Hyderabad WP No.193/1997,** therein Hon'ble High Court have held,

"*Sri Krovvidi Narasimham, the learned counsel for the 2nd respondent contends, supporting the award that it was a permanent vacancy and even though the 2nd respondent was appointed on temporary basis, his services were not liable to be terminated and he was to be regularised into service on permanent basis. Shastry award warrants that no temporary appointment can be made to a permanent post. But the matter is now covered by two division bench judgements dated 28.11.1986 in W.A. No.791 of 1986 and 25.8.1987 in W.A. No.270 of 1982. The ratio decided in the two judgements is to the effect that there cannot be any mandate to appoint employees on permanent basis when the requirement was for appointment on temporary basis. But it is held in the said judgements that when a temporary appointee is ousted from service and not for misconduct and, if again temporary appointment is to be made, then, the*

case of such temporary appointee who was ousted, has got to be considered in accordance with Sec. 25-H of the Act."

In the case of **State of Haryana and others vs. Piara Singh and others. 1992 (4) SCC 118,** therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

" 49. If for any reason an adhoc or temporary employee is continued for a fairly long spell, the authorities must consider his case for regularization provided he is eligible and qualified according to the rules and his service record is satisfactory and his appointment does not run counter to the reservation policy of the state."

In the above cited judgements by the Workman the facts of the case are different hence do not apply to instant case of Workman.

47. On the other hand, in support of his contention Respondent has examined witness MW1 and MW1 in chief examination states that, Settlements i.e., on 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988, 9.1.1991 were entered into between the SBI and SBI Staff Federation for filling up of the vacancies that arise up to 1994 for those temporary employees who has worked on scale wages. Further, MW1 states that two different panels for messengers and non-messengers as per the eligibility criteria prescribed by the bank. There are four modules in Andhra Pradesh and they are Hyderabad, Tirupathi, Vijayawada and Visakhapatnam. MW1 states that the temporary employees so empanelled were given permanent absorption depending upon the vacancies so arise strictly in terms of the settlement. MW1 states that on 9.6.1995 conciliation proceeding was held before the RLC(C), Hyderabad and in said proceedings it was decided that the panels will be kept live up to 31.3.1997 and vacancies will be filled from both the lists concurrently. A copy of the said minutes of proceedings is Ex.M5. Further, MW1 states that on 30.7.1996 another settlement was entered between the SBI and All India SBI Staff Federation providing for filling up of the vacancies arising up to December 1994 in respect of subordinate cadre and daily wage /casual wage employees out of panel so prepared were to be considered against vacancies arising from January 1995 to December 1996, thereafter the said panels lapse. MW1 states that it was also agreed that all the non- messenger positions in subordinate cadre including part time attendants specially provided as leave reserve will be filled before 31.3.1997 and as regards to non-messengerial positions it is agreed that all such posts sanctioned and fallen vacant up to 31.3.1997 shall be filled before the empanelled list is allowed to lapse. Thus in both the cases empanelled list were lapsed on 1985. Ex.M6 is the copy of the settlement dated 30.7.1996. Further, witness states that on 27.2.1997 a memorandum of understanding was reached between the SBI and SBI Staff Federation providing that both the panels above mentioned will lapse on 31.3.1997. Ex.M7 is the copy of the memorandum of understanding and Ex.M8 is the copy of the statements giving the particulars of 1989 non-messenger panel, Ex.M9 is the copy of the statement of 1989 non-messenger panel, Ex.M10 is the copy of statement of 1992 panel. Further, witness states that petitioner was included in the 1989 panel. As the existing vacancies at that time were exhausted and his turn did not come he could not be given permanent employment in the bank as per the agreements. All the appointments were made strictly in accordance with the settlements reached from time to time between SBI and SBI staff federation and as per seniority, number of days of temporary service put in by them in the bank in the given period. Further, MW1 states petitioner was not sponsored by any employment exchange he did not undergo the regular process of selection required for appointment as a regular non-messenger the petitioner has not worked for 240 days in any year in his entire temporary service in the bank. The petitioner and other temporary employees were terminated from service by the bank. Further, MW1 states that the vacancies were filled up on regular basis with the temporary employees from the panels and these panels were expired in terms of the settlements so reached and there were no vacancies to absorb such employees. Thus, witness MW1 has proved the documents Ex.M1 to Ex.M12 and also contentions made in the counter. However, MW1 was cross examined by the Petitioner Counsel. But nothing has been elicited in his cross examination so as to discredit the testimony of the witness MW1 as regards the date of lapse of both the panels on 31.3.1997 and reasons assigned for non-absorption of the Petitioner from the panel list to the permanent post. Moreover the witness MW1 was re-examined by the Respondent and the witness MW1 states that panels were expired in terms of the settlement send absorptions to the extent of the available vacancies were made. There was no termination of any temporary messenger as such but their services were not utilized after the cut off date as the available vacancies were already filled up and most of these Petitioners were not in the service of the bank as on the date of the expiry date of the panels. Therefore, in view of the aforesaid testimony of the MW1 in re-examination in the absence of cross examination remained uncontraverted, the claim of the Workman that he was entitled for absorption in permanent post in the branch of Respondent Management on the basis of panel list is found not established.

This point is answered against the Workman.

48. **Point No.IV**:- In view of the discussion and finding given at Point Nos. I, II and III, the Workman is not entitled for any relief and claim statement of Workman sans merit and liable to be dismissed.

This Point is answered accordingly.

AWARD

In view of the fore gone discussion, it is held that the action of the Respondent bank in terminating the services of Sri Angalakurthi Chennaiah, Ex. Messenger by way of oral orders w.e.f. the year 1985 is justified. Hence, the Petitioner is not entitled for any relief as prayed for. The claim statement filed by Workman sans merit, hence, dismissed.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, Personal Assistant, transcribed by her, corrected and signed by me on this the 12th day of June, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner	Witnesses examined for the Respondent
WW1: Sri Angalakurthi Chennaiah	MW1: Sri I.S. Appa Rao

Documents marked for the Petitioner

Ex.W1:	Photocopy of service certificate
Ex.W2:	Photocopy of transfer certificate
Ex.W3:	Photocopy of caste certificate
Ex.W4:	Photocopy of interview letter

Documents marked for the Respondent

Ex.M1:	Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.17.11.87
Ex.M2:	Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.16.7.88
Ex.M3:	Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.27.10.1988
Ex.M4:	Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.9.1.1991
Ex.M5:	Photocopy of conciliation proceedings before the Regional Labour Commissioner(C) dt.9.6.1995
Ex.M6:	Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.30.7.1996
Ex.M7:	Photocopy of Memorandum of understanding dt. 27.1.1997
Ex.M8:	Photocopy of statements giving the particulars of 1989 messenger panel.
Ex.M9:	Photocopy of statement of 1989 Non-messenger panel
Ex.M10:	Photocopy of statement of 1992 panel
Ex.M11:	Photocopy of order of Hon'ble High Court in WA No.86/98 dt. 1.5.98
Ex.M12:	Photocopy of order in SLP No.11886-11888 of 1998 dated 10.8.98

नई दिल्ली, 3 अगस्त, 2026

का.आ. 1668.— औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार स्टेट बैंक ऑफ़ इंडिया के प्रबंधतत्र, संबद्ध नियोजको और उनके कर्मकार के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद के **पंचाट** (17/2003) प्रकाशित करती है।

[सं. एल- 12025/01/2026- आई आर (बी-I)-154]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 3rd August, 2026

S.O. 1668.— In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the **Award (Ref. 17/2003*)*** of the ***Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court Hyderabad*** as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of **State Bank of India** and **their workman.**

[No. L-12025/01/2026-IR(B-I)-154]

SALONI, Dy. Director

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD

Present: - **Sri Irfan Qamar**

Presiding Officer

Dated the 15th day of June, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE L.C.No. 17/2003

[Old ID No. 267/99 of Labour Court, Guntur]

Between:

Sri J. Srinivasa Rao,

S/o Adinarayana,

Velumuripadu, Addanki,

Prakasam distt. ….. Petitioner

And

1. The Chairman,
   State Bank of India,
   Central office,
   Mumbai.
2. The Chief General Manager,
   (Personnel)
   State Bank of India,
   Bank Street
   Hyderabad.
3. The Branch Manager,
   State Bank of India,
   Addanki branch.
4. The Regional Manager,
   State Bank of India,
   Zonal Office,
   Tirupathi. …..Respondents

Appearances:

For the Petitioner : M/s. S. Prasada Rao, Advocates

For the Respondent: Sri Y. Ranjeeth Reddy, Advocate

AWARD

Sri J. Srinivasa Rao who worked as Messenger (who will be referred to as the workman) has filed this petition under Sec. 2A(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 against the Respondents State Bank of India seeking for reinstatement into service as Messenger duly granting all the consequential benefits such as continuity of service, back wages and all 82her attendant benefits etc., and such other reliefs as this court may deem fit. Earlier Petitioner has filed this dispute before the Labour Court, Guntur for adjudication and later the same has been transferred to this Tribunal bearing ID No. 267/99, as per orders of Central Government vide Lr.No.H-11026/1/2001-IR(C.II) dated 18.10.2001 and registered, numbered in this Tribunal as LC No. 17/2003.

2. Before unfolding the factual matrix of the instant industrial dispute it would be apposite to have a bird eye view of a chequered history of the instant industrial dispute. Earlier instant industrial dispute along with the batch cases was decided by this Tribunal vide common award dated 17.5.2005 and the reference was answered in favour of the Respondent and against the Workman. That said common award dated 17.5.2005 was challenged by the aggrieved Workmen in various Writ petition No.6470/2014 along with batch of writ petitions before the Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh and Hon'ble High Court vide its' judgement dated 23.6.2014 allowed all batch of writ petitions and set aside the common award dated 17.5.2005 passed in ID No.222 of 2001 and other batch of ID cases by Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad and the Respondent management of State Bank of India was directed to reengage the Writ Petitioners in position, which they have been occupying prior to their termination and further directed to consider their cases for regularization as and when the substantive vacancy arises. This judgement dated 23.6.2014 of Hon'ble High Court of AP, passed in WP No.6470/2014 and batch petitions was challenged by Respondent management before the Hon'ble High Court in Writ Appeal No. 1268 of 2014. The aforesaid Writ Appeals No.1268/2014 and other Writ Appeals were decided by Division Bench of High Court of Andhra Pradesh by a common judgement dated 20.3.2019. Hon'ble High Court in aforesaid Writ Appeal was pleased to pass the order which is extracted as below:-

" 7. Hearing the learned senior counsel for the SBI and the learned senior counsel for the contesting unofficial Respondents, we see that while the learned single Judge was justified in setting aside the award af the Tribunal, the proper course to be adopted was to remit all the cases to the Tribunal. This we say for reasons more than one. Firstly, in such matters, claims have to be decided on individual basis, as different persons have different claims as to the length of officiation or discharge of duties and functions; quality of engagement, drawings, accounting of the post for each one of them, who have worked etc. All these issues will not be the same in all the cases. Therefore, each case ought to have been directed to be decided by the Tribunal afresh on individual basis. The second and most important aspect is the learned single Judge has in one go ordered re-employment of all the workmen. This is not a relief that could have been granted without answering the individual issues; each issue relating to each case could not have been decided by the writ Court within the format of its adjudication procedures and scope. The adjudicating body, which has to do that activity, is the Industrial Tribunal. Therefore, we are of the view that while we would sustain the order of the learned singe Judge insofar as it interfered and sets aside the award of the Tribunal, the further findings and directions, issued through the impugned order have to go and the individual cases have to be sent back for consideration of the Tribunal. Such further procedure before the Tribunal will have to be carried forward with the materials already on record and also by affording an opportunity to the persons, who have claims as well as the management to place their rival contentions and further material before the Tribunal. The learned counsel appearing for the workmen are justified in pointing out that enormous delay has already happened and further action by the Tribunal in this line may be expedited.

9. In the result, these writ appeals are ordered;

(1) affirming the impugned common order of the learned single Judge to the extent it sets aside the common award dated 17.05.2005 of the Industrial Tribunal;

(2) the further findings and directions issued through the impugned common order are vacated:

(3) all the matters shall be remitted to the Industrial Tribunal with a direction to dispose of them within an outer limit of five (5) months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order; and,

(4) the parties to make appearance before the Tribunal on the given date."

Thus, in view of the above direction of Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh in W.A.No.1268 of 2014 and batch cases. This Tribunal has taken up the matter of industrial dispute for hearing and deciding it afresh in view of the aforesaid guidelines laid down by the Hon'ble High Court in Writ Appeal No.1268/2014 vide judgement dated 20.3.019.

3. The factual matrix of instant industrial dispute as narrated by the Workman in his claim statement are that, the Workman joined in the service of the management institution as Messenger from 1983 to 1996, and has rendered unblemished service spreading over a period of about 13 years. The Respondent has terminated services of Workman by oral orders with effect from 31.7.98. Further, it is submitted that the management of Respondent bank

decided to give a chance to temporarily employed personnel "found suitable for permanent appointment" by wait-listing them by offering permanent appointment or waitlisting till such opportunity arises.

4. That on 17.11.1987 a settlement was reached between All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and the Management of State Bank of India - settlement one, under this settlement three categories of employees were listed. That is, A) those who have completed 240 days in 12 months or less after 1.7.1975. B) those who have completed 270 days in any continuous block of 36 calendar months after 1.7.1975. C) (i) those who have completed minimum of 30 days aggregate temporary service in any calendar year after 1.7.1975 or (ii) 70 days aggregate temporary service in continuous block of 36 months after 1.7.1975.

5. The persons who satisfied in all the above 4 categories were to be interviewed by a selection committee and the said selection committee would determine the suitability of the said candidate for permanent appointment. Therefore, the bank prescribed certain qualifications and from among the candidates satisfying the qualifications the suitable candidates were enlisted by a selection committee. The Clause 7 of the said agreement provided with the selected candidate would be wait listed in order of their respective categorization and the selected panel would be valid upto December, 1991. Clause 10 of the settlement specifically provided that henceforth. "there will be no temporary appointments in the subordinate cadre", except on a restrictive basis in the specified category, "from amongst empanelled candidates as per existing guidelines of the bank". The Workman further submits that consequent upon the said agreement and the draft, a notification was issued in the newspapers. The last date for responding to the advertisement was 30.8.1988. A written examination followed by viva-voce in May, 1989 was held. A selected panel was prepared, as per Clause 7 of the agreement, ie. Settlement No.1, the selected panel was to be valid upto December, 1991, the Workman submits that circular was issued on 26.4.91 by the said letter it is mentioned that the terms of the agreement dated 17.11.87 was modified vide second agreement dated 16.7.88 was entered into between the parties. In terms of the said agreement a chance was to be given, "to all eligible temporary employees for permanent appointments. The appointments were against the vacancies likely to arise during the years 1995-96, circular made it clear that in view of the enormity of the problem an extension of the currency of the panel, eligible temporary employees who have been empanelled could not appear in the earlier interviews and have been pursuing their cases thereafter, "will be given another chance to appear for interview".

6. Workman submits that there were total five settlements. The settlement dated 17.11.87 is the 1st settlement (Ex M1), settlement dated 16.7.88 is 2nd settlement (Ex M2), settlement dated 27.10.88 is the 3rd settlement (Ex M3), then settlement dated 9.1.91 is 4th settlement and settlement dated 30.7.96 is 5th settlement (Ex M6). In between there is minutes of conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.95 marked as Ex M5. That due to all these settlements which were extended by subsequent settlements thereby created reasonable expectations in the list of the selected candidates arose with that it's a question of time their appointments or services would be regularized in the services of the bank. The Workman was working with the bank on temporary basis was under the bonafide hope that sooner his services will be regularized with the bank. He is thereby closed all his options elsewhere. It is needless to point out that employing person to whom hope of employment in substantial terms was made is a facet of Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

7. Further Workman submits that the Government of India issued Circular No. F-3/3/104/87-IR, dated 16.8.1990. Under said circular the chief Executives of all public sector banks including the Management herein were specifically instructed that until the problem of existing temporary employees is fully resolved, no bank is permitted to make any permanent appointments. That some of the persons similarly situated like this Workman aggrieved by the inaction on the part of the management of the bank is not regularizing their services from out of the selected panel and not clearly focusing the vacancy position, filed W.P. No. 4194/97 before Hon'ble High court of A.P.. It is specifically averred in the said writ petition that the Management of the bank had failed to implement the settlement and that it violates the various fundamental rights guaranteed under the constitution of India. The Hon'ble High court of A.P .. by order dated 5.3.97 directed the bank to implement the settlement as amended from time to time. It also directed the bank to carry out the terms of settlement before the expiry of March, 1997. The Hon'ble High Court also recorded finding that the Bank cannot escape its liability of enforcement of the Settlement. In view of the directions given by the High Court all candidates whose names appeared in the select panels prepared on the basis of the agreement entered into on 17.11.87 under which the panel was valid upto December, 1991, and on the basis of a settlement dated 27.10.1988 whereby the panels were made alive upto 31.3.1997 under which the panel was valid upto December, 1999. The other agreement dated 16.7.1988 under which the panel was valid upto 1992 and on the basis of the settlement dated 27.10.1998 whereby the panels were made alive upto 31.3.1997 were under the bonafide impression that their cases will be considered for regularization and were living on the basis of the said reasonable expectation. Unfortunately, contrary to the aforesaid directions given by the High Court and contrary to the settlements entered into between the parties, the bank issued proceedings dated 25.3.1997, dated 27.3.1997 and 31.3.1997 instructing the various authorities of the Management not to continue the temporary employees those who are in services of the bank from 1.4.97. The said order was followed by the Management. Aggrieved by the said action the Workman herein and similarly situated candidates have filed a writ petition before the Hon'ble High Court and by way of Writ Petition No.9206/97 seeking a declaration that the proceedings issued by the Deputy General Manager and the Assistant General Manager (Respondents 3,4 and 5 therein) on 25.3.97, 27.3.97 and 31.3.97 as

illegal and also non-continuance of the Workmen therein in service by absorbing them in the services of the bank as violative of Section 2(p) and 18(1) read with Rule 58 of Central Rules and sought for specific direction to the bank to absorb them in service.

8. Further, Workman submits that in the counter affidavit filed in Writ Petition No.9206/97, the bank has submitted that it has about 805 branches in Andhra Pradesh alone. It has stated that due to exigencies of circumstances and on account of the urgent need in its banks, it employed temporary employees in subordinate cadre. It is pertinent to mention that it does not state the urgent or need or the nature of temporary employees that it had engaged. Enquiry into the same would reveal that the stand taken by the bank either on the ground of urgent need or of temporary employees is a façade to perpetuate unfair labour practice. It is designed to on the one hand, keep the employed in the erroneous zone of hope and on the other to ensure that benefits that a model employer will extend under various statutes to its employees is not required to be borne out by the bank. A reading of the counter affidavit would show that the bank would opines that being just fair and reasonable are which obviously is reprehensible and is a facet of unfair labour practice.

9. The Workman submits that the bank had referred in its counter affidavit to three settlements dated 17.11.87, 16.7.88 and 27.10.88. The bank in the guise of extending the benefits of the circular of Government dated 16.8.90 stated in its counter affidavit that as follows:

"Government of India, vide its letter dated 16.8.1990, issued guidelines to all the public sector banks with regard to recruitment and absorption of temporary employees in public sector banks. The said guidelines were issued to implement on the lines of the approach paper on the issue provided by a committee constituted in this regard. The Government of India guidelines made it clear that all the public sector banks may follow the provisions laid down in the approach paper.

The approach paper specified that the cases of temporary employees who had put in not less than 240 days of temporary service in 12 consecutive Months and who are entitled to benefit of Section 25-F may be decided by entering into a settlement with the representative union. In respect of temporary employees who had put in less than 240 days of service in 12 consecutive months or less, a settlement could be avoided and however if the Management so desired, they could enter into a conciliation settlement with the representative union. Para 6(h), it is mentioned that only those temporary employees who had put in temporary service of 90 or more days after 1.1 1982 would be eligible for considering under the scheme. Although the Government guidelines envisaged for a settlement in respect of employees who had put in temporary service of 90 or more days, the bank by way of further concession entered into settlements Even in respect of those who had put in less than 90 days. As such, it could be Seen that the settlements are more beneficial to the temporary employees concerned. The approach paper also specify at para 6(c) that the banks would provide one time opportunity to all the temporary employees and for that purpose temporary employees worked in the bank on or after 1.1.1982 could be considered for re-employment in terms of the scheme. The Respondents have gone further wherein even persons working after 1975 were also considered.

As could be seen from the above, there was a genuine effort on the part of the Respondent bank to provide permanent employment for as many as possible subject to availability of the vacancies.

It is further submitted that at para 6(k) of the approach paper, it was made clear that this would be one time exercise in full and final settlement of all the aims and disputes for the past period in respect of temporary workmen covered by the settlement. This would mean that the Government of India guidelines would cover only those persons who were temporarily employed for the period specified therein and not otherwise. As such, it is submitted that the Respondents have not only followed the Government of India guidelines but in fact covered cases of the employees who had worked for less than 90 days. As such, question of violation does not arise and in any case those were only broad guidelines and not directives".

10. The Workman submits that the bank also referred a subsequent settlement dated 9.1.1991 wherein there is a clause to the effect- that the panel of temporary employees and the panel of daily wage employees will be operated to a particular period. Therefore, their cases will not be considered. The Management herein relying upon this settlement in their impugned action. It is submitted that even the settlement dated 9.1.1991 will not empower the management to terminate the services of the temporary employees who are working in the bank services like the Workman herein as it does not specify the termination of the employees. In fact there are so many vacancies wherein the Management has engaged several new persons as temporary messengers/ attendars/ sweepers etc., even after the judgment of Hon'ble High Court without considering the cases of the similarly situated candidates like the Workman herein. It is submitted inspite of engaging fresh candidates as is now being done by the Management they would have continued the similarly situated candidates like the Workman herein in the services of the bank and consider their cases for absorption in view of the circulars issued by Central Government as well as the directions of this Hon'ble Court in Writ Petition No.4194/97, dated 5.3.97. In view of the circulars issued by the Central Government, the Management should not have relied upon the settlement dated 9.1.1991. Hence, the impugned action of the Management is illegal, unjust, violative of fundamental rights such as Articles 14,16 and 21 of the Constitution of India.

11. The Workman submits that in W.P. No.4194/97 filed by the union of temporary employees where in they have complained about the non- implementation of the settlements arrived between the parties and sought for absorption. Such employees in the bank services on permanent basis before the date fixed for carrying out the terms of settlement, the Court held that the members of the union had been empanelled in the list, they were not regularized and the time was going to run out to the near future and the Respondent bank and its officers cannot escape from the liability of enforcing the settlement which has been reached and therefore directed that the bank and the officers shall implement the settlement dated 17.11.87 as amended from time to time before the expiry of 31.3.97.

12. Further, it is submitted that in the clause of Settlement it is specifically mentioned that the workmen to be absorbed/appointed in the bank prohibiting any temporary appointments subsequent to the date of settlement even the authorities want to make temporary appointments that should be made only from among the empanelled can be appointed either for temporary vacancy or permanent vacancy except from among the empanelled candidates like the Workman and that should be continued till they are absorbed. The management committed unfair labour practices and terminated the services of the candidates with effect from 1985 which is arbitrary, discriminatory, contrary to their own guidelines and violative of the constitutional provisions which are guaranteed in Chapter-III of the Constitution of India.

13. The Workman submits that it is strange as to how the panels were allowed to lapse by a so-called Memorandum of Understanding dated 25.2.1997, that the action of terminating such employees like the Workman by virtue of an impugned oral proceedings without implementing the settlement would be illegal and unfair labour practice which cannot be allowed to be perpetuated. That the discontinuance of the Workman after 31.3.97 who had served in the bank in any capacity amounts to retrenchment. It could not have been done without any notice and it violates Sec.25FF of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and the said action is violative of principles of natural justice guaranteed under Chapter III of the Constitution of India. This amounts to retrenchment without one month's notice and taken in view of such notice. Thus, the main proceedings issued by the Respondent is without jurisdiction and is arbitrary, illegal and therefore liable to be quashed. That the alleged Memorandum of Understanding dated 27.2.97, Ex.M5 does not own any legal entity, as the said Memorandum of Understanding is not published anywhere to brought to the notice of the Workman whose rights are being affected. It is submitted that Management did not adhere to the procedure envisaged by the Central Government in its' instructions dated 16.8.90 in the year 1995. The same was not followed in the year 1997 despite there being vacancies. The management has followed the procedure of calling candidates through Employment exchange instead of giving chance to the empanelled candidates like the Workman here. It is pertinent to mention here that the Respondent Management sent letters to the all similarly situated candidates like the Workman in the month of June, 1997, subsequent to the passing of impugned termination orders. After knowing the facts that the candidates are litigating, the Management refused to engage these candidates. It is once again reiterated that the panels are meant for absorption but not for termination. It was the duty of the Management to engage the empanelled candidates like the Workman even in temporary vacancies till they are absorbed permanently in regular vacancies. Hence, the action of the Respondent Management terminating the services of the Workman by oral order dated 31.3.97 is unjust, illegal, violative of principles of natural justice and hence, the Management be directed to reinstate and absorb the Workman and to grant all incidental and consequential benefits.

14. Per contra, Respondent had filed counter and made a contentions that the reference is not tenable and contrary to the provisions of I.D. Act, 1947. Respondent submitted that to tide over severe sub-ordinate staff constraints which arose out of leave vacancies, exigencies, etc., and also owning to the restrictions imposed by the Government of India/Reserve Bank of India on intake of staff, the Respondent bank used to engage sub-ordinate staff like messengers, sweepers, sweeper cum water boys, etc., depending on the availability of work on purely temporary basis for the smooth and uninterrupted functioning of the branches. It is submitted that the All India State Bank of India Staff Federation which represents majority of the employees in the State Bank of India comprising about 98% of the work force as its' members espoused the cause of temporary employees who have put in less than 240 days of temporary service in 12 calendar months in the bank and who were ineligible for any protection under Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 to give a chance for being considered for absorption and permanent appointments.

15. Discussions were held and on 17.11.1987 an agreement was signed between the federation and the Management bank under Sec. 2(p) read with Sec 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules 1957. A copy of the said settlement dated 17.11.87 which may be herein after referred as first settlement is filed and 4 categories were made as it has already been mentioned in the claim statement above, it need not be repeated here. In the first settlement, it was agreed that the temporary employees as categorized would be given a chance for being considered for permanent appointment in the bank's service against the vacancies which are likely to arise during the period 1987 to 1991. On 16.7.88 second settlement was arrived between the Federation and the Bank whereby it was agreed to substitute the period of consideration of vacancies as 1987 to 1992 in place of 1987 to 1991 as contemplated under the first settlement dated 17.11.1987. This is the second settlement. A 3rd settlement was entered into on 27.10.88 and it was agreed that the bank's service against the vacancies likely to arise from 1988 to 1992 was to be considered. Government of India vide its letter dated 16.8.90 issued guidelines to all the public sector banks with regard to recruitment and absorption of temporary employees in public sector banks.

The said guidelines were issued to implement on the lines of approach paper on the issue provided by a committee constituted in this regard. Government of India guidelines made it clear that all the public sector banks may follow the provisions laid down in the approach paper. The approach paper specified that the cases of temporary service in 12 consecutive months and who are entitled to benefit of Sec.25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 may be decided by entering into a settlement with the representative union. In respect of temporary employees who had put in less than 240 days of service in 12 consecutive months or less, a settlement could be avoided and however if the Management so desired they could enter into a conciliation settlement with the representative union. In para. 6(h) it is mentioned that only those temporary employees who had put in temporary service of 90 days or more days after 1.1.82 would be eligible for considering under the scheme. Although the Government guidelines envisaged for a settlement in respect of employees who had put in temporary service of 90 days or more days, the bank by way of a further concession entered into settlements. Even in respect of those who had put in less than 90 days and also the bank went a step further and said those persons who are working after 1975 were also considered. Hence, there was a genuine effort on the part of the Respondent bank to provide as many as possible jobs subject to the availability of the vacancies. However, para 6 (k) of the approach paper made it clear that it is a one time, exercise in full and final, settlement of all the claims and disputes for the past period, in respect of temporary workmen covered by the settlement. Another settlement was entered on 9.1.91 herein after referred as 4th settlement and the time limit was extended upto 1994 and separate panel was prepared for temporary employees, casual/daily wagers. It was agreed that while vacancies arising between 1988 to 1994 in respect of temporary employees and in respect of casual/daily wagers, they can be considered for the vacancies arising between 1995-96 only.

16. It is submitted that the administrative set up of the Hyderabad Local Head Office comprises of four Zonal Offices (Zones) at Hyderabad, Vijayawada, Visakhapatnam and Tirupathi covering all the Districts of Andhra Pradesh. In terms of the settlement the Management after following the procedure laid down therein prepared the panels of qualified candidates of temporary employees denoted as 1989 panel and also panel of casual/daily wagers denoted as 1992 panel for giving a chance for being considered for permanent absorption. These panels were prepared zone-wise separately for messengers and non-messengers in the descending order of temporary service put in by the candidates during the stipulated period i.e., 1.7.1975 to 31.7.1988. That the Federation approached the Regional Labour Commissioner(C) for implementation of bi-partite settlement in respect of absorption of temporary employees. The Regional Labour Commissioner(C) conducted conciliation proceedings and an agreement was arrived between the Federation and the bank. It was agreed that it would be kept alive upto March, 1997. A copy of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.2.1995 signed by the parties is filed as material paper. A settlement was arrived at and an agreement was signed between the Federation and the Management bank on 30.7.1996 under Sec.2 (p) read with Sec.18(1) of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957, which is hereinafter called as 5th settlement. That on 27.2.1997 a Memorandum of understanding was also signed by the federation's affiliate and the bank Management recording the fact that the exercise of identifying the messengerial vacancies as on 31.12.1994 has since been completed by Central Office and thereby 403 messengerial vacancies were sanctioned . It was agreed that these vacancies may be filled from 1989 panel of temporary employees after effecting conversion from full time non-messengerial staff in the usual manner and the agreement was reached accordingly. It was agreed between the Federation's affiliate and the Management bank that in terms of the settlement dated 30.7.1996 both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees would lapse on 31.3.1997. That as agreed upon vacancies were filled from the panels. The Workman who has put in an aggregate temporary service of less than 240 days in a continuous block of 12 months period during 1.7.1975 to 31.7.1988 has no right to seek a direction to consider his candidature for absorption in the Management bank under any rule/law except under the settlement entered into thereon.

17. Respondent contended that, in fact, the case of the Workman can be considered under all the five settlements having got his case considered under provisions of these settlements. All the other provisions and terms of the settlements are also binding on him/her. The Management bank has not violated any of the provisions of the terms of the said settlement. That the very preparation and maintenance of panel is in compliance of the terms agreed under these settlements. These settlements were time bound and they ceased to exist on 31.3.1997. That the bank has never promised that all the candidates in the panel will be absorbed. In the advertisement itself it was made clear that candidates will be considered for absorption in the vacancies that may arise upto 1992. Keeping alive the panels after 31.3.1997 is contrary to the settlements arrived between the State Bank of India Staff Federation and the Management bank. That the settlements are binding on the parties. The Workman is also bound under the terms of the said settlement. The settlement does not suffer from any ambiguity as their language is very clear. The right under the settlements is to give them a chance to be considered for future appointment in the bank's services against the vacancies likely to arise. The settlements were effected to balance the expectations of the temporary employees to be absorbed in permanent service as against the constitutional rights for all eligible persons to be considered for employment every time a vacancy arises. That the alleged dispute including the demand for reinstatement has to be decided in this context. It is submitted that the period of panel list got expired on 31.3.97 and it is an integral term of the settlement and cannot be modified in any proceedings under the law. These temporary employees who unfortunately could not be accommodated for want of vacancies have no further rights to be considered for regularization. That the Hon'ble High Court in WP No.12964/94, held as follows, "It is needless to state that the

settlement arrived at between the All India State Bank of India Staff Federation which, is the majority union and the bank Management is binding on the Workmen also. It is not at all the case of the Workman that any of the terms of the settlement has been violated by the bank's Management. If the Workman had worked in the bank on part-time basis before 31.5.94, that itself would not vest in him a right to claim that his services should be regularized on permanent basis against a full time cadre post. The claim put forth by the Workman in the present petition is therefore misconceived and not tenable. However, it is open to the Workman to claim any right which flows from the settlement between the union and the bank Management. As already pointed out that it is not the grievance of the Workman that some right which has flown from the settlement in favour of the Workman has been denied by the bank Management. Therefore, I do not find any ground, let alone substantial ground, to grant the kind of relief sought for by the Workman. Writ Petition fails and is accordingly dismissed. No costs."

18. Further, it is contended that if the panels were not lapsed at the end of designated period and allowed to be continued it would result in making the contracts of temporary employment indirectly permanent through back door entry, which would not only be contrary to the settlements but also to Articles 14 and 16 of Constitution of India and deprive the chances of original claimants who would Come through proper recruitment procedure. As their rights have been crystallized by operation of the settlements. Hence, there is no question of any Legitimate expectation being violated.

19. Similarly placed ex-employees filed WP No.9206/1995 and the batch before the Hon'ble High Court of A.P. and the learned Single Judge allowed the Writ Petitions. Aggrieved by the same WA No.86/98 and the batch was filed and the Division Bench set aside the order of the Single Judge. Thereafter the ex-temporary employees filed Special Leave Petition No.11886-11888 of 1998 before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India also dismissed the SLP. Therefore, reference to the Judgement of the Learned Single Judge in WP No.9206/97 is of no consequences as the same has already been set aside. The observations made in the Judgements cannot be relied upon for any purpose what so ever. The question of operation of Sec.25F would not come into play. Further the issue is covered by various Judgements of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India and various Hon'ble High Courts. Hence, the reference may be ordered that the Workman is not entitled for any relief.

20. In order to fortify his claim Workman has examined himself as WW1 and has filed photocopies of four documents in evidence, which are marked as Ex.W1 to W6. The details of the documents are as under:

Ex.W1 is the service certificate. Ex.W2 is the interview call letter. Ex.W3 is the service certificate. Ex.W4 is service certificate. Ex.W5 is the caste certificate. Ex.W6 is the study certificate.

21. On the other hand, Respondent has examined witness MW1 Sri I.S. Appa Rao and this witness has exhibited 12 documents, marked as Ex.M1 to M12. The details of these documents are as follows:-

Ex.M.1 is the Settlement dated 17.11.1987. Ex.M2 is the Settlement dated 16.7.1988. Ex.M3 is the Settlement dated 27.10.1988. Ex.M4 is the Settlement dated 9.1.1991. Ex.M5 is the Minutes of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.1995. Ex.M6 is the Settlement dated 30.7.1996. Ex.M7 is the Memorandum of Understanding dt. 27.2.1997. Ex.M8 is the Particulars of 1989 Messengerial Panel. Ex.M9 is the Particulars of 1989 Non-Messengerial Panel. Ex.M10 is the Particulars of 1992 General Attendant Panel. Ex.M11 is the Judgment of Hon’ble High Court of A.P. in Writ Appeal No.86/98 dt.1.5.1998. Ex.M12 is the Judgment of Hon’ble Supreme Court of India in SLP No. 11886-11888 of 1998 dt.10.8.1998.

22. Apart from afore mentioned documents, Learned Counsel for Workman has also filed a long list of various judgements of Hon’ble Supreme Court as well as Hon’ble High Court, which we will discuss at appropriate place in this Award.

23. Heard the argument of Learned Counsel for Workman as well as for Respondent.

24. On the basis of rival pleadings of both the parties and submissions made by the Learned Counsel for both the parties, following points arise for determination in the industrial dispute :-

I. Whether the 1st settlement dated 17.11.1987, 2nd settlement dated 16.7.1988, 3rd settlement dated 27.10.1988, 4th settlement dated 9.1.1991 and 5th settlement dated 30.7.1996 entered into between State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and also Memorandum of Understanding are binding upon both the parties?

II. Whether the action of State Bank of India, Addanki Main branch in terminating the services of Workman Sri J. Srinivasa Rao, a Messenger with effect from 31.7.98 is justified?

III. Whether the Workman is entitled for absorption on permanent post in the Branch of Respondent management as per averments made by him in the claim statement?

IV. To what relief if any the Workman is entitled for?

Findings:-

25. **Point No.I**:- Undisputedly settlements dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988, 9.1.1991 and 30.7.1996, minutes of conciliation proceedings and memorandum of understanding dated 27.2.1997 were executed between the State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation under section 2(p) and 18 (1) of I.D. Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Disputes (Central Rules), 1957.

Section 2(p) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 as follows:-

(p) "settlement" means a settlement arrived at in the course of conciliation proceeding and includes a written agreement between the employer and workmen arrived at otherwise than in the course of conciliation proceeding where such agreement has been signed by the parties thereto in such manner as may be prescribed and a copy thereof has been sent to an officer authorised in this behalf by the appropriate Government and the conciliation officer;

Section 18(1) provides as follows:-

18. Persons on whom settlements and awards are binding.

- [(1) A settlement arrived at by agreement between the employer and Workman otherwise than in the course of conciliation proceeding shall be binding on the parties to the agreement.

Therefore, in view of the provision contained u/s.18 (1) I.D. Act, 1947, terms and conditions enumerated in the aforesaid settlements are binding on the parties to the agreement. The Learned Counsel for Workman has argued that the Workman after going through the selection procedure has successfully been listed in the panel for appointment on the permanent basis in the Respondent management and the empanelled list has to be valid till last person in the empanelled list is appointed on permanent basis. But the impugned order dated 25.3.97, 27.3.97 and 31.3.97, has been issued by Respondent management thereby the services of the Workman has been terminated and the said order is not in consonance of the terms of the agreement entered into between the parties. Further, Workman submits that the Respondent in the 5th settlement has mentioned the date i.e., 31.3.1997 for lapse of empanel list which is illegal and that is not binding upon the Workman. The condition of lapse of empanelment list on 31.3.97 incorporated in the aforesaid 5th settlement, is arbitrary and illegal.

26. The perusal of the impugned order dated 25.3.1997 goes to reveal that the Chief/Branch Manager, SBI Zonal Office has issued the letter to all the branches with regard to the subject not to make any temporary appointments in the Branch in messengerial category from 1985. The extract of the said letter is given below:-

"We have been advised by the Deputy General Manager, Zonal Office, Hyderabad that as both the panels of temporary employees of 1989 and daily wagers/casual labours of 1992 will lapse by 31.3.1997, it has been decided by Central Office not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial category from 1985."

Thus, from the contents of the aforesaid letter, it manifest that Head Office of State Bank of India vide letter dated 25.3.1997 has issued direction to all its branches not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial category from 1985 due to reason of lapse of both panels i.e., 1989 & 1992 on 31.3.1997 as per terms of settlements entered into by both parties. Further, the contents of the subsequent letter dated 27.3.1997 issued by Respondent Management is also direction to Branch Manager, State Bank of India not to make any temporary messengerial category appointment with effect from 1985 and it has also been communicated to all concerned that the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers maintained by Zonal offices stand lapsed from 31.1.1997. Further, office order dated 31.3.1997 has been issued by Respondent management that goes to reveal that the said office order has been issued to this effect that, "Consequent on absorption of temporary employees in permanent cadre, it has been decided by the competent authority that no one onwards, no further daily labour or temporary employees/appointments should be resorted to/engaged/employed." Therefore, it reflects from the contents of the aforesaid orders that the temporary appointment in messengerial category and daily labour has been stopped by the Respondent management with effect from 1985 because of the lapsed of panel of temporary workers and daily wagers by 31.3.1997. The agreement for lapse of both the panels on 31.3.1997 is contained in the 5th settlement which has been arrived at between the parties on dated 30.7.1996 with the consensus of both the parties. Therefore, Workman can not challenge the terms and conditions contained in settlement dated 30.7.1996 regarding lapse of panel on 31.3.1997 as agreed between State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation. As per provision contained u/s.18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 the said Agreement dated 30.7.1996 is binding on both the parties.

In the case of **Allied Sales Corporation Secunderabad vs.The Authority Under Andhra Pradesh..... 1990 II LLJ 510 AP para 414, Hon'ble Court have held:-**

"*4. There was a settlement between the Management and the workmen under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act on 25th April 1983 under which the age of superannuation of the workmen was fixed at 55 years. The settlement was to be in force upto 30th June 1986 and the next settlement, incorporating practically the same terms, was again entered into on 4th February 1987 under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act. There is no dispute that these settlements are under Section 18(1).*

14. Now the Authority constituted under Section 41(1) of the Act is an authority with very limited jurisdiction. It can only decide in the first appeal whether a termination by the management is valid or not and is within the parameters of Section 40 of the Act. The said Authority, in our view, has absolutely no jurisdiction to decide whether a settlement entered into under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act between the representatives of the Workmen and of the Management, is vitiated by undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion on the part of the Management. The Authority, namely, the Assistant Commissioner of Labour, was never intended by the A.P. Legislature to have jurisdiction to go into the question of the validity of a settlement arrived at under Section 18 of the Industrial Disputes Act by an Industrial Court. That Parliament has, in fact, constituted Industrial Courts under the Industrial Disputes Act, with extensive powers cannot be disputed. What we mean to say is that the Authority under Section 41(1) of the A.P. Act has no jurisdiction what-so-ever either to question or to decide about the validity of any such settlements. If parties to a settlement have a grievance about the validity of a settlement, it is for them to agitate the matter before the appropriate forum and they cannot ask an Authority constituted under Section 41(1) of the A.P. Shops and Establishments Act, 1966 with limited jurisdiction, to go into any such question and, that too, incidentally while deciding whether retirement as per the contract of employment, is legal or not."

It is not the case of Workman that aforesaid settlements are vitiated by undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion on the part of the management. If the Workman feeling aggrieved by any terms of settlement/ agreement on the aforementioned grounds then he can challenge of settlement before a competent authority under the Act, 1947. But here in the instant matter it is not a case of Workman that aforementioned settlement has been entered into between the parties on the ground of undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion. Therefore, Workman is barred to raise any objection in respect of fixing the date of lapse of both panels on 31.3.1997 as agreed between both the parties and Workman can not challenge any terms of said Agreement.

Further in the case of **Herbertsons Limited Vs. Workmen of Herbertsons Limited and Ors, 1977 AIR 322,** Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

The Tribunal thought that the question of the quantum of membership of the 2nd Respondent did not call for a finding at all in view of 1his Court's order. As observed above that was not a correct assumption. On the other hand, we feel that this view of the Tribunal has led it to approach the matter in an entirely erroneous manner. The Tribunal is, rightly enough, conscious that under section 18 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act the settlement was binding on the company and the members of the 3rd Respondent union. Even so, the Tribunal devoted nearly half of its order in scanning the evidence given by the company and Respondent No. 3 to find out whether the terms of the settlement had been explained by the President of the union to the workmen or not and whether the workers voluntarily accepted the settlement knowing all the "consequences". This to our mind is again an entirely wrong approach.

"When a recognised union negotiates with an employer the workers as individuals do not come into the picture. It is not necessary that each individual worker should know the implications of the settlement since a recognised union, which is expected to protect the legitimate interests of labour, enters into a settlement in the best interests of labour. This would be the normal rule. We cannot altogether rule out exceptional cases where there may be allegations of mala fides, fraud or even corruption or other induce- ments. Nothing of that kind has been suggested against the President of the 3rd Respondent in this case. That being the position, prima facie, this is a settlement in the course of collective bargaining and, therefore, is entitled to due weight and consideration.

It is not possible to scan the settlement in bits and pieces and hold some parts good and acceptable and others bad. Unless it can be demonstrated that the objectionable portion is such that it completely outweighs all the other advantages gained the Court will be slow to hold a settle- ment as unfair and unjust. The settlement has to be accepted or rejected as a whole and we are unable to reject it as a whole as unfair or unjust. Even before this Court the 3rd Respondent representing admittedly the large majority of the workmen has stood by this settlement and that is a strong factor which it is difficult to ignore. As stated elsewhere in the judgment, we cannot also be oblivious of the fact that all workmen of the company have accepted the settlement. Besides, the period of settlement has since expired and we are informed that the employer and the 3rd Respondent are negotiating another settlement with further improvements. These factors, apart from what has been stated above, and the need for industrial peace and harmony when a union backed by a large majority of workmen has accepted a settlement in the course of collective bargaining have impelled us not to interfere with this settlement. That being the position, we unhold the settlement as fair and just and order that the award of the Tribunal shall be substituted by the settlement dated October 18, 1973. The said settlement shall be the substituted award. The appeal is disposed of accordingly. There will be no order as to costs."

Therefore, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above, the contention of the Workman that the date fixed for lapse of empanelled list on 31.3.1997 for appointment to the permanent post vide 5th Settlement dated 30.7.1996 is arbitrary, illegal is not untenable. The recognized union of Workmen has negotiated with the Respondent Bank Management representing large number of Workmen and the Workman as individual do not come into picture. Workman in the instant case has work as temporary Workmen in the Respondent Branch and in response of Notification he had applied for inclusion of his name in the panel and he was selected for inclusion his name in the panel list to be utilized for absorption of such Workman to permanent post in order of their seniority in the list. The Settlement dated 30.7.1996 between State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff

Federation under Sec.2(p) and Sec.18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 has clearly provided as regard non-messengerial position and it is agreed that all such posts sanctioned fallen vacant upto 31.3.1997 shall be filled before empanel list is allowed to lapse. Thus, in view of law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, in the instant case, Agreement dated 30.7.1996 was entered into between both the parties in respect of lapsing of the both the panels on 31.3.1997 and absorption of the Workmen from panel list was subject to availability of vacancy of post likely to arise upto 31.3.1997, have a binding force on Workman as well as management of State Bank of India in view of provision contained under section 18 (1) of I.D. Act, 1947.

Thus, Point No.I is answered against the Workman and in favour of the Respondent.

27. **Point No.II**:- Firstly, it is submitted on behalf of the Workman that the Respondent has terminated his services by oral order on 31.7.98 without issuing any notice or paying any salary or compensation in lieu thereof. Therefore, the termination order of the Workman from service is in violation of provision contained Under Section 25 F of I.D. Act, 1947. Therefore, the order is liable to be set aside.

28. On the other hand, Respondent counsel contended that Workman has not worked for 240 days in any preceding calendar year. Therefore, reference of the industrial dispute is not relevant. In this context, the Workman has examined himself as WW1 who has reiterated that Workman has been terminated from service by Respondent on 31.7.98 without notice of salary or compensation in lieu thereof. Before examining the claim of the Workman on merit it would be apposite to reproduce the provision contained under section 25 F:-

Section 25F provides:-

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].

Compensation to workmen in case of transfer of undertakings.

Section 25B defines the term continuous service which provides

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 authorized 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;

In order to prove the fact of 240 days of service within 12 months of a calendar year just preceding from the date of termination, the initial burden of proof lies upon the Workman and the Workman has to prove this factum by adducing his oral as well as documentary evidence in support of his claim.

Further, how to calculate 240 days of service by the Workman in a calendar year. In this context the reference of decisions of Hon'ble Supreme Court is relevant and the same are discussed below:-

In Rajasthan State Ganganagar S. Mills Ltd. v. State of Rajasthan and Anr. (2004) Apex Court held:

"It was the case of the Workman that he had worked for more than 240 days in the year concerned. This claim was denied by the appellant. It was for the claimant to lead evidence to show that he had worked for 240 days in the year preceding the date of his termination. He has filed an affidavit. It is statement which is in his favor and that cannot be regarded as sufficient evidence for any Court or Tribunal to come to the conclusion that in fact the claimant had worked for 240 days in a year These aspects were highlighted in Range Forest Officer v. S.T. Hadimani (2002 (3) SCC 25. No proof of receipt of salary or wages for 240 days or order or record in that regard was produced. Mere

non-production of the muster roll for a particular period was not sufficient for the Labour Court held that the Workman had worked for 240 days as claimed."

In Municipal Corporation, Faridabad v. Siri Niwas (2004 (8) SCC 195), held "*the burden was on the Workman to show that he was working for more than 240 days in the preceding one year prior to his alleged retrenchment." In M.P. Electricity Board v. Hariram (2004 (8) SCC 246) the position was again reiterated in paragraph 11 as follows: "The above burden having not been discharged and the Labour Court having held so, in our opinion, the Industrial Court and the High Court erred in basing an order of reinstatement solely on an adverse inference drawn erroneously ..*"

In the case of Manager, RBI, Bangalore vs. S Mani (2005) SCC Page 100, the 3 Judges Bench of the Apex Court held that "*the initial burden of proof was on the Workman to show that he had completed 240 days of service."*

Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of Mohan Lal vs Management BEL 1981 SCC page 225 has laid down the principle that how to count 240 days of service within one year it is held: *"Clause (2)(a) provides for a fiction to treat a Workman in continuous service for a period of one year despite the fact that he has not rendered uninterrupted service for a period of one year but he has rendered period of 240 days during the period of 12 calendar service for months counting backwards and just preceding the relevant date being the date of retrenchment. In other words, in order to invoke the fiction enacted in clause (2)(a) it is necessary to determine first the relevant date, ie the date of termination of service which is complained of as retrenchment. After that date is ascertained. move backward to a period of 12 months just preceding the date of retrenchment and then ascertain whether within the period of 12 months, the Workman has rendered service for a period of 240 days. If these three facts are affirmatively answered in favor of the Workman pursuant to the deeming fiction enacted in clause (2)(a) it will have to be assumed that the Workman is in continuous service for a period of one year and he will satisfy the eligibility qualification enacted in Section 25-F"*

"14. We have already extracted section 25B since its amendment and the change in language is the legislative exposition of which note must be taken. In fact, we need not further dilate upon this aspect because in Surendra Kumar Verma and Ors. v. Central Government Industrial-cum-Labour Court, New Delhi and Anr., Chinnappa Reddy. J., after noticing the amendment and referring to the decision in Sur Enamel and Stamping Works (P) Ltd case, held as under:

"These changes brought about by Act 36 of 1964 appear to be clearly designed to provide that a Workman who has actually worked under the employer for not less than 240 days during a period of twelve months shall be deemed to have been in continuous service for a period of one year whether or not he has in fact been in such continuous service for a period of one year. It is enough that he has worked for 240 days in a period of 12 months, it is not necessary that he should have been in the service of the employer for one whole year."

In a concurring judgment Pathak J. agreed with this interpretation of section 25B(2). Therefore, both on principle and on precedent it must be held that section 25B(2) comprehends a situation where a Workman is not in employment for a period of 12 calendar months, but has rendered service for a period of 240 days within the period of 12 calendar months commencing and counting backwards from the relevant date, i.e. the date of retrenchment. If he has, he would be deemed to be in continuous service for a period of one year for the purpose of section 25B and Chapter VA."

Thus, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above the initial burden of proof lies upon the Workman to show that he has completed 240 days of the service with the Respondent just preceding from the date of his termination. Further, in respect of the employment of calculating the 240 days service provision contained under Section 25-F read with Section 25-B of the I.D. Act, 1947.

29. Now, in view of the provision contained under Section 25 F and law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, we have to examine whether the Workman has discharged his initial burden of proof in respect of his claim of 240 days continuous service in a calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination i.e., 31.7.98.

In this context, WW1 in his cross examination has stated that,

" My service was for total no. of 547 days spread over with gaps from time to time during the period from 1983 to 96.....

I was not sponsored by any employment exchange. ..... It is not true to suggest that I never worked for 240 days in a year continuously and I was casual worker I am not entitled for any relief."

Thus, it is clear from the testimony of WW1 that the Workman had not worked for 240 days continuously in any 12 months of a calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination in the Respondent bank. Therefore, Workman failed to establish his plea by his oral and documentary evidence that he had worked for 240 days continuously in calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination i.e., 31.7.98. Thus, the claim of the Workman that he has been terminated by oral order without issuing notice or payment in lieu after termination, in contravention of Section 25 F of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is not tenable. However the documents filed by the

Workman in support of his claim, number of days worked with the Respondent goes to reveal that the Workman had worked intermittently as daily wager depending upon availability of work in branch. Workman did not file any document of appointment letter or salary slips in support of his claim for appointment as a non-messenger in the Respondent branch on temporary basis.

30. Per contra, the Learned Counsel for Respondent has submitted the allegation of Workman that he was terminated from services is not correct. As the vacancies were filled up on regular basis in order of their respective seniority the non-engagement of the Workman does not amount to termination. Further, Respondent contended that no law provide that even though there is no work temporary employee should be continued in the bank work as the very engagement of Workman was subject to availability of work. Therefore, the allegation that the bank has indulged in unfair labour practice is incorrect.

31. Thus, in view of the fore gone discussion and contentions made by the Respondent, I find the force in the argument advanced by the Respondent that in the instant matter, Workman was not terminated from service by order dated 31.7.98 rather he was disengaged in view of the non-availability of the work in the branch. Further, there was direction issued by the Head Office of the Respondent authority not to engage any daily wager Workman/ temporary Worker w.e.f. 31.7.98. Thus, such disengagement of Workman does not amount to termination. Moreover, the Workman failed to prove his claim that he was terminated in contravention of provision of Sec.25F of the I.D. Act, 1947 as he failed to establish his plea by any oral or documentary evidence that he had worked for 240 days continuously in a twelve months of calendar year just preceding from date of termination i.e., 31.7.98.

32. Further, perusal of the order dated 25.3.1997 goes to reveal that the Chief Branch Manager, State Bank of India has issued the letter to Zonal Office with direction to all its branches to this effect that they have been advised by the DGM, Zonal Office, Hyderabad that as both the panel of temporary employees of 1989 and daily wagers/casual labour of 1992 will lapse on 31.3.1997 it has been decided by central office not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial cadre from 31.7.98, therefore it was directed to issue suitable instructions not to make temporary appointments from 31.7.98. There is no mention in this order that the Workman herein has been terminated from service by this order.

33. Further, the circular dated 27.3.1997 was issued by DGM, SBI to all branches in commercial network in respect of the non-appointment of temporary employees in subordinate cadre and it has directed not to make any temporary employment in the subordinate cadre with effect from 1.4.97 and further, it has directed to ensure that no temporary/casual/daily basis appointment of the petty cash. Further, it is directed to all Branch Managers that any deviation in this regard will be viewed seriously. Thus, these circulars do not reflect that the Workman has been terminated from service by this order.

34. Similarly, office order dated 31.3.1997 is simply a direction to all branches of the Respondent bank by DGM that no further daily labour should be engaged or employed. Therefore, the plea of the Workman that he has been terminated by the aforesaid order dated 25.3.1997, 27.3.1997 and 31.3.1997 from the service by the Respondent is not acceptable. The evidence adduced by the Workman clearly goes to reveal that he had worked as a daily wager for which he has been paid wages according to number of working days. As there was an order for prohibition for engaging temporary workmen, in the bank, therefore, Workman could not be engaged by the Respondent for work from 31.7.98 and there after. It is settled law that the daily wagers are engaged by the employer depending upon the availability of work and as the work was not available the Workman was not engaged further by the Respondent management. Therefore, the Workman on the ground of number of days he had worked in the Respondent bank cannot claim any right to reinstate him into the employment. As the Workman failed to prove the mandatory condition of 240 days of continuous service as required under Sec.25F of I.D. Act, 1947. Therefore, the disengagement of Workman from work can not be termed in contravention of provision contained under Sec.25F and 25 B of the I.D. Act, 1947.

Thus, this point is answered against the Workman and in favour of Respondent.

35. **Point No.III**:- In this context, the Workman has contended that the management failed to implement the selected panels during its valid tenure. The management adopted the back door methods contrary to the settlements and filled up the vacancies. The same is evident from the proceedings dated 18.11.1985 a copy of the same is filed in the material papers and the same may be read as part of the claim statement. Further, it is submitted that management has to adhere the procedure issued by the Central Government, the instructions dated 16.8.1990 in the year 1995, but same was not followed in the year 1997 despite there being vacancies. The management has followed the procedure of calling candidates through employment exchange instead of giving chance to the empanelled candidates like the Workman herein. The management sent call letters to the similarly situated candidates like the Workman in the month of June 1997 subsequent to issuance of impugned termination orders. After knowing the fact that they are litigating the issue by way of dispute, the management has refused to engage those candidates, the copies of call letters issued are filed herein along with claim petition. The Workman herein reiterates that the panels are meant for absorption but not for termination. In view of the same a duty is cast upon the Respondent management to engage the empanelled candidates like the Workman herein even in temporary vacancies till they are absorbed permanently in regular vacancies.

36. On the other hand, Respondent has contended that the Federation approached Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) for implementation of bipartite settlement in respect of the absorption of temporary employees. The Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) conducted conciliation proceedings and agreement was arrived at between the Federation and the Management bank. It is submitted that it was agreed between the Federation and the Management that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers /casual labour would be kept alive upto March, 1997 and the vacancies as agreed to under the afore set out settlements will be filled from both the lists concurrently. A copy of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.1995 signed by the parties to the dispute is filed as a material paper. Further, it is submitted that the settlement was arrived at and an agreement was signed between the Federation and the Management bank on 30.7.1996 under Section 2(p) read with Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules 1957 which is binding on the parties. A copy of this agreement which hereinafter may be referred to as 5th settlement for brevity, is also filed as a material paper. The 5th settlement dated 30.7.1996 whereunder the earlier four settlements dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988 and 9.1.1991 were also referred, it was agreed to, by the Federation and the Management bank that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees will be kept alive upto March, 1997 for filling the vacancies existing/arrived at as on 31.12.1994 as per the norms agreed to between the bank and Federation and that thereafter the said panels would lapse. It was also agreed that within the framework of the above settlements the modalities about drawing names from either the panel of temporary employees or the panel of daily wagers and casual labour would be decided administratively on circle to circle basis depending upon the local requirements in consultation with the Federation's affiliate by the Circle management. It was further agreed that all messenger real vacancies/positions in the subordinate cadre including part-time attendants specifically provided as leave reserve will be filled by the end of 31.3.1997. Further, Respondent contended that on 27.2.1997 a memorandum of understanding was also signed between the Federation's affiliate and the bank management regarding the fact that the exercise of identifying the messengerial vacancies as on 31.12.1994 has since been completed by central office and thereby 403 messengerial vacancies were sanctioned to the circle of the Management bank and it was agreed that these vacancies may be filled from 1989 panel of temporary employees after effecting conversion from full time non-messengerial staff in the usual manner and the agreement was reached upon. Further, it was agreed between the Federations affiliate and the management bank that in terms of the settlement dated 30.7.1996 both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers /casual employees would lapse on 31.3.1997.

37. The Workman has contended that the empanelled list prepared by the Respondent management for appointment of temporary and daily wage Workers to the permanent post cannot lapse unless until it is exhausted by appointing all the empanelled persons and it should continue even after 31.3.1997, i.e., the date fixed for the lapse of panel. It is undisputed that the date of lapse of empanelled list of Workmen has been fixed to 31.3.1997 as mentioned in the settlement dated 30.7.1996, and agreed between the parties. It is settled law that and once the life of panel list lapses on the date as agreed between the parties it cannot be extended beyond that date. In the instant case the panel list of the workmen was valid upto 31.3.1997 in view of the terms and conditions enumerated in the 5th Settlement entered into between the parties. As the lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997 has been agreed by State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation through 5th Settlement, the Workman is not competent to challenge the same.

In this context I would like to take reference of the decision of the apex court in the case of **Syndicate Bank and Ors vs. Shankar Paul and Ors , AIR 1997 SC 3091, therein the Hon'ble Apex Court** have held:-

"Till 1982, the branches of the appellant Bank in Calcutta region were recruiting persons locally to work as temporary attenders in leave vacancies. In view of the revised procedure prescribed by the Government of India in respect of such temporary appointments, the Calcutta regional office of the appellant Bank issued a circular to all of its branches on 14.8.1982, instructing all the branches under it to discontinue the old practice from 1.6.1982 and appoint only empanelled candidates. The regional office was to prepare a panel of eligible candidates, after calling names from the local/district employment exchange, and split it up branch-wise. Following that new procedure yearly panels were prepared thereafter. Names of the Respondents were for the first time included in the panel prepared for the period 7.2.1987 to 6.2.1988. By its letter dated 7.2.1987 the Bank had informed the Respondents that the panel was valid for one year only and that inclusion of their names in the panel was not to confer on them any right to seek permanent appointment in the service of the bank. Considering the object with which the panel was prepared and the fact that it was an yearly panel expiring on 6.2.1988, we are of the opinion that the Respondents did not get any right, because of inclusion of their names in the said panel, for permanent absorption in the service of the Bank. Whatever conditional right they had came to an end with the expiry of the panel. The claim of the Respondents, as contained in the writ petition was thus misconceived and therefore the learned single Judge and the Division Bench, when it first decided the appeal, were right in dismissing the writ petition and the appeal respectively."

Thus, in view of the above law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court and in view of the terms and conditions of the 5th Settlement the contention of the Workman that empanelled list should continue even after 31.3.1997 till the last Workman in the panel is absorbed is not tenable. The contention of the Workman is baseless in view of recital in the settlement. Therefore, in view of the fore gone discussion and finding given at Point No. I regarding binding nature of Settlements and terms and conditions enumerated therein, in view of the provision contained u/s.18(1) of the I.D. Act, 1947, I am of the considered view that life of panels lapsed on 31.3.1997 in view of terms of settlement dated 30.7.1996 and plea of Workman that the panel shall continue even after 31.3.1997 till last man absorbed has no legal force and same is untenable.

38. Undisputedly, settlement agreement dated 30.7.1996 was executed between the State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation and in that settlement it was agreed that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/ casual employees will be used for filling vacancies existing as on 31.12.1994 as per the norms agreed between the bank and the Federation. These empanelled workmen were to be given a chance for permanent appointment in the bank against vacancies arising up to December 1994 whereas the daily wagers/ casual employees were to be considered against the vacancies arise from January 1995 to December 1996, whereby the said panel would lapse. It was agreed that the vacancies falls upto 31.3.1997 shall be filled before the empanelled list is allowed to lapse. Thus, the claim of the Workman to the post of permanent non-messenger in the Respondent management was subject to the availability of the sanctioned post and vacancies arising upto 31.3.1997. The workmen given chance to the permanent post were seniors in number of working days in panel list and Workman herein was junior to those workmen. Therefore, Workman could not be given absorption to permanent post being junior to other workmen in the panel list.

39. Moreover, the Respondent management witness MW1 in chief statement has given the evidence that, "The Petitioner has not completed 240 days of service in a calendar year." Although this witness was cross examined by the Petitioner but the above statement of the management witness in chief remained uncontroverted, as the witness MW1 was not cross examined by Petitioner on this point. Therefore, the claim of the Petitioner that he has been removed from service by the management illegally is untenable. Further, witness MW1 in his chief statement has stated that, "The temporary messengers and Non-messengers were engaged by the bank in leave vacancies and for administrative exigencies. The Petitioner did not work continuously for 240 days in any year or over a period of 36 months." This statement of witness MW1 remained uncontroverted as the Petitioner did not cross examine the witness MW1 on this point. Therefore, the Petitioner Workman as per number of working days, failed to fulfil eligibility criteria of working days as required for regularisation. Therefore, he was not given regularisation in the employment of the Respondent. Therefore, in view of the statement of MW1, the claim of the Petitioner that he was refused regularization by the Respondent management illegally, is untenable.

40. However, Workman has taken the plea that the panels of Workmen for absorption in the employment of the Respondent banks (panels of temporary employees and daily wagers) has been lapsed on 31.3.1997 in contravention of terms of settlement as the object of preparing the entire empanelment of temporary and daily wagers was to provide them permanent employment and till the both the panel lists exhausted the panel list cannot be lapsed on 31.3.1997 and the date of lapsing of the panel on 31.3.1997 has been fixed by the Respondent arbitrarily without any authority.

41. In this context, the perusal of Settlement dated 30.7.1996 reveals that the 5th Settlement dated 30.7.1996 was entered under Section 2(p) and 18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Dispute (Central) Rules 1957. This settlement has been entered into by the competent parties and in this settlement parties thereto agreed that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees will lapse on 31.3.1997. Thus the date of lapse of panel was fixed by both the parties with consensus under the settlement dated 30.7.1996 and same is binding upon the Workman under the provision of Section 18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947. Moreover, this issue of binding force of the settlement dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988 and 9.1.1991 has already been discussed, decided at finding in Point No.I of this award. However, the legality and validity of the aforementioned settlement has not been challenged by the Workman before any competent forum. Thus, claim of Workman that the date of lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997 has been fixed arbitrarily by the Respondent bank is untenable. As regard the claim of Workman for his absorption to the permanent post it is settled law that the Workman can not claim his regularization to permanent post merely on the basis of number of working days.

42. In this context the reference of the decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Oil and Natural Gas Corporation vs Krishan Gopal 2020(3) SCALE 272, date of decision 7.2.2020** is relevant therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have has laid down principle regarding regularization of the Workman on permanent posts. Hon'ble Supreme Court have laid down the prepositions of regularization of the workmen to permanent post is as under:-

"*(i) Wide as they are, the powers of the Labour Court and the Industrial Court cannot extend to a direction to order regularisation, where such a direction would in the context of public employment offend the provisions contained in Article 14 of the Constitution;*

(ii) The statutory power of the Labour Court or Industrial Court to grant relief to workmen including the status of permanency continues to exist in circumstances where the employer has indulged in an unfair labour practice by not filling up permanent posts even though such posts are available and by continuing to employ workmen as temporary or daily wage employees despite their performing the same work as regular workmen on lower wages;

(iii) The power to create permanent or sanctioned posts lies outside the judicial domain and where no posts are available, a direction to grant regularisation would be impermissible merely on the basis of the number of years

of service;

(iv) Where an employer has regularised similarly situated workmen either in a scheme or otherwise, it would be open to workmen who have been deprived of the same benefit at par with the workmen who have been regularised to make

a complaint before the Labour or Industrial Court, since the deprivation of the benefit would amount to a violation of Article 14; and

(v) In order to constitute an unfair labour practice under Section 2(ra) read with Item 10 of the Vth Schedule of the ID Act, the employer should be engaging workmen as badlis, temporaries or casuals, and continuing them for years, with the object of depriving them of the benefits payable to permanent workmen.

Thus, in view of the principles laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court as discussed above, in the instant matter the Workman utterly failed to prove his claim by adducing any documentary or oral evidence that the employer has indulged in unfair labour practice by not filling the permanent posts even though such posts are available and by continuing to employ workmen as temporary or daily wage employees despite their performance was the same work, as regular workmen on lower wages.

43. Respondent has contended that all the vacancies exist and arise upto 31.3.1997 has been filled up from the panel list in order of seniority and no vacancy exists or arises as on 31.3.1997 remained unfilled. Further, it is contended that as per terms of settlement the life of panel lists has been lapsed on 31.3.1997, hence, there is no occasion to extend the life of panel lists beyond 31.3.1997. However, the workman failed to prove contrary by any evidence to the aforesaid contention of the Respondent that the vacancies were existing as on 31.3.1997 and the workman was not given absorption to the permanent post in order of his seniority. It is settled law that the power to create permanent or sanctioned post lies outside the judicial domain and where no posts are available, a direction to grant regularization would be impermissible merely on the basis of the number of years of service. Therefore, the claim of the workman on this ground also not acceptable.

44. Further, as per the of settlement, panel was prepared for absorption of the workmen on the permanent posts has already been lapsed on 31.3.1997 and the vacancies existing and arising upto 31.12.1994 and upto 31.3.1997 as settlement dated 30.7.1996 has been filled up from the panel by appointing the workmen as per seniority in the panel list. Workman witness WW1 in his cross examination has himself admitted this fact that, some of the temporary employees whose names were included in the panel were given regular appointment in the bank in order of their seniority in the panel. The Workman failed to show that there was any breach of terms of settlement has been committed by the Respondent in appointment to permanent post from aforesaid panel list.

45. As discussed in preceding paragraph of this Award, the life of the panel has not been extended beyond 31.3.1997, by any further settlement hence, the panel list in which name of the Workman was included got expired on 31.3.1997. It is not the case of the Workman that Respondent has regularized similarly situated workmen either in the scheme or otherwise and the Workman has been deprived of same benefit on par with those workmen or the vacancies remained unfilled on the date of lapse of panels i.e., 31.3.1997, Industrial Tribunal has no jurisdiction to extend the date of lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997. This Tribunal can not order for regularization of workmen to the permanent post in contravention of the provision of Article 14 of the Constitution of India.

In the case of **Mahboob Deepak vs. Nagar Panchayat Gajraula & Anr, Civil Appeal No.5875/2007 date of judgement 13.12.2007,** Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

"8. Respondent is a Local Authority. The terms and conditions of employment of the employees are governed by a statute and statutory rules. No appointment can be made by a Local Authority without following the provisions of the recruitment rules. Any appointment made in violation of the said rules as also the constitutional scheme of equality as contained in Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India would be a nullity.

9. Due to some exigency of work, although recruitment on daily wages or on an ad hoc basis was permissible, but by reason thereof an employee cannot claim any right to be permanently absorbed in service or made permanent in absence of any statute or statutory rules. Merely because an employee has completed 240 days of work in a year preceding the date of retrenchment, the same would not mean that his services were liable to be regularized."

Therefore, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, the claim of the Workman for absorption merely on the basis of number of day of work in the Respondent bank Branch is not acceptable. As regard plea of the Workman that the Workman should have been given employment even after 31.3.1997 as temporary Workman, it is the discretion of Respondent to engage the Workman depending upon availability of work and this Tribunal can not direct the Respondent to engage the Workman in the absent of such rule/scheme.

46. In view of principle laid down by Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above, in the instant matter Workman utterly failed to establish the fact of rendering continuous service for a period of 240 days of service within a period of 12 calendar months commencing and coming backward from relevant date i.e., the date of retrenchment, if has he would be denied to be in continuous service for a period of one year. Therefore, the provision contained under Sec.25F of retrenchment is not applicable to Workman.

Counsel for Workman has relied upon number of decisions of Hon'ble High Court and Hon'ble Supreme Court and few of them are discussed herein:-

In the case of **F.C.I., vs. Kamdhenu Cattle Feed Industries 1985 (1) SCC 71,** therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

"7. In contractual sphere as in all other State actions, the State and all its instrumentalities have to conform to Article 14 of the Constitution of which non-arbitrariness is a significant facet. There is no unfettered discretion in public law: A public authority possesses powers only to use them for public good. This impose the duty to act fairly and to adopt a procedure which is `fairplay in action'. Due observance of this obligation as a part of good administration raises a reasonable or legitimate expectation in every citizen to be treated fairly in his interaction with the State and its instrumentalities, with this element forming a necessary component of the decision making process in all State actions. To satisfy this requirement of non- arbitrariness in a State action, it is, therefore, necessary to consider and give due weight to the reasonable or legitimate expectations of the persons likely lo be affected by the decision or else that unfairness in the exercise of the power may amount to an abuse or excess of power apart from affecting the bona fides of the decision in a given case. The decision so made would be exposed to challenge on the ground of arbitrariness. Rule of law does not completely eliminate discretion in the exercise of power, as it is unrealistic, but providers for control of its exercise by judicial review."

In the case of **State Bank of India, R.O., Vijayawada vs. Industrial Tribunal, Hyderabad WP No.193/1997,** therein Hon'ble High Court have held,

"*Sri Krovvidi Narasimham, the learned counsel for the 2nd respondent contends, supporting the award that it was a permanent vacancy and even though the 2nd respondent was appointed on temporary basis, his services were not liable to be terminated and he was to be regularised into service on permanent basis. Shastry award warrants that no temporary appointment can be made to a permanent post. But the matter is now covered by two division bench judgements dated 28.11.1986 in W.A. No.791 of 1986 and 25.8.1987 in W.A. No.270 of 1982. The ratio decided in the two judgements is to the effect that there cannot be any mandate to appoint employees on permanent basis when the requirement was for appointment on temporary basis. But it is held in the said judgements that when a temporary appointee is ousted from service and not for misconduct and, if again temporary appointment is to be made, then, the case of such temporary appointee who was ousted, has got to be considered in accordance with Sec. 25-H of the Act."*

In the case of **State of Haryana and others vs. Piara Singh and others. 1992 (4) SCC 118,** therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

" 49. If for any reason an adhoc or temporary employee is continued for a fairly long spell, the authorities must consider his case for regularization provided he is eligible and qualified according to the rules and his service record is satisfactory and his appointment does not run counter to the reservation policy of the state."

In the above cited judgements by the Workman the facts of the case are different hence do not apply to instant case of Workman.

47. On the other hand, in support of his contention Respondent has examined witness MW1 and MW1 in chief examination states that, Settlements i.e., on 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988, 9.1.1991 were entered into between the SBI and SBI Staff Federation for filling up of the vacancies that arise up to 1994 for those temporary employees who has worked on scale wages. Further, MW1 states that two different panels for messengers and non-messengers as per the eligibility criteria prescribed by the bank. There are four modules in Andhra Pradesh and they are Hyderabad, Tirupathi, Vijayawada and Visakhapatnam. MW1 states that the temporary employees so empanelled were given permanent absorption depending upon the vacancies so arise strictly in terms of the settlement. MW1 states that on 9.6.1995 conciliation proceeding was held before the RLC(C), Hyderabad and in said proceedings it was decided that the panels will be kept live up to 31.3.1997 and vacancies will be filled from both the lists concurrently. A copy of the said minutes of proceedings is Ex.M5. Further, MW1 states that on 30.7.1996 another settlement was entered between the SBI and All India SBI Staff Federation providing for filling up of the vacancies arising up to December 1994 in respect of subordinate cadre and daily wage /casual wage employees out of panel so prepared were to be considered against vacancies arising from January 1995 to December 1996, thereafter the said panels lapse. MW1 states that it was also agreed that all the non- messenger positions in subordinate cadre including part time attendants specially provided as leave reserve will be filled before 31.3.1997 and as regards to non-messengerial positions it is agreed that all such posts sanctioned and fallen vacant up to 31.3.1997 shall be filled before the empanelled list is allowed to lapse. Thus in both the cases empanelled list were lapsed on 1985. Ex.M6 is the copy of the settlement dated 30.7.1996. Further, witness states that on 27.2.1997 a memorandum of understanding was reached between the SBI and SBI Staff Federation providing that both the panels above mentioned will lapse on 31.3.1997. Ex.M7 is the copy of the memorandum of understanding and Ex.M8 is the copy of the statements giving the particulars of 1989 non-messenger panel, Ex.M9 is the copy of the statement of 1989 non-messenger panel, Ex.M10 is the copy of statement of 1992 panel. Further, witness states that petitioner was included in the 1989 panel. As the existing vacancies at that time were exhausted and his turn did not come he could not be given permanent employment in the bank as per the agreements. All the appointments were made strictly in accordance with the settlements reached from time to time between SBI and SBI staff federation and as per seniority, number of days of temporary service put in by them in the bank in the given period. Further, MW1 states petitioner

was not sponsored by any employment exchange he did not undergo the regular process of selection required for appointment as a regular non-messenger the petitioner has not worked for 240 days in any year in his entire temporary service in the bank. The petitioner and other temporary employees were terminated from service by the bank. Further, MW1 states that the vacancies were filled up on regular basis with the temporary employees from the panels and these panels were expired in terms of the settlements so reached and there were no vacancies to absorb such employees. Thus, witness MW1 has proved the documents Ex.M1 to Ex.M12 and also contentions made in the counter. However, MW1 was cross examined by the Petitioner Counsel. But nothing has been elicited in his cross examination so as to discredit the testimony of the witness MW1 as regards the date of lapse of both the panels on 31.3.1997 and reasons assigned for non-absorption of the Petitioner from the panel list to the permanent post. Moreover the witness MW1 was re-examined by the Respondent and the witness MW1 states that panels were expired in terms of the settlement send absorptions to the extent of the available vacancies were made. There was no termination of any temporary messenger as such but their services were not utilized after the cut off date as the available vacancies were already filled up and most of these Petitioners were not in the service of the bank as on the date of the expiry date of the panels. Therefore, in view of the aforesaid testimony of the MW1 in re-examination in the absence of cross examination remained uncontraverted, the claim of the Workman that he was entitled for absorption in permanent post in the branch of Respondent Management on the basis of panel list is found not established.

This point is answered against the Workman.

48. **Point No.IV**:- In view of the discussion and finding given at Point Nos. I, II and III, the Workman is not entitled for any relief and claim statement of Workman sans merit and liable to be dismissed.

This Point is answered accordingly.

AWARD

In view of the fore gone discussion, it is held that the action of the Respondent bank in terminating the services of Sri J. Srinivasa Rao, Ex. Messenger by way of oral orders w.e.f. the year 31.7.98 is justified. Hence, the Petitioner is not entitled for any relief as prayed for. The claim statement filed by Workman sans merit, hence, dismissed.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, Personal Assistant, transcribed by her, corrected and signed by me on this the 15th day of June, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner	Witnesses examined for the Respondent
WW1: Sri J. Srinivasa Rao	MW1: Sri I.S. Appa Rao

Documents marked for the Petitioner

Ex.W1:	Photocopy of service certificate
Ex.W2:	Photocopy of interview call letter
Ex.W3:	Photocopy of service certificate
Ex.W4:	Photocopy of interview letter
Ex.W5:	Photocopy of caste certificate
Ex.W6:	Photocopy of study certificate.

Documents marked for the Respondent

Ex.M1:	Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.17.11.87
Ex.M2:	Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.16.7.88
Ex.M3:	Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.27.10.1988

Ex.M4:	Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.9.1.1991
Ex.M5:	Photocopy of conciliation proceedings before the Regional Labour Commissioner(C) dt.9.6.1995
Ex.M6:	Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.30.7.1996
Ex.M7:	Photocopy of Memorandum of understanding dt. 27.1.1997
Ex.M8:	Photocopy of statements giving the particulars of 1989 messenger panel.
Ex.M9:	Photocopy of statement of 1989 Non-messenger panel
Ex.M10:	Photocopy of statement of 1992 panel
Ex.M11:	Photocopy of order of Hon'ble High Court in WA No.86/98 dt. 1.5.98
Ex.M12:	Photocopy of order in SLP No.11886-11888 of 1998 dated 10.8.98

नई दिल्ली, 3 अगस्त, 2026

का.आ. 1669.— औघोगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार स्टेट बैंक ऑफ़ इंडिया के प्रबंधतत्र, संबद्ध नियोजको और उनके कर्मकार के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औघोगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औघोगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद के पंचाट (24/2003) प्रकाशित करती है।

[सं. एल- 12025/01/2026- आई आर (बी-I)-155]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 3rd August, 2026

S.O. 1669.— In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the **Award (Ref. 24/2003*)*** of the ***Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court Hyderabad*** as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of **State Bank of India** and **their workman.**

[No. L-12025/01/2026-IR(B-I)-155]

SALONI, Dy. Director

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD

Present: - **Sri Irfan Qamar**

Presiding Officer

Dated the 12th day of June, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE L.C.No. 24/2003

[Old ID No. 265/99 of Labour Court, Guntur]

Between:

Sri Gudur Issac,

S/o George,

A.B.M. Compound,

Podili-523240

Prakasam distt. ….. Petitioner

And

1. The Chairman,
   State Bank of India,
   Central office,
   Mumbai.
2. The Chief General Manager,
   (Personnel)
   State Bank of India,
   Bank Street
   Hyderabad.
3. The Branch Manager,
   State Bank of India ,
   Podili,
   Prakasam dist.
4. The Regional Manager,
   State Bank of India,
   Zonal Office,
   Tirupathi. …..Respondents

Appearances:

For the Petitioner : M/s. S. Prasada Rao, Advocates

For the Respondent: Sri Y. Ranjeeth Reddy, Advocate

AWARD

Sri Gudur Issac who worked as Messenger (who will be referred to as the workman) has filed this petition under Sec. 2A(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 against the Respondents State Bank of India seeking for reinstatement into service as Messenger duly granting all the consequential benefits such as continuity of service, back wages and all other attendant benefits etc., and such other reliefs as this court may deem fit. Earlier Petitioner has filed this dispute before the Labour Court, Guntur for adjudication and later the same has been transferred to this Tribunal bearing ID No. 265/99, as per orders of Central Government vide Lr.No.H-11026/1/2001-IR(C.II) dated 18.10.2001 and registered, numbered in this Tribunal as LC No. 24 /2003.

2. Before unfolding the factual matrix of the instant industrial dispute it would be apposite to have a bird eye view of a chequered history of the instant industrial dispute. Earlier instant industrial dispute along with the batch cases was decided by this Tribunal vide common award dated 17.5.2005 and the reference was answered in favour of the Respondent and against the Workman. That said common award dated 17.5.2005 was challenged by the aggrieved Workmen in various Writ petition No.6470/2014 along with batch of writ petitions before the Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh and Hon'ble High Court vide its' judgement dated 23.6.2014 allowed all batch of writ petitions and set aside the common award dated 17.5.2005 passed in ID No.222 of 2001 and other batch of ID cases by Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad and the Respondent management of State Bank of India was directed to reengage the Writ Petitioners in position, which they have been occupying prior to their termination and further directed to consider their cases for regularization as and when the substantive vacancy arises. This judgement dated 23.6.2014 of Hon'ble High Court of AP, passed in WP No.6470/2014 and batch petitions was challenged by Respondent management before the Hon'ble High Court in Writ Appeal No. 1268 of 2014. The aforesaid Writ Appeals No.1268/2014 and other Writ Appeals were decided by Division Bench of High Court of Andhra Pradesh by a common judgement dated 20.3.2019. Hon'ble High Court in aforesaid Writ Appeal was pleased to pass the order which is extracted as below:-

" 7. Hearing the learned senior counsel for the SBI and the learned senior counsel for the contesting unofficial Respondents, we see that while the learned single Judge was justified in setting aside the award af the Tribunal, the proper course to be adopted was to remit all the cases to the Tribunal. This we say for reasons more than one. Firstly, in such matters, claims have to be decided on individual basis, as different persons have different claims as to the length of officiation or discharge of duties and functions; quality of engagement, drawings, accounting of the post for each one of them, who have worked etc. All these issues will not be the same in all the cases. Therefore, each case ought to have been directed to be decided by the Tribunal afresh on individual basis. The second and most important aspect is the learned single Judge has in one go ordered re-employment of all the workmen. This is not a relief that

could have been granted without answering the individual issues; each issue relating to each case could not have been decided by the writ Court within the format of its adjudication procedures and scope. The adjudicating body, which has to do that activity, is the Industrial Tribunal. Therefore, we are of the view that while we would sustain the order of the learned singe Judge insofar as it interfered and sets aside the award of the Tribunal, the further findings and directions, issued through the impugned order have to go and the individual cases have to be sent back for consideration of the Tribunal. Such further procedure before the Tribunal will have to be carried forward with the materials already on record and also by affording an opportunity to the persons, who have claims as well as the management to place their rival contentions and further material before the Tribunal. The learned counsel appearing for the workmen are justified in pointing out that enormous delay has already happened and further action by the Tribunal in this line may be expedited.

9. In the result, these writ appeals are ordered;

(1) affirming the impugned common order of the learned single Judge to the extent it sets aside the common award dated 17.05.2005 of the Industrial Tribunal;

(2) the further findings and directions issued through the impugned common order are vacated:

(3) all the matters shall be remitted to the Industrial Tribunal with a direction to dispose of them within an outer limit of five (5) months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order; and,

(4) the parties to make appearance before the Tribunal on the given date."

Thus, in view of the above direction of Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh in W.A.No.1268 of 2014 and batch cases. This Tribunal has taken up the matter of industrial dispute for hearing and deciding it afresh in view of the aforesaid guidelines laid down by the Hon'ble High Court in Writ Appeal No.1268/2014 vide judgement dated 20.3.019.

3. The factual matrix of instant industrial dispute as narrated by the Workman in his claim statement are that, the Workman joined in the service of the management institution as Messenger from 1983 to 1985, and has rendered unblemished service spreading over a period of about 2 years. The Respondent has terminated services of Workman by oral orders with effect from the year 1985. Further, it is submitted that the management of Respondent bank decided to give a chance to temporarily employed personnel "found suitable for permanent appointment" by wait-listing them by offering permanent appointment or waitlisting till such opportunity arises.

4. That on 17.11.1987 a settlement was reached between All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and the Management of State Bank of India - settlement one, under this settlement three categories of employees were listed. That is, A) those who have completed 240 days in 12 months or less after 1.7.1975. B) those who have completed 270 days in any continuous block of 36 calendar months after 1.7.1975. C) (i) those who have completed minimum of 30 days aggregate temporary service in any calendar year after 1.7.1975 or (ii) 70 days aggregate temporary service in continuous block of 36 months after 1.7.1975.

5. The persons who satisfied in all the above 4 categories were to be interviewed by a selection committee and the said selection committee would determine the suitability of the said candidate for permanent appointment. Therefore, the bank prescribed certain qualifications and from among the candidates satisfying the qualifications the suitable candidates were enlisted by a selection committee. The Clause 7 of the said agreement provided with the selected candidate would be wait listed in order of their respective categorization and the selected panel would be valid upto December, 1991. Clause 10 of the settlement specifically provided that henceforth. "there will be no temporary appointments in the subordinate cadre", except on a restrictive basis in the specified category, "from amongst empanelled candidates as per existing guidelines of the bank". The Workman further submits that consequent upon the said agreement and the draft, a notification was issued in the newspapers. The last date for responding to the advertisement was 30.8.1988. A written examination followed by viva-voce in May, 1989 was held. A selected panel was prepared, as per Clause 7 of the agreement, ie. Settlement No.1, the selected panel was to be valid upto December, 1991, the Workman submits that circular was issued on 26.4.91 by the said letter it is mentioned that the terms of the agreement dated 17.11.87 was modified vide second agreement dated 16.7.88 was entered into between the parties. In terms of the said agreement a chance was to be given, "to all eligible temporary employees for permanent appointments. The appointments were against the vacancies likely to arise during the years 1995-96, circular made it clear that in view of the enormity of the problem an extension of the currency of the panel, eligible temporary employees who have been empanelled could not appear in the earlier interviews and have been pursuing their cases thereafter, "will be given another chance to appear for interview".

6. Workman submits that there were total five settlements. The settlement dated 17.11.87 is the 1st settlement (Ex M1), settlement dated 16.7.88 is 2nd settlement (Ex M2), settlement dated 27.10.88 is the 3rd settlement (Ex M3), then settlement dated 9.1.91 is 4th settlement and settlement dated 30.7.96 is 5th settlement (Ex M6). In between there is minutes of conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.95 marked as Ex M5. That due to all these settlements which were extended by subsequent settlements thereby created reasonable expectations in the list of the selected candidates arose with that it's a question of time their appointments or services would be

regularized in the services of the bank. The Workman was working with the bank on temporary basis was under the bonafide hope that sooner his services will be regularized with the bank. He is thereby closed all his options elsewhere. It is needless to point out that employing person to whom hope of employment in substantial terms was made is a facet of Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

7. Further Workman submits that the Government of India issued Circular No. F-3/3/104/87-IR, dated 16.8.1990. Under said circular the chief Executives of all public sector banks including the Management herein were specifically instructed that until the problem of existing temporary employees is fully resolved, no bank is permitted to make any permanent appointments. That some of the persons similarly situated like this Workman aggrieved by the inaction on the part of the management of the bank is not regularizing their services from out of the selected panel and not clearly focusing the vacancy position, filed W.P. No. 4194/97 before Hon'ble High court of A.P.. It is specifically averred in the said writ petition that the Management of the bank had failed to implement the settlement and that it violates the various fundamental rights guaranteed under the constitution of India. The Hon'ble High court of A.P .. by order dated 5.3.97 directed the bank to implement the settlement as amended from time to time. It also directed the bank to carry out the terms of settlement before the expiry of March, 1997. The Hon'ble High Court also recorded finding that the Bank cannot escape its liability of enforcement of the Settlement. In view of the directions given by the High Court all candidates whose names appeared in the select panels prepared on the basis of the agreement entered into on 17.11.87 under which the panel was valid upto December, 1991, and on the basis of a settlement dated 27.10.1988 whereby the panels were made alive upto 31.3.1997 under which the panel was valid upto December, 1999. The other agreement dated 16.7.1988 under which the panel was valid upto 1992 and on the basis of the settlement dated 27.10.1998 whereby the panels were made alive upto 31.3.1997 were under the bonafide impression that their cases will be considered for regularization and were living on the basis of the said reasonable expectation. Unfortunately, contrary to the aforesaid directions given by the High Court and contrary to the settlements entered into between the parties, the bank issued proceedings dated 25.3.1997, dated 27.3.1997 and 31.3.1997 instructing the various authorities of the Management not to continue the temporary employees those who are in services of the bank from 1.4.97. The said order was followed by the Management. Aggrieved by the said action the Workman herein and similarly situated candidates have filed a writ petition before the Hon'ble High Court and by way of Writ Petition No.9206/97 seeking a declaration that the proceedings issued by the Deputy General Manager and the Assistant General Manager (Respondents 3,4 and 5 therein) on 25.3.97, 27.3.97 and 31.3.97 as illegal and also non-continuance of the Workmen therein in service by absorbing them in the services of the bank as violative of Section 2(p) and 18(1) read with Rule 58 of Central Rules and sought for specific direction to the bank to absorb them in service.

8. Further, Workman submits that in the counter affidavit filed in Writ Petition No.9206/97, the bank has submitted that it has about 805 branches in Andhra Pradesh alone. It has stated that due to exigencies of circumstances and on account of the urgent need in its banks, it employed temporary employees in subordinate cadre. It is pertinent to mention that it does not state the urgent or need or the nature of temporary employees that it had engaged. Enquiry into the same would reveal that the stand taken by the bank either on the ground of urgent need or of temporary employees is a façade to perpetuate unfair labour practice. It is designed to on the one hand, keep the employed in the erroneous zone of hope and on the other to ensure that benefits that a model employer will extend under various statutes to its employees is not required to be borne out by the bank. A reading of the counter affidavit would show that the bank would opines that being just fair and reasonable are which obviously is reprehensible and is a facet of unfair labour practice.

9. The Workman submits that the bank had referred in its counter affidavit to three settlements dated 17.11.87, 16.7.88 and 27.10.88. The bank in the guise of extending the benefits of the circular of Government dated 16.8.90 stated in its counter affidavit that as follows:

"Government of India, vide its letter dated 16.8.1990, issued guidelines to all the public sector banks with regard to recruitment and absorption of temporary employees in public sector banks. The said guidelines were issued to implement on the lines of the approach paper on the issue provided by a committee constituted in this regard. The Government of India guidelines made it clear that all the public sector banks may follow the provisions laid down in the approach paper.

The approach paper specified that the cases of temporary employees who had put in not less than 240 days of temporary service in 12 consecutive Months and who are entitled to benefit of Section 25-F may be decided by entering into a settlement with the representative union. In respect of temporary employees who had put in less than 240 days of service in 12 consecutive months or less, a settlement could be avoided and however if the Management so desired, they could enter into a conciliation settlement with the representative union. Para 6(h), it is mentioned that only those temporary employees who had put in temporary service of 90 or more days after 1.1 1982 would be eligible for considering under the scheme. Although the Government guidelines envisaged for a settlement in respect of employees who had put in temporary service of 90 or more days, the bank by way of further concession entered into settlements Even in respect of those who had put in less than 90 days. As such, it could be Seen that the settlements are more beneficial to the temporary employees concerned. The approach paper also specify at para 6(c)

that the banks would provide one time opportunity to all the temporary employees and for that purpose temporary employees worked in the bank on or after 1.1.1982 could be considered for re-employment in terms of the scheme. The Respondents have gone further wherein even persons working after 1975 were also considered.

As could be seen from the above, there was a genuine effort on the part of the Respondent bank to provide permanent employment for as many as possible subject to availability of the vacancies.

It is further submitted that at para 6(k) of the approach paper, it was made clear that this would be one time exercise in full and final settlement of all the aims and disputes for the past period in respect of temporary workmen covered by the settlement. This would mean that the Government of India guidelines would cover only those persons who were temporarily employed for the period specified therein and not otherwise. As such, it is submitted that the Respondents have not only followed the Government of India guidelines but in fact covered cases of the employees who had worked for less than 90 days. As such, question of violation does not arise and in any case those were only broad guidelines and not directives".

10. The Workman submits that the bank also referred a subsequent settlement dated 9.1.1991 wherein there is a clause to the effect- that the panel of temporary employees and the panel of daily wage employees will be operated to a particular period. Therefore, their cases will not be considered. The Management herein relying upon this settlement in their impugned action. It is submitted that even the settlement dated 9.1.1991 will not empower the management to terminate the services of the temporary employees who are working in the bank services like the Workman herein as it does not specify the termination of the employees. In fact there are so many vacancies wherein the Management has engaged several new persons as temporary messengers/ attendars/ sweepers etc., even after the judgment of Hon'ble High Court without considering the cases of the similarly situated candidates like the Workman herein. It is submitted inspite of engaging fresh candidates as is now being done by the Management they would have continued the similarly situated candidates like the Workman herein in the services of the bank and consider their cases for absorption in view of the circulars issued by Central Government as well as the directions of this Hon'ble Court in Writ Petition No.4194/97, dated 5.3.97. In view of the circulars issued by the Central Government, the Management should not have relied upon the settlement dated 9.1.1991. Hence, the impugned action of the Management is illegal, unjust, violative of fundamental rights such as Articles 14,16 and 21 of the Constitution of India.

11. The Workman submits that in W.P. No.4194/97 filed by the union of temporary employees where in they have complained about the non- implementation of the settlements arrived between the parties and sought for absorption. Such employees in the bank services on permanent basis before the date fixed for carrying out the terms of settlement, the Court held that the members of the union had been empanelled in the list, they were not regularized and the time was going to run out to the near future and the Respondent bank and its officers cannot escape from the liability of enforcing the settlement which has been reached and therefore directed that the bank and the officers shall implement the settlement dated 17.11.87 as amended from time to time before the expiry of 31.3.97.

12. Further, it is submitted that in the clause of Settlement it is specifically mentioned that the workmen to be absorbed/appointed in the bank prohibiting any temporary appointments subsequent to the date of settlement even the authorities want to make temporary appointments that should be made only from among the empanelled can be appointed either for temporary vacancy or permanent vacancy except from among the empanelled candidates like the Workman and that should be continued till they are absorbed. The management committed unfair labour practices and terminated the services of the candidates with effect from the year 1985 which is arbitrary, discriminatory, contrary to their own guidelines and violative of the constitutional provisions which are guaranteed in Chapter-III of the Constitution of India.

13. The Workman submits that it is strange as to how the panels were allowed to lapse by a so-called Memorandum of Understanding dated 25.2.1997, that the action of terminating such employees like the Workman by virtue of an impugned oral proceedings without implementing the settlement would be illegal and unfair labour practice which cannot be allowed to be perpetuated. That the discontinuance of the Workman after 31.3.97 who had served in the bank in any capacity amounts to retrenchment. It could not have been done without any notice and it violates Sec.25FF of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and the said action is violative of principles of natural justice guaranteed under Chapter III of the Constitution of India. This amounts to retrenchment without one month's notice and taken in view of such notice. Thus, the main proceedings issued by the Respondent is without jurisdiction and is arbitrary, illegal and therefore liable to be quashed. That the alleged Memorandum of Understanding dated 27.2.97, Ex.M5 does not own any legal entity, as the said Memorandum of Understanding is not published anywhere to brought to the notice of the Workman whose rights are being affected. It is submitted that Management did not adhere to the procedure envisaged by the Central Government in its' instructions dated 16.8.90 in the year 1995. The same was not followed in the year 1997 despite there being vacancies. The management has followed the procedure of calling candidates through Employment exchange instead of giving chance to the empanelled candidates like the Workman here. It is pertinent to mention here that the Respondent Management sent letters to the all similarly situated candidates like the Workman in the month of June, 1997, subsequent to the passing of impugned termination orders. After knowing the facts that the candidates are litigating, the Management refused to engage these candidates. It is once again reiterated that the panels are meant for absorption but not for termination. It was the duty of the

Management to engage the empanelled candidates like the Workman even in temporary vacancies till they are absorbed permanently in regular vacancies. Hence, the action of the Respondent Management terminating the services of the Workman by oral order dated 31.3.97 is unjust, illegal, violative of principles of natural justice and hence, the Management be directed to reinstate and absorb the Workman and to grant all incidental and consequential benefits.

14. Per contra, Respondent had filed counter and made a contentions that the reference is not tenable and contrary to the provisions of I.D. Act, 1947. Respondent submitted that to tide over severe sub-ordinate staff constraints which arose out of leave vacancies, exigencies, etc., and also owning to the restrictions imposed by the Government of India/Reserve Bank of India on intake of staff, the Respondent bank used to engage sub-ordinate staff like messengers, sweepers, sweeper cum water boys, etc., depending on the availability of work on purely temporary basis for the smooth and uninterrupted functioning of the branches. It is submitted that the All India State Bank of India Staff Federation which represents majority of the employees in the State Bank of India comprising about 98% of the work force as its' members espoused the cause of temporary employees who have put in less than 240 days of temporary service in 12 calendar months in the bank and who were ineligible for any protection under Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 to give a chance for being considered for absorption and permanent appointments.

15. Discussions were held and on 17.11.1987 an agreement was signed between the federation and the Management bank under Sec. 2(p) read with Sec 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules 1957. A copy of the said settlement dated 17.11.87 which may be herein after referred as first settlement is filed and 4 categories were made as it has already been mentioned in the claim statement above, it need not be repeated here. In the first settlement, it was agreed that the temporary employees as categorized would be given a chance for being considered for permanent appointment in the bank's service against the vacancies which are likely to arise during the period 1987 to 1991. On 16.7.88 second settlement was arrived between the Federation and the Bank whereby it was agreed to substitute the period of consideration of vacancies as 1987 to 1992 in place of 1987 to 1991 as contemplated under the first settlement dated 17.11.1987. This is the second settlement. A 3rd settlement was entered into on 27.10.88 and it was agreed that the bank's service against the vacancies likely to arise from 1988 to 1992 was to be considered. Government of India vide its letter dated 16.8.90 issued guidelines to all the public sector banks with regard to recruitment and absorption of temporary employees in public sector banks. The said guidelines were issued to implement on the lines of approach paper on the issue provided by a committee constituted in this regard. Government of India guidelines made it clear that all the public sector banks may follow the provisions laid down in the approach paper. The approach paper specified that the cases of temporary service in 12 consecutive months and who are entitled to benefit of Sec.25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 may be decided by entering into a settlement with the representative union. In respect of temporary employees who had put in less than 240 days of service in 12 consecutive months or less, a settlement could be avoided and however if the Management so desired they could enter into a conciliation settlement with the representative union. In para. 6(h) it is mentioned that only those temporary employees who had put in temporary service of 90 days or more days after 1.1.82 would be eligible for considering under the scheme. Although the Government guidelines envisaged for a settlement in respect of employees who had put in temporary service of 90 days or more days, the bank by way of a further concession entered into settlements. Even in respect of those who had put in less than 90 days and also the bank went a step further and said those persons who are working after 1975 were also considered. Hence, there was a genuine effort on the part of the Respondent bank to provide as many as possible jobs subject to the availability of the vacancies. However, para 6 (k) of the approach paper made it clear that it is a one time, exercise in full and final, settlement of all the claims and disputes for the past period, in respect of temporary workmen covered by the settlement. Another settlement was entered on 9.1.91 herein after referred as 4th settlement and the time limit was extended upto 1994 and separate panel was prepared for temporary employees, casual/daily wagers. It was agreed that while vacancies arising between 1988 to 1994 in respect of temporary employees and in respect of casual/daily wagers, they can be considered for the vacancies arising between 1995-96 only.

16. It is submitted that the administrative set up of the Hyderabad Local Head Office comprises of four Zonal Offices (Zones) at Hyderabad, Vijayawada, Visakhapatnam and Tirupathi covering all the Districts of Andhra Pradesh. In terms of the settlement the Management after following the procedure laid down therein prepared the panels of qualified candidates of temporary employees denoted as 1989 panel and also panel of casual/daily wagers denoted as 1992 panel for giving a chance for being considered for permanent absorption. These panels were prepared zone-wise separately for messengers and non-messengers in the descending order of temporary service put in by the candidates during the stipulated period i.e., 1.7.1975 to 31.7.1988. That the Federation approached the Regional Labour Commissioner(C) for implementation of bi-partite settlement in respect of absorption of temporary employees. The Regional Labour Commissioner(C) conducted conciliation proceedings and an agreement was arrived between the Federation and the bank. It was agreed that it would be kept alive upto March, 1997. A copy of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.2.1995 signed by the parties is filed as material paper. A settlement was arrived

at and an agreement was signed between the Federation and the Management bank on 30.7.1996 under Sec.2 (p) read with Sec.18(1) of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957, which is hereinafter called as 5th settlement. That on 27.2.1997 a Memorandum of understanding was also signed by the federation's affiliate and the bank Management recording the fact that the exercise of identifying the messengerial vacancies as on 31.12.1994 has since been completed by Central Office and thereby 403 messengerial vacancies were sanctioned . It was agreed that these vacancies may be filled from 1989 panel of temporary employees after effecting conversion from full time non-messengerial staff in the usual manner and the agreement was reached accordingly. It was agreed between the Federation's affiliate and the Management bank that in terms of the settlement dated 30.7.1996 both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees would lapse on 31.3.1997. That as agreed upon vacancies were filled from the panels. The Workman who has put in an aggregate temporary service of less than 240 days in a continuous block of 12 months period during 1.7.1975 to 31.7.1988 has no right to seek a direction to consider his candidature for absorption in the Management bank under any rule/law except under the settlement entered into thereon.

17. Respondent contended that, in fact, the case of the Workman can be considered under all the five settlements having got his case considered under provisions of these settlements. All the other provisions and terms of the settlements are also binding on him/her. The Management bank has not violated any of the provisions of the terms of the said settlement. That the very preparation and maintenance of panel is in compliance of the terms agreed under these settlements. These settlements were time bound and they ceased to exist on 31.3.1997. That the bank has never promised that all the candidates in the panel will be absorbed. In the advertisement itself it was made clear that candidates will be considered for absorption in the vacancies that may arise upto 1992. Keeping alive the panels after 31.3.1997 is contrary to the settlements arrived between the State Bank of India Staff Federation and the Management bank. That the settlements are binding on the parties. The Workman is also bound under the terms of the said settlement. The settlement does not suffer from any ambiguity as their language is very clear. The right under the settlements is to give them a chance to be considered for future appointment in the bank's services against the vacancies likely to arise. The settlements were effected to balance the expectations of the temporary employees to be absorbed in permanent service as against the constitutional rights for all eligible persons to be considered for employment every time a vacancy arises. That the alleged dispute including the demand for reinstatement has to be decided in this context. It is submitted that the period of panel list got expired on 31.3.97 and it is an integral term of the settlement and cannot be modified in any proceedings under the law. These temporary employees who unfortunately could not be accommodated for want of vacancies have no further rights to be considered for regularization. That the Hon'ble High Court in WP No.12964/94, held as follows, "It is needless to state that the settlement arrived at between the All India State Bank of India Staff Federation which, is the majority union and the bank Management is binding on the Workmen also. It is not at all the case of the Workman that any of the terms of the settlement has been violated by the bank's Management. If the Workman had worked in the bank on part-time basis before 31.5.94, that itself would not vest in him a right to claim that his services should be regularized on permanent basis against a full time cadre post. The claim put forth by the Workman in the present petition is therefore misconceived and not tenable. However, it is open to the Workman to claim any right which flows from the settlement between the union and the bank Management. As already pointed out that it is not the grievance of the Workman that some right which has flown from the settlement in favour of the Workman has been denied by the bank Management. Therefore, I do not find any ground, let alone substantial ground, to grant the kind of relief sought for by the Workman. Writ Petition fails and is accordingly dismissed. No costs."

18. Further, it is contended that if the panels were not lapsed at the end of designated period and allowed to be continued it would result in making the contracts of temporary employment indirectly permanent through back door entry, which would not only be contrary to the settlements but also to Articles 14 and 16 of Constitution of India and deprive the chances of original claimants who would Come through proper recruitment procedure. As their rights have been crystallized by operation of the settlements. Hence, there is no question of any Legitimate expectation being violated.

19. Similarly placed ex-employees filed WP No.9206/1995 and the batch before the Hon'ble High Court of A.P. and the learned Single Judge allowed the Writ Petitions. Aggrieved by the same WA No.86/98 and the batch was filed and the Division Bench set aside the order of the Single Judge. Thereafter the ex-temporary employees filed Special Leave Petition No.11886-11888 of 1998 before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India also dismissed the SLP. Therefore, reference to the Judgement of the Learned Single Judge in WP No.9206/97 is of no consequences as the same has already been set aside. The observations made in the Judgements cannot be relied upon for any purpose what so ever. The question of operation of Sec.25F would not come into play. Further the issue is covered by various Judgements of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India and various Hon'ble High Courts. Hence, the reference may be ordered that the Workman is not entitled for any relief.

20. In order to fortify his claim Workman has examined himself as WW1 and not filed any documents in evidence.

21. On the other hand, Respondent has examined witness MW1 Sri I.S. Appa Rao and this witness has exhibited 12 documents, marked as Ex.M1 to M12. The details of these documents are as follows:-

Ex.M.1 is the Settlement dated 17.11.1987. Ex.M2 is the Settlement dated 16.7.1988. Ex.M3 is the Settlement dated 27.10.1988. Ex.M4 is the Settlement dated 9.1.1991. Ex.M5 is the Minutes of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.1995. Ex.M6 is the Settlement dated 30.7.1996. Ex.M7 is the Memorandum of Understanding dt. 27.2.1997. Ex.M8 is the Particulars of 1989 Messengerial Panel. Ex.M9 is the Particulars of 1989 Non-Messengerial Panel. Ex.M10 is the Particulars of 1992 General Attendant Panel. Ex.M11 is the Judgment of Hon'ble High Court of A.P. in Writ Appeal No.86/98 dt.1.5.1998. Ex.M12 is the Judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in SLP No. 11886-11888 of 1998 dt.10.8.1998.

22. Apart from afore mentioned documents, Learned Counsel for Workman has also filed a long list of various judgements of Hon'ble Supreme Court as well as Hon'ble High Court, which we will discuss at appropriate place in this Award.

23. Heard the argument of Learned Counsel for Workman as well as for Respondent.

24. On the basis of rival pleadings of both the parties and submissions made by the Learned Counsel for both the parties, following points arise for determination in the industrial dispute :-

I. Whether the 1st settlement dated 17.11.1987, 2nd settlement dated 16.7.1988, 3rd settlement dated 27.10.1988, 4th settlement dated 9.1.1991 and 5th settlement dated 30.7.1996 entered into between State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and also Memorandum of Understanding are binding upon both the parties?

II. Whether the action of State Bank of India, in terminating the services of Workman Sri Gudur Issac, a Messenger with effect from the year 1985 is justified?

III. Whether the Workman is entitled for absorption on permanent post in the Branch of Respondent management as per averments made by him in the claim statement?

IV. To what relief if any the Workman is entitled for?

Findings:-

25. Point No.I:- Undisputedly settlements dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988, 9.1.1991 and 30.7.1996, minutes of conciliation proceedings and memorandum of understanding dated 27.2.1997 were executed between the State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation under section 2(p) and 18 (1) of I.D. Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Disputes (Central Rules), 1957.

Section 2(p) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 as follows:-

(p) "settlement" means a settlement arrived at in the course of conciliation proceeding and includes a written agreement between the employer and workmen arrived at otherwise than in the course of conciliation proceeding where such agreement has been signed by the parties thereto in such manner as may be prescribed and a copy thereof has been sent to an officer authorised in this behalf by the appropriate Government and the conciliation officer;

Section 18(1) provides as follows:-

18. Persons on whom settlements and awards are binding.

- [(1) A settlement arrived at by agreement between the employer and Workman otherwise than in the course of conciliation proceeding shall be binding on the parties to the agreement.

Therefore, in view of the provision contained u/s.18 (1) I.D. Act, 1947, terms and conditions enumerated in the aforesaid settlements are binding on the parties to the agreement. The Learned Counsel for Workman has argued that the Workman after going through the selection procedure has successfully been listed in the panel for appointment on the permanent basis in the Respondent management and the empanelled list has to be valid till last person in the empanelled list is appointed on permanent basis. But the impugned order dated 25.3.97, 27.3.97 and 31.3.97, has been issued by Respondent management thereby the services of the Workman has been terminated and the said order is not in consonance of the terms of the agreement entered into between the parties. Further, Workman submits that the Respondent in the 5th settlement has mentioned the date i.e., 31.3.1997 for lapse of empanel list which is illegal and that is not binding upon the Workman. The condition of lapse of empanelment list on 31.3.97 incorporated in the aforesaid 5th settlement, is arbitrary and illegal.

26. The perusal of the impugned order dated 25.3.1997 goes to reveal that the Chief/Branch Manager, SBI Zonal Office has issued the letter to all the branches with regard to the subject not to make any temporary appointments in the Branch in messengerial category from the year 1985. The extract of the said letter is given below:-

"We have been advised by the Deputy General Manager, Zonal Office, Hyderabad that as both the panels of temporary employees of 1989 and daily wagers/casual labours of 1992 will lapse by 31.3.1997, it has been decided by Central Office not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial category from the year 1985."

Thus, from the contents of the aforesaid letter, it manifest that Head Office of State Bank of India vide letter dated 25.3.1997 has issued direction to all its branches not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial category from the year 1985 due to reason of lapse of both panels i.e., 1989 & 1992 on 31.3.1997 as per terms of settlements entered into by both parties. Further, the contents of the subsequent letter dated 27.3.1997 issued by Respondent Management is also direction to Branch Manager, State Bank of India not to make any temporary messengerial category appointment with effect from the year 1985 and it has also been communicated to all concerned that the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers maintained by Zonal offices stand lapsed from 31.1.1997. Further, office order dated 31.3.1997 has been issued by Respondent management that goes to reveal that the said office order has been issued to this effect that, "Consequent on absorption of temporary employees in permanent cadre, it has been decided by the competent authority that no one onwards, no further daily labour or temporary employees/appointments should be resorted to/engaged/employed." Therefore, it reflects from the contents of the aforesaid orders that the temporary appointment in messengerial category and daily labour has been stopped by the Respondent management with effect from the year 1985 because of the lapsed of panel of temporary workers and daily wagers by 31.3.1997. The agreement for lapse of both the panels on 31.3.1997 is contained in the 5th settlement which has been arrived at between the parties on dated 30.7.1996 with the consensus of both the parties. Therefore, Workman can not challenge the terms and conditions contained in settlement dated 30.7.1996 regarding lapse of panel on 31.3.1997 as agreed between State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation. As per provision contained u/s.18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 the said Agreement dated 30.7.1996 is binding on both the parties.

In the case of **Allied Sales Corporation Secunderabad vs.The Authority Under Andhra Pradesh..... 1990 II LLJ 510 AP para 414, Hon'ble Court have held:-**

"*4. There was a settlement between the Management and the workmen under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act on 25th April 1983 under which the age of superannuation of the workmen was fixed at 55 years. The settlement was to be in force upto 30th June 1986 and the next settlement, incorporating practically the same terms, was again entered into on 4th February 1987 under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act. There is no dispute that these settlements are under Section 18(1).*

14. Now the Authority constituted under Section 41(1) of the Act is an authority with very limited jurisdiction. It can only decide in the first appeal whether a termination by the management is valid or not and is within the parameters of Section 40 of the Act. The said Authority, in our view, has absolutely no jurisdiction to decide whether a settlement entered into under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act between the representatives of the Workmen and of the Management, is vitiated by undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion on the part of the Management. The Authority, namely, the Assistant Commissioner of Labour, was never intended by the A.P. Legislature to have jurisdiction to go into the question of the validity of a settlement arrived at under Section 18 of the Industrial Disputes Act by an Industrial Court. That Parliament has, in fact, constituted Industrial Courts under the Industrial Disputes Act, with extensive powers cannot be disputed. What we mean to say is that the Authority under Section 41(1) of the A.P. Act has no jurisdiction what-so-ever either to question or to decide about the validity of any such settlements. If parties to a settlement have a grievance about the validity of a settlement, it is for them to agitate the matter before the appropriate forum and they cannot ask an Authority constituted under Section 41(1) of the A.P. Shops and Establishments Act, 1966 with limited jurisdiction, to go into any such question and, that too, incidentally while deciding whether retirement as per the contract of employment, is legal or not."

It is not the case of Workman that aforesaid settlements are vitiated by undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion on the part of the management. If the Workman feeling aggrieved by any terms of settlement/ agreement on the aforementioned grounds then he can challenge of settlement before a competent authority under the Act, 1947. But here in the instant matter it is not a case of Workman that aforementioned settlement has been entered into between the parties on the ground of undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion. Therefore, Workman is barred to raise any objection in respect of fixing the date of lapse of both panels on 31.3.1997 as agreed between both the parties and Workman can not challenge any terms of said Agreement.

Further in the case of **Herbertsons Limited Vs. Workmen of Herbertsons Limited and Ors, 1977 AIR 322,** Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

The Tribunal thought that the question of the quantum of membership of the 2nd Respondent did not call for a finding at all in view of 1his Court's order. As observed above that was not a correct assumption. On the other hand, we feel that this view of the Tribunal has led it to approach the matter in an entirely erroneous manner. The Tribunal is, rightly enough, conscious that under section 18 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act the settlement was binding on the company and the members of the 3rd Respondent union. Even so, the Tribunal devoted nearly half of its order in scanning the evidence given by the company and Respondent No. 3 to find out whether the terms of the settlement had been explained by the President of the union to the workmen or not and whether the workers voluntarily accepted the settlement knowing all the "consequences". This to our mind is again an entirely wrong approach.

"When a recognised union negotiates with an employer the workers as individuals do not come into the picture. It is not necessary that each individual worker should know the implications of the settlement since a recognised union, which is expected to protect the legitimate interests of labour, enters into a settlement in the best interests of labour.

This would be the normal rule. We cannot altogether rule out exceptional cases where there may be allegations of mala fides, fraud or even corruption or other induce- ments. Nothing of that kind has been suggested against the President of the 3rd Respondent in this case. That being the position, prima facie, this is a settlement in the course of collective bargaining and, therefore, is entitled to due weight and consideration.

It is not possible to scan the settlement in bits and pieces and hold some parts good and acceptable and others bad. Unless it can be demonstrated that the objectionable portion is such that it completely outweighs all the other advantages gained the Court will be slow to hold a settle- ment as unfair and unjust. The settlement has to be accepted or rejected as a whole and we are unable to reject it as a whole as unfair or unjust. Even before this Court the 3rd Respondent representing admittedly the large majority of the workmen has stood by this settlement and that is a strong factor which it is difficult to ignore. As stated elsewhere in the judgment, we cannot also be oblivious of the fact that all workmen of the company have accepted the settlement. Besides, the period of settlement has since expired and we are informed that the employer and the 3rd Respondent are negotiating another settlement with further improvements. These factors, apart from what has been stated above, and the need for industrial peace and harmony when a union backed by a large majority of workmen has accepted a settlement in the course of collective bargaining have impelled us not to interfere with this settlement. That being the position, we unhold the settlement as fair and just and order that the award of the Tribunal shall be substituted by the settlement dated October 18, 1973. The said settlement shall be the substituted award. The appeal is disposed of accordingly. There will be no order as to costs."

Therefore, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above, the contention of the Workman that the date fixed for lapse of empanelled list on 31.3.1997 for appointment to the permanent post vide 5th Settlement dated 30.7.1996 is arbitrary, illegal is not untenable. The recognized union of Workmen has negotiated with the Respondent Bank Management representing large number of Workmen and the Workman as individual do not come into picture. Workman in the instant case has work as temporary Workmen in the Respondent Branch and in response of Notification he had applied for inclusion of his name in the panel and he was selected for inclusion his name in the panel list to be utilized for absorption of such Workman to permanent post in order of their seniority in the list. The Settlement dated 30.7.1996 between State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation under Sec.2(p) and Sec.18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 has clearly provided as regard non-messengerial position and it is agreed that all such posts sanctioned fallen vacant upto 31.3.1997 shall be filled before empanel list is allowed to lapse. Thus, in view of law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, in the instant case, Agreement dated 30.7.1996 was entered into between both the parties in respect of lapsing of the both the panels on 31.3.1997 and absorption of the Workmen from panel list was subject to availability of vacancy of post likely to arise upto 31.3.1997, have a binding force on Workman as well as management of State Bank of India in view of provision contained under section 18 (1) of I.D. Act, 1947.

Thus, Point No.I is answered against the Workman and in favour of the Respondent.

27. **Point No.II**:- Firstly, it is submitted on behalf of the Workman that the Respondent has terminated his services by oral order on the year 1985 without issuing any notice or paying any salary or compensation in lieu thereof. Therefore, the termination order of the Workman from service is in violation of provision contained Under Section 25 F of I.D. Act, 1947. Therefore, the order is liable to be set aside.

28. On the other hand, Respondent counsel contended that Workman has not worked for 240 days in any preceding calendar year. Therefore, reference of the industrial dispute is not relevant. In this context, the Workman has examined himself as WW1 who has reiterated that Workman has been terminated from service by Respondent on the year 1985 without notice of salary or compensation in lieu thereof. Before examining the claim of the Workman on merit it would be apposite to reproduce the provision contained under section 25 F:-

Section 25F provides:-

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].

Compensation to workmen in case of transfer of undertakings.

Section 25B defines the term continuous service which provides

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 authorized 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;

In order to prove the fact of 240 days of service within 12 months of a calendar year just preceding from the date of termination, the initial burden of proof lies upon the Workman and the Workman has to prove this factum by adducing his oral as well as documentary evidence in support of his claim.

Further, how to calculate 240 days of service by the Workman in a calendar year. In this context the reference of decisions of Hon'ble Supreme Court is relevant and the same are discussed below:-

In Rajasthan State Ganganagar S. Mills Ltd. v. State of Rajasthan and Anr. (2004) Apex Court held:

"It was the case of the Workman that he had worked for more than 240 days in the year concerned. This claim was denied by the appellant. It was for the claimant to lead evidence to show that he had worked for 240 days in the year preceding the date of his termination. He has filed an affidavit. It is statement which is in his favor and that cannot be regarded as sufficient evidence for any Court or Tribunal to come to the conclusion that in fact the claimant had worked for 240 days in a year These aspects were highlighted in Range Forest Officer v. S.T. Hadimani (2002 (3) SCC 25. No proof of receipt of salary or wages for 240 days or order or record in that regard was produced. Mere non-production of the muster roll for a particular period was not sufficient for the Labour Court held that the Workman had worked for 240 days as claimed."

In Municipal Corporation, Faridabad v. Siri Niwas (2004 (8) SCC 195), held "*the burden was on the Workman to show that he was working for more than 240 days in the preceding one year prior to his alleged retrenchment." In M.P. Electricity Board v. Hariram (2004 (8) SCC 246) the position was again reiterated in paragraph 11 as follows: "The above burden having not been discharged and the Labour Court having held so, in our opinion, the Industrial Court and the High Court erred in basing an order of reinstatement solely on an adverse inference drawn erroneously ..*"

In the case of Manager, RBI, Bangalore vs. S Mani (2005) SCC Page 100, the 3 Judges Bench of the Apex Court held that "*the initial burden of proof was on the Workman to show that he had completed 240 days of service."*

Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of Mohan Lal vs Management BEL 1981 SCC page 225 has laid down the principle that how to count 240 days of service within one year it is held: *"Clause (2)(a) provides for a fiction to treat a Workman in continuous service for a period of one year despite the fact that he has not rendered uninterrupted service for a period of one year but he has rendered period of 240 days during the period of 12 calendar service for months counting backwards and just preceding the relevant date being the date of retrenchment. In other words, in order to invoke the fiction enacted in clause (2)(a) it is necessary to determine first the relevant date, ie the date of termination of service which is complained of as retrenchment. After that date is ascertained. move backward to a period of 12 months just preceding the date of retrenchment and then ascertain whether within the period of 12 months, the Workman has rendered service for a period of 240 days. If these three facts are affirmatively answered in favor of the Workman pursuant to the deeming fiction enacted in clause (2)(a) it will have to be assumed that the Workman is in continuous service for a period of one year and he will satisfy the eligibility qualification enacted in Section 25-F"*

"14. We have already extracted section 25B since its amendment and the change in language is the legislative exposition of which note must be taken. In fact, we need not further dilate upon this aspect because in Surendra Kumar Verma and Ors. v. Central Government Industrial-cum-Labour Court, New Delhi and Anr., Chinnappa Reddy. J., after noticing the amendment and referring to the decision in Sur Enamel and Stamping Works (P) Ltd case, held as under:

"These changes brought about by Act 36 of 1964 appear to be clearly designed to provide that a Workman who has actually worked under the employer for not less than 240 days during a period of twelve months shall be deemed to have been in continuous service for a period of one year whether or not he has in fact been in such continuous service for a period of one year. It is enough that he has worked for 240 days in a period of 12 months, it is not necessary that he should have been in the service of the employer for one whole year."

In a concurring judgment Pathak J. agreed with this interpretation of section 25B(2). Therefore, both on principle and on precedent it must be held that section 25B(2) comprehends a situation where a Workman is not in employment for a period of 12 calendar months, but has rendered service for a period of 240 days within the period of 12 calendar months commencing and counting backwards from the relevant date, i.e. the date of retrenchment. If he has, he would be deemed to be in continuous service for a period of one year for the purpose of section 25B and Chapter VA."

Thus, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above the initial burden of proof lies upon the Workman to show that he has completed 240 days of the service with the Respondent just preceding from the date of his termination. Further, in respect of the employment of calculating the 240 days service provision contained under Section 25-F read with Section 25-B of the I.D. Act, 1947.

29. Now, in view of the provision contained under Section 25 F and law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, we have to examine whether the Workman has discharged his initial burden of proof in respect of his claim of 240 days continuous service in a calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination i.e., the year 1985.

In this context, WW1 in his cross examination has stated that,

"I worked for a total no. of 229 days during 1983-85. After 1985 I was never worked in the bank….

I was not sponsored by any employment exchange. ….. It is not true to suggest that I never worked for 240 days in a year continuously and I was casual worker I am not entitled for any relief."

Thus, it is clear from the testimony of WW1 that the Workman had not worked for 240 days continuously in any 12 months of a calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination in the Respondent bank. Therefore, Workman failed to establish his plea by his oral and documentary evidence that he had worked for 240 days continuously in calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination i.e., the year 1985. Thus, the claim of the Workman that he has been terminated by oral order without issuing notice or payment in lieu after termination, in contravention of Section 25 F of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is not tenable. However the documents filed by the Workman in support of his claim, number of days worked with the Respondent goes to reveal that the Workman had worked intermittently as daily wager depending upon availability of work in branch. Workman did not file any document of appointment letter or salary slips in support of his claim for appointment as a non-messenger in the Respondent branch on temporary basis.

30. Per contra, the Learned Counsel for Respondent has submitted the allegation of Workman that he was terminated from services is not correct. As the vacancies were filled up on regular basis in order of their respective seniority the non-engagement of the Workman does not amount to termination. Further, Respondent contended that no law provide that even though there is no work temporary employee should be continued in the bank work as the very engagement of Workman was subject to availability of work. Therefore, the allegation that the bank has indulged in unfair labour practice is incorrect.

31. Thus, in view of the fore gone discussion and contentions made by the Respondent, I find the force in the argument advanced by the Respondent that in the instant matter, Workman was not terminated from service by order dated the year 1985 rather he was disengaged in view of the non-availability of the work in the branch. Further, there was direction issued by the Head Office of the Respondent authority not to engage any daily wager Workman/ temporary Worker w.e.f. the year 1985. Thus, such disengagement of Workman does not amount to termination. Moreover, the Workman failed to prove his claim that he was terminated in contravention of provision of Sec.25F of the I.D. Act, 1947 as he failed to establish his plea by any oral or documentary evidence that he had worked for 240 days continuously in a twelve months of calendar year just preceding from date of termination i.e., the year 1985.

32. Further, perusal of the order dated 25.3.1997 goes to reveal that the Chief Branch Manager, State Bank of India has issued the letter to Zonal Office with direction to all its branches to this effect that they have been advised by the DGM, Zonal Office, Hyderabad that as both the panel of temporary employees of 1989 and daily wagers/casual labour of 1992 will lapse on 31.3.1997 it has been decided by central office not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial cadre from the year 1985, therefore it was directed to issue suitable instructions not to make temporary appointments from the year 1985. There is no mention in this order that the Workman herein has been terminated from service by this order.

33. Further, the circular dated 27.3.1997 was issued by DGM, SBI to all branches in commercial network in respect of the non-appointment of temporary employees in subordinate cadre and it has directed not to make any temporary employment in the subordinate cadre with effect from 1.4.97 and further, it has directed to ensure that no temporary/casual/daily basis appointment of the petty cash. Further, it is directed to all Branch Managers that any deviation in this regard will be viewed seriously. Thus, these circulars do not reflect that the Workman has been terminated from service by this order.

34. Similarly, office order dated 31.3.1997 is simply a direction to all branches of the Respondent bank by DGM that no further daily labour should be engaged or employed. Therefore, the plea of the Workman that he has

been terminated by the aforesaid order dated 25.3.1997, 27.3.1997 and 31.3.1997 from the service by the Respondent is not acceptable. The evidence adduced by the Workman clearly goes to reveal that he had worked as a daily wager for which he has been paid wages according to number of working days. As there was an order for prohibition for engaging temporary workmen, in the bank, therefore, Workman could not be engaged by the Respondent for work from the year 1985 and there after. It is settled law that the daily wagers are engaged by the employer depending upon the availability of work and as the work was not available the Workman was not engaged further by the Respondent management. Therefore, the Workman on the ground of number of days he had worked in the Respondent bank cannot claim any right to reinstate him into the employment. As the Workman failed to prove the mandatory condition of 240 days of continuous service as required under Sec.25F of I.D. Act, 1947. Therefore, the disengagement of Workman from work can not be termed in contravention of provision contained under Sec.25F and 25 B of the I.D. Act, 1947.

Thus, this point is answered against the Workman and in favour of Respondent.

35. **Point No.III**:- In this context, the Workman has contended that the management failed to implement the selected panels during its valid tenure. The management adopted the back door methods contrary to the settlements and filled up the vacancies. The same is evident from the proceedings dated 18.11.1985 a copy of the same is filed in the material papers and the same may be read as part of the claim statement. Further, it is submitted that management has to adhere the procedure issued by the Central Government, the instructions dated 16.8.1990 in the year 1995, but same was not followed in the year 1997 despite there being vacancies. The management has followed the procedure of calling candidates through employment exchange instead of giving chance to the empanelled candidates like the Workman herein. The management sent call letters to the similarly situated candidates like the Workman in the month of June 1997 subsequent to issuance of impugned termination orders. After knowing the fact that they are litigating the issue by way of dispute, the management has refused to engage those candidates, the copies of call letters issued are filed herein along with claim petition. The Workman herein reiterates that the panels are meant for absorption but not for termination. In view of the same a duty is cast upon the Respondent management to engage the empanelled candidates like the Workman herein even in temporary vacancies till they are absorbed permanently in regular vacancies.

36. On the other hand, Respondent has contended that the Federation approached Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) for implementation of bipartite settlement in respect of the absorption of temporary employees. The Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) conducted conciliation proceedings and agreement was arrived at between the Federation and the Management bank. It is submitted that it was agreed between the Federation and the Management that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers /casual labour would be kept alive upto March, 1997 and the vacancies as agreed to under the afore set out settlements will be filled from both the lists concurrently. A copy of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.1995 signed by the parties to the dispute is filed as a material paper. Further, it is submitted that the settlement was arrived at and an agreement was signed between the Federation and the Management bank on 30.7.1996 under Section 2(p) read with Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules 1957 which is binding on the parties. A copy of this agreement which hereinafter may be referred to as 5th settlement for brevity, is also filed as a material paper. The 5th settlement dated 30.7.1996 whereunder the earlier four settlements dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988 and 9.1.1991 were also referred, it was agreed to, by the Federation and the Management bank that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees will be kept alive upto March, 1997 for filling the vacancies existing/arrived at as on 31.12.1994 as per the norms agreed to between the bank and Federation and that thereafter the said panels would lapse. It was also agreed that within the framework of the above settlements the modalities about drawing names from either the panel of temporary employees or the panel of daily wagers and casual labour would be decided administratively on circle to circle basis depending upon the local requirements in consultation with the Federation's affiliate by the Circle management. It was further agreed that all messenger real vacancies/positions in the subordinate cadre including part-time attendants specifically provided as leave reserve will be filled by the end of 31.3.1997. Further, Respondent contended that on 27.2.1997 a memorandum of understanding was also signed between the Federation's affiliate and the bank management regarding the fact that the exercise of identifying the messengerial vacancies as on 31.12.1994 has since been completed by central office and thereby 403 messengerial vacancies were sanctioned to the circle of the Management bank and it was agreed that these vacancies may be filled from 1989 panel of temporary employees after effecting conversion from full time non-messengerial staff in the usual manner and the agreement was reached upon. Further, it was agreed between the Federations affiliate and the management bank that in terms of the settlement dated 30.7.1996 both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers /casual employees would lapse on 31.3.1997.

37. The Workman has contended that the empanelled list prepared by the Respondent management for appointment of temporary and daily wage Workers to the permanent post cannot lapse unless until it is exhausted by appointing all the empanelled persons and it should continue even after 31.3.1997, i.e., the date fixed for the lapse of panel. It is undisputed that the date of lapse of empanelled list of Workmen has been fixed to 31.3.1997 as mentioned in the settlement dated 30.7.1996, and agreed between the parties. It is settled law that and once the life of panel list lapses on the date as agreed between the parties it cannot be extended beyond that date. In the instant

case the panel list of the workmen was valid upto 31.3.1997 in view of the terms and conditions enumerated in the 5th Settlement entered into between the parties. As the lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997 has been agreed by State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation through 5th Settlement, the Workman is not competent to challenge the same.

In this context I would like to take reference of the decision of the apex court in the case of **Syndicate Bank and Ors vs. Shankar Paul and Ors , AIR 1997 SC 3091, therein the Hon'ble Apex Court** have held:-

"Till 1982, the branches of the appellant Bank in Calcutta region were recruiting persons locally to work as temporary attenders in leave vacancies. In view of the revised procedure prescribed by the Government of India in respect of such temporary appointments, the Calcutta regional office of the appellant Bank issued a circular to all of its branches on 14.8.1982, instructing all the branches under it to discontinue the old practice from 1.6.1982 and appoint only empanelled candidates. The regional office was to prepare a panel of eligible candidates, after calling names from the local/district employment exchange, and split it up branch-wise. Following that new procedure yearly panels were prepared thereafter. Names of the Respondents were for the first time included in the panel prepared for the period 7.2.1987 to 6.2.1988. By its letter dated 7.2.1987 the Bank had informed the Respondents that the panel was valid for one year only and that inclusion of their names in the panel was not to confer on them any right to seek permanent appointment in the service of the bank. Considering the object with which the panel was prepared and the fact that it was an yearly panel expiring on 6.2.1988, we are of the opinion that the Respondents did not get any right, because of inclusion of their names in the said panel, for permanent absorption in the service of the Bank. Whatever conditional right they had came to an end with the expiry of the panel. The claim of the Respondents, as contained in the writ petition was thus misconceived and therefore the learned single Judge and the Division Bench, when it first decided the appeal, were right in dismissing the writ petition and the appeal respectively."

Thus, in view of the above law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court and in view of the terms and conditions of the 5th Settlement the contention of the Workman that empanelled list should continue even after 31.3.1997 till the last Workman in the panel is absorbed is not tenable. The contention of the Workman is baseless in view of recital in the settlement. Therefore, in view of the fore gone discussion and finding given at Point No. I regarding binding nature of Settlements and terms and conditions enumerated therein, in view of the provision contained u/s.18(1) of the I.D. Act, 1947, I am of the considered view that life of panels lapsed on 31.3.1997 in view of terms of settlement dated 30.7.1996 and plea of Workman that the panel shall continue even after 31.3.1997 till last man absorbed has no legal force and same is untenable.

38. Undisputedly, settlement agreement dated 30.7.1996 was executed between the State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation and in that settlement it was agreed that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/ casual employees will be used for filling vacancies existing as on 31.12.1994 as per the norms agreed between the bank and the Federation. These empanelled workmen were to be given a chance for permanent appointment in the bank against vacancies arising up to December 1994 whereas the daily wagers/ casual employees were to be considered against the vacancies arise from January 1995 to December 1996, whereby the said panel would lapse. It was agreed that the vacancies falls upto 31.3.1997 shall be filled before the empanelled list is allowed to lapse. Thus, the claim of the Workman to the post of permanent non-messenger in the Respondent management was subject to the availability of the sanctioned post and vacancies arising upto 31.3.1997. The workmen given chance to the permanent post were seniors in number of working days in panel list and Workman herein was junior to those workmen. Therefore, Workman could not be given absorption to permanent post being junior to other workmen in the panel list.

39. Moreover, the Respondent management witness MW1 in chief statement has given the evidence that, "The Petitioner has not completed 240 days of service in a calendar year." Although this witness was cross examined by the Petitioner but the above statement of the management witness in chief remained uncontroverted, as the witness MW1 was not cross examined by Petitioner on this point. Therefore, the claim of the Petitioner that he has been removed from service by the management illegally is untenable. Further, witness MW1 in his chief statement has stated that, "The temporary messengers and Non-messengers were engaged by the bank in leave vacancies and for administrative exigencies. The Petitioner did not work continuously for 240 days in any year or over a period of 36 months." This statement of witness MW1 remained uncontroverted as the Petitioner did not cross examine the witness MW1 on this point. Therefore, the Petitioner Workman as per number of working days, failed to fulfil eligibility criteria of working days as required for regularisation. Therefore, he was not given regularisation in the employment of the Respondent. Therefore, in view of the statement of MW1, the claim of the Petitioner that he was refused regularization by the Respondent management illegally, is untenable.

40. However, Workman has taken the plea that the panels of Workmen for absorption in the employment of the Respondent banks (panels of temporary employees and daily wagers) has been lapsed on 31.3.1997 in contravention of terms of settlement as the object of preparing the entire empanelment of temporary and daily wagers was to provide them permanent employment and till the both the panel lists exhausted the panel list cannot be lapsed on 31.3.1997 and the date of lapsing of the panel on 31.3.1997 has been fixed by the Respondent arbitrarily without any authority.

41. In this context, the perusal of Settlement dated 30.7.1996 reveals that the 5th Settlement dated 30.7.1996 was entered under Section 2(p) and 18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Dispute (Central) Rules 1957. This settlement has been entered into by the competent parties and in this settlement parties thereto agreed that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees will lapse on 31.3.1997. Thus the date of lapse of panel was fixed by both the parties with consensus under the settlement dated 30.7.1996 and same is binding upon the Workman under the provision of Section 18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947. Moreover, this issue of binding force of the settlement dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988 and 9.1.1991 has already been discussed, decided at finding in Point No.I of this award. However, the legality and validity of the aforementioned settlement has not been challenged by the Workman before any competent forum. Thus, claim of Workman that the date of lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997 has been fixed arbitrarily by the Respondent bank is untenable. As regard the claim of Workman for his absorption to the permanent post it is settled law that the Workman can not claim his regularization to permanent post merely on the basis of number of working days.

42. In this context the reference of the decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Oil and Natural Gas Corporation vs Krishan Gopal 2020(3) SCALE 272, date of decision 7.2.2020** is relevant therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have has laid down principle regarding regularization of the Workman on permanent posts. Hon'ble Supreme Court have laid down the prepositions of regularization of the workmen to permanent post is as under:-

"*(i) Wide as they are, the powers of the Labour Court and the Industrial Court cannot extend to a direction to order regularisation, where such a direction would in the context of public employment offend the provisions contained in Article 14 of the Constitution;*

(ii) The statutory power of the Labour Court or Industrial Court to grant relief to workmen including the status of permanency continues to exist in circumstances where the employer has indulged in an unfair labour practice by not filling up permanent posts even though such posts are available and by continuing to employ workmen as temporary or daily wage employees despite their performing the same work as regular workmen on lower wages;

(iii) The power to create permanent or sanctioned posts lies outside the judicial domain and where no posts are available, a direction to grant regularisation would be impermissible merely on the basis of the number of years of service;

(iv) Where an employer has regularised similarly situated workmen either in a scheme or otherwise, it would be open to workmen who have been deprived of the same benefit at par with the workmen who have been regularised to make a complaint before the Labour or Industrial Court, since the deprivation of the benefit would amount to a violation of Article 14; and

(v) In order to constitute an unfair labour practice under Section 2(ra) read with Item 10 of the Vth Schedule of the ID Act, the employer should be engaging workmen as badlis, temporaries or casuals, and continuing them for years, with the object of depriving them of the benefits payable to permanent workmen.

Thus, in view of the principles laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court as discussed above, in the instant matter the Workman utterly failed to prove his claim by adducing any documentary or oral evidence that the employer has indulged in unfair labour practice by not filling the permanent posts even though such posts are available and by continuing to employ workmen as temporary or daily wage employees despite their performance was the same work, as regular workmen on lower wages.

43. Respondent has contended that all the vacancies exist and arise upto 31.3.1997 has been filled up from the panel list in order of seniority and no vacancy exists or arises as on 31.3.1997 remained unfilled. Further, it is contended that as per terms of settlement the life of panel lists has been lapsed on 31.3.1997, hence, there is no occasion to extend the life of panel lists beyond 31.3.1997. However, the workman failed to prove contrary by any evidence to the aforesaid contention of the Respondent that the vacancies were existing as on 31.3.1997 and the workman was not given absorption to the permanent post in order of his seniority. It is settled law that the power to create permanent or sanctioned post lies outside the judicial domain and where no posts are available, a direction to grant regularization would be impermissible merely on the basis of the number of years of service. Therefore, the claim of the workman on this ground also not acceptable.

44. Further, as per the of settlement, panel was prepared for absorption of the workmen on the permanent posts has already been lapsed on 31.3.1997 and the vacancies existing and arising upto 31.12.1994 and upto 31.3.1997 as settlement dated 30.7.1996 has been filled up from the panel by appointing the workmen as per seniority in the panel list. Workman witness WW1 in his cross examination has himself admitted this fact that, some of the temporary employees whose names were included in the panel were given regular appointment in the bank in order of their seniority in the panel. The Workman failed to show that there was any breach of terms of settlement has been committed by the Respondent in appointment to permanent post from aforesaid panel list.

45. As discussed in preceding paragraph of this Award, the life of the panel has not been extended beyond 31.3.1997, by any further settlement hence, the panel list in which name of the Workman was included got expired on 31.3.1997. It is not the case of the Workman that Respondent has regularized similarly situated workmen either in

the scheme or otherwise and the Workman has been deprived of same benefit on par with those workmen or the vacancies remained unfilled on the date of lapse of panels i.e., 31.3.1997, Industrial Tribunal has no jurisdiction to extend the date of lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997. This Tribunal can not order for regularization of workmen to the permanent post in contravention of the provision of Article 14 of the Constitution of India.

In the case of **Mahboob Deepak vs. Nagar Panchayat Gajraula & Anr, Civil Appeal No.5875/2007 date of judgement 13.12.2007,** Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

"8. Respondent is a Local Authority. The terms and conditions of employment of the employees are governed by a statute and statutory rules. No appointment can be made by a Local Authority without following the provisions of the recruitment rules. Any appointment made in violation of the said rules as also the constitutional scheme of equality as contained in Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India would be a nullity.

9. Due to some exigency of work, although recruitment on daily wages or on an ad hoc basis was permissible, but by reason thereof an employee cannot claim any right to be permanently absorbed in service or made permanent in absence of any statute or statutory rules. Merely because an employee has completed 240 days of work in a year preceding the date of retrenchment, the same would not mean that his services were liable to be regularized."

Therefore, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, the claim of the Workman for absorption merely on the basis of number of day of work in the Respondent bank Branch is not acceptable. As regard plea of the Workman that the Workman should have been given employment even after 31.3.1997 as temporary Workman, it is the discretion of Respondent to engage the Workman depending upon availability of work and this Tribunal can not direct the Respondent to engage the Workman in the absent of such rule/scheme.

46. In view of principle laid down by Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above, in the instant matter Workman utterly failed to establish the fact of rendering continuous service for a period of 240 days of service within a period of 12 calendar months commencing and coming backward from relevant date i.e., the date of retrenchment, if has he would be denied to be in continuous service for a period of one year. Therefore, the provision contained under Sec.25F of retrenchment is not applicable to Workman.

Counsel for Workman has relied upon number of decisions of Hon'ble High Court and Hon'ble Supreme Court and few of them are discussed herein:-

In the case of **F.C.I., vs. Kamdhenu Cattle Feed Industries 1985 (1) SCC 71,** therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

"7. In contractual sphere as in all other State actions, the State and all its instrumentalities have to conform to Article 14 of the Constitution of which non-arbitrariness is a significant facet. There is no unfettered discretion in public law: A public authority possesses powers only to use them for public good. This impose the duty to act fairly and to adopt a procedure which is `fairplay in action'. Due observance of this obligation as a part of good administration raises a reasonable or legitimate expectation in every citizen to be treated fairly in his interaction with the State and its instrumentalities, with this element forming a necessary component of the decision making process in all State actions. To satisfy this requirement of non- arbitrariness in a State action, it is, therefore, necessary to consider and give due weight to the reasonable or legitimate expectations of the persons likely lo be affected by the decision or else that unfairness in the exercise of the power may amount to an abuse or excess of power apart from affecting the bona fides of the decision in a given case. The decision so made would be exposed to challenge on the ground of arbitrariness. Rule of law does not completely eliminate discretion in the exercise of power, as it is unrealistic, but providers for control of its exercise by judicial review."

In the case of **State Bank of India, R.O., Vijayawada vs. Industrial Tribunal, Hyderabad WP No.193/1997,** therein Hon'ble High Court have held,

"*Sri Krovvidi Narasimham, the learned counsel for the 2nd respondent contends, supporting the award that it was a permanent vacancy and even though the 2nd respondent was appointed on temporary basis, his services were not liable to be terminated and he was to be regularised into service on permanent basis. Shastry award warrants that no temporary appointment can be made to a permanent post. But the matter is now covered by two division bench judgements dated 28.11.1986 in W.A. No.791 of 1986 and 25.8.1987 in W.A. No.270 of 1982. The ratio decided in the two judgements is to the effect that there cannot be any mandate to appoint employees on permanent basis when the requirement was for appointment on temporary basis. But it is held in the said judgements that when a temporary appointee is ousted from service and not for misconduct and, if again temporary appointment is to be made, then, the case of such temporary appointee who was ousted, has got to be considered in accordance with Sec. 25-H of the Act."*

In the case of **State of Haryana and others vs. Piara Singh and others. 1992 (4) SCC 118,** therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

" 49. If for any reason an adhoc or temporary employee is continued for a fairly long spell, the authorities must consider his case for regularization provided he is eligible and qualified according to the rules and his service record is satisfactory and his appointment does not run counter to the reservation policy of the state."

In the above cited judgements by the Workman the facts of the case are different hence do not apply to instant case of Workman.

47. On the other hand, in support of his contention Respondent has examined witness MW1 and MW1 in chief examination states that, Settlements i.e., on 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988, 9.1.1991 were entered into between the SBI and SBI Staff Federation for filling up of the vacancies that arise up to 1994 for those temporary employees who has worked on scale wages. Further, MW1 states that two different panels for messengers and non-messengers as per the eligibility criteria prescribed by the bank. There are four modules in Andhra Pradesh and they are Hyderabad, Tirupathi, Vijayawada and Visakhapatnam. MW1 states that the temporary employees so empanelled were given permanent absorption depending upon the vacancies so arise strictly in terms of the settlement. MW1 states that on 9.6.1995 conciliation proceeding was held before the RLC(C), Hyderabad and in said proceedings it was decided that the panels will be kept live up to 31.3.1997 and vacancies will be filled from both the lists concurrently. A copy of the said minutes of proceedings is Ex.M5. Further, MW1 states that on 30.7.1996 another settlement was entered between the SBI and All India SBI Staff Federation providing for filling up of the vacancies arising up to December 1994 in respect of subordinate cadre and daily wage /casual wage employees out of panel so prepared were to be considered against vacancies arising from January 1995 to December 1996, thereafter the said panels lapse. MW1 states that it was also agreed that all the non- messenger positions in subordinate cadre including part time attendants specially provided as leave reserve will be filled before 31.3.1997 and as regards to non-messengerial positions it is agreed that all such posts sanctioned and fallen vacant up to 31.3.1997 shall be filled before the empanelled list is allowed to lapse. Thus in both the cases empanelled list were lapsed on the year 1985. Ex.M6 is the copy of the settlement dated 30.7.1996. Further, witness states that on 27.2.1997 a memorandum of understanding was reached between the SBI and SBI Staff Federation providing that both the panels above mentioned will lapse on 31.3.1997. Ex.M7 is the copy of the memorandum of understanding and Ex.M8 is the copy of the statements giving the particulars of 1989 non-messenger panel, Ex.M9 is the copy of the statement of 1989 non-messenger panel, Ex.M10 is the copy of statement of 1992 panel. Further, witness states that petitioner was included in the 1989 panel. As the existing vacancies at that time were exhausted and his turn did not come he could not be given permanent employment in the bank as per the agreements. All the appointments were made strictly in accordance with the settlements reached from time to time between SBI and SBI staff federation and as per seniority, number of days of temporary service put in by them in the bank in the given period. Further, MW1 states petitioner was not sponsored by any employment exchange he did not undergo the regular process of selection required for appointment as a regular non-messenger the petitioner has not worked for 240 days in any year in his entire temporary service in the bank. The petitioner and other temporary employees were terminated from service by the bank. Further, MW1 states that the vacancies were filled up on regular basis with the temporary employees from the panels and these panels were expired in terms of the settlements so reached and there were no vacancies to absorb such employees. Thus, witness MW1 has proved the documents Ex.M1 to Ex.M12 and also contentions made in the counter. However, MW1 was cross examined by the Petitioner Counsel. But nothing has been elicited in his cross examination so as to discredit the testimony of the witness MW1 as regards the date of lapse of both the panels on 31.3.1997 and reasons assigned for non-absorption of the Petitioner from the panel list to the permanent post. Moreover the witness MW1 was re-examined by the Respondent and the witness MW1 states that panels were expired in terms of the settlement send absorptions to the extent of the available vacancies were made. There was no termination of any temporary messenger as such but their services were not utilized after the cut off date as the available vacancies were already filled up and most of these Petitioners were not in the service of the bank as on the date of the expiry date of the panels. Therefore, in view of the aforesaid testimony of the MW1 in re-examination in the absence of cross examination remained uncontraverted, the claim of the Workman that he was entitled for absorption in permanent post in the branch of Respondent Management on the basis of panel list is found not established.

This point is answered against the Workman.

48. **Point No.IV**:- In view of the discussion and finding given at Point Nos. I, II and III, the Workman is not entitled for any relief and claim statement of Workman sans merit and liable to be dismissed.

This Point is answered accordingly.

AWARD

In view of the fore gone discussion, it is held that the action of the Respondent bank in terminating the services of Sri Gudur Issac, Ex. Messenger by way of oral orders w.e.f. the year 1985 is justified. Hence, the Petitioner is not entitled for any relief as prayed for. The claim statement filed by Workman sans merit, hence, dismissed.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, Personal Assistant, transcribed by her, corrected and signed by me on this the 12th day of June, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner	Witnesses examined for the Respondent
WW1: Sri Gudur Issac	MW1: Sri I.S. Appa Rao

Documents marked for the Petitioner

NIL

Documents marked for the Respondent

Ex.M1:	Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.17.11.87
Ex.M2:	Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.16.7.88
Ex.M3:	Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.27.10.1988
Ex.M4:	Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.9.1.1991
Ex.M5:	Photocopy of conciliation proceedings before the Regional Labour Commissioner(C) dt.9.6.1995
Ex.M6:	Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.30.7.1996
Ex.M7:	Photocopy of Memorandum of understanding dt. 27.1.1997
Ex.M8:	Photocopy of statements giving the particulars of 1989 messenger panel.
Ex.M9:	Photocopy of statement of 1989 Non-messenger panel
Ex.M10:	Photocopy of statement of 1992 panel
Ex.M11:	Photocopy of order of Hon'ble High Court in WA No.86/98 dt. 1.5.98
Ex.M12:	Photocopy of order in SLP No.11886-11888 of 1998 dated 10.8.98

नई दिल्ली, 3 अगस्त, 2026

का.आ. 1670.— औघोगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार स्टेट बैंक ऑफ़ इंडिया के प्रबंधतत्र, संबद्ध नियोजको और उनके कर्मकार के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औघोगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औघोगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद के **पंचाट** (25/2003) प्रकाशित करती है।

[सं. एल- 12025/01/2026- आई आर (बी-I)-156]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 3rd August, 2026

S.O. 1670.— In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the **Award (Ref. 25/2003*)*** of the ***Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court Hyderabad*** as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of **State Bank of India** and **their workman.**

[No. L-12025/01/2026-IR(B-I)-156]

SALONI, Dy. Director

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD

Present: - **Sri Irfan Qamar**
Presiding Officer
Dated the 15th day of June, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE L.C.No. 25/2003

[Old ID No. 266/99 of Labour Court, Guntur]

Between:

Sri Sk. Kaleshah,
S/o Allabaksh,
Opp. R.T.O. Office,
Kandukur,
Prakasam distt. ….. Petitioner

And

1. The Chairman,
State Bank of India,
Central office,
Mumbai.

2. The Chief General Manager,
(Personnel)
State Bank of India,
Bank Street
Hyderabad.

3. The Branch Manager,
State Bank of India,
Kandukur branch.

4. The Regional Manager,
State Bank of India,
Zonal Office,
Tirupathi. …..Respondents

Appearances :
For the Petitioner : M/s. S. Prasada Rao, Advocates
For the Respondent : Sri Y. Ranjeeth Reddy, Advocate

AWARD

Sri Sk. Kaleshah who worked as Messenger (who will be referred to as the workman) has filed this petition under Sec. 2A(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 against the Respondents State Bank of India seeking for reinstatement into service as Messenger duly granting all the consequential benefits such as continuity of service, back wages and all other attendant benefits etc., and such other reliefs as this court may deem fit. Earlier Petitioner has filed this dispute before the Labour Court, Guntur for adjudication and later the same has been transferred to this Tribunal bearing ID No. 266/99, as per orders of Central Government vide Lr.No.H-11026/1/2001-IR(C.II) dated 18.10.2001 and registered, numbered in this Tribunal as LC No. 25 /2003.

2. Before unfolding the factual matrix of the instant industrial dispute it would be apposite to have a bird eye view of a chequered history of the instant industrial dispute. Earlier instant industrial dispute along with the batch cases was decided by this Tribunal vide common award dated 17.5.2005 and the reference was answered in favour of the Respondent and against the Workman. That said common award dated 17.5.2005 was challenged by the aggrieved Workmen in various Writ petition No.6470/2014 along with batch of writ petitions before the Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh and Hon'ble High Court vide its' judgement dated 23.6.2014 allowed all batch of writ petitions and set aside the common award dated 17.5.2005 passed in ID No.222 of 2001 and other batch of ID cases by Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad and the Respondent management of State Bank of India was directed to reengage the Writ Petitioners in position, which they have been occupying prior to their termination and further directed to consider their cases for regularization as and when the substantive vacancy arises. This judgement dated 23.6.2014 of Hon'ble High Court of AP, passed in WP No.6470/2014 and batch petitions was challenged by Respondent management before the Hon'ble High Court in Writ Appeal No. 1268 of 2014. The aforesaid Writ Appeals No.1268/2014 and other Writ Appeals were decided by Division Bench of High Court of Andhra Pradesh by a common judgement dated 20.3.2019. Hon'ble High Court in aforesaid Writ Appeal was pleased to pass the order which is extracted as below:-

" 7. Hearing the learned senior counsel for the SBI and the learned senior counsel for the contesting unofficial Respondents, we see that while the learned single Judge was justified in setting aside the award af the Tribunal, the proper course to be adopted was to remit all the cases to the Tribunal. This we say for reasons more than one. Firstly, in such matters, claims have to be decided on individual basis, as different persons have different claims as to the length of officiation or discharge of duties and functions; quality of engagement, drawings, accounting of the post for each one of them, who have worked etc. All these issues will not be the same in all the cases. Therefore, each case ought to have been directed to be decided by the Tribunal afresh on individual basis. The second and most important aspect is the learned single Judge has in one go ordered re-employment of all the workmen. This is not a relief that could have been granted without answering the individual issues; each issue relating to each case could not have been decided by the writ Court within the format of its adjudication procedures and scope. The adjudicating body, which has to do that activity, is the Industrial Tribunal. Therefore, we are of the view that while we would sustain the order of the learned singe Judge insofar as it interfered and sets aside the award of the Tribunal, the further findings and directions, issued through the impugned order have to go and the individual cases have to be sent back for consideration of the Tribunal. Such further procedure before the Tribunal will have to be carried forward with the materials already on record and also by affording an opportunity to the persons, who have claims as well as the management to place their rival contentions and further material before the Tribunal. The learned counsel appearing for the workmen are justified in pointing out that enormous delay has already happened and further action by the Tribunal in this line may be expedited.

9. In the result, these writ appeals are ordered;

(1) affirming the impugned common order of the learned single Judge to the extent it sets aside the common award dated 17.05.2005 of the Industrial Tribunal;

(2) the further findings and directions issued through the impugned common order are vacated:

(3) all the matters shall be remitted to the Industrial Tribunal with a direction to dispose of them within an outer limit of five (5) months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order; and,

(4) the parties to make appearance before the Tribunal on the given date."

Thus, in view of the above direction of Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh in W.A.No.1268 of 2014 and batch cases. This Tribunal has taken up the matter of industrial dispute for hearing and deciding it afresh in view of the aforesaid guidelines laid down by the Hon'ble High Court in Writ Appeal No.1268/2014 vide judgement dated 20.3.019.

3. The factual matrix of instant industrial dispute as narrated by the Workman in his claim statement are that, the Workman joined in the service of the management institution as Messenger from 1983 to 6.4.86, and has rendered unblemished service spreading over a period of about 6 years. The Respondent has terminated services of Workman by oral orders with effect from 6.4.86. Further, it is submitted that the management of Respondent bank decided to give a chance to temporarily employed personnel "found suitable for permanent appointment" by wait-listing them by offering permanent appointment or waitlisting till such opportunity arises.

4. That on 17.11.1987 a settlement was reached between All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and the Management of State Bank of India - settlement one, under this settlement three categories of employees were listed. That is, A) those who have completed 240 days in 12 months or less after 1.7.1975. B) those who have completed 270 days in any continuous block of 36 calendar months after 1.7.1975. C) (i) those who have completed minimum of 30 days aggregate temporary service in any calendar year after 1.7.1975 or (ii) 70 days aggregate temporary service in continuous block of 36 months after 1.7.1975.

5. The persons who satisfied in all the above 4 categories were to be interviewed by a selection committee and the said selection committee would determine the suitability of the said candidate for permanent appointment. Therefore, the bank prescribed certain qualifications and from among the candidates satisfying the qualifications the suitable candidates were enlisted by a selection committee. The Clause 7 of the said agreement provided with the selected candidate would be wait listed in order of their respective categorization and the selected panel would be valid upto December, 1991. Clause 10 of the settlement specifically provided that henceforth. "there will be no temporary appointments in the subordinate cadre", except on a restrictive basis in the specified category, "from amongst empanelled candidates as per existing guidelines of the bank". The Workman further submits that consequent upon the said agreement and the draft, a notification was issued in the newspapers. The last date for responding to the advertisement was 30.8.1988. A written examination followed by viva-voce in May, 1989 was held. A selected panel was prepared, as per Clause 7 of the agreement, ie. Settlement No.1, the selected panel was to be valid upto December, 1991, the Workman submits that circular was issued on 26.4.91 by the said letter it is mentioned that the terms of the agreement dated 17.11.87 was modified vide second agreement dated 16.7.88 was entered into between the parties. In terms of the said agreement a chance was to be given, "to all eligible temporary employees for permanent appointments. The appointments were against the vacancies likely to arise during the years 1995-96, circular made it clear that in view of the enormity of the problem an extension of the currency of the panel, eligible temporary employees who have been empanelled could not appear in the earlier interviews and have been pursuing their cases thereafter, "will be given another chance to appear for interview".

6. Workman submits that there were total five settlements. The settlement dated 17.11.87 is the 1st settlement (Ex M1), settlement dated 16.7.88 is 2nd settlement (Ex M2), settlement dated 27.10.88 is the 3rd settlement (Ex M3), then settlement dated 9.1.91 is 4th settlement and settlement dated 30.7.96 is 5th settlement (Ex M6). In between there is minutes of conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.95 marked as Ex M5. That due to all these settlements which were extended by subsequent settlements thereby created reasonable expectations in the list of the selected candidates arose with that it's a question of time their appointments or services would be regularized in the services of the bank. The Workman was working with the bank on temporary basis was under the bonafide hope that sooner his services will be regularized with the bank. He is thereby closed all his options elsewhere. It is needless to point out that employing person to whom hope of employment in substantial terms was made is a facet of Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

7. Further Workman submits that the Government of India issued Circular No. F-3/3/104/87-IR, dated 16.8.1990. Under said circular the chief Executives of all public sector banks including the Management herein were specifically instructed that until the problem of existing temporary employees is fully resolved, no bank is permitted to make any permanent appointments. That some of the persons similarly situated like this Workman aggrieved by the inaction on the part of the management of the bank is not regularizing their services from out of the selected panel and not clearly focusing the vacancy position, filed W.P. No. 4194/97 before Hon'ble High court of A.P.. It is specifically averred in the said writ petition that the Management of the bank had failed to implement the settlement and that it violates the various fundamental rights guaranteed under the constitution of India. The Hon'ble High court of A.P .. by order dated 5.3.97 directed the bank to implement the settlement as amended from time to time. It also directed the bank to carry out the terms of settlement before the expiry of March, 1997. The Hon'ble High Court also recorded finding that the Bank cannot escape its liability of enforcement of the Settlement. In view of the directions given by the High Court all candidates whose names appeared in the select panels prepared on the basis of the agreement entered into on 17.11.87 under which the panel was valid upto December, 1991, and on the basis of a settlement dated 27.10.1988 whereby the panels were made alive upto 31.3.1997 under which the panel was valid upto December, 1999. The other agreement dated 16.7.1988 under which the panel was valid upto 1992 and on the basis of the settlement dated 27.10.1998 whereby the panels were made alive upto 31.3.1997 were under the bonafide impression that their cases will be considered for regularization and were living on the basis of the said reasonable expectation. Unfortunately, contrary to the aforesaid directions given by the High Court and contrary to the settlements entered into between the parties, the bank issued proceedings dated 25.3.1997, dated 27.3.1997 and 31.3.1997 instructing the various authorities of the Management not to continue the temporary employees those who are in services of the bank from 1.4.97. The said order was followed by the Management. Aggrieved by the said action the Workman herein and similarly situated candidates have filed a writ petition before the Hon'ble High Court and by way of Writ Petition No.9206/97 seeking a declaration that the proceedings issued by the Deputy General Manager and the Assistant General Manager (Respondents 3,4 and 5 therein) on 25.3.97, 27.3.97 and 31.3.97 as illegal and also non-continuance of the Workmen therein in service by absorbing them in the services of the bank as violative of Section 2(p) and 18(1) read with Rule 58 of Central Rules and sought for specific direction to the bank to absorb them in service.

8. Further, Workman submits that in the counter affidavit filed in Writ Petition No.9206/97, the bank has submitted that it has about 805 branches in Andhra Pradesh alone. It has stated that due to exigencies of circumstances and on account of the urgent need in its banks, it employed temporary employees in subordinate cadre. It is pertinent to mention that it does not state the urgent or need or the nature of temporary employees that it had engaged. Enquiry into the same would reveal that the stand taken by the bank either on the ground of urgent need or of temporary employees is a façade to perpetuate unfair labour practice. It is designed to on the one hand, keep the employed in the erroneous zone of hope and on the other to ensure that benefits that a model employer will extend under various statutes to its employees is not required to be borne out by the bank. A reading of the counter affidavit would show that the bank would opines that being just fair and reasonable are which obviously is reprehensible and is a facet of unfair labour practice.

9. The Workman submits that the bank had referred in its counter affidavit to three settlements dated 17.11.87, 16.7.88 and 27.10.88. The bank in the guise of extending the benefits of the circular of Government dated 16.8.90 stated in its counter affidavit that as follows:

"Government of India, vide its letter dated 16.8.1990, issued guidelines to all the public sector banks with regard to recruitment and absorption of temporary employees in public sector banks. The said guidelines were issued to implement on the lines of the approach paper on the issue provided by a committee constituted in this regard. The Government of India guidelines made it clear that all the public sector banks may follow the provisions laid down in the approach paper.

The approach paper specified that the cases of temporary employees who had put in not less than 240 days of temporary service in 12 consecutive Months and who are entitled to benefit of Section 25-F may be decided by entering into a settlement with the representative union. In respect of temporary employees who had put in less than 240 days of service in 12 consecutive months or less, a settlement could be avoided and however if the Management so desired, they could enter into a conciliation settlement with the representative union. Para 6(h), it is mentioned

that only those temporary employees who had put in temporary service of 90 or more days after 1.1 1982 would be eligible for considering under the scheme. Although the Government guidelines envisaged for a settlement in respect of employees who had put in temporary service of 90 or more days, the bank by way of further concession entered into settlements Even in respect of those who had put in less than 90 days. As such, it could be Seen that the settlements are more beneficial to the temporary employees concerned. The approach paper also specify at para 6(c) that the banks would provide one time opportunity to all the temporary employees and for that purpose temporary employees worked in the bank on or after 1.1.1982 could be considered for re-employment in terms of the scheme. The Respondents have gone further wherein even persons working after 1975 were also considered.

As could be seen from the above, there was a genuine effort on the part of the Respondent bank to provide permanent employment for as many as possible subject to availability of the vacancies.

It is further submitted that at para 6(k) of the approach paper, it was made clear that this would be one time exercise in full and final settlement of all the aims and disputes for the past period in respect of temporary workmen covered by the settlement. This would mean that the Government of India guidelines would cover only those persons who were temporarily employed for the period specified therein and not otherwise. As such, it is submitted that the Respondents have not only followed the Government of India guidelines but in fact covered cases of the employees who had worked for less than 90 days. As such, question of violation does not arise and in any case those were only broad guidelines and not directives".

10. The Workman submits that the bank also referred a subsequent settlement dated 9.1.1991 wherein there is a clause to the effect- that the panel of temporary employees and the panel of daily wage employees will be operated to a particular period. Therefore, their cases will not be considered. The Management herein relying upon this settlement in their impugned action. It is submitted that even the settlement dated 9.1.1991 will not empower the management to terminate the services of the temporary employees who are working in the bank services like the Workman herein as it does not specify the termination of the employees. In fact there are so many vacancies wherein the Management has engaged several new persons as temporary messengers/ attendars/ sweepers etc., even after the judgment of Hon'ble High Court without considering the cases of the similarly situated candidates like the Workman herein. It is submitted inspite of engaging fresh candidates as is now being done by the Management they would have continued the similarly situated candidates like the Workman herein in the services of the bank and consider their cases for absorption in view of the circulars issued by Central Government as well as the directions of this Hon'ble Court in Writ Petition No.4194/97, dated 5.3.97. In view of the circulars issued by the Central Government, the Management should not have relied upon the settlement dated 9.1.1991. Hence, the impugned action of the Management is illegal, unjust, violative of fundamental rights such as Articles 14,16 and 21 of the Constitution of India.

11. The Workman submits that in W.P. No.4194/97 filed by the union of temporary employees where in they have complained about the non- implementation of the settlements arrived between the parties and sought for absorption. Such employees in the bank services on permanent basis before the date fixed for carrying out the terms of settlement, the Court held that the members of the union had been empanelled in the list, they were not regularized and the time was going to run out to the near future and the Respondent bank and its officers cannot escape from the liability of enforcing the settlement which has been reached and therefore directed that the bank and the officers shall implement the settlement dated 17.11.87 as amended from time to time before the expiry of 31.3.97.

12. Further, it is submitted that in the clause of Settlement it is specifically mentioned that the workmen to be absorbed/appointed in the bank prohibiting any temporary appointments subsequent to the date of settlement even the authorities want to make temporary appointments that should be made only from among the empanelled can be appointed either for temporary vacancy or permanent vacancy except from among the empanelled candidates like the Workman and that should be continued till they are absorbed. The management committed unfair labour practices and terminated the services of the candidates with effect from 6.4.86 which is arbitrary, discriminatory, contrary to their own guidelines and violative of the constitutional provisions which are guaranteed in Chapter-III of the Constitution of India.

13. The Workman submits that it is strange as to how the panels were allowed to lapse by a so-called Memorandum of Understanding dated 25.2.1997, that the action of terminating such employees like the Workman by virtue of an impugned oral proceedings without implementing the settlement would be illegal and unfair labour practice which cannot be allowed to be perpetuated. That the discontinuance of the Workman after 31.3.97 who had served in the bank in any capacity amounts to retrenchment. It could not have been done without any notice and it violates Sec.25FF of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and the said action is violative of principles of natural justice guaranteed under Chapter III of the Constitution of India. This amounts to retrenchment without one month's notice and taken in view of such notice. Thus, the main proceedings issued by the Respondent is without jurisdiction and is arbitrary, illegal and therefore liable to be quashed. That the alleged Memorandum of Understanding dated 27.2.97, Ex.M5 does not own any legal entity, as the said Memorandum of Understanding is not published anywhere to brought to the notice of the Workman whose rights are being affected. It is submitted that

Management did not adhere to the procedure envisaged by the Central Government in its' instructions dated 16.8.90 in the year 1995. The same was not followed in the year 1997 despite there being vacancies. The management has followed the procedure of calling candidates through Employment exchange instead of giving chance to the empanelled candidates like the Workman here. It is pertinent to mention here that the Respondent Management sent letters to the all similarly situated candidates like the Workman in the month of June, 1997, subsequent to the passing of impugned termination orders. After knowing the facts that the candidates are litigating, the Management refused to engage these candidates. It is once again reiterated that the panels are meant for absorption but not for termination. It was the duty of the Management to engage the empanelled candidates like the Workman even in temporary vacancies till they are absorbed permanently in regular vacancies. Hence, the action of the Respondent Management terminating the services of the Workman by oral order dated 31.3.97 is unjust, illegal, violative of principles of natural justice and hence, the Management be directed to reinstate and absorb the Workman and to grant all incidental and consequential benefits.

14. Per contra, Respondent had filed counter and made a contentions that the reference is not tenable and contrary to the provisions of I.D. Act, 1947. Respondent submitted that to tide over severe sub-ordinate staff constraints which arose out of leave vacancies, exigencies, etc., and also owning to the restrictions imposed by the Government of India/Reserve Bank of India on intake of staff, the Respondent bank used to engage sub-ordinate staff like messengers, sweepers, sweeper cum water boys, etc., depending on the availability of work on purely temporary basis for the smooth and uninterrupted functioning of the branches. It is submitted that the All India State Bank of India Staff Federation which represents majority of the employees in the State Bank of India comprising about 98% of the work force as its' members espoused the cause of temporary employees who have put in less than 240 days of temporary service in 12 calendar months in the bank and who were ineligible for any protection under Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 to give a chance for being considered for absorption and permanent appointments.

15. Discussions were held and on 17.11.1987 an agreement was signed between the federation and the Management bank under Sec. 2(p) read with Sec 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules 1957. A copy of the said settlement dated 17.11.87 which may be herein after referred as first settlement is filed and 4 categories were made as it has already been mentioned in the claim statement above, it need not be repeated here. In the first settlement, it was agreed that the temporary employees as categorized would be given a chance for being considered for permanent appointment in the bank's service against the vacancies which are likely to arise during the period 1987 to 1991. On 16.7.88 second settlement was arrived between the Federation and the Bank whereby it was agreed to substitute the period of consideration of vacancies as 1987 to 1992 in place of 1987 to 1991 as contemplated under the first settlement dated 17.11.1987. This is the second settlement. A 3rd settlement was entered into on 27.10.88 and it was agreed that the bank's service against the vacancies likely to arise from 1988 to 1992 was to be considered. Government of India vide its letter dated 16.8.90 issued guidelines to all the public sector banks with regard to recruitment and absorption of temporary employees in public sector banks. The said guidelines were issued to implement on the lines of approach paper on the issue provided by a committee constituted in this regard. Government of India guidelines made it clear that all the public sector banks may follow the provisions laid down in the approach paper. The approach paper specified that the cases of temporary service in 12 consecutive months and who are entitled to benefit of Sec.25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 may be decided by entering into a settlement with the representative union. In respect of temporary employees who had put in less than 240 days of service in 12 consecutive months or less, a settlement could be avoided and however if the Management so desired they could enter into a conciliation settlement with the representative union. In para. 6(h) it is mentioned that only those temporary employees who had put in temporary service of 90 days or more days after 1.1.82 would be eligible for considering under the scheme. Although the Government guidelines envisaged for a settlement in respect of employees who had put in temporary service of 90 days or more days, the bank by way of a further concession entered into settlements. Even in respect of those who had put in less than 90 days and also the bank went a step further and said those persons who are working after 1975 were also considered. Hence, there was a genuine effort on the part of the Respondent bank to provide as many as possible jobs subject to the availability of the vacancies. However, para 6 (k) of the approach paper made it clear that it is a one time, exercise in full and final, settlement of all the claims and disputes for the past period, in respect of temporary workmen covered by the settlement. Another settlement was entered on 9.1.91 herein after referred as 4th settlement and the time limit was extended upto 1994 and separate panel was prepared for temporary employees, casual/daily wagers. It was agreed that while vacancies arising between 1988 to 1994 in respect of temporary employees and in respect of casual/daily wagers, they can be considered for the vacancies arising between 1995-96 only.

16. It is submitted that the administrative set up of the Hyderabad Local Head Office comprises of four Zonal Offices (Zones) at Hyderabad, Vijayawada, Visakhapatnam and Tirupathi covering all the Districts of Andhra Pradesh. In terms of the settlement the Management after following the procedure laid down therein prepared the panels of qualified candidates of temporary employees denoted as 1989 panel and also panel of casual/daily wagers denoted as 1992 panel for giving a chance for being considered for permanent absorption. These panels were prepared zone-wise separately for messengers and non-messengers in the descending order of temporary service put in by the candidates during the stipulated period i.e., 1.7.1975 to 31.7.1988. That the Federation approached the Regional Labour Commissioner(C) for implementation of bi-partite settlement in respect of absorption of temporary

employees. The Regional Labour Commissioner(C) conducted conciliation proceedings and an agreement was arrived between the Federation and the bank. It was agreed that it would be kept alive upto March, 1997. A copy of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.2.1995 signed by the parties is filed as material paper. A settlement was arrived at and an agreement was signed between the Federation and the Management bank on 30.7.1996 under Sec.2 (p) read with Sec.18(1) of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957, which is hereinafter called as 5th settlement. That on 27.2.1997 a Memorandum of understanding was also signed by the federation's affiliate and the bank Management recording the fact that the exercise of identifying the messengerial vacancies as on 31.12.1994 has since been completed by Central Office and thereby 403 messengerial vacancies were sanctioned . It was agreed that these vacancies may be filled from 1989 panel of temporary employees after effecting conversion from full time non-messengerial staff in the usual manner and the agreement was reached accordingly. It was agreed between the Federation's affiliate and the Management bank that in terms of the settlement dated 30.7.1996 both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees would lapse on 31.3.1997. That as agreed upon vacancies were filled from the panels. The Workman who has put in an aggregate temporary service of less than 240 days in a continuous block of 12 months period during 1.7.1975 to 31.7.1988 has no right to seek a direction to consider his candidature for absorption in the Management bank under any rule/law except under the settlement entered into thereon.

17. Respondent contended that, in fact, the case of the Workman can be considered under all the five settlements having got his case considered under provisions of these settlements. All the other provisions and terms of the settlements are also binding on him/her. The Management bank has not violated any of the provisions of the terms of the said settlement. That the very preparation and maintenance of panel is in compliance of the terms agreed under these settlements. These settlements were time bound and they ceased to exist on 31.3.1997. That the bank has never promised that all the candidates in the panel will be absorbed. In the advertisement itself it was made clear that candidates will be considered for absorption in the vacancies that may arise upto 1992. Keeping alive the panels after 31.3.1997 is contrary to the settlements arrived between the State Bank of India Staff Federation and the Management bank. That the settlements are binding on the parties. The Workman is also bound under the terms of the said settlement. The settlement does not suffer from any ambiguity as their language is very clear. The right under the settlements is to give them a chance to be considered for future appointment in the bank's services against the vacancies likely to arise. The settlements were effected to balance the expectations of the temporary employees to be absorbed in permanent service as against the constitutional rights for all eligible persons to be considered for employment every time a vacancy arises. That the alleged dispute including the demand for reinstatement has to be decided in this context. It is submitted that the period of panel list got expired on 31.3.97 and it is an integral term of the settlement and cannot be modified in any proceedings under the law. These temporary employees who unfortunately could not be accommodated for want of vacancies have no further rights to be considered for regularization. That the Hon'ble High Court in WP No.12964/94, held as follows, "It is needless to state that the settlement arrived at between the All India State Bank of India Staff Federation which, is the majority union and the bank Management is binding on the Workmen also. It is not at all the case of the Workman that any of the terms of the settlement has been violated by the bank's Management. If the Workman had worked in the bank on part-time basis before 31.5.94, that itself would not vest in him a right to claim that his services should be regularized on permanent basis against a full time cadre post. The claim put forth by the Workman in the present petition is therefore misconceived and not tenable. However, it is open to the Workman to claim any right which flows from the settlement between the union and the bank Management. As already pointed out that it is not the grievance of the Workman that some right which has flown from the settlement in favour of the Workman has been denied by the bank Management. Therefore, I do not find any ground, let alone substantial ground, to grant the kind of relief sought for by the Workman. Writ Petition fails and is accordingly dismissed. No costs."

18. Further, it is contended that if the panels were not lapsed at the end of designated period and allowed to be continued it would result in making the contracts of temporary employment indirectly permanent through back door entry, which would not only be contrary to the settlements but also to Articles 14 and 16 of Constitution of India and deprive the chances of original claimants who would Come through proper recruitment procedure. As their rights have been crystallized by operation of the settlements. Hence, there is no question of any Legitimate expectation being violated.

19. Similarly placed ex-employees filed WP No.9206/1995 and the batch before the Hon'ble High Court of A.P. and the learned Single Judge allowed the Writ Petitions. Aggrieved by the same WA No.86/98 and the batch was filed and the Division Bench set aside the order of the Single Judge. Thereafter the ex-temporary employees filed Special Leave Petition No.11886-11888 of 1998 before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India also dismissed the SLP. Therefore, reference to the Judgement of the Learned Single Judge in WP No.9206/97 is of no consequences as the same has already been set aside. The observations made in the Judgements cannot be relied upon for any purpose what so ever. The question of operation of Sec.25F would not come into play. Further the issue is covered by various Judgements of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India and various Hon'ble High Courts. Hence, the reference may be ordered that the Workman is not entitled for any relief.

20. In order to fortify his claim Workman has examined himself as WW1 and workman has filed photostat copies of three documents in evidence in support of his claim, which are marked as Ex.W1 to Ex.W3. The details of the documents is given as below:-

Ex.W1 is the service certificate. Ex.W2 is the nativity certificate. Ex.W3 is the transfer certificate.

21. On the other hand, Respondent has examined witness MW1 Sri I.S. Appa Rao and this witness has exhibited 12 documents, marked as Ex.M1 to M12. The details of these documents are as follows:-

Ex.M.1 is the Settlement dated 17.11.1987. Ex.M2 is the Settlement dated 16.7.1988. Ex.M3 is the Settlement dated 27.10.1988. Ex.M4 is the Settlement dated 9.1.1991. Ex.M5 is the Minutes of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.1995. Ex.M6 is the Settlement dated 30.7.1996. Ex.M7 is the Memorandum of Understanding dt. 27.2.1997. Ex.M8 is the Particulars of 1989 Messengerial Panel. Ex.M9 is the Particulars of 1989 Non-Messengerial Panel. Ex.M10 is the Particulars of 1992 General Attendant Panel. Ex.M11 is the Judgment of Hon'ble High Court of A.P. in Writ Appeal No.86/98 dt.1.5.1998. Ex.M12 is the Judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in SLP No. 11886-11888 of 1998 dt.10.8.1998.

22. Apart from afore mentioned documents, Learned Counsel for Workman has also filed a long list of various judgements of Hon'ble Supreme Court as well as Hon'ble High Court, which we will discuss at appropriate place in this Award.

23. Heard the argument of Learned Counsel for Workman as well as for Respondent.

24. On the basis of rival pleadings of both the parties and submissions made by the Learned Counsel for both the parties, following points arise for determination in the industrial dispute :-

I. Whether the 1st settlement dated 17.11.1987, 2nd settlement dated 16.7.1988, 3rd settlement dated 27.10.1988, 4th settlement dated 9.1.1991 and 5th settlement dated 30.7.1996 entered into between State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and also Memorandum of Understanding are binding upon both the parties?

II. Whether the action of State Bank of India, Addanki Main branch in terminating the services of Workman Sri Sk. Kaleshah, a Messenger with effect from 6.4.86 is justified?

III. Whether the Workman is entitled for absorption on permanent post in the Branch of Respondent management as per averments made by him in the claim statement?

IV. To what relief if any the Workman is entitled for?

Findings:-

25. Point No.I:- Undisputedly settlements dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988, 9.1.1991 and 30.7.1996, minutes of conciliation proceedings and memorandum of understanding dated 27.2.1997 were executed between the State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation under section 2(p) and 18 (1) of I.D. Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Disputes (Central Rules), 1957.

Section 2(p) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 as follows:-
(p) "settlement" means a settlement arrived at in the course of conciliation proceeding and includes a written agreement between the employer and workmen arrived at otherwise than in the course of conciliation proceeding where such agreement has been signed by the parties thereto in such manner as may be prescribed and a copy thereof has been sent to an officer authorised in this behalf by the appropriate Government and the conciliation officer;
Section 18(1) provides as follows:-
18. Persons on whom settlements and awards are binding.

- [(1) A settlement arrived at by agreement between the employer and Workman otherwise than in the course of conciliation proceeding shall be binding on the parties to the agreement.
Therefore, in view of the provision contained u/s.18 (1) I.D. Act, 1947, terms and conditions enumerated in the aforesaid settlements are binding on the parties to the agreement. The Learned Counsel for Workman has argued that the Workman after going through the selection procedure has successfully been listed in the panel for appointment on the permanent basis in the Respondent management and the empanelled list has to be valid till last person in the empanelled list is appointed on permanent basis. But the impugned order dated 25.3.97, 27.3.97 and 31.3.97, has been issued by Respondent management thereby the services of the Workman has been terminated and the said order is not in consonance of the terms of the agreement entered into between the parties. Further, Workman submits that the Respondent in the 5th settlement has mentioned the date i.e., 31.3.1997 for lapse of empanel list which is illegal and that is not binding upon the Workman. The condition of lapse of empanelment list on 31.3.97 incorporated in the aforesaid 5th settlement, is arbitrary and illegal.

26. The perusal of the impugned order dated 25.3.1997 goes to reveal that the Chief/Branch Manager, SBI Zonal Office has issued the letter to all the branches with regard to the subject not to make any temporary appointments in the Branch in messengerial category from 1985. The extract of the said letter is given below:-

"We have been advised by the Deputy General Manager, Zonal Office, Hyderabad that as both the panels of temporary employees of 1989 and daily wagers/casual labours of 1992 will lapse by 31.3.1997, it has been decided by Central Office not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial category from 1985."

Thus, from the contents of the aforesaid letter, it manifest that Head Office of State Bank of India vide letter dated 25.3.1997 has issued direction to all its branches not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial category from 1985 due to reason of lapse of both panels i.e., 1989 & 1992 on 31.3.1997 as per terms of settlements entered into by both parties. Further, the contents of the subsequent letter dated 27.3.1997 issued by Respondent Management is also direction to Branch Manager, State Bank of India not to make any temporary messengerial category appointment with effect from 31.3.1997 and it has also been communicated to all concerned that the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers maintained by Zonal offices stand lapsed from 31.1.1997. Further, office order dated 31.3.1997 has been issued by Respondent management that goes to reveal that the said office order has been issued to this effect that, "Consequent on absorption of temporary employees in permanent cadre, it has been decided by the competent authority that no one onwards, no further daily labour or temporary employees/appointments should be resorted to/engaged/employed." Therefore, it reflects from the contents of the aforesaid orders that the temporary appointment in messengerial category and daily labour has been stopped by the Respondent management with effect from 31.3.1997 because of the lapsed of panel of temporary workers and daily wagers by 31.3.1997. The agreement for lapse of both the panels on 31.3.1997 is contained in the 5th settlement which has been arrived at between the parties on dated 30.7.1996 with the consensus of both the parties. Therefore, Workman can not challenge the terms and conditions contained in settlement dated 30.7.1996 regarding lapse of panel on 31.3.1997 as agreed between State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation. As per provision contained u/s.18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 the said Agreement dated 30.7.1996 is binding on both the parties.

In the case of **Allied Sales Corporation Secunderabad vs.The Authority Under Andhra Pradesh..... 1990 II LLJ 510 AP para 414, Hon'ble Court have held:-**

"*4. There was a settlement between the Management and the workmen under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act on 25th April 1983 under which the age of superannuation of the workmen was fixed at 55 years. The settlement was to be in force upto 30th June 1986 and the next settlement, incorporating practically the same terms, was again entered into on 4th February 1987 under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act. There is no dispute that these settlements are under Section 18(1).*

14. Now the Authority constituted under Section 41(1) of the Act is an authority with very limited jurisdiction. It can only decide in the first appeal whether a termination by the management is valid or not and is within the parameters of Section 40 of the Act. The said Authority, in our view, has absolutely no jurisdiction to decide whether a settlement entered into under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act between the representatives of the Workmen and of the Management, is vitiated by undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion on the part of the Management. The Authority, namely, the Assistant Commissioner of Labour, was never intended by the A.P. Legislature to have jurisdiction to go into the question of the validity of a settlement arrived at under Section 18 of the Industrial Disputes Act by an Industrial Court. That Parliament has, in fact, constituted Industrial Courts under the Industrial Disputes Act, with extensive powers cannot be disputed. What we mean to say is that the Authority under Section 41(1) of the A.P. Act has no jurisdiction what-so-ever either to question or to decide about the validity of any such settlements. If parties to a settlement have a grievance about the validity of a settlement, it is for them to agitate the matter before the appropriate forum and they cannot ask an Authority constituted under Section 41(1) of the A.P. Shops and Establishments Act, 1966 with limited jurisdiction, to go into any such question and, that too, incidentally while deciding whether retirement as per the contract of employment, is legal or not."

It is not the case of Workman that aforesaid settlements are vitiated by undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion on the part of the management. If the Workman feeling aggrieved by any terms of settlement/ agreement on the aforementioned grounds then he can challenge of settlement before a competent authority under the Act, 1947. But here in the instant matter it is not a case of Workman that aforementioned settlement has been entered into between the parties on the ground of undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion. Therefore, Workman is barred to raise any objection in respect of fixing the date of lapse of both panels on 31.3.1997 as agreed between both the parties and Workman can not challenge any terms of said Agreement.

Further in the case of **Herbertsons Limited Vs. Workmen of Herbertsons Limited and Ors, 1977 AIR 322,** Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

The Tribunal thought that the question of the quantum of membership of the 2nd Respondent did not call for a finding at all in view of 1his Court's order. As observed above that was not a correct assumption. On the other hand, we feel that this view of the Tribunal has led it to approach the matter in an entirely erroneous manner. The Tribunal is,

rightly enough, conscious that under section 18 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act the settlement was binding on the company and the members of the 3rd Respondent union. Even so, the Tribunal devoted nearly half of its order in scanning the evidence given by the company and Respondent No. 3 to find out whether the terms of the settlement had been explained by the President of the union to the workmen or not and whether the workers voluntarily accepted the settlement knowing all the "consequences". This to our mind is again an entirely wrong approach.

"When a recognised union negotiates with an employer the workers as individuals do not come into the picture. It is not necessary that each individual worker should know the implications of the settlement since a recognised union, which is expected to protect the legitimate interests of labour, enters into a settlement in the best interests of labour. This would be the normal rule. We cannot altogether rule out exceptional cases where there may be allegations of mala fides, fraud or even corruption or other induce- ments. Nothing of that kind has been suggested against the President of the 3rd Respondent in this case. That being the position, prima facie, this is a settlement in the course of collective bargaining and, therefore, is entitled to due weight and consideration.

It is not possible to scan the settlement in bits and pieces and hold some parts good and acceptable and others bad. Unless it can be demonstrated that the objectionable portion is such that it completely outweighs all the other advantages gained the Court will be slow to hold a settle- ment as unfair and unjust. The settlement has to be accepted or rejected as a whole and we are unable to reject it as a whole as unfair or unjust. Even before this Court the 3rd Respondent representing admittedly the large majority of the workmen has stood by this settlement and that is a strong factor which it is difficult to ignore. As stated elsewhere in the judgment, we cannot also be oblivious of the fact that all workmen of the company have accepted the settlement. Besides, the period of settlement has since expired and we are informed that the employer and the 3rd Respondent are negotiating another settlement with further improvements. These factors, apart from what has been stated above, and the need for industrial peace and harmony when a union backed by a large majority of workmen has accepted a settlement in the course of collective bargaining have impelled us not to interfere with this settlement. That being the position, we unhold the settlement as fair and just and order that the award of the Tribunal shall be substituted by the settlement dated October 18, 1973. The said settlement shall be the substituted award. The appeal is disposed of accordingly. There will be no order as to costs."

Therefore, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above, the contention of the Workman that the date fixed for lapse of empanelled list on 31.3.1997 for appointment to the permanent post vide 5th Settlement dated 30.7.1996 is arbitrary, illegal is not untenable. The recognized union of Workmen has negotiated with the Respondent Bank Management representing large number of Workmen and the Workman as individual do not come into picture. Workman in the instant case has work as temporary Workmen in the Respondent Branch and in response of Notification he had applied for inclusion of his name in the panel and he was selected for inclusion his name in the panel list to be utilized for absorption of such Workman to permanent post in order of their seniority in the list. The Settlement dated 30.7.1996 between State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation under Sec.2(p) and Sec.18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 has clearly provided as regard non-messengerial position and it is agreed that all such posts sanctioned fallen vacant upto 31.3.1997 shall be filled before empanel list is allowed to lapse. Thus, in view of law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, in the instant case, Agreement dated 30.7.1996 was entered into between both the parties in respect of lapsing of the both the panels on 31.3.1997 and absorption of the Workmen from panel list was subject to availability of vacancy of post likely to arise upto 31.3.1997, have a binding force on Workman as well as management of State Bank of India in view of provision contained under section 18 (1) of I.D. Act, 1947.

Thus, Point No.I is answered against the Workman and in favour of the Respondent.

27. **Point No.II**:- Firstly, it is submitted on behalf of the Workman that the Respondent has terminated his services by oral order on 6.4.86 without issuing any notice or paying any salary or compensation in lieu thereof. Therefore, the termination order of the Workman from service is in violation of provision contained Under Section 25 F of I.D. Act, 1947. Therefore, the order is liable to be set aside.

28. On the other hand, Respondent counsel contended that Workman has not worked for 240 days in any preceding calendar year. Therefore, reference of the industrial dispute is not relevant. In this context, the Workman has examined himself as WW1 who has reiterated that Workman has been terminated from service by Respondent on 6.4.86 without notice of salary or compensation in lieu thereof. Before examining the claim of the Workman on merit it would be apposite to reproduce the provision contained under section 25 F:-

Section 25F provides:-

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].
Compensation to workmen in case of transfer of undertakings.

Section 25B defines the term continuous service which provides
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 authorized 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;
In order to prove the fact of 240 days of service within 12 months of a calendar year just preceding from the date of termination, the initial burden of proof lies upon the Workman and the Workman has to prove this factum by adducing his oral as well as documentary evidence in support of his claim.

Further, how to calculate 240 days of service by the Workman in a calendar year. In this context the reference of decisions of Hon'ble Supreme Court is relevant and the same are discussed below:-

In Rajasthan State Ganganagar S. Mills Ltd. v. State of Rajasthan and Anr. (2004) Apex Court held:

"It was the case of the Workman that he had worked for more than 240 days in the year concerned. This claim was denied by the appellant. It was for the claimant to lead evidence to show that he had worked for 240 days in the year preceding the date of his termination. He has filed an affidavit. It is statement which is in his favor and that cannot be regarded as sufficient evidence for any Court or Tribunal to come to the conclusion that in fact the claimant had worked for 240 days in a year These aspects were highlighted in Range Forest Officer v. S.T. Hadimani (2002 (3) SCC 25. No proof of receipt of salary or wages for 240 days or order or record in that regard was produced. Mere non-production of the muster roll for a particular period was not sufficient for the Labour Court held that the Workman had worked for 240 days as claimed."
In Municipal Corporation, Faridabad v. Siri Niwas (2004 (8) SCC 195), held "*the burden was on the Workman to show that he was working for more than 240 days in the preceding one year prior to his alleged retrenchment." In M.P. Electricity Board v. Hariram (2004 (8) SCC 246) the position was again reiterated in paragraph 11 as follows: "The above burden having not been discharged and the Labour Court having held so, in our opinion, the Industrial Court and the High Court erred in basing an order of reinstatement solely on an adverse inference drawn erroneously ..*"
In the case of Manager, RBI, Bangalore vs. S Mani (2005) SCC Page 100, the 3 Judges Bench of the Apex Court held that "*the initial burden of proof was on the Workman to show that he had completed 240 days of service."*

Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of Mohan Lal vs Management BEL 1981 SCC page 225 has laid down the principle that how to count 240 days of service within one year it is held: *"Clause (2)(a) provides for a fiction to treat a Workman in continuous service for a period of one year despite the fact that he has not rendered uninterrupted service for a period of one year but he has rendered period of 240 days during the period of 12 calendar service for months counting backwards and just preceding the relevant date being the date of retrenchment. In other words, in order to invoke the fiction enacted in clause (2)(a) it is necessary to determine first the relevant date, ie the date of termination of service which is complained of as retrenchment. After that date is ascertained. move backward to a period of 12 months just preceding the date of retrenchment and then ascertain whether within the period of 12 months, the Workman has rendered service for a period of 240 days. If these three facts are affirmatively answered in favor of the Workman pursuant to the deeming fiction enacted in clause (2)(a) it will have to be assumed that the Workman is in continuous service for a period of one year and he will satisfy the eligibility qualification enacted in Section 25-F"*

"14. We have already extracted section 25B since its amendment and the change in language is the legislative exposition of which note must be taken. In fact, we need not further dilate upon this aspect because in Surendra Kumar Verma and Ors. v. Central Government Industrial-cum-Labour Court, New Delhi and Anr., Chinnappa Reddy. J., after noticing the amendment and referring to the decision in Sur Enamel and Stamping Works (P) Ltd case, held as under:

"These changes brought about by Act 36 of 1964 appear to be clearly designed to provide that a Workman who has actually worked under the employer for not less than 240 days during a period of twelve months shall be deemed to have been in continuous service for a period of one year whether or not he has in fact been in such continuous service

for a period of one year. It is enough that he has worked for 240 days in a period of 12 months, it is not necessary that he should have been in the service of the employer for one whole year."

In a concurring judgment Pathak J. agreed with this interpretation of section 25B(2). Therefore, both on principle and on precedent it must be held that section 25B(2) comprehends a situation where a Workman is not in employment for a period of 12 calendar months, but has rendered service for a period of 240 days within the period of 12 calendar months commencing and counting backwards from the relevant date, i.e. the date of retrenchment. If he has, he would be deemed to be in continuous service for a period of one year for the purpose of section 25B and Chapter VA."

Thus, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above the initial burden of proof lies upon the Workman to show that he has completed 240 days of the service with the Respondent just preceding from the date of his termination. Further, in respect of the employment of calculating the 240 days service provision contained under Section 25-F read with Section 25-B of the I.D. Act, 1947.

29. Now, in view of the provision contained under Section 25 F and law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, we have to examine whether the Workman has discharged his initial burden of proof in respect of his claim of 240 days continuous service in a calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination i.e., 6.4.86.

In this context, WW1 in his cross examination has stated that,

" My service was for total no. of 700 days spread over with gaps from time to time during the period from 1975 to 1996 .....

I was not sponsored by any employment exchange but, I was not issued any appointment order at the time of joining my service. ..... It is not true to suggest that I never worked for 240 days in a year continuously and I was casual worker I am not entitled for any relief."

Thus, it is clear from the testimony of WW1 that the Workman had not worked for 240 days continuously in any 12 months of a calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination in the Respondent bank. Therefore, Workman failed to establish his plea by his oral and documentary evidence that he had worked for 240 days continuously in calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination i.e., 6.4.86. Thus, the claim of the Workman that he has been terminated by oral order without issuing notice or payment in lieu after termination, in contravention of Section 25 F of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is not tenable. However the documents filed by the Workman in support of his claim, number of days worked with the Respondent goes to reveal that the Workman had worked intermittently as daily wager depending upon availability of work in branch. Workman did not file any document of appointment letter or salary slips in support of his claim for appointment as a non-messenger in the Respondent branch on temporary basis.

30. Per contra, the Learned Counsel for Respondent has submitted the allegation of Workman that he was terminated from services is not correct. As the vacancies were filled up on regular basis in order of their respective seniority the non-engagement of the Workman does not amount to termination. Further, Respondent contended that no law provide that even though there is no work temporary employee should be continued in the bank work as the very engagement of Workman was subject to availability of work. Therefore, the allegation that the bank has indulged in unfair labour practice is incorrect.

31. Thus, in view of the fore gone discussion and contentions made by the Respondent, I find the force in the argument advanced by the Respondent that in the instant matter, Workman was not terminated from service by order dated 6.4.86 rather he was disengaged in view of the non-availability of the work in the branch. Further, there was direction issued by the Head Office of the Respondent authority not to engage any daily wager Workman/ temporary Worker w.e.f. 31.3.1997. Thus, such disengagement of Workman does not amount to termination. Moreover, the Workman failed to prove his claim that he was terminated in contravention of provision of Sec.25F of the I.D. Act, 1947 as he failed to establish his plea by any oral or documentary evidence that he had worked for 240 days continuously in a twelve months of calendar year just preceding from date of termination i.e., 6.4.86.

32. Further, perusal of the order dated 25.3.1997 goes to reveal that the Chief Branch Manager, State Bank of India has issued the letter to Zonal Office with direction to all its branches to this effect that they have been advised by the DGM, Zonal Office, Hyderabad that as both the panel of temporary employees of 1989 and daily wagers/casual labour of 1992 will lapse on 31.3.1997 it has been decided by central office not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial cadre from 31.3.1997, therefore it was directed to issue suitable instructions not to make temporary appointments from 31.3.1997. There is no mention in this order that the Workman herein has been terminated from service by this order.

33. Further, the circular dated 27.3.1997 was issued by DGM, SBI to all branches in commercial network in respect of the non-appointment of temporary employees in subordinate cadre and it has directed not to make any temporary employment in the subordinate cadre with effect from 1.4.97 and further, it has directed to ensure that no temporary/casual/daily basis appointment of the petty cash. Further, it is directed to all Branch Managers that any

deviation in this regard will be viewed seriously. Thus, these circulars do not reflect that the Workman has been terminated from service by this order.

34. Similarly, office order dated 31.3.1997 is simply a direction to all branches of the Respondent bank by DGM that no further daily labour should be engaged or employed. Therefore, the plea of the Workman that he has been terminated by the aforesaid order dated 25.3.1997, 27.3.1997 and 31.3.1997 from the service by the Respondent is not acceptable. The evidence adduced by the Workman clearly goes to reveal that he had worked as a daily wager for which he has been paid wages according to number of working days. As there was an order for prohibition for engaging temporary workmen, in the bank, therefore, Workman could not be engaged by the Respondent for work from 31.3.1997 and there after. It is settled law that the daily wagers are engaged by the employer depending upon the availability of work and as the work was not available the Workman was not engaged further by the Respondent management. Therefore, the Workman on the ground of number of days he had worked in the Respondent bank cannot claim any right to reinstate him into the employment. As the Workman failed to prove the mandatory condition of 240 days of continuous service as required under Sec.25F of I.D. Act, 1947. Therefore, the disengagement of Workman from work can not be termed in contravention of provision contained under Sec.25F and 25 B of the I.D. Act, 1947.

Thus, this point is answered against the Workman and in favour of Respondent.

35. **Point No.III**:- In this context, the Workman has contended that the management failed to implement the selected panels during its valid tenure. The management adopted the back door methods contrary to the settlements and filled up the vacancies. The same is evident from the proceedings dated 18.11.1985 a copy of the same is filed in the material papers and the same may be read as part of the claim statement. Further, it is submitted that management has to adhere the procedure issued by the Central Government, the instructions dated 16.8.1990 in the year 1995, but same was not followed in the year 1997 despite there being vacancies. The management has followed the procedure of calling candidates through employment exchange instead of giving chance to the empanelled candidates like the Workman herein. The management sent call letters to the similarly situated candidates like the Workman in the month of June 1997 subsequent to issuance of impugned termination orders. After knowing the fact that they are litigating the issue by way of dispute, the management has refused to engage those candidates, the copies of call letters issued are filed herein along with claim petition. The Workman herein reiterates that the panels are meant for absorption but not for termination. In view of the same a duty is cast upon the Respondent management to engage the empanelled candidates like the Workman herein even in temporary vacancies till they are absorbed permanently in regular vacancies.

36. On the other hand, Respondent has contended that the Federation approached Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) for implementation of bipartite settlement in respect of the absorption of temporary employees. The Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) conducted conciliation proceedings and agreement was arrived at between the Federation and the Management bank. It is submitted that it was agreed between the Federation and the Management that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers /casual labour would be kept alive upto March, 1997 and the vacancies as agreed to under the afore set out settlements will be filled from both the lists concurrently. A copy of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.1995 signed by the parties to the dispute is filed as a material paper. Further, it is submitted that the settlement was arrived at and an agreement was signed between the Federation and the Management bank on 30.7.1996 under Section 2(p) read with Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules 1957 which is binding on the parties. A copy of this agreement which hereinafter may be referred to as 5th settlement for brevity, is also filed as a material paper. The 5th settlement dated 30.7.1996 whereunder the earlier four settlements dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988 and 9.1.1991 were also referred, it was agreed to, by the Federation and the Management bank that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees will be kept alive upto March, 1997 for filling the vacancies existing/arrived at as on 31.12.1994 as per the norms agreed to between the bank and Federation and that thereafter the said panels would lapse. It was also agreed that within the framework of the above settlements the modalities about drawing names from either the panel of temporary employees or the panel of daily wagers and casual labour would be decided administratively on circle to circle basis depending upon the local requirements in consultation with the Federation's affiliate by the Circle management. It was further agreed that all messenger real vacancies/positions in the subordinate cadre including part-time attendants specifically provided as leave reserve will be filled by the end of 31.3.1997. Further, Respondent contended that on 27.2.1997 a memorandum of understanding was also signed between the Federation's affiliate and the bank management regarding the fact that the exercise of identifying the messengerial vacancies as on 31.12.1994 has since been completed by central office and thereby 403 messengerial vacancies were sanctioned to the circle of the Management bank and it was agreed that these vacancies may be filled from 1989 panel of temporary employees after effecting conversion from full time non-messengerial staff in the usual manner and the agreement was reached upon. Further, it was agreed between the Federations affiliate and the management bank that in terms of the settlement dated 30.7.1996 both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers /casual employees would lapse on 31.3.1997.

37. The Workman has contended that the empanelled list prepared by the Respondent management for appointment of temporary and daily wage Workers to the permanent post cannot lapse unless until it is exhausted by appointing all the empanelled persons and it should continue even after 31.3.1997, i.e., the date fixed for the lapse of panel. It is undisputed that the date of lapse of empanelled list of Workmen has been fixed to 31.3.1997 as mentioned in the settlement dated 30.7.1996, and agreed between the parties. It is settled law that and once the life of panel list lapses on the date as agreed between the parties it cannot be extended beyond that date. In the instant case the panel list of the workmen was valid upto 31.3.1997 in view of the terms and conditions enumerated in the 5th Settlement entered into between the parties. As the lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997 has been agreed by State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation through 5th Settlement, the Workman is not competent to challenge the same.

In this context I would like to take reference of the decision of the apex court in the case of **Syndicate Bank and Ors vs. Shankar Paul and Ors , AIR 1997 SC 3091, therein the Hon'ble Apex Court** have held:-

"Till 1982, the branches of the appellant Bank in Calcutta region were recruiting persons locally to work as temporary attenders in leave vacancies. In view of the revised procedure prescribed by the Government of India in respect of such temporary appointments, the Calcutta regional office of the appellant Bank issued a circular to all of its branches on 14.8.1982, instructing all the branches under it to discontinue the old practice from 1.6.1982 and appoint only empanelled candidates. The regional office was to prepare a panel of eligible candidates, after calling names from the local/district employment exchange, and split it up branch-wise. Following that new procedure yearly panels were prepared thereafter. Names of the Respondents were for the first time included in the panel prepared for the period 7.2.1987 to 6.2.1988. By its letter dated 7.2.1987 the Bank had informed the Respondents that the panel was valid for one year only and that inclusion of their names in the panel was not to confer on them any right to seek permanent appointment in the service of the bank. Considering the object with which the panel was prepared and the fact that it was an yearly panel expiring on 6.2.1988, we are of the opinion that the Respondents did not get any right, because of inclusion of their names in the said panel, for permanent absorption in the service of the Bank. Whatever conditional right they had came to an end with the expiry of the panel. The claim of the Respondents, as contained in the writ petition was thus misconceived and therefore the learned single Judge and the Division Bench, when it first decided the appeal, were right in dismissing the writ petition and the appeal respectively."

Thus, in view of the above law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court and in view of the terms and conditions of the 5th Settlement the contention of the Workman that empanelled list should continue even after 31.3.1997 till the last Workman in the panel is absorbed is not tenable. The contention of the Workman is baseless in view of recital in the settlement. Therefore, in view of the fore gone discussion and finding given at Point No. I regarding binding nature of Settlements and terms and conditions enumerated therein, in view of the provision contained u/s.18(1) of the I.D. Act, 1947, I am of the considered view that life of panels lapsed on 31.3.1997 in view of terms of settlement dated 30.7.1996 and plea of Workman that the panel shall continue even after 31.3.1997 till last man absorbed has no legal force and same is untenable.

38. Undisputedly, settlement agreement dated 30.7.1996 was executed between the State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation and in that settlement it was agreed that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/ casual employees will be used for filling vacancies existing as on 31.12.1994 as per the norms agreed between the bank and the Federation. These empanelled workmen were to be given a chance for permanent appointment in the bank against vacancies arising up to December 1994 whereas the daily wagers/ casual employees were to be considered against the vacancies arise from January 1995 to December 1996, whereby the said panel would lapse. It was agreed that the vacancies falls upto 31.3.1997 shall be filled before the empanelled list is allowed to lapse. Thus, the claim of the Workman to the post of permanent non-messenger in the Respondent management was subject to the availability of the sanctioned post and vacancies arising upto 31.3.1997. The workmen given chance to the permanent post were seniors in number of working days in panel list and Workman herein was junior to those workmen. Therefore, Workman could not be given absorption to permanent post being junior to other workmen in the panel list.

39. Moreover, the Respondent management witness MW1 in chief statement has given the evidence that, "The Petitioner has not completed 240 days of service in a calendar year." Although this witness was cross examined by the Petitioner but the above statement of the management witness in chief remained uncontroverted, as the witness MW1 was not cross examined by Petitioner on this point. Therefore, the claim of the Petitioner that he has been removed from service by the management illegally is untenable. Further, witness MW1 in his chief statement has stated that, "The temporary messengers and Non-messengers were engaged by the bank in leave vacancies and for administrative exigencies. The Petitioner did not work continuously for 240 days in any year or over a period of 36 months." This statement of witness MW1 remained uncontroverted as the Petitioner did not cross examine the witness MW1 on this point. Therefore, the Petitioner Workman as per number of working days, failed to fulfil eligibility criteria of working days as required for regularisation. Therefore, he was not given regularisation in the employment of the Respondent. Therefore, in view of the statement of MW1, the claim of the Petitioner that he was refused regularization by the Respondent management illegally, is untenable.

40. However, Workman has taken the plea that the panels of Workmen for absorption in the employment of the Respondent banks (panels of temporary employees and daily wagers) has been lapsed on 31.3.1997 in contravention of terms of settlement as the object of preparing the entire empanelment of temporary and daily wagers was to provide them permanent employment and till the both the panel lists exhausted the panel list cannot be lapsed on 31.3.1997 and the date of lapsing of the panel on 31.3.1997 has been fixed by the Respondent arbitrarily without any authority.

41. In this context, the perusal of Settlement dated 30.7.1996 reveals that the 5th Settlement dated 30.7.1996 was entered under Section 2(p) and 18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Dispute (Central) Rules 1957. This settlement has been entered into by the competent parties and in this settlement parties thereto agreed that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees will lapse on 31.3.1997. Thus the date of lapse of panel was fixed by both the parties with consensus under the settlement dated 30.7.1996 and same is binding upon the Workman under the provision of Section 18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947. Moreover, this issue of binding force of the settlement dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988 and 9.1.1991 has already been discussed, decided at finding in Point No.I of this award. However, the legality and validity of the aforementioned settlement has not been challenged by the Workman before any competent forum. Thus, claim of Workman that the date of lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997 has been fixed arbitrarily by the Respondent bank is untenable. As regard the claim of Workman for his absorption to the permanent post it is settled law that the Workman can not claim his regularization to permanent post merely on the basis of number of working days.

42. In this context the reference of the decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Oil and Natural Gas Corporation vs Krishan Gopal 2020(3) SCALE 272, date of decision 7.2.2020** is relevant therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have has laid down principle regarding regularization of the Workman on permanent posts. Hon'ble Supreme Court have laid down the prepositions of regularization of the workmen to permanent post is as under:-

"*(i) Wide as they are, the powers of the Labour Court and the Industrial Court cannot extend to a direction to order regularisation, where such a direction would in the context of public employment offend the provisions contained in Article 14 of the Constitution;*

(ii) The statutory power of the Labour Court or Industrial Court to grant relief to workmen including the status of permanency continues to exist in circumstances where the employer has indulged in an unfair labour practice by not filling up permanent posts even though such posts are available and by continuing to employ workmen as temporary or daily wage employees despite their performing the same work as regular workmen on lower wages;

(iii) The power to create permanent or sanctioned posts lies outside the judicial domain and where no posts are available, a direction to grant regularisation would be impermissible merely on the basis of the number of years of service;

(iv) Where an employer has regularised similarly situated workmen either in a scheme or otherwise, it would be open to workmen who have been deprived of the same benefit at par with the workmen who have been regularised to make a complaint before the Labour or Industrial Court, since the deprivation of the benefit would amount to a violation of Article 14; and

(v) In order to constitute an unfair labour practice under Section 2(ra) read with Item 10 of the Vth Schedule of the ID Act, the employer should be engaging workmen as badlis, temporaries or casuals, and continuing them for years, with the object of depriving them of the benefits payable to permanent workmen.

Thus, in view of the principles laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court as discussed above, in the instant matter the Workman utterly failed to prove his claim by adducing any documentary or oral evidence that the employer has indulged in unfair labour practice by not filling the permanent posts even though such posts are available and by continuing to employ workmen as temporary or daily wage employees despite their performance was the same work, as regular workmen on lower wages.

43. Respondent has contended that all the vacancies exist and arise upto 31.3.1997 has been filled up from the panel list in order of seniority and no vacancy exists or arises as on 31.3.1997 remained unfilled. Further, it is contended that as per terms of settlement the life of panel lists has been lapsed on 31.3.1997, hence, there is no occasion to extend the life of panel lists beyond 31.3.1997. However, the workman failed to prove contrary by any evidence to the aforesaid contention of the Respondent that the vacancies were existing as on 31.3.1997 and the workman was not given absorption to the permanent post in order of his seniority. It is settled law that the power to create permanent or sanctioned post lies outside the judicial domain and where no posts are available, a direction to grant regularization would be impermissible merely on the basis of the number of years of service. Therefore, the claim of the workman on this ground also not acceptable.

44. Further, as per the of settlement, panel was prepared for absorption of the workmen on the permanent posts has already been lapsed on 31.3.1997 and the vacancies existing and arising upto 31.12.1994 and upto 31.3.1997 as settlement dated 30.7.1996 has been filled up from the panel by appointing the workmen as per seniority in the panel list. Workman witness WW1 in his cross examination has himself admitted this fact that, some of the temporary

employees whose names were included in the panel were given regular appointment in the bank in order of their seniority in the panel. The Workman failed to show that there was any breach of terms of settlement has been committed by the Respondent in appointment to permanent post from aforesaid panel list.

45. As discussed in preceding paragraph of this Award, the life of the panel has not been extended beyond 31.3.1997, by any further settlement hence, the panel list in which name of the Workman was included got expired on 31.3.1997. It is not the case of the Workman that Respondent has regularized similarly situated workmen either in the scheme or otherwise and the Workman has been deprived of same benefit on par with those workmen or the vacancies remained unfilled on the date of lapse of panels i.e., 31.3.1997, Industrial Tribunal has no jurisdiction to extend the date of lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997. This Tribunal can not order for regularization of workmen to the permanent post in contravention of the provision of Article 14 of the Constitution of India.

In the case of **Mahboob Deepak vs. Nagar Panchayat Gajraula & Anr, Civil Appeal No.5875/2007 date of judgement 13.12.2007,** Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

"8. Respondent is a Local Authority. The terms and conditions of employment of the employees are governed by a statute and statutory rules. No appointment can be made by a Local Authority without following the provisions of the recruitment rules. Any appointment made in violation of the said rules as also the constitutional scheme of equality as contained in Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India would be a nullity.

9. Due to some exigency of work, although recruitment on daily wages or on an ad hoc basis was permissible, but by reason thereof an employee cannot claim any right to be permanently absorbed in service or made permanent in absence of any statute or statutory rules. Merely because an employee has completed 240 days of work in a year preceding the date of retrenchment, the same would not mean that his services were liable to be regularized."

Therefore, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, the claim of the Workman for absorption merely on the basis of number of day of work in the Respondent bank Branch is not acceptable. As regard plea of the Workman that the Workman should have been given employment even after 31.3.1997 as temporary Workman, it is the discretion of Respondent to engage the Workman depending upon availability of work and this Tribunal can not direct the Respondent to engage the Workman in the absent of such rule/scheme.

46. In view of principle laid down by Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above, in the instant matter Workman utterly failed to establish the fact of rendering continuous service for a period of 240 days of service within a period of 12 calendar months commencing and coming backward from relevant date i.e., the date of retrenchment, if has he would be denied to be in continuous service for a period of one year. Therefore, the provision contained under Sec.25F of retrenchment is not applicable to Workman.

Counsel for Workman has relied upon number of decisions of Hon'ble High Court and Hon'ble Supreme Court and few of them are discussed herein:-

In the case of **F.C.I., vs. Kamdhenu Cattle Feed Industries 1985 (1) SCC 71,** therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

"7. In contractual sphere as in all other State actions, the State and all its instrumentalities have to conform to Article 14 of the Constitution of which non-arbitrariness is a significant facet. There is no unfettered discretion in public law: A public authority possesses powers only to use them for public good. This impose the duty to act fairly and to adopt a procedure which is `fairplay in action'. Due observance of this obligation as a part of good administration raises a reasonable or legitimate expectation in every citizen to be treated fairly in his interaction with the State and its instrumentalities, with this element forming a necessary component of the decision making process in all State actions. To satisfy this requirement of non- arbitrariness in a State action, it is, therefore, necessary to consider and give due weight to the reasonable or legitimate expectations of the persons likely lo be affected by the decision or else that unfairness in the exercise of the power may amount to an abuse or excess of power apart from affecting the bona fides of the decision in a given case. The decision so made would be exposed to challenge on the ground of arbitrariness. Rule of law does not completely eliminate discretion in the exercise of power, as it is unrealistic, but providers for control of its exercise by judicial review."

In the case of **State Bank of India, R.O., Vijayawada vs. Industrial Tribunal, Hyderabad WP No.193/1997,** therein Hon'ble High Court have held,

"*Sri Krovvidi Narasimham, the learned counsel for the 2nd respondent contends, supporting the award that it was a permanent vacancy and even though the 2nd respondent was appointed on temporary basis, his services were not liable to be terminated and he was to be regularised into service on permanent basis. Shastry award warrants that no temporary appointment can be made to a permanent post. But the matter is now covered by two division bench judgements dated 28.11.1986 in W.A. No.791 of 1986 and 25.8.1987 in W.A. No.270 of 1982. The ratio decided in the two judgements is to the effect that there cannot be any mandate to appoint employees on permanent basis when the requirement was for appointment on temporary basis. But it is held in the said judgements that when a temporary appointee is ousted from service and not for misconduct and, if again temporary appointment is to be made, then, the*

case of such temporary appointee who was ousted, has got to be considered in accordance with Sec. 25-H of the Act."

In the case of **State of Haryana and others vs. Piara Singh and others. 1992 (4) SCC 118,** therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

" 49. If for any reason an adhoc or temporary employee is continued for a fairly long spell, the authorities must consider his case for regularization provided he is eligible and qualified according to the rules and his service record is satisfactory and his appointment does not run counter to the reservation policy of the state."

In the above cited judgements by the Workman the facts of the case are different hence do not apply to instant case of Workman.

47. On the other hand, in support of his contention Respondent has examined witness MW1 and MW1 in chief examination states that, Settlements i.e., on 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988, 9.1.1991 were entered into between the SBI and SBI Staff Federation for filling up of the vacancies that arise up to 1994 for those temporary employees who has worked on scale wages. Further, MW1 states that two different panels for messengers and non-messengers as per the eligibility criteria prescribed by the bank. There are four modules in Andhra Pradesh and they are Hyderabad, Tirupathi, Vijayawada and Visakhapatnam. MW1 states that the temporary employees so empanelled were given permanent absorption depending upon the vacancies so arise strictly in terms of the settlement. MW1 states that on 9.6.1995 conciliation proceeding was held before the RLC(C), Hyderabad and in said proceedings it was decided that the panels will be kept live up to 31.3.1997 and vacancies will be filled from both the lists concurrently. A copy of the said minutes of proceedings is Ex.M5. Further, MW1 states that on 30.7.1996 another settlement was entered between the SBI and All India SBI Staff Federation providing for filling up of the vacancies arising up to December 1994 in respect of subordinate cadre and daily wage /casual wage employees out of panel so prepared were to be considered against vacancies arising from January 1995 to December 1996, thereafter the said panels lapse. MW1 states that it was also agreed that all the non- messenger positions in subordinate cadre including part time attendants specially provided as leave reserve will be filled before 31.3.1997 and as regards to non-messengerial positions it is agreed that all such posts sanctioned and fallen vacant up to 31.3.1997 shall be filled before the empanelled list is allowed to lapse. Thus in both the cases empanelled list were lapsed on 1985. Ex.M6 is the copy of the settlement dated 30.7.1996. Further, witness states that on 27.2.1997 a memorandum of understanding was reached between the SBI and SBI Staff Federation providing that both the panels above mentioned will lapse on 31.3.1997. Ex.M7 is the copy of the memorandum of understanding and Ex.M8 is the copy of the statements giving the particulars of 1989 non-messenger panel, Ex.M9 is the copy of the statement of 1989 non-messenger panel, Ex.M10 is the copy of statement of 1992 panel. Further, witness states that petitioner was included in the 1989 panel. As the existing vacancies at that time were exhausted and his turn did not come he could not be given permanent employment in the bank as per the agreements. All the appointments were made strictly in accordance with the settlements reached from time to time between SBI and SBI staff federation and as per seniority, number of days of temporary service put in by them in the bank in the given period. Further, MW1 states petitioner was not sponsored by any employment exchange he did not undergo the regular process of selection required for appointment as a regular non-messenger the petitioner has not worked for 240 days in any year in his entire temporary service in the bank. The petitioner and other temporary employees were terminated from service by the bank. Further, MW1 states that the vacancies were filled up on regular basis with the temporary employees from the panels and these panels were expired in terms of the settlements so reached and there were no vacancies to absorb such employees. Thus, witness MW1 has proved the documents Ex.M1 to Ex.M12 and also contentions made in the counter. However, MW1 was cross examined by the Petitioner Counsel. But nothing has been elicited in his cross examination so as to discredit the testimony of the witness MW1 as regards the date of lapse of both the panels on 31.3.1997 and reasons assigned for non-absorption of the Petitioner from the panel list to the permanent post. Moreover the witness MW1 was re-examined by the Respondent and the witness MW1 states that panels were expired in terms of the settlement send absorptions to the extent of the available vacancies were made. There was no termination of any temporary messenger as such but their services were not utilized after the cut off date as the available vacancies were already filled up and most of these Petitioners were not in the service of the bank as on the date of the expiry date of the panels. Therefore, in view of the aforesaid testimony of the MW1 in re-examination in the absence of cross examination remained uncontraverted, the claim of the Workman that he was entitled for absorption in permanent post in the branch of Respondent Management on the basis of panel list is found not established.

This point is answered against the Workman.

48. **Point No.IV**:- In view of the discussion and finding given at Point Nos. I, II and III, the Workman is not entitled for any relief and claim statement of Workman sans merit and liable to be dismissed.

This Point is answered accordingly.

AWARD

In view of the fore gone discussion, it is held that the action of the Respondent bank in terminating the services of Sri Sk. Kaleshah, Ex. Messenger by way of oral orders w.e.f. the year 6.4.86 is justified. Hence, the Petitioner is not entitled for any relief as prayed for. The claim statement filed by Workman sans merit, hence, dismissed.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, Personal Assistant, transcribed by her, corrected and signed by me on this the 15th day of June, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner	Witnesses examined for the Respondent
WW1: Sri Sk. Kaleshah	MW1: Sri I.S. Appa Rao

Documents marked for the Petitioner

Ex.W1:	Photostat copy of service certificate
Ex.W2:	Photostat copy of nativity certificate
Ex.W3:	Photostat copy of transfer certificate.

Documents marked for the Respondent

Ex.M1:	Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.17.11.87
Ex.M2:	Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.16.7.88
Ex.M3:	Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.27.10.1988
Ex.M4:	Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.9.1.1991
Ex.M5:	Photocopy of conciliation proceedings before the Regional Labour Commissioner(C) dt.9.6.1995
Ex.M6:	Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.30.7.1996
Ex.M7:	Photocopy of Memorandum of understanding dt. 27.1.1997
Ex.M8:	Photocopy of statements giving the particulars of 1989 messenger panel.
Ex.M9:	Photocopy of statement of 1989 Non-messenger panel
Ex.M10:	Photocopy of statement of 1992 panel
Ex.M11:	Photocopy of order of Hon'ble High Court in WA No.86/98 dt. 1.5.98
Ex.M12:	Photocopy of order in SLP No.11886-11888 of 1998 dated 10.8.98

नई दिल्ली, 3 अगस्त, 2026

का.आ. 1671.— औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार स्टेट बैंक ऑफ़ इंडिया के प्रबंधतत्र, संबद्ध नियोजको और उनके कर्मकार के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद के पंचाट (26/2003) प्रकाशित करती है।

[सं. एल- 12025/01/2026- आई आर (बी-I)-157]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 3rd August, 2026

S.O. 1671.— In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the **Award (Ref. 26/2003*)*** of the ***Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court Hyderabad*** as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of **State Bank of India** and **their workman.**

[No. L-12025/01/2026-IR(B-I)-157]

SALONI, Dy. Director

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD

Present: - **Sri Irfan Qamar**

Presiding Officer

Dated the 15th day of June, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE L.C.No. 26/2003

[Old ID No. 279/99 of Labour Court, Guntur]

Between:

Sri Ch. Prabhakar

S/o Ramaiah,

Kanukur,

Kandukur Mandal,

Prakasam distt.

… Petitioner

And

1. The Chairman,
   State Bank of India,
   Central office,
   Mumbai.
2. The Chief General Manager,
   (Personnel)
   State Bank of India,
   Bank Street
   Hyderabad.
3. The Regional Asst. General Manager,
   State Bank of India,
   Kandukur,
   Prakasam District.
4. The Zonal Manager,
   State Bank of India,
   Zonal office,
   Tirupathi.

…..Respondents

Appearances:

For the Petitioner : Sri S. Adinarayana, Advocate

For the Respondent: Sri Y. Ranjeeth Reddy, Advocate

AWARD

Sri Ch. Prabhakar who worked as Messenger (who will be referred to as the workman) has filed this petition under Sec. 2A(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 against the Respondents State Bank of India seeking for reinstatement into service as Messenger duly granting all the consequential benefits such as continuity of service, back wages and all other attendant benefits etc., and such other reliefs as this court may deem fit. Earlier Petitioner has filed this dispute before the Labour Court, Guntur for adjudication and later the same has been transferred to this Tribunal bearing ID No. 279/99, as per orders of Central Government vide Lr.No.H-11026/1/2001-IR(C.II) dated 18.10.2001 and registered, numbered in this Tribunal as LC No. 26/2003.

2. Before unfolding the factual matrix of the instant industrial dispute it would be apposite to have a bird eye view of a chequered history of the instant industrial dispute. Earlier instant industrial dispute along with the batch cases was decided by this Tribunal vide common award dated 17.5.2005 and the reference was answered in favour of the Respondent and against the Workman. That said common award dated 17.5.2005 was challenged by the aggrieved Workmen in various Writ petition No.6470/2014 along with batch of writ petitions before the Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh and Hon'ble High Court vide its' judgement dated 23.6.2014 allowed all batch of writ petitions and set aside the common award dated 17.5.2005 passed in ID No.222 of 2001 and other batch of ID cases by Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad and the Respondent management of State Bank of India was directed to reengage the Writ Petitioners in position, which they have been occupying prior to their termination and further directed to consider their cases for regularization as and when the substantive vacancy arises. This judgement dated 23.6.2014 of Hon'ble High Court of AP, passed in WP No.6470/2014 and batch petitions was challenged by Respondent management before the Hon'ble High Court in Writ Appeal No. 1268 of 2014. The aforesaid Writ Appeals No.1268/2014 and other Writ Appeals were decided by Division Bench of High Court of Andhra Pradesh by a common judgement dated 20.3.2019. Hon'ble High Court in aforesaid Writ Appeal was pleased to pass the order which is extracted as below:-

" 7. Hearing the learned senior counsel for the SBI and the learned senior counsel for the contesting unofficial Respondents, we see that while the learned single Judge was justified in setting aside the award af the Tribunal, the proper course to be adopted was to remit all the cases to the Tribunal. This we say for reasons more than one. Firstly, in such matters, claims have to be decided on individual basis, as different persons have different claims as to the length of officiation or discharge of duties and functions; quality of engagement, drawings, accounting of the post for each one of them, who have worked etc. All these issues will not be the same in all the cases. Therefore, each case ought to have been directed to be decided by the Tribunal afresh on individual basis. The second and most important aspect is the learned single Judge has in one go ordered re-employment of all the workmen. This is not a relief that could have been granted without answering the individual issues; each issue relating to each case could not have been decided by the writ Court within the format of its adjudication procedures and scope. The adjudicating body, which has to do that activity, is the Industrial Tribunal. Therefore, we are of the view that while we would sustain the order of the learned singe Judge insofar as it interfered and sets aside the award of the Tribunal, the further findings and directions, issued through the impugned order have to go and the individual cases have to be sent back for consideration of the Tribunal. Such further procedure before the Tribunal will have to be carried forward with the materials already on record and also by affording an opportunity to the persons, who have claims as well as the management to place their rival contentions and further material before the Tribunal. The learned counsel appearing for the workmen are justified in pointing out that enormous delay has already happened and further action by the Tribunal in this line may be expedited.

9. In the result, these writ appeals are ordered;

(1) affirming the impugned common order of the learned single Judge to the extent it sets aside the common award dated 17.05.2005 of the Industrial Tribunal;

(2) the further findings and directions issued through the impugned common order are vacated:

(3) all the matters shall be remitted to the Industrial Tribunal with a direction to dispose of them within an outer limit of five (5) months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order; and,

(4) the parties to make appearance before the Tribunal on the given date."

Thus, in view of the above direction of Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh in W.A.No.1268 of 2014 and batch cases. This Tribunal has taken up the matter of industrial dispute for hearing and deciding it afresh in view of the aforesaid guidelines laid down by the Hon'ble High Court in Writ Appeal No.1268/2014 vide judgement dated 20.3.019.

3. The factual matrix of instant industrial dispute as narrated by the Workman in his claim statement are that, the Workman joined in the service of the management institution as Messenger from December, 1985 to 31.3.1997 and has rendered unblemished service spreading over a period of about 12 years. The Respondent has terminated services of Workman by oral orders with effect from 31.3.1997. Further, it is submitted that the management of Respondent bank decided to give a chance to temporarily employed personnel "found suitable for permanent appointment" by wait- listing them by offering permanent appointment or waitlisting till such opportunity arises.

4. That on 17.11.1987 a settlement was reached between All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and the Management of State Bank of India - settlement one, under this settlement three categories of employees were listed. That is, A) those who have completed 240 days in 12 months or less after 1.7.1975. B) those who have completed 270 days in any continuous block of 36 calendar months after 1.7.1975. C) (i) those who have completed minimum of 30 days aggregate temporary service in any calendar year after 1.7.1975 or (ii) 70 days aggregate temporary service in continuous block of 36 months after 1.7.1975.

5. The persons who satisfied in all the above 4 categories were to be interviewed by a selection committee and the said selection committee would determine the suitability of the said candidate for permanent appointment. Therefore, the bank prescribed certain qualifications and from among the candidates satisfying the qualifications the suitable candidates were enlisted by a selection committee. The Clause 7 of the said agreement provided with the selected candidate would be wait listed in order of their respective categorization and the selected panel would be valid upto December, 1991. Clause 10 of the settlement specifically provided that henceforth. "there will be no temporary appointments in the subordinate cadre", except on a restrictive basis in the specified category, "from amongst empanelled candidates as per existing guidelines of the bank". The Workman further submits that consequent upon the said agreement and the draft, a notification was issued in the newspapers. The last date for responding to the advertisement was 30.8.1988. A written examination followed by viva-voce in May, 1989 was held. A selected panel was prepared, as per Clause 7 of the agreement, ie. Settlement No.1, the selected panel was to be valid upto December, 1991, the Workman submits that circular was issued on 26.4.91 by the said letter it is mentioned that the terms of the agreement dated 17.11.87 was modified vide second agreement dated 16.7.88 was entered into between the parties. In terms of the said agreement a chance was to be given, "to all eligible temporary employees for permanent appointments. The appointments were against the vacancies likely to arise during the years 1995-96, circular made it clear that in view of the enormity of the problem an extension of the currency of the panel, eligible temporary employees who have been empanelled could not appear in the earlier interviews and have been pursuing their cases thereafter, "will be given another chance to appear for interview".

6. Workman submits that there were total five settlements. The settlement dated 17.11.87 is the 1st settlement (Ex M1), settlement dated 16.7.88 is 2nd settlement (Ex M2), settlement dated 27.10.88 is the 3rd settlement (Ex M3), then settlement dated 9.1.91 is 4th settlement and settlement dated 30.7.96 is 5th settlement (Ex M6). In between there is minutes of conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.95 marked as Ex M5. That due to all these settlements which were extended by subsequent settlements thereby created reasonable expectations in the list of the selected candidates arose with that it's a question of time their appointments or services would be regularized in the services of the bank. The Workman was working with the bank on temporary basis was under the bonafide hope that sooner his services will be regularized with the bank. He is thereby closed all his options elsewhere. It is needless to point out that employing person to whom hope of employment in substantial terms was made is a facet of Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

7. Further Workman submits that the Government of India issued Circular No. F-3/3/104/87-IR, dated 16.8.1990. Under said circular the chief Executives of all public sector banks including the Management herein were specifically instructed that until the problem of existing temporary employees is fully resolved, no bank is permitted to make any permanent appointments. That some of the persons similarly situated like this Workman aggrieved by the inaction on the part of the management of the bank is not regularizing their services from out of the selected panel and not clearly focusing the vacancy position, filed W.P. No. 4194/97 before Hon'ble High court of A.P.. It is specifically averred in the said writ petition that the Management of the bank had failed to implement the settlement and that it violates the various fundamental rights guaranteed under the constitution of India. The Hon'ble High court of A.P .. by order dated 5.3.97 directed the bank to implement the settlement as amended from time to time. It also directed the bank to carry out the terms of settlement before the expiry of March, 1997. The Hon'ble High Court also recorded finding that the Bank cannot escape its liability of enforcement of the Settlement. In view of the directions given by the High Court all candidates whose names appeared in the select panels prepared on the basis of the agreement entered into on 17.11.87 under which the panel was valid upto December, 1991, and on the basis of a settlement dated 27.10.1988 whereby the panels were made alive upto 31.3.1997 under which the panel was valid upto December, 1999. The other agreement dated 16.7.1988 under which the panel was valid upto 1992 and on the basis of the settlement dated 27.10.1998 whereby the panels were made alive upto 31.3.1997 were under the bonafide impression that their cases will be considered for regularization and were living on the basis of the said reasonable expectation. Unfortunately, contrary to the aforesaid directions given by the High Court and contrary to the settlements entered into between the parties, the bank issued proceedings dated 25.3.1997, dated 27.3.1997 and 31.3.1997 instructing the various authorities of the Management not to continue the temporary employees those who

are in services of the bank from 1.4.97. The said order was followed by the Management. Aggrieved by the said action the Workman herein and similarly situated candidates have filed a writ petition before the Hon'ble High Court and by way of Writ Petition No.9206/97 seeking a declaration that the proceedings issued by the Deputy General Manager and the Assistant General Manager (Respondents 3,4 and 5 therein) on 25.3.97, 27.3.97 and 31.3.97 as illegal and also non-continuance of the Workmen therein in service by absorbing them in the services of the bank as violative of Section 2(p) and 18(1) read with Rule 58 of Central Rules and sought for specific direction to the bank to absorb them in service.

8. Further, Workman submits that in the counter affidavit filed in Writ Petition No.9206/97, the bank has submitted that it has about 805 branches in Andhra Pradesh alone. It has stated that due to exigencies of circumstances and on account of the urgent need in its banks, it employed temporary employees in subordinate cadre. It is pertinent to mention that it does not state the urgent or need or the nature of temporary employees that it had engaged. Enquiry into the same would reveal that the stand taken by the bank either on the ground of urgent need or of temporary employees is a façade to perpetuate unfair labour practice. It is designed to on the one hand, keep the employed in the erroneous zone of hope and on the other to ensure that benefits that a model employer will extend under various statutes to its employees is not required to be borne out by the bank. A reading of the counter affidavit would show that the bank would opines that being just fair and reasonable are which obviously is reprehensible and is a facet of unfair labour practice.

9. The Workman submits that the bank had referred in its counter affidavit to three settlements dated 17.11.87, 16.7.88 and 27.10.88. The bank in the guise of extending the benefits of the circular of Government dated 16.8.90 stated in its counter affidavit that as follows:

"Government of India, vide its letter dated 16.8.1990, issued guidelines to all the public sector banks with regard to recruitment and absorption of temporary employees in public sector banks. The said guidelines were issued to implement on the lines of the approach paper on the issue provided by a committee constituted in this regard. The Government of India guidelines made it clear that all the public sector banks may follow the provisions laid down in the approach paper.

The approach paper specified that the cases of temporary employees who had put in not less than 240 days of temporary service in 12 consecutive Months and who are entitled to benefit of Section 25-F may be decided by entering into a settlement with the representative union. In respect of temporary employees who had put in less than 240 days of service in 12 consecutive months or less, a settlement could be avoided and however if the Management so desired, they could enter into a conciliation settlement with the representative union. Para 6(h), it is mentioned that only those temporary employees who had put in temporary service of 90 or more days after 1.1 1982 would be eligible for considering under the scheme. Although the Government guidelines envisaged for a settlement in respect of employees who had put in temporary service of 90 or more days, the bank by way of further concession entered into settlements Even in respect of those who had put in less than 90 days. As such, it could be Seen that the settlements are more beneficial to the temporary employees concerned. The approach paper also specify at para 6(c) that the banks would provide one time opportunity to all the temporary employees and for that purpose temporary employees worked in the bank on or after 1.1.1982 could be considered for re-employment in terms of the scheme. The Respondents have gone further wherein even persons working after 1975 were also considered.

As could be seen from the above, there was a genuine effort on the part of the Respondent bank to provide permanent employment for as many as possible subject to availability of the vacancies.

It is further submitted that at para 6(k) of the approach paper, it was made clear that this would be one time exercise in full and final settlement of all the aims and disputes for the past period in respect of temporary workmen covered by the settlement. This would mean that the Government of India guidelines would cover only those persons who were temporarily employed for the period specified therein and not otherwise. As such, it is submitted that the Respondents have not only followed the Government of India guidelines but in fact covered cases of the employees who had worked for less than 90 days. As such, question of violation does not arise and in any case those were only broad guidelines and not directives".

10. The Workman submits that the bank also referred a subsequent settlement dated 9.1.1991 wherein there is a clause to the effect- that the panel of temporary employees and the panel of daily wage employees will be operated to a particular period. Therefore, their cases will not be considered. The Management herein relying upon this settlement in their impugned action. It is submitted that even the settlement dated 9.1.1991 will not empower the management to terminate the services of the temporary employees who are working in the bank services like the Workman herein as it does not specify the termination of the employees. In fact there are so many vacancies wherein the Management has engaged several new persons as temporary messengers/ attendars/ sweepers etc., even after the judgment of Hon'ble High Court without considering the cases of the similarly situated candidates like the Workman herein. It is submitted inspite of engaging fresh candidates as is now being done by the Management they would have continued the similarly situated candidates like the Workman herein in the services of the bank and consider their cases for absorption in view of the circulars issued by Central Government as well as the directions of this Hon'ble Court in Writ Petition No.4194/97, dated 5.3.97. In view of the circulars issued by the Central Government, the Management

should not have relied upon the settlement dated 9.1.1991. Hence, the impugned action of the Management is illegal, unjust, violative of fundamental rights such as Articles 14,16 and 21 of the Constitution of India.

11. The Workman submits that in W.P. No.4194/97 filed by the union of temporary employees where in they have complained about the non- implementation of the settlements arrived between the parties and sought for absorption. Such employees in the bank services on permanent basis before the date fixed for carrying out the terms of settlement, the Court held that the members of the union had been empanelled in the list, they were not regularized and the time was going to run out to the near future and the Respondent bank and its officers cannot escape from the liability of enforcing the settlement which has been reached and therefore directed that the bank and the officers shall implement the settlement dated 17.11.87 as amended from time to time before the expiry of 31.3.97.

12. Further, it is submitted that in the clause of Settlement it is specifically mentioned that the workmen to be absorbed/appointed in the bank prohibiting any temporary appointments subsequent to the date of settlement even the authorities want to make temporary appointments that should be made only from among the empanelled can be appointed either for temporary vacancy or permanent vacancy except from among the empanelled candidates like the Workman and that should be continued till they are absorbed. The management committed unfair labour practices and terminated the services of the candidates with effect from 31.3.1997 which is arbitrary, discriminatory, contrary to their own guidelines and violative of the constitutional provisions which are guaranteed in Chapter-III of the Constitution of India.

13. The Workman submits that it is strange as to how the panels were allowed to lapse by a so-called Memorandum of Understanding dated 25.2.1997, that the action of terminating such employees like the Workman by virtue of an impugned oral proceedings without implementing the settlement would be illegal and unfair labour practice which cannot be allowed to be perpetuated. That the discontinuance of the Workman after 31.3.97 who had served in the bank in any capacity amounts to retrenchment. It could not have been done without any notice and it violates Sec.25FF of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and the said action is violative of principles of natural justice guaranteed under Chapter III of the Constitution of India. This amounts to retrenchment without one month's notice and taken in view of such notice. Thus, the main proceedings issued by the Respondent is without jurisdiction and is arbitrary, illegal and therefore liable to be quashed. That the alleged Memorandum of Understanding dated 27.2.97, Ex.M5 does not own any legal entity, as the said Memorandum of Understanding is not published anywhere to brought to the notice of the Workman whose rights are being affected. It is submitted that Management did not adhere to the procedure envisaged by the Central Government in its' instructions dated 16.8.90 in the year 1995. The same was not followed in the year 1997 despite there being vacancies. The management has followed the procedure of calling candidates through Employment exchange instead of giving chance to the empanelled candidates like the Workman here. It is pertinent to mention here that the Respondent Management sent letters to the all similarly situated candidates like the Workman in the month of June, 1997, subsequent to the passing of impugned termination orders. After knowing the facts that the candidates are litigating, the Management refused to engage these candidates. It is once again reiterated that the panels are meant for absorption but not for termination. It was the duty of the Management to engage the empanelled candidates like the Workman even in temporary vacancies till they are absorbed permanently in regular vacancies. Hence, the action of the Respondent Management terminating the services of the Workman by oral order dated 31.3.97 is unjust, illegal, violative of principles of natural justice and hence, the Management be directed to reinstate and absorb the Workman and to grant all incidental and consequential benefits.

14. Per contra, Respondent had filed counter and made a contentions that the reference is not tenable and contrary to the provisions of I.D. Act, 1947. Respondent submitted that to tide over severe sub-ordinate staff constraints which arose out of leave vacancies, exigencies, etc., and also owning to the restrictions imposed by the Government of India/Reserve Bank of India on intake of staff, the Respondent bank used to engage sub-ordinate staff like messengers, sweepers, sweeper cum water boys, etc., depending on the availability of work on purely temporary basis for the smooth and uninterrupted functioning of the branches. It is submitted that the All India State Bank of India Staff Federation which represents majority of the employees in the State Bank of India comprising about 98% of the work force as its' members espoused the cause of temporary employees who have put in less than 240 days of temporary service in 12 calendar months in the bank and who were ineligible for any protection under Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 to give a chance for being considered for absorption and permanent appointments.

15. Discussions were held and on 17.11.1987 an agreement was signed between the federation and the Management bank under Sec. 2(p) read with Sec 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules 1957. A copy of the said settlement dated 17.11.87 which may be herein after referred as first settlement is filed and 4 categories were made as it has already been mentioned in the claim statement above, it need not be repeated here. In the first settlement, it was agreed that the temporary employees as categorized would be given a chance for being considered for permanent appointment in the bank's service against the vacancies which are likely to arise during the period 1987 to 1991. On 16.7.88 second settlement was arrived between the Federation and the Bank whereby it was agreed to substitute the period of consideration of vacancies as 1987 to 1992 in place of 1987 to 1991 as contemplated under the first settlement dated 17.11.1987. This is the second settlement.

A 3rd settlement was entered into on 27.10.88 and it was agreed that the bank's service against the vacancies likely to arise from 1988 to 1992 was to be considered. Government of India vide its letter dated 16.8.90 issued guidelines to all the public sector banks with regard to recruitment and absorption of temporary employees in public sector banks. The said guidelines were issued to implement on the lines of approach paper on the issue provided by a committee constituted in this regard. Government of India guidelines made it clear that all the public sector banks may follow the provisions laid down in the approach paper. The approach paper specified that the cases of temporary service in 12 consecutive months and who are entitled to benefit of Sec.25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 may be decided by entering into a settlement with the representative union. In respect of temporary employees who had put in less than 240 days of service in 12 consecutive months or less, a settlement could be avoided and however if the Management so desired they could enter into a conciliation settlement with the representative union. In para. 6(h) it is mentioned that only those temporary employees who had put in temporary service of 90 days or more days after 1.1.82 would be eligible for considering under the scheme. Although the Government guidelines envisaged for a settlement in respect of employees who had put in temporary service of 90 days or more days, the bank by way of a further concession entered into settlements. Even in respect of those who had put in less than 90 days and also the bank went a step further and said those persons who are working after 1975 were also considered. Hence, there was a genuine effort on the part of the Respondent bank to provide as many as possible jobs subject to the availability of the vacancies. However, para 6 (k) of the approach paper made it clear that it is a one time, exercise in full and final, settlement of all the claims and disputes for the past period, in respect of temporary workmen covered by the settlement. Another settlement was entered on 9.1.91 herein after referred as 4th settlement and the time limit was extended upto 1994 and separate panel was prepared for temporary employees, casual/daily wagers. It was agreed that while vacancies arising between 1988 to 1994 in respect of temporary employees and in respect of casual/daily wagers, they can be considered for the vacancies arising between 1995-96 only.

16. It is submitted that the administrative set up of the Hyderabad Local Head Office comprises of four Zonal Offices (Zones) at Hyderabad, Vijayawada, Visakhapatnam and Tirupathi covering all the Districts of Andhra Pradesh. In terms of the settlement the Management after following the procedure laid down therein prepared the panels of qualified candidates of temporary employees denoted as 1989 panel and also panel of casual/daily wagers denoted as 1992 panel for giving a chance for being considered for permanent absorption. These panels were prepared zone-wise separately for messengers and non-messengers in the descending order of temporary service put in by the candidates during the stipulated period i.e., 1.7.1975 to 31.7.1988. That the Federation approached the Regional Labour Commissioner(C) for implementation of bi-partite settlement in respect of absorption of temporary employees. The Regional Labour Commissioner(C) conducted conciliation proceedings and an agreement was arrived between the Federation and the bank. It was agreed that it would be kept alive upto March, 1997. A copy of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.2.1995 signed by the parties is filed as material paper. A settlement was arrived at and an agreement was signed between the Federation and the Management bank on 30.7.1996 under Sec.2 (p) read with Sec.18(1) of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957, which is hereinafter called as 5th settlement. That on 27.2.1997 a Memorandum of understanding was also signed by the federation's affiliate and the bank Management recording the fact that the exercise of identifying the messengerial vacancies as on 31.12.1994 has since been completed by Central Office and thereby 403 messengerial vacancies were sanctioned . It was agreed that these vacancies may be filled from 1989 panel of temporary employees after effecting conversion from full time non-messengerial staff in the usual manner and the agreement was reached accordingly. It was agreed between the Federation's affiliate and the Management bank that in terms of the settlement dated 30.7.1996 both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees would lapse on 31.3.1997. That as agreed upon vacancies were filled from the panels. The Workman who has put in an aggregate temporary service of less than 240 days in a continuous block of 12 months period during 1.7.1975 to 31.7.1988 has no right to seek a direction to consider his candidature for absorption in the Management bank under any rule/law except under the settlement entered into thereon.

17. Respondent contended that, in fact, the case of the Workman can be considered under all the five settlements having got his case considered under provisions of these settlements. All the other provisions and terms of the settlements are also binding on him/her. The Management bank has not violated any of the provisions of the terms of the said settlement. That the very preparation and maintenance of panel is in compliance of the terms agreed under these settlements. These settlements were time bound and they ceased to exist on 31.3.1997. That the bank has never promised that all the candidates in the panel will be absorbed. In the advertisement itself it was made clear that candidates will be considered for absorption in the vacancies that may arise upto 1992. Keeping alive the panels after 31.3.1997 is contrary to the settlements arrived between the State Bank of India Staff Federation and the Management bank. That the settlements are binding on the parties. The Workman is also bound under the terms of the said settlement. The settlement does not suffer from any ambiguity as their language is very clear. The right under the settlements is to give them a chance to be considered for future appointment in the bank's services against the vacancies likely to arise. The settlements were effected to balance the expectations of the temporary employees to be absorbed in permanent service as against the constitutional rights for all eligible persons to be considered for employment every time a vacancy arises. That the alleged dispute including the demand for reinstatement has to be decided in this context. It is submitted that the period of panel list got expired on 31.3.97 and it is an integral term of

the settlement and cannot be modified in any proceedings under the law. These temporary employees who unfortunately could not be accommodated for want of vacancies have no further rights to be considered for regularization. That the Hon'ble High Court in WP No.12964/94, held as follows, "It is needless to state that the settlement arrived at between the All India State Bank of India Staff Federation which, is the majority union and the bank Management is binding on the Workmen also. It is not at all the case of the Workman that any of the terms of the settlement has been violated by the bank's Management. If the Workman had worked in the bank on part-time basis before 31.5.94, that itself would not vest in him a right to claim that his services should be regularized on permanent basis against a full time cadre post. The claim put forth by the Workman in the present petition is therefore misconceived and not tenable. However, it is open to the Workman to claim any right which flows from the settlement between the union and the bank Management. As already pointed out that it is not the grievance of the Workman that some right which has flown from the settlement in favour of the Workman has been denied by the bank Management. Therefore, I do not find any ground, let alone substantial ground, to grant the kind of relief sought for by the Workman. Writ Petition fails and is accordingly dismissed. No costs."

18. Further, it is contended that if the panels were not lapsed at the end of designated period and allowed to be continued it would result in making the contracts of temporary employment indirectly permanent through back door entry, which would not only be contrary to the settlements but also to Articles 14 and 16 of Constitution of India and deprive the chances of original claimants who would Come through proper recruitment procedure. As their rights have been crystallized by operation of the settlements. Hence, there is no question of any Legitimate expectation being violated.

19. Similarly placed ex-employees filed WP No.9206/1995 and the batch before the Hon'ble High Court of A.P. and the learned Single Judge allowed the Writ Petitions. Aggrieved by the same WA No.86/98 and the batch was filed and the Division Bench set aside the order of the Single Judge. Thereafter the ex-temporary employees filed Special Leave Petition No.11886-11888 of 1998 before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India also dismissed the SLP. Therefore, reference to the Judgement of the Learned Single Judge in WP No.9206/97 is of no consequences as the same has already been set aside. The observations made in the Judgements cannot be relied upon for any purpose what so ever. The question of operation of Sec.25F would not come into play. Further the issue is covered by various Judgements of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India and various Hon'ble High Courts. Hence, the reference may be ordered that the Workman is not entitled for any relief.

20. In order to fortify his claim Workman has examined himself as WW1 and also filed documents in evidence which has been exhibited as Ex.W1 to W5. Further, the Workman has filed photocopies of documents in support of his claim which are discussed as under:-

Ex.W1 is the service certificate. Ex.W2 is the employment card. Ex.W3 is the appointment order. Ex.W4 is the caste certificate. Ex.W5 is the transfer certificate.

21. On the other hand, Respondent has examined witness MW1 Sri I.s. Appa Rao and this witness has exhibited 12 documents, marked as Ex.M1 to M12. The details of these documents are as follows:-

Ex.M.1 is the Settlement dated 17.11.1987. Ex.M2 is the Settlement dated 16.7.1988. Ex.M3 is the Settlement dated 27.10.1988. Ex.M4 is the Settlement dated 9.1.1991. Ex.M5 is the Minutes of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.1995. Ex.M6 is the Settlement dated 30.7.1996. Ex.M7 is the Memorandum of Understanding dt. 27.2.1997. Ex.M8 is the Particulars of 1989 Messengerial Panel. Ex.M9 is the Particulars of 1989 Non-Messengerial Panel. Ex.M10 is the Particulars of 1992 General Attendant Panel. Ex.M11 is the Judgment of Hon’ble High Court of A.P. in Writ Appeal No.86/98 dt.1.5.1998. Ex.M12 is the Judgment of Hon’ble Supreme Court of India in SLP No. 11886-11888 of 1998 dt.10.8.1998.

22. Apart from afore mentioned documents, Learned Counsel for Workman has also filed a long list of various judgements of Hon’ble Supreme Court as well as Hon’ble High Court, which we will discuss at appropriate place in this Award.

23. Heard the argument of Learned Counsel for Workman as well as for Respondent.

24. On the basis of rival pleadings of both the parties and submissions made by the Learned Counsel for both the parties, following points arise for determination in the industrial dispute :-

I. Whether the 1st settlement dated 17.11.1987, 2nd settlement dated 16.7.1988, 3rd settlement dated 27.10.1988, 4th settlement dated 9.1.1991 and 5th settlement dated 30.7.1996 entered into between State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and also Memorandum of Understanding are binding upon both the parties?

II. Whether the action of State Bank of India, Kandukur Main branch, in terminating the services of Workman Sri Ch. Prabhakar, a Messenger with effect from 31.3.1997 is justified?

III. Whether the Workman is entitled for absorption on permanent post in the Branch of Respondent management as per averments made by him in the claim statement?

IV. To what relief if any the Workman is entitled for?

Findings:-

25. **Point No.I**:- Undisputedly settlements dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988, 9.1.1991 and 30.7.1996, minutes of conciliation proceedings and memorandum of understanding dated 27.2.1997 were executed between the State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation under section 2(p) and 18 (1) of I.D. Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Disputes (Central Rules), 1957.

Section 2(p) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 as follows:-

(p) "settlement" means a settlement arrived at in the course of conciliation proceeding and includes a written agreement between the employer and workmen arrived at otherwise than in the course of conciliation proceeding where such agreement has been signed by the parties thereto in such manner as may be prescribed and a copy thereof has been sent to an officer authorised in this behalf by the appropriate Government and the conciliation officer;

Section 18(1) provides as follows:-

18. Persons on whom settlements and awards are binding.

- [(1) A settlement arrived at by agreement between the employer and Workman otherwise than in the course of conciliation proceeding shall be binding on the parties to the agreement.

Therefore, in view of the provision contained u/s.18 (1) I.D. Act, 1947, terms and conditions enumerated in the aforesaid settlements are binding on the parties to the agreement. The Learned Counsel for Workman has argued that the Workman after going through the selection procedure has successfully been listed in the panel for appointment on the permanent basis in the Respondent management and the empanelled list has to be valid till last person in the empanelled list is appointed on permanent basis. But the impugned order dated 25.3.97, 27.3.97 and 31.3.97, has been issued by Respondent management thereby the services of the Workman has been terminated and the said order is not in consonance of the terms of the agreement entered into between the parties. Further, Workman submits that the Respondent in the 5th settlement has mentioned the date i.e., 31.3.1997 for lapse of empanel list which is illegal and that is not binding upon the Workman. The condition of lapse of empanelment list on 31.3.97 incorporated in the aforesaid 5th settlement, is arbitrary and illegal.

26. The perusal of the impugned order dated 25.3.1997 goes to reveal that the Chief/Branch Manager, SBI Zonal Office has issued the letter to all the branches with regard to the subject not to make any temporary appointments in the Branch in messengerial category from 31.3.1997. The extract of the said letter is given below:-

"We have been advised by the Deputy General Manager, Zonal Office, Hyderabad that as both the panels of temporary employees of 1989 and daily wagers/casual labours of 1992 will lapse by 31.3.1997, it has been decided by Central Office not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial category from 31.3.1997."

Thus, from the contents of the aforesaid letter, it manifest that Head Office of State Bank of India vide letter dated 25.3.1997 has issued direction to all its branches not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial category from 31.3.1997 due to reason of lapse of both panels i.e., 1989 & 1992 on 31.3.1997 as per terms of settlements entered into by both parties. Further, the contents of the subsequent letter dated 27.3.1997 issued by Respondent Management is also direction to Branch Manager, State Bank of India not to make any temporary messengerial category appointment with effect from 31.3.1997 and it has also been communicated to all concerned that the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers maintained by Zonal offices stand lapsed from 31.1.1997. Further, office order dated 31.3.1997 has been issued by Respondent management that goes to reveal that the said office order has been issued to this effect that, "Consequent on absorption of temporary employees in permanent cadre, it has been decided by the competent authority that no one onwards, no further daily labour or temporary employees/appointments should be resorted to/engaged/employed." Therefore, it reflects from the contents of the aforesaid orders that the temporary appointment in messengerial category and daily labour has been stopped by the Respondent management with effect from 31.3.1997 because of the lapsed of panel of temporary workers and daily wagers by 31.3.1997. The agreement for lapse of both the panels on 31.3.1997 is contained in the 5th settlement which has been arrived at between the parties on dated 30.7.1996 with the consensus of both the parties. Therefore, Workman can not challenge the terms and conditions contained in settlement dated 30.7.1996 regarding lapse of panel on 31.3.1997 as agreed between State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation. As per provision contained u/s.18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 the said Agreement dated 30.7.1996 is binding on both the parties.

In the case of **Allied Sales Corporation Secunderabad vs.The Authority Under Andhra Pradesh..... 1990 II LLJ 510 AP para 414, Hon'ble Court have held:-**

"*4. There was a settlement between the Management and the workmen under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act on 25th April 1983 under which the age of superannuation of the workmen was fixed at 55 years. The settlement was to be in force upto 30th June 1986 and the next settlement, incorporating practically the same terms, was again*

entered into on 4th February 1987 under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act. There is no dispute that these settlements are under Section 18(1).

14. Now the Authority constituted under Section 41(1) of the Act is an authority with very limited jurisdiction. It can only decide in the first appeal whether a termination by the management is valid or not and is within the parameters of Section 40 of the Act. The said Authority, in our view, has absolutely no jurisdiction to decide whether a settlement entered into under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act between the representatives of the Workmen and of the Management, is vitiated by undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion on the part of the Management. The Authority, namely, the Assistant Commissioner of Labour, was never intended by the A.P. Legislature to have jurisdiction to go into the question of the validity of a settlement arrived at under Section 18 of the Industrial Disputes Act by an Industrial Court. That Parliament has, in fact, constituted Industrial Courts under the Industrial Disputes Act, with extensive powers cannot be disputed. What we mean to say is that the Authority under Section 41(1) of the A.P. Act has no jurisdiction what-so-ever either to question or to decide about the validity of any such settlements. If parties to a settlement have a grievance about the validity of a settlement, it is for them to agitate the matter before the appropriate forum and they cannot ask an Authority constituted under Section 41(1) of the A.P. Shops and Establishments Act, 1966 with limited jurisdiction, to go into any such question and, that too, incidentally while deciding whether retirement as per the contract of employment, is legal or not."

It is not the case of Workman that aforesaid settlements are vitiated by undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion on the part of the management. If the Workman feeling aggrieved by any terms of settlement/ agreement on the aforementioned grounds then he can challenge of settlement before a competent authority under the Act, 1947. But here in the instant matter it is not a case of Workman that aforementioned settlement has been entered into between the parties on the ground of undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion. Therefore, Workman is barred to raise any objection in respect of fixing the date of lapse of both panels on 31.3.1997 as agreed between both the parties and Workman can not challenge any terms of said Agreement.

Further in the case of **Herbertsons Limited Vs. Workmen of Herbertsons Limited and Ors, 1977 AIR 322,** Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

The Tribunal thought that the question of the quantum of membership of the 2nd Respondent did not call for a finding at all in view of 1his Court's order. As observed above that was not a correct assumption. On the other hand, we feel that this view of the Tribunal has led it to approach the matter in an entirely erroneous manner. The Tribunal is, rightly enough, conscious that under section 18 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act the settlement was binding on the company and the members of the 3rd Respondent union. Even so, the Tribunal devoted nearly half of its order in scanning the evidence given by the company and Respondent No. 3 to find out whether the terms of the settlement had been explained by the President of the union to the workmen or not and whether the workers voluntarily accepted the settlement knowing all the "consequences". This to our mind is again an entirely wrong approach.

"When a recognised union negotiates with an employer the workers as individuals do not come into the picture. It is not necessary that each individual worker should know the implications of the settlement since a recognised union, which is expected to protect the legitimate interests of labour, enters into a settlement in the best interests of labour. This would be the normal rule. We cannot altogether rule out exceptional cases where there may be allegations of mala fides, fraud or even corruption or other induce- ments. Nothing of that kind has been suggested against the President of the 3rd Respondent in this case. That being the position, prima facie, this is a settlement in the course of collective bargaining and, therefore, is entitled to due weight and consideration.

It is not possible to scan the settlement in bits and pieces and hold some parts good and acceptable and others bad. Unless it can be demonstrated that the objectionable portion is such that it completely outweighs all the other advantages gained the Court will be slow to hold a settle- ment as unfair and unjust. The settlement has to be accepted or rejected as a whole and we are unable to reject it as a whole as unfair or unjust. Even before this Court the 3rd Respondent representing admittedly the large majority of the workmen has stood by this settlement and that is a strong factor which it is difficult to ignore. As stated elsewhere in the judgment, we cannot also be oblivious of the fact that all workmen of the company have accepted the settlement. Besides, the period of settlement has since expired and we are informed that the employer and the 3rd Respondent are negotiating another settlement with further improvements. These factors, apart from what has been stated above, and the need for industrial peace and harmony when a union backed by a large majority of workmen has accepted a settlement in the course of collective bargaining have impelled us not to interfere with this settlement. That being the position, we unhold the settlement as fair and just and order that the award of the Tribunal shall be substituted by the settlement dated October 18, 1973. The said settlement shall be the substituted award. The appeal is disposed of accordingly. There will be no order as to costs."

Therefore, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above, the contention of the Workman that the date fixed for lapse of empanelled list on 31.3.1997 for appointment to the permanent post vide 5th Settlement dated 30.7.1996 is arbitrary, illegal is not untenable. The recognized union of Workmen has negotiated with the Respondent Bank Management representing large number of Workmen and the Workman as individual do not come into picture. Workman in the instant case has work as temporary Workmen in the Respondent Branch and

in response of Notification he had applied for inclusion of his name in the panel and he was selected for inclusion his name in the panel list to be utilized for absorption of such Workman to permanent post in order of their seniority in the list. The Settlement dated 30.7.1996 between State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation under Sec.2(p) and Sec.18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 has clearly provided as regard non-messengerial position and it is agreed that all such posts sanctioned fallen vacant upto 31.3.1997 shall be filled before empanel list is allowed to lapse. Thus, in view of law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, in the instant case, Agreement dated 30.7.1996 was entered into between both the parties in respect of lapsing of the both the panels on 31.3.1997 and absorption of the Workmen from panel list was subject to availability of vacancy of post likely to arise upto 31.3.1997, have a binding force on Workman as well as management of State Bank of India in view of provision contained under section 18 (1) of I.D. Act, 1947.

Thus, Point No.I is answered against the Workman and in favour of the Respondent.

27. **Point No.II**:- Firstly, it is submitted on behalf of the Workman that the Respondent has terminated his services by oral order on 31.3.1997 without issuing any notice or paying any salary or compensation in lieu thereof. Therefore, the termination order of the Workman from service is in violation of provision contained Under Section 25 F of I.D. Act, 1947. Therefore, the order is liable to be set aside.

28. On the other hand, Respondent counsel contended that Workman has not worked for 240 days in any preceding calendar year. Therefore, reference of the industrial dispute is not relevant. In this context, the Workman has examined himself as WW1 who has reiterated that Workman has been terminated from service by Respondent on 31.3.1997 without notice of salary or compensation in lieu thereof. Before examining the claim of the Workman on merit it would be apposite to reproduce the provision contained under section 25 F:-

Section 25F provides:-

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].

Compensation to workmen in case of transfer of undertakings.

Section 25B defines the term continuous service which provides

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 authorized 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;

In order to prove the fact of 240 days of service within 12 months of a calendar year just preceding from the date of termination, the initial burden of proof lies upon the Workman and the Workman has to prove this factum by adducing his oral as well as documentary evidence in support of his claim.

Further, how to calculate 240 days of service by the Workman in a calendar year. In this context the reference of decisions of Hon'ble Supreme Court is relevant and the same are discussed below:-

In Rajasthan State Ganganagar S. Mills Ltd. v. State of Rajasthan and Anr. (2004) Apex Court held:

"It was the case of the Workman that he had worked for more than 240 days in the year concerned. This claim was denied by the appellant. It was for the claimant to lead evidence to show that he had worked for 240 days in the year preceding the date of his termination. He has filed an affidavit. It is statement which is in his favor and that cannot be regarded as sufficient evidence for any Court or Tribunal to come to the conclusion that in fact the claimant had worked for 240 days in a year These aspects were highlighted in Range Forest Officer v. S.T. Hadimani (2002 (3)

SCC 25. No proof of receipt of salary or wages for 240 days or order or record in that regard was produced. Mere non-production of the muster roll for a particular period was not sufficient for the Labour Court held that the Workman had worked for 240 days as claimed."

In Municipal Corporation, Faridabad v. Siri Niwas (2004 (8) SCC 195), held "*the burden was on the Workman to show that he was working for more than 240 days in the preceding one year prior to his alleged retrenchment." In M.P. Electricity Board v. Hariram (2004 (8) SCC 246) the position was again reiterated in paragraph 11 as follows: "The above burden having not been discharged and the Labour Court having held so, in our opinion, the Industrial Court and the High Court erred in basing an order of reinstatement solely on an adverse inference drawn erroneously ..*"

In the case of Manager, RBI, Bangalore vs. S Mani (2005) SCC Page 100, the 3 Judges Bench of the Apex Court held that "*the initial burden of proof was on the Workman to show that he had completed 240 days of service."*

Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of Mohan Lal vs Management BEL 1981 SCC page 225 has laid down the principle that how to count 240 days of service within one year it is held: *"Clause (2)(a) provides for a fiction to treat a Workman in continuous service for a period of one year despite the fact that he has not rendered uninterrupted service for a period of one year but he has rendered period of 240 days during the period of 12 calendar service for months counting backwards and just preceding the relevant date being the date of retrenchment. In other words, in order to invoke the fiction enacted in clause (2)(a) it is necessary to determine first the relevant date, ie the date of termination of service which is complained of as retrenchment. After that date is ascertained. move backward to a period of 12 months just preceding the date of retrenchment and then ascertain whether within the period of 12 months, the Workman has rendered service for a period of 240 days. If these three facts are affirmatively answered in favor of the Workman pursuant to the deeming fiction enacted in clause (2)(a) it will have to be assumed that the Workman is in continuous service for a period of one year and he will satisfy the eligibility qualification enacted in Section 25-F"*

"14. We have already extracted section 25B since its amendment and the change in language is the legislative exposition of which note must be taken. In fact, we need not further dilate upon this aspect because in Surendra Kumar Verma and Ors. v. Central Government Industrial-cum-Labour Court, New Delhi and Anr., Chinnappa Reddy. J., after noticing the amendment and referring to the decision in Sur Enamel and Stamping Works (P) Ltd case, held as under:

"These changes brought about by Act 36 of 1964 appear to be clearly designed to provide that a Workman who has actually worked under the employer for not less than 240 days during a period of twelve months shall be deemed to have been in continuous service for a period of one year whether or not he has in fact been in such continuous service for a period of one year. It is enough that he has worked for 240 days in a period of 12 months, it is not necessary that he should have been in the service of the employer for one whole year."

In a concurring judgment Pathak J. agreed with this interpretation of section 25B(2). Therefore, both on principle and on precedent it must be held that section 25B(2) comprehends a situation where a Workman is not in employment for a period of 12 calendar months, but has rendered service for a period of 240 days within the period of 12 calendar months commencing and counting backwards from the relevant date, i.e. the date of retrenchment. If he has, he would be deemed to be in continuous service for a period of one year for the purpose of section 25B and Chapter VA."

Thus, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above the initial burden of proof lies upon the Workman to show that he has completed 240 days of the service with the Respondent just preceding from the date of his termination. Further, in respect of the employment of calculating the 240 days service provision contained under Section 25-F read with Section 25-B of the I.D. Act, 1947.

29. Now, in view of the provision contained under Section 25 F and law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, we have to examine whether the Workman has discharged his initial burden of proof in respect of his claim of 240 days continuous service in a calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination i.e., 31.3.1997.

In this context, WW1 in his cross examination has stated that,

" My service was for total no. of 178 days continuously.....

I was not sponsored by employment exchange. ..... It is not true to suggest that I never worked for 240 days in a year continuously and I was casual worker I am not entitled for any relief."

Thus, it is clear from the testimony of WW1 that the Workman had not worked for 240 days continuously in any 12 months of a calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination in the Respondent bank. Therefore, Workman failed to establish his plea by his oral and documentary evidence that he had worked for 240 days continuously in calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination i.e., 31.3.1997. Thus, the claim of the Workman that he has been terminated by oral order without issuing notice or payment in lieu after termination, in contravention of Section 25 F of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is not tenable. However the documents filed by the

Workman in support of his claim, number of days worked with the Respondent goes to reveal that the Workman had worked intermittently as daily wager depending upon availability of work in branch. Workman did not file any document of appointment letter or salary slips in support of his claim for appointment as a non-messenger in the Respondent branch on temporary basis.

30. Per contra, the Learned Counsel for Respondent has submitted the allegation of Workman that he was terminated from services is not correct. As the vacancies were filled up on regular basis in order of their respective seniority the non-engagement of the Workman does not amount to termination. Further, Respondent contended that no law provide that even though there is no work temporary employee should be continued in the bank work as the very engagement of Workman was subject to availability of work. Therefore, the allegation that the bank has indulged in unfair labour practice is incorrect.

31. Thus, in view of the fore gone discussion and contentions made by the Respondent, I find the force in the argument advanced by the Respondent that in the instant matter, Workman was not terminated from service by order dated 31.3.1997 rather he was disengaged in view of the non-availability of the work in the branch. Further, there was direction issued by the Head Office of the Respondent authority not to engage any daily wager Workman/ temporary Worker w.e.f. 31.3.1997. Thus, such disengagement of Workman does not amount to termination. Moreover, the Workman failed to prove his claim that he was terminated in contravention of provision of Sec.25F of the I.D. Act, 1947 as he failed to establish his plea by any oral or documentary evidence that he had worked for 240 days continuously in a twelve months of calendar year just preceding from date of termination i.e., 31.3.1997.

32. Further, perusal of the order dated 25.3.1997 goes to reveal that the Chief Branch Manager, State Bank of India has issued the letter to Zonal Office with direction to all its branches to this effect that they have been advised by the DGM, Zonal Office, Hyderabad that as both the panel of temporary employees of 1989 and daily wagers/casual labour of 1992 will lapse on 31.3.1997 it has been decided by central office not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial cadre from 31.3.1997, therefore it was directed to issue suitable instructions not to make temporary appointments from 31.3.1997. There is no mention in this order that the Workman herein has been terminated from service by this order.

33. Further, the circular dated 27.3.1997 was issued by DGM, SBI to all branches in commercial network in respect of the non-appointment of temporary employees in subordinate cadre and it has directed not to make any temporary employment in the subordinate cadre with effect from 1.4.97 and further, it has directed to ensure that no temporary/casual/daily basis appointment of the petty cash. Further, it is directed to all Branch Managers that any deviation in this regard will be viewed seriously. Thus, these circulars do not reflect that the Workman has been terminated from service by this order.

34. Similarly, office order dated 31.3.1997 is simply a direction to all branches of the Respondent bank by DGM that no further daily labour should be engaged or employed. Therefore, the plea of the Workman that he has been terminated by the aforesaid order dated 25.3.1997, 27.3.1997 and 31.3.1997 from the service by the Respondent is not acceptable. The evidence adduced by the Workman clearly goes to reveal that he had worked as a daily wager for which he has been paid wages according to number of working days. As there was an order for prohibition for engaging temporary workmen, in the bank, therefore, Workman could not be engaged by the Respondent for work from 31.3.1997 and there after. It is settled law that the daily wagers are engaged by the employer depending upon the availability of work and as the work was not available the Workman was not engaged further by the Respondent management. Therefore, the Workman on the ground of number of days he had worked in the Respondent bank cannot claim any right to reinstate him into the employment. As the Workman failed to prove the mandatory condition of 240 days of continuous service as required under Sec.25F of I.D. Act, 1947. Therefore, the disengagement of Workman from work can not be termed in contravention of provision contained under Sec.25F and 25 B of the I.D. Act, 1947.

Thus, this point is answered against the Workman and in favour of Respondent.

35. **Point No.III**:- In this context, the Workman has contended that the management failed to implement the selected panels during its valid tenure. The management adopted the back door methods contrary to the settlements and filled up the vacancies. The same is evident from the proceedings dated 18.11.1993 a copy of the same is filed in the material papers and the same may be read as part of the claim statement. Further, it is submitted that management has to adhere the procedure issued by the Central Government, the instructions dated 16.8.1990 in the year 1995, but same was not followed in the year 1997 despite there being vacancies. The management has followed the procedure of calling candidates through employment exchange instead of giving chance to the empanelled candidates like the Workman herein. The management sent call letters to the similarly situated candidates like the Workman in the month of June 1997 subsequent to issuance of impugned termination orders. After knowing the fact that they are litigating the issue by way of dispute, the management has refused to engage those candidates, the copies of call letters issued are filed herein along with claim petition. The Workman herein reiterates that the panels are meant for absorption but not for termination. In view of the same a duty is cast upon the Respondent management to engage the empanelled candidates like the Workman herein even in temporary vacancies till they are absorbed permanently in regular vacancies.

36. On the other hand, Respondent has contended that the Federation approached Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) for implementation of bipartite settlement in respect of the absorption of temporary employees. The Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) conducted conciliation proceedings and agreement was arrived at between the Federation and the Management bank. It is submitted that it was agreed between the Federation and the Management that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers /casual labour would be kept alive upto March, 1997 and the vacancies as agreed to under the afore set out settlements will be filled from both the lists concurrently. A copy of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.1995 signed by the parties to the dispute is filed as a material paper. Further, it is submitted that the settlement was arrived at and an agreement was signed between the Federation and the Management bank on 30.7.1996 under Section 2(p) read with Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules 1957 which is binding on the parties. A copy of this agreement which hereinafter may be referred to as 5th settlement for brevity, is also filed as a material paper. The 5th settlement dated 30.7.1996 whereunder the earlier four settlements dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988 and 9.1.1991 were also referred, it was agreed to, by the Federation and the Management bank that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees will be kept alive upto March, 1997 for filling the vacancies existing/arrived at as on 31.12.1994 as per the norms agreed to between the bank and Federation and that thereafter the said panels would lapse. It was also agreed that within the framework of the above settlements the modalities about drawing names from either the panel of temporary employees or the panel of daily wagers and casual labour would be decided administratively on circle to circle basis depending upon the local requirements in consultation with the Federation's affiliate by the Circle management. It was further agreed that all messenger real vacancies/positions in the subordinate cadre including part-time attendants specifically provided as leave reserve will be filled by the end of 31.3.1997. Further, Respondent contended that on 27.2.1997 a memorandum of understanding was also signed between the Federation's affiliate and the bank management regarding the fact that the exercise of identifying the messengerial vacancies as on 31.12.1994 has since been completed by central office and thereby 403 messengerial vacancies were sanctioned to the circle of the Management bank and it was agreed that these vacancies may be filled from 1989 panel of temporary employees after effecting conversion from full time non-messengerial staff in the usual manner and the agreement was reached upon. Further, it was agreed between the Federations affiliate and the management bank that in terms of the settlement dated 30.7.1996 both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers /casual employees would lapse on 31.3.1997.

37. The Workman has contended that the empanelled list prepared by the Respondent management for appointment of temporary and daily wage Workers to the permanent post cannot lapse unless until it is exhausted by appointing all the empanelled persons and it should continue even after 31.3.1997, i.e., the date fixed for the lapse of panel. It is undisputed that the date of lapse of empanelled list of Workmen has been fixed to 31.3.1997 as mentioned in the settlement dated 30.7.1996, and agreed between the parties. It is settled law that and once the life of panel list lapses on the date as agreed between the parties it cannot be extended beyond that date. In the instant case the panel list of the workmen was valid upto 31.3.1997 in view of the terms and conditions enumerated in the 5th Settlement entered into between the parties. As the lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997 has been agreed by State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation through 5th Settlement, the Workman is not competent to challenge the same.

In this context I would like to take reference of the decision of the apex court in the case of **Syndicate Bank and Ors vs. Shankar Paul and Ors , AIR 1997 SC 3091, therein the Hon'ble Apex Court** have held:-

"Till 1982, the branches of the appellant Bank in Calcutta region were recruiting persons locally to work as temporary attenders in leave vacancies. In view of the revised procedure prescribed by the Government of India in respect of such temporary appointments, the Calcutta regional office of the appellant Bank issued a circular to all of its branches on 14.8.1982, instructing all the branches under it to discontinue the old practice from 1.6.1982 and appoint only empanelled candidates. The regional office was to prepare a panel of eligible candidates, after calling names from the local/district employment exchange, and split it up branch-wise. Following that new procedure yearly panels were prepared thereafter. Names of the Respondents were for the first time included in the panel prepared for the period 7.2.1987 to 6.2.1988. By its letter dated 7.2.1987 the Bank had informed the Respondents that the panel was valid for one year only and that inclusion of their names in the panel was not to confer on them any right to seek permanent appointment in the service of the bank. Considering the object with which the panel was prepared and the fact that it was an yearly panel expiring on 6.2.1988, we are of the opinion that the Respondents did not get any right, because of inclusion of their names in the said panel, for permanent absorption in the service of the Bank. Whatever conditional right they had came to an end with the expiry of the panel. The claim of the Respondents, as contained in the writ petition was thus misconceived and therefore the learned single Judge and the Division Bench, when it first decided the appeal, were right in dismissing the writ petition and the appeal respectively."

Thus, in view of the above law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court and in view of the terms and conditions of the 5th Settlement the contention of the Workman that empanelled list should continue even after 31.3.1997 till the last Workman in the panel is absorbed is not tenable. The contention of the Workman is baseless in view of recital in the settlement. Therefore, in view of the fore gone discussion and finding given at Point No. I regarding binding nature of Settlements and terms and conditions enumerated therein, in view of the provision contained u/s.18(1) of the I.D.

Act, 1947, I am of the considered view that life of panels lapsed on 31.3.1997 in view of terms of settlement dated 30.7.1996 and plea of Workman that the panel shall continue even after 31.3.1997 till last man absorbed has no legal force and same is untenable.

38. Undisputedly, settlement agreement dated 30.7.1996 was executed between the State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation and in that settlement it was agreed that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/ casual employees will be used for filling vacancies existing as on 31.12.1994 as per the norms agreed between the bank and the Federation. These empanelled workmen were to be given a chance for permanent appointment in the bank against vacancies arising up to December 1994 whereas the daily wagers/ casual employees were to be considered against the vacancies arise from January 1995 to December 1996, whereby the said panel would lapse. It was agreed that the vacancies falls upto 31.3.1997 shall be filled before the empanelled list is allowed to lapse. Thus, the claim of the Workman to the post of permanent non-messenger in the Respondent management was subject to the availability of the sanctioned post and vacancies arising upto 31.3.1997. The workmen given chance to the permanent post were seniors in number of working days in panel list and Workman herein was junior to those workmen. Therefore, Workman could not be given absorption to permanent post being junior to other workmen in the panel list.

39. Moreover, the Respondent management witness MW1 in chief statement has given the evidence that, "The Petitioner has not completed 240 days of service in a calendar year." Although this witness was cross examined by the Petitioner but the above statement of the management witness in chief remained uncontroverted, as the witness MW1 was not cross examined by Petitioner on this point. Therefore, the claim of the Petitioner that he has been removed from service by the management illegally is untenable. Further, witness MW1 in his chief statement has stated that, "The temporary messengers and Non-messengers were engaged by the bank in leave vacancies and for administrative exigencies. The Petitioner did not work continuously for 240 days in any year or over a period of 36 months." This statement of witness MW1 remained uncontroverted as the Petitioner did not cross examine the witness MW1 on this point. Therefore, the Petitioner Workman as per number of working days, failed to fulfil eligibility criteria of working days as required for regularisation. Therefore, he was not given regularisation in the employment of the Respondent. Therefore, in view of the statement of MW1, the claim of the Petitioner that he was refused regularization by the Respondent management illegally, is untenable.

40. However, Workman has taken the plea that the panels of Workmen for absorption in the employment of the Respondent banks (panels of temporary employees and daily wagers) has been lapsed on 31.3.1997 in contravention of terms of settlement as the object of preparing the entire empanelment of temporary and daily wagers was to provide them permanent employment and till the both the panel lists exhausted the panel list cannot be lapsed on 31.3.1997 and the date of lapsing of the panel on 31.3.1997 has been fixed by the Respondent arbitrarily without any authority.

41. In this context, the perusal of Settlement dated 30.7.1996 reveals that the 5th Settlement dated 30.7.1996 was entered under Section 2(p) and 18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Dispute (Central) Rules 1957. This settlement has been entered into by the competent parties and in this settlement parties thereto agreed that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees will lapse on 31.3.1997. Thus the date of lapse of panel was fixed by both the parties with consensus under the settlement dated 30.7.1996 and same is binding upon the Workman under the provision of Section 18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947. Moreover, this issue of binding force of the settlement dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988 and 9.1.1991 has already been discussed, decided at finding in Point No.I of this award. However, the legality and validity of the aforementioned settlement has not been challenged by the Workman before any competent forum. Thus, claim of Workman that the date of lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997 has been fixed arbitrarily by the Respondent bank is untenable. As regard the claim of Workman for his absorption to the permanent post it is settled law that the Workman can not claim his regularization to permanent post merely on the basis of number of working days.

42. In this context the reference of the decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Oil and Natural Gas Corporation vs Krishan Gopal 2020(3) SCALE 272, date of decision 7.2.2020** is relevant therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have has laid down principle regarding regularization of the Workman on permanent posts. Hon'ble Supreme Court have laid down the prepositions of regularization of the workmen to permanent post is as under:-

"*(i) Wide as they are, the powers of the Labour Court and the Industrial Court cannot extend to a direction to order regularisation, where such a direction would in the context of public employment offend the provisions contained in Article 14 of the Constitution;*

(ii) The statutory power of the Labour Court or Industrial Court to grant relief to workmen including the status of permanency continues to exist in circumstances where the employer has indulged in an unfair labour practice by not filling up permanent posts even though such posts are available and by continuing to employ workmen as temporary or daily wage employees despite their performing the same work as regular workmen on lower wages;

(iii) The power to create permanent or sanctioned posts lies outside the judicial domain and where no posts are available, a direction to grant regularisation would be impermissible merely on the basis of the number of years of service;

(iv) Where an employer has regularised similarly situated workmen either in a scheme or otherwise, it would be open to workmen who have been deprived of the same benefit at par with the workmen who have been regularised to make a complaint before the Labour or Industrial Court, since the deprivation of the benefit would amount to a violation of Article 14; and

(v) In order to constitute an unfair labour practice under Section 2(ra) read with Item 10 of the Vth Schedule of the ID Act, the employer should be engaging workmen as badlis, temporaries or casuals, and continuing them for years, with the object of depriving them of the benefits payable to permanent workmen.

Thus, in view of the principles laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court as discussed above, in the instant matter the Workman utterly failed to prove his claim by adducing any documentary or oral evidence that the employer has indulged in unfair labour practice by not filling the permanent posts even though such posts are available and by continuing to employ workmen as temporary or daily wage employees despite their performance was the same work, as regular workmen on lower wages.

43. Respondent has contended that all the vacancies exist and arise upto 31.3.1997 has been filled up from the panel list in order of seniority and no vacancy exists or arises as on 31.3.1997 remained unfilled. Further, it is contended that as per terms of settlement the life of panel lists has been lapsed on 31.3.1997, hence, there is no occasion to extend the life of panel lists beyond 31.3.1997. However, the workman failed to prove contrary by any evidence to the aforesaid contention of the Respondent that the vacancies were existing as on 31.3.1997 and the workman was not given absorption to the permanent post in order of his seniority. It is settled law that the power to create permanent or sanctioned post lies outside the judicial domain and where no posts are available, a direction to grant regularization would be impermissible merely on the basis of the number of years of service. Therefore, the claim of the workman on this ground also not acceptable.

44. Further, as per the of settlement, panel was prepared for absorption of the workmen on the permanent posts has already been lapsed on 31.3.1997 and the vacancies existing and arising upto 31.12.1994 and upto 31.3.1997 as settlement dated 30.7.1996 has been filled up from the panel by appointing the workmen as per seniority in the panel list. Workman witness WW1 in his cross examination has himself admitted this fact that, some of the temporary employees whose names were included in the panel were given regular appointment in the bank in order of their seniority in the panel. The Workman failed to show that there was any breach of terms of settlement has been committed by the Respondent in appointment to permanent post from aforesaid panel list.

45. As discussed in preceding paragraph of this Award, the life of the panel has not been extended beyond 31.3.1997, by any further settlement hence, the panel list in which name of the Workman was included got expired on 31.3.1997. It is not the case of the Workman that Respondent has regularized similarly situated workmen either in the scheme or otherwise and the Workman has been deprived of same benefit on par with those workmen or the vacancies remained unfilled on the date of lapse of panels i.e., 31.3.1997, Industrial Tribunal has no jurisdiction to extend the date of lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997. This Tribunal can not order for regularization of workmen to the permanent post in contravention of the provision of Article 14 of the Constitution of India.

In the case of **Mahboob Deepak vs. Nagar Panchayat Gajraula & Anr, Civil Appeal No.5875/2007 date of judgement 13.12.2007,** Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

"8. Respondent is a Local Authority. The terms and conditions of employment of the employees are governed by a statute and statutory rules. No appointment can be made by a Local Authority without following the provisions of the recruitment rules. Any appointment made in violation of the said rules as also the constitutional scheme of equality as contained in Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India would be a nullity.

9. Due to some exigency of work, although recruitment on daily wages or on an ad hoc basis was permissible, but by reason thereof an employee cannot claim any right to be permanently absorbed in service or made permanent in absence of any statute or statutory rules. Merely because an employee has completed 240 days of work in a year preceding the date of retrenchment, the same would not mean that his services were liable to be regularized."

Therefore, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, the claim of the Workman for absorption merely on the basis of number of day of work in the Respondent bank Branch is not acceptable. As regard plea of the Workman that the Workman should have been given employment even after 31.3.1997 as temporary Workman, it is the discretion of Respondent to engage the Workman depending upon availability of work and this Tribunal can not direct the Respondent to engage the Workman in the absent of such rule/scheme.

46. In view of principle laid down by Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above, in the instant matter Workman utterly failed to establish the fact of rendering continuous service for a period of 240 days of service within a period of 12 calendar months commencing and coming backward from relevant date i.e., the date of retrenchment, if has he

would be denied to be in continuous service for a period of one year. Therefore, the provision contained under Sec.25F of retrenchment is not applicable to Workman.

Counsel for Workman has relied upon number of decisions of Hon'ble High Court and Hon'ble Supreme Court and few of them are discussed herein:-

In the case of **F.C.I., vs. Kamdhenu Cattle Feed Industries 1993 (1) SCC 71,** therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

"7. In contractual sphere as in all other State actions, the State and all its instrumentalities have to conform to Article 14 of the Constitution of which non-arbitrariness is a significant facet. There is no unfettered discretion in public law: A public authority possesses powers only to use them for public good. This impose the duty to act fairly and to adopt a procedure which is `fairplay in action'. Due observance of this obligation as a part of good administration raises a reasonable or legitimate expectation in every citizen to be treated fairly in his interaction with the State and its instrumentalities, with this element forming a necessary component of the decision making process in all State actions. To satisfy this requirement of non- arbitrariness in a State action, it is, therefore, necessary to consider and give due weight to the reasonable or legitimate expectations of the persons likely lo be affected by the decision or else that unfairness in the exercise of the power may amount to an abuse or excess of power apart from affecting the bona fides of the decision in a given case. The decision so made would be exposed to challenge on the ground of arbitrariness. Rule of law does not completely eliminate discretion in the exercise of power, as it is unrealistic, but providers for control of its exercise by judicial review."

In the case of **State Bank of India, R.O., Vijayawada vs. Industrial Tribunal, Hyderabad WP No.193/1997,** therein Hon'ble High Court have held,

"*Sri Krovvidi Narasimham, the learned counsel for the 2nd respondent contends, supporting the award that it was a permanent vacancy and even though the 2nd respondent was appointed on temporary basis, his services were not liable to be terminated and he was to be regularised into service on permanent basis. Shastry award warrants that no temporary appointment can be made to a permanent post. But the matter is now covered by two division bench judgements dated 28.11.1986 in W.A. No.791 of 1986 and 25.8.1987 in W.A. No.270 of 1982. The ratio decided in the two judgements is to the effect that there cannot be any mandate to appoint employees on permanent basis when the requirement was for appointment on temporary basis. But it is held in the said judgements that when a temporary appointee is ousted from service and not for misconduct and, if again temporary appointment is to be made, then, the case of such temporary appointee who was ousted, has got to be considered in accordance with Sec. 25-H of the Act."*

In the case of **State of Haryana and others vs. Piara Singh and others. 1992 (4) SCC 118,** therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

" 49. If for any reason an adhoc or temporary employee is continued for a fairly long spell, the authorities must consider his case for regularization provided he is eligible and qualified according to the rules and his service record is satisfactory and his appointment does not run counter to the reservation policy of the state."

In the above cited judgements by the Workman the facts of the case are different hence do not apply to instant case of Workman.

47. On the other hand, in support of his contention Respondent has examined witness MW1 and MW1 in chief examination states that, Settlements i.e., on 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988, 9.1.1991 were entered into between the SBI and SBI Staff Federation for filling up of the vacancies that arise up to 1994 for those temporary employees who has worked on scale wages. Further, MW1 states that two different panels for messengers and non-messengers as per the eligibility criteria prescribed by the bank. There are four modules in Andhra Pradesh and they are Hyderabad, Tirupathi, Vijayawada and Visakhapatnam. MW1 states that the temporary employees so empanelled were given permanent absorption depending upon the vacancies so arise strictly in terms of the settlement. MW1 states that on 9.6.1995 conciliation proceeding was held before the RLC(C), Hyderabad and in said proceedings it was decided that the panels will be kept live up to 31.3.1997 and vacancies will be filled from both the lists concurrently. A copy of the said minutes of proceedings is Ex.M5. Further, MW1 states that on 30.7.1996 another settlement was entered between the SBI and All India SBI Staff Federation providing for filling up of the vacancies arising up to December 1994 in respect of subordinate cadre and daily wage /casual wage employees out of panel so prepared were to be considered against vacancies arising from January 1995 to December 1996, thereafter the said panels lapse. MW1 states that it was also agreed that all the non- messenger positions in subordinate cadre including part time attendants specially provided as leave reserve will be filled before 31.3.1997 and as regards to non-messengerial positions it is agreed that all such posts sanctioned and fallen vacant up to 31.3.1997 shall be filled before the empanelled list is allowed to lapse. Thus in both the cases empanelled list were lapsed on 31.3.1997. Ex.M6 is the copy of the settlement dated 30.7.1996. Further, witness states that on 27.2.1997 a memorandum of understanding was reached between the SBI and SBI Staff Federation providing that both the panels above mentioned will lapse on 31.3.1997. Ex.M7 is the copy of the memorandum of understanding and Ex.M8 is the copy of the statements giving the particulars of 1989 non-messenger panel, Ex.M9 is the copy of the statement of 1989 non-

messenger panel, Ex.M10 is the copy of statement of 1992 panel. Further, witness states that petitioner was included in the 1989 panel. As the existing vacancies at that time were exhausted and his turn did not come he could not be given permanent employment in the bank as per the agreements. All the appointments were made strictly in accordance with the settlements reached from time to time between SBI and SBI staff federation and as per seniority, number of days of temporary service put in by them in the bank in the given period. Further, MW1 states petitioner was not sponsored by any employment exchange he did not undergo the regular process of selection required for appointment as a regular non-messenger the petitioner has not worked for 240 days in any year in his entire temporary service in the bank. The petitioner and other temporary employees were terminated from service by the bank. Further, MW1 states that the vacancies were filled up on regular basis with the temporary employees from the panels and these panels were expired in terms of the settlements so reached and there were no vacancies to absorb such employees. Thus, witness MW1 has proved the documents Ex.M1 to Ex.M12 and also contentions made in the counter. However, MW1 was cross examined by the Petitioner Counsel. But nothing has been elicited in his cross examination so as to discredit the testimony of the witness MW1 as regards the date of lapse of both the panels on 31.3.1997 and reasons assigned for non-absorption of the Petitioner from the panel list to the permanent post. Moreover the witness MW1 was re-examined by the Respondent and the witness MW1 states that panels were expired in terms of the settlement send absorptions to the extent of the available vacancies were made. There was no termination of any temporary messenger as such but their services were not utilized after the cut off date as the available vacancies were already filled up and most of these Petitioners were not in the service of the bank as on the date of the expiry date of the panels. Therefore, in view of the aforesaid testimony of the MW1 in re-examination in the absence of cross examination remained uncontraverted, the claim of the Workman that he was entitled for absorption in permanent post in the branch of Respondent Management on the basis of panel list is found not established.

This point is answered against the Workman.

48. **Point No.IV**:- In view of the discussion and finding given at Point Nos. I, II and III, the Workman is not entitled for any relief and claim statement of Workman sans merit and liable to be dismissed.

This Point is answered accordingly.

AWARD

In view of the fore gone discussion, it is held that the action of the Respondent bank in terminating the services of Sri Ch. Prabhakar, Ex. Messenger by way of oral orders w.e.f. 31.3.1997 is justified. Hence, the Petitioner is not entitled for any relief as prayed for. The claim statement filed by Workman sans merit, hence, dismissed.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, Personal Assistant, transcribed by her, corrected and signed by me on this the 15th day of June, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner	Witnesses examined for the Respondent
WW1: Sri Ch. Prabhakar	MW1: Sri K. Chandra Sekhar Goud

Documents marked for the Petitioner

Ex.W1:	Photocopy of service certificate
Ex.W2:	Photocopy of employment registration card
Ex.W3:	Photocopy of appointment order
Ex.W4:	Photocopy of caste certificate
Ex.W5:	Photocopy of transfer certificate

Documents marked for the Respondent

Ex.M1:	Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.17.11.87
Ex.M2:	Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.16.7.88
Ex.M3:	Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.27.10.1988
Ex.M4:	Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.9.1.1991
Ex.M5:	Photocopy of conciliation proceedings before the Regional Labour Commissioner(C) dt.9.6.1995
Ex.M6:	Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.30.7.1996
Ex.M7:	Photocopy of Memorandum of understanding dt. 27.1.1997
Ex.M8:	Photocopy of statements giving the particulars of 1989 messenger panel.
Ex.M9:	Photocopy of statement of 1989 Non-messenger panel
Ex.M10:	Photocopy of statement of 1992 panel
Ex.M11:	Photocopy of order of Hon'ble High Court in WA No.86/98 dt. 1.5.98
Ex.M12:	Photocopy of order in SLP No.11886-11888 of 1998 dated 10.8.98

नई दिल्ली, 3 अगस्त, 2026

का.आ. 1672.— औघोगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार स्टेट बैंक ऑफ़ इंडिया के प्रबंधतत्र, संबद्ध नियोजको और उनके कर्मकार के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औघोगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औघोगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद के **पंचाट** (31/2003) प्रकाशित करती है।

[सं. एल- 12025/01/2026- आई आर (बी-I)-158]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 3rd August, 2026

S.O. 1672.— In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the **Award (Ref. 31/2003*)*** of the ***Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court Hyderabad*** as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of **State Bank of India** and **their workman**

[No. L-12025/01/2026-IR(B-I)-158]

SALONI, Dy. Director

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD

Present: - **Sri Irfan Qamar**

Presiding Officer

Dated the 11th day of June, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE L.C.No. 31/2003

[Old ID No. 275/99 of Labour Court, Guntur]

Between:

Sri J. Rama Rao

S/o Veera Swami,

R/o Velamuripadu Village,

Addanki Mandal,

Prakasam district. ….Petitioner

And

1. The Chairman,
   State Bank of India,
   Central office,
   Mumbai.
2. The Chief General Manager,
   (Personnel)
   State Bank of India,
   Bank Street
   Hyderabad-500 095.
3. The Regional Manager,
   State Bank of India,
   ADB branch,
   Addanki,
4. The Zonal Manager,
   State Bank of India
   Zonal Office, Tirupathi. …..Respondents

Appearances:

For the Petitioner : M/s. S. Prasada Rao, Advocates

For the Respondent: Sri Y. Ranjeeth Reddy, Advocate

AWARD

Sri J. Rama Rao who worked as Messenger (who will be referred to as the workman) has filed this petition under Sec. 2A(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 against the Respondents State Bank of India seeking for reinstatement into service as Messenger/Sweeper duly granting all the consequential benefits such as continuity of service, back wages and all other attendant benefits etc., and such other reliefs as this court may deem fit. Earlier Petitioner has filed this dispute before the Labour Court, Guntur for adjudication and later the same has been transferred to this Tribunal bearing ID No.275/99, as per orders of Central Government vide Lr.No.H-11026/1/2001-IR(C.II) dated 18.10.2001 and registered, numbered in this Tribunal as LC No. 31/2003.

2. Before unfolding the factual matrix of the instant industrial dispute it would be apposite to have a bird eye view of a chequered history of the instant industrial dispute. Earlier instant industrial dispute along with the batch cases was decided by this Tribunal vide common award dated 17.5.2005 and the reference was answered in favour of the Respondent and against the Workman. That said common award dated 17.5.2005 was challenged by the aggrieved Workmen in various Writ petition No.6470/2014 along with batch of writ petitions before the Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh and Hon'ble High Court vide its' judgement dated 23.6.2014 allowed all batch of writ petitions and set aside the common award dated 17.5.2005 passed in ID No.222 of 2001 and other batch of ID cases by Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad and the Respondent management of State Bank of India was directed to reengage the Writ Petitioners in position, which they have been occupying prior to their termination and further directed to consider their cases for regularization as and when the substantive vacancy arises. This judgement dated 23.6.2014 of Hon'ble High Court of AP, passed in WP No.6470/2014 and batch petitions was challenged by Respondent management before the Hon'ble High Court in Writ Appeal No. 1268 of 2014. The aforesaid Writ Appeals No.1268/2014 and other Writ Appeals were decided by Division Bench of High Court of Andhra Pradesh by a common judgement dated 20.3.2019. Hon'ble High Court in aforesaid Writ Appeal was pleased to pass the order which is extracted as below:-

" 7. Hearing the learned senior counsel for the SBI and the learned senior counsel for the contesting unofficial Respondents, we see that while the learned single Judge was justified in setting aside the award af the Tribunal, the proper course to be adopted was to remit all the cases to the Tribunal. This we say for reasons more than one. Firstly, in such matters, claims have to be decided on individual basis, as different persons have different claims as to the length of officiation or discharge of duties and functions; quality of engagement, drawings, accounting of the post for each one of them, who have worked etc. All these issues will not be the same in all the cases. Therefore, each case ought to have been directed to be decided by the Tribunal afresh on individual basis. The second and most important

aspect is the learned single Judge has in one go ordered re-employment of all the workmen. This is not a relief that could have been granted without answering the individual issues; each issue relating to each case could not have been decided by the writ Court within the format of its adjudication procedures and scope. The adjudicating body, which has to do that activity, is the Industrial Tribunal. Therefore, we are of the view that while we would sustain the order of the learned singe Judge insofar as it interfered and sets aside the award of the Tribunal, the further findings and directions, issued through the impugned order have to go and the individual cases have to be sent back for consideration of the Tribunal. Such further procedure before the Tribunal will have to be carried forward with the materials already on record and also by affording an opportunity to the persons, who have claims as well as the management to place their rival contentions and further material before the Tribunal. The learned counsel appearing for the workmen are justified in pointing out that enormous delay has already happened and further action by the Tribunal in this line may be expedited.

9. In the result, these writ appeals are ordered;

(1) affirming the impugned common order of the learned single Judge to the extent it sets aside the common award dated 17.05.2005 of the Industrial Tribunal;

(2) the further findings and directions issued through the impugned common order are vacated:

(3) all the matters shall be remitted to the Industrial Tribunal with a direction to dispose of them within an outer limit of five (5) months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order; and,

(4) the parties to make appearance before the Tribunal on the given date."

Thus, in view of the above direction of Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh in W.A.No.1268 of 2014 and batch cases. This Tribunal has taken up the matter of industrial dispute for hearing and deciding it afresh in view of the aforesaid guidelines laid down by the Hon'ble High Court in Writ Appeal No.1268/2014 vide judgement dated 20.3.019.

3. The factual matrix of instant industrial dispute as narrated by the Workman in his claim statement are that, the Workman joined in the service of the management institution as Messenger from 8.8.84 to 26.7.89, and has rendered unblemished service spreading over a period of about 5 years. The Respondent has terminated services of Workman by oral orders with effect from 26.7.89. Further, it is submitted that the management of Respondent bank decided to give a chance to temporarily employed personnel "found suitable for permanent appointment" by wait-listing them by offering permanent appointment or waitlisting till such opportunity arises.

4. That on 17.11.1987 a settlement was reached between All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and the Management of State Bank of India - settlement one, under this settlement three categories of employees were listed. That is, A) those who have completed 240 days in 12 months or less after 1.7.1975. B) those who have completed 270 days in any continuous block of 36 calendar months after 1.7.1975. C) (i) those who have completed minimum of 30 days aggregate temporary service in any calendar year after 1.7.1975 or (ii) 70 days aggregate temporary service in continuous block of 36 months after 1.7.1975.

5. The persons who satisfied in all the above 4 categories were to be interviewed by a selection committee and the said selection committee would determine the suitability of the said candidate for permanent appointment. Therefore, the bank prescribed certain qualifications and from among the candidates satisfying the qualifications the suitable candidates were enlisted by a selection committee. The Clause 7 of the said agreement provided with the selected candidate would be wait listed in order of their respective categorization and the selected panel would be valid upto December, 1991. Clause 10 of the settlement specifically provided that henceforth. "there will be no temporary appointments in the subordinate cadre", except on a restrictive basis in the specified category, "from amongst empanelled candidates as per existing guidelines of the bank". The Workman further submits that consequent upon the said agreement and the draft, a notification was issued in the newspapers. The last date for responding to the advertisement was 30.8.1988. A written examination followed by viva-voce in May, 1989 was held. A selected panel was prepared, as per Clause 7 of the agreement, ie. Settlement No.1, the selected panel was to be valid upto December, 1991, the Workman submits that circular was issued on 26.4.91 by the said letter it is mentioned that the terms of the agreement dated 17.11.87 was modified vide second agreement dated 16.7.88 was entered into between the parties. In terms of the said agreement a chance was to be given, "to all eligible temporary employees for permanent appointments. The appointments were against the vacancies likely to arise during the years 1995-96, circular made it clear that in view of the enormity of the problem an extension of the currency of the panel, eligible temporary employees who have been empanelled could not appear in the earlier interviews and have been pursuing their cases thereafter, "will be given another chance to appear for interview".

6. Workman submits that there were total five settlements. The settlement dated 17.11.87 is the 1st settlement (Ex M1), settlement dated 16.7.88 is 2nd settlement (Ex M2), settlement dated 27.10.88 is the 3rd settlement (Ex M3), then settlement dated 9.1.91 is 4th settlement and settlement dated 30.7.96 is 5th settlement (Ex M6). In between there is minutes of conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.95 marked as Ex M5. That due to all these settlements which were extended by subsequent settlements thereby created reasonable expectations in the

list of the selected candidates arose with that it's a question of time their appointments or services would be regularized in the services of the bank. The Workman was working with the bank on temporary basis was under the bonafide hope that sooner his services will be regularized with the bank. He is thereby closed all his options elsewhere. It is needless to point out that employing person to whom hope of employment in substantial terms was made is a facet of Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

7. Further Workman submits that the Government of India issued Circular No. F-3/3/104/87-IR, dated 16.8.1990. Under said circular the chief Executives of all public sector banks including the Management herein were specifically instructed that until the problem of existing temporary employees is fully resolved, no bank is permitted to make any permanent appointments. That some of the persons similarly situated like this Workman aggrieved by the inaction on the part of the management of the bank is not regularizing their services from out of the selected panel and not clearly focusing the vacancy position, filed W.P. No. 4194/97 before Hon'ble High court of A.P.. It is specifically averred in the said writ petition that the Management of the bank had failed to implement the settlement and that it violates the various fundamental rights guaranteed under the constitution of India. The Hon'ble High court of A.P .. by order dated 5.3.97 directed the bank to implement the settlement as amended from time to time. It also directed the bank to carry out the terms of settlement before the expiry of March, 1997. The Hon'ble High Court also recorded finding that the Bank cannot escape its liability of enforcement of the Settlement. In view of the directions given by the High Court all candidates whose names appeared in the select panels prepared on the basis of the agreement entered into on 17.11.87 under which the panel was valid upto December, 1991, and on the basis of a settlement dated 27.10.1988 whereby the panels were made alive upto 31.3.1997 under which the panel was valid upto December, 1999. The other agreement dated 16.7.1988 under which the panel was valid upto 1992 and on the basis of the settlement dated 27.10.1998 whereby the panels were made alive upto 31.3.1997 were under the bonafide impression that their cases will be considered for regularization and were living on the basis of the said reasonable expectation. Unfortunately, contrary to the aforesaid directions given by the High Court and contrary to the settlements entered into between the parties, the bank issued proceedings dated 25.3.1997, dated 27.3.1997 and 31.3.1997 instructing the various authorities of the Management not to continue the temporary employees those who are in services of the bank from 1.4.97. The said order was followed by the Management. Aggrieved by the said action the Workman herein and similarly situated candidates have filed a writ petition before the Hon'ble High Court and by way of Writ Petition No.9206/97 seeking a declaration that the proceedings issued by the Deputy General Manager and the Assistant General Manager (Respondents 3,4 and 5 therein) on 25.3.97, 27.3.97 and 31.3.97 as illegal and also non-continuance of the Workmen therein in service by absorbing them in the services of the bank as violative of Section 2(p) and 18(1) read with Rule 58 of Central Rules and sought for specific direction to the bank to absorb them in service.

8. Further, Workman submits that in the counter affidavit filed in Writ Petition No.9206/97, the bank has submitted that it has about 805 branches in Andhra Pradesh alone. It has stated that due to exigencies of circumstances and on account of the urgent need in its banks, it employed temporary employees in subordinate cadre. It is pertinent to mention that it does not state the urgent or need or the nature of temporary employees that it had engaged. Enquiry into the same would reveal that the stand taken by the bank either on the ground of urgent need or of temporary employees is a façade to perpetuate unfair labour practice. It is designed to on the one hand, keep the employed in the erroneous zone of hope and on the other to ensure that benefits that a model employer will extend under various statutes to its employees is not required to be borne out by the bank. A reading of the counter affidavit would show that the bank would opines that being just fair and reasonable are which obviously is reprehensible and is a facet of unfair labour practice.

9. The Workman submits that the bank had referred in its counter affidavit to three settlements dated 17.11.87, 16.7.88 and 27.10.88. The bank in the guise of extending the benefits of the circular of Government dated 16.8.90 stated in its counter affidavit that as follows:

"Government of India, vide its letter dated 16.8.1990, issued guidelines to all the public sector banks with regard to recruitment and absorption of temporary employees in public sector banks. The said guidelines were issued to implement on the lines of the approach paper on the issue provided by a committee constituted in this regard. The Government of India guidelines made it clear that all the public sector banks may follow the provisions laid down in the approach paper.

The approach paper specified that the cases of temporary employees who had put in not less than 240 days of temporary service in 12 consecutive Months and who are entitled to benefit of Section 25-F may be decided by entering into a settlement with the representative union. In respect of temporary employees who had put in less than 240 days of service in 12 consecutive months or less, a settlement could be avoided and however if the Management so desired, they could enter into a conciliation settlement with the representative union. Para 6(h), it is mentioned that only those temporary employees who had put in temporary service of 90 or more days after 1.1 1982 would be eligible for considering under the scheme. Although the Government guidelines envisaged for a settlement in respect of employees who had put in temporary service of 90 or more days, the bank by way of further concession entered into settlements Even in respect of those who had put in less than 90 days. As such, it could be Seen that the

settlements are more beneficial to the temporary employees concerned. The approach paper also specify at para 6(c) that the banks would provide one time opportunity to all the temporary employees and for that purpose temporary employees worked in the bank on or after 1.1.1982 could be considered for re-employment in terms of the scheme. The Respondents have gone further wherein even persons working after 1975 were also considered.

As could be seen from the above, there was a genuine effort on the part of the Respondent bank to provide permanent employment for as many as possible subject to availability of the vacancies.

It is further submitted that at para 6(k) of the approach paper, it was made clear that this would be one time exercise in full and final settlement of all the aims and disputes for the past period in respect of temporary workmen covered by the settlement. This would mean that the Government of India guidelines would cover only those persons who were temporarily employed for the period specified therein and not otherwise. As such, it is submitted that the Respondents have not only followed the Government of India guidelines but in fact covered cases of the employees who had worked for less than 90 days. As such, question of violation does not arise and in any case those were only broad guidelines and not directives".

10. The Workman submits that the bank also referred a subsequent settlement dated 9.1.1991 wherein there is a clause to the effect- that the panel of temporary employees and the panel of daily wage employees will be operated to a particular period. Therefore, their cases will not be considered. The Management herein relying upon this settlement in their impugned action. It is submitted that even the settlement dated 9.1.1991 will not empower the management to terminate the services of the temporary employees who are working in the bank services like the Workman herein as it does not specify the termination of the employees. In fact there are so many vacancies wherein the Management has engaged several new persons as temporary messengers/ attendars/ sweepers etc., even after the judgment of Hon'ble High Court without considering the cases of the similarly situated candidates like the Workman herein. It is submitted inspite of engaging fresh candidates as is now being done by the Management they would have continued the similarly situated candidates like the Workman herein in the services of the bank and consider their cases for absorption in view of the circulars issued by Central Government as well as the directions of this Hon'ble Court in Writ Petition No.4194/97, dated 5.3.97. In view of the circulars issued by the Central Government, the Management should not have relied upon the settlement dated 9.1.1991. Hence, the impugned action of the Management is illegal, unjust, violative of fundamental rights such as Articles 14,16 and 21 of the Constitution of India.

11. The Workman submits that in W.P. No.4194/97 filed by the union of temporary employees where in they have complained about the non- implementation of the settlements arrived between the parties and sought for absorption. Such employees in the bank services on permanent basis before the date fixed for carrying out the terms of settlement, the Court held that the members of the union had been empanelled in the list, they were not regularized and the time was going to run out to the near future and the Respondent bank and its officers cannot escape from the liability of enforcing the settlement which has been reached and therefore directed that the bank and the officers shall implement the settlement dated 17.11.87 as amended from time to time before the expiry of 31.3.97.

12. Further, it is submitted that in the clause of Settlement it is specifically mentioned that the workmen to be absorbed/appointed in the bank prohibiting any temporary appointments subsequent to the date of settlement even the authorities want to make temporary appointments that should be made only from among the empanelled can be appointed either for temporary vacancy or permanent vacancy except from among the empanelled candidates like the Workman and that should be continued till they are absorbed. The management committed unfair labour practices and terminated the services of the candidates with effect from 26.7.89 which is arbitrary, discriminatory, contrary to their own guidelines and violative of the constitutional provisions which are guaranteed in Chapter-III of the Constitution of India.

13. The Workman submits that it is strange as to how the panels were allowed to lapse by a so-called Memorandum of Understanding dated 25.2.1997, that the action of terminating such employees like the Workman by virtue of an impugned oral proceedings without implementing the settlement would be illegal and unfair labour practice which cannot be allowed to be perpetuated. That the discontinuance of the Workman after 31.3.97 who had served in the bank in any capacity amounts to retrenchment. It could not have been done without any notice and it violates Sec.25FF of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and the said action is violative of principles of natural justice guaranteed under Chapter III of the Constitution of India. This amounts to retrenchment without one month's notice and taken in view of such notice. Thus, the main proceedings issued by the Respondent is without jurisdiction and is arbitrary, illegal and therefore liable to be quashed. That the alleged Memorandum of Understanding dated 27.2.97, Ex.M5 does not own any legal entity, as the said Memorandum of Understanding is not published anywhere to brought to the notice of the Workman whose rights are being affected. It is submitted that Management did not adhere to the procedure envisaged by the Central Government in its' instructions dated 16.8.90 in the year 1995. The same was not followed in the year 1997 despite there being vacancies. The management has followed the procedure of calling candidates through Employment exchange instead of giving chance to the empanelled candidates like the Workman here. It is pertinent to mention here that the Respondent Management sent letters to the all similarly situated candidates like the Workman in the month of June, 1997, subsequent to the passing of impugned termination orders. After knowing the facts that the candidates are litigating,

the Management refused to engage these candidates. It is once again reiterated that the panels are meant for absorption but not for termination. It was the duty of the Management to engage the empanelled candidates like the Workman even in temporary vacancies till they are absorbed permanently in regular vacancies. Hence, the action of the Respondent Management terminating the services of the Workman by oral order dated 31.3.97 is unjust, illegal, violative of principles of natural justice and hence, the Management be directed to reinstate and absorb the Workman and to grant all incidental and consequential benefits.

14. Per contra, Respondent had filed counter and made a contentions that the reference is not tenable and contrary to the provisions of I.D. Act, 1947. Respondent submitted that to tide over severe sub-ordinate staff constraints which arose out of leave vacancies, exigencies, etc., and also owning to the restrictions imposed by the Government of India/Reserve Bank of India on intake of staff, the Respondent bank used to engage sub-ordinate staff like messengers, sweepers, sweeper cum water boys, etc., depending on the availability of work on purely temporary basis for the smooth and uninterrupted functioning of the branches. It is submitted that the All India State Bank of India Staff Federation which represents majority of the employees in the State Bank of India comprising about 98% of the work force as its' members espoused the cause of temporary employees who have put in less than 240 days of temporary service in 12 calendar months in the bank and who were ineligible for any protection under Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 to give a chance for being considered for absorption and permanent appointments.

15. Discussions were held and on 17.11.1987 an agreement was signed between the federation and the Management bank under Sec. 2(p) read with Sec 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules 1957. A copy of the said settlement dated 17.11.87 which may be herein after referred as first settlement is filed and 4 categories were made as it has already been mentioned in the claim statement above, it need not be repeated here. In the first settlement, it was agreed that the temporary employees as categorized would be given a chance for being considered for permanent appointment in the bank's service against the vacancies which are likely to arise during the period 1987 to 1991. On 16.7.88 second settlement was arrived between the Federation and the Bank whereby it was agreed to substitute the period of consideration of vacancies as 1987 to 1992 in place of 1987 to 1991 as contemplated under the first settlement dated 17.11.1987. This is the second settlement. A 3rd settlement was entered into on 27.10.88 and it was agreed that the bank's service against the vacancies likely to arise from 1988 to 1992 was to be considered. Government of India vide its letter dated 16.8.90 issued guidelines to all the public sector banks with regard to recruitment and absorption of temporary employees in public sector banks. The said guidelines were issued to implement on the lines of approach paper on the issue provided by a committee constituted in this regard. Government of India guidelines made it clear that all the public sector banks may follow the provisions laid down in the approach paper. The approach paper specified that the cases of temporary service in 12 consecutive months and who are entitled to benefit of Sec.25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 may be decided by entering into a settlement with the representative union. In respect of temporary employees who had put in less than 240 days of service in 12 consecutive months or less, a settlement could be avoided and however if the Management so desired they could enter into a conciliation settlement with the representative union. In para. 6(h) it is mentioned that only those temporary employees who had put in temporary service of 90 days or more days after 1.1.82 would be eligible for considering under the scheme. Although the Government guidelines envisaged for a settlement in respect of employees who had put in temporary service of 90 days or more days, the bank by way of a further concession entered into settlements. Even in respect of those who had put in less than 90 days and also the bank went a step further and said those persons who are working after 1975 were also considered. Hence, there was a genuine effort on the part of the Respondent bank to provide as many as possible jobs subject to the availability of the vacancies. However, para 6 (k) of the approach paper made it clear that it is a one time, exercise in full and final, settlement of all the claims and disputes for the past period, in respect of temporary workmen covered by the settlement. Another settlement was entered on 9.1.91 herein after referred as 4th settlement and the time limit was extended upto 1994 and separate panel was prepared for temporary employees, casual/daily wagers. It was agreed that while vacancies arising between 1988 to 1994 in respect of temporary employees and in respect of casual/daily wagers, they can be considered for the vacancies arising between 1995-96 only.

16. It is submitted that the administrative set up of the Hyderabad Local Head Office comprises of four Zonal Offices (Zones) at Hyderabad, Vijayawada, Visakhapatnam and Tirupathi covering all the Districts of Andhra Pradesh. In terms of the settlement the Management after following the procedure laid down therein prepared the panels of qualified candidates of temporary employees denoted as 1989 panel and also panel of casual/daily wagers denoted as 1992 panel for giving a chance for being considered for permanent absorption. These panels were prepared zone-wise separately for messengers and non-messengers in the descending order of temporary service put in by the candidates during the stipulated period i.e., 1.7.1975 to 31.7.1988. That the Federation approached the Regional Labour Commissioner(C) for implementation of bi-partite settlement in respect of absorption of temporary employees. The Regional Labour Commissioner(C) conducted conciliation proceedings and an agreement was arrived between the Federation and the bank. It was agreed that it would be kept alive upto March, 1997. A copy of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.2.1995 signed by the parties is filed as material paper. A settlement was arrived at and an agreement was signed between the Federation and the Management bank on 30.7.1996 under Sec.2 (p) read with Sec.18(1) of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957, which is hereinafter called as 5th settlement. That on

27.2.1997 a Memorandum of understanding was also signed by the federation's affiliate and the bank Management recording the fact that the exercise of identifying the messengerial vacancies as on 31.12.1994 has since been completed by Central Office and thereby 403 messengerial vacancies were sanctioned . It was agreed that these vacancies may be filled from 1989 panel of temporary employees after effecting conversion from full time non-messengerial staff in the usual manner and the agreement was reached accordingly. It was agreed between the Federation's affiliate and the Management bank that in terms of the settlement dated 30.7.1996 both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees would lapse on 31.3.1997. That as agreed upon vacancies were filled from the panels. The Workman who has put in an aggregate temporary service of less than 240 days in a continuous block of 12 months period during 1.7.1975 to 31.7.1988 has no right to seek a direction to consider his candidature for absorption in the Management bank under any rule/law except under the settlement entered into thereon.

17. Respondent contended that, in fact, the case of the Workman can be considered under all the five settlements having got his case considered under provisions of these settlements. All the other provisions and terms of the settlements are also binding on him/her. The Management bank has not violated any of the provisions of the terms of the said settlement. That the very preparation and maintenance of panel is in compliance of the terms agreed under these settlements. These settlements were time bound and they ceased to exist on 31.3.1997. That the bank has never promised that all the candidates in the panel will be absorbed. In the advertisement itself it was made clear that candidates will be considered for absorption in the vacancies that may arise upto 1992. Keeping alive the panels after 31.3.1997 is contrary to the settlements arrived between the State Bank of India Staff Federation and the Management bank. That the settlements are binding on the parties. The Workman is also bound under the terms of the said settlement. The settlement does not suffer from any ambiguity as their language is very clear. The right under the settlements is to give them a chance to be considered for future appointment in the bank's services against the vacancies likely to arise. The settlements were effected to balance the expectations of the temporary employees to be absorbed in permanent service as against the constitutional rights for all eligible persons to be considered for employment every time a vacancy arises. That the alleged dispute including the demand for reinstatement has to be decided in this context. It is submitted that the period of panel list got expired on 31.3.97 and it is an integral term of the settlement and cannot be modified in any proceedings under the law. These temporary employees who unfortunately could not be accommodated for want of vacancies have no further rights to be considered for regularization. That the Hon'ble High Court in WP No.12964/94, held as follows, "It is needless to state that the settlement arrived at between the All India State Bank of India Staff Federation which, is the majority union and the bank Management is binding on the Workmen also. It is not at all the case of the Workman that any of the terms of the settlement has been violated by the bank's Management. If the Workman had worked in the bank on part-time basis before 31.5.94, that itself would not vest in him a right to claim that his services should be regularized on permanent basis against a full time cadre post. The claim put forth by the Workman in the present petition is therefore misconceived and not tenable. However, it is open to the Workman to claim any right which flows from the settlement between the union and the bank Management. As already pointed out that it is not the grievance of the Workman that some right which has flown from the settlement in favour of the Workman has been denied by the bank Management. Therefore, I do not find any ground, let alone substantial ground, to grant the kind of relief sought for by the Workman. Writ Petition fails and is accordingly dismissed. No costs."

18. Further, it is contended that if the panels were not lapsed at the end of designated period and allowed to be continued it would result in making the contracts of temporary employment indirectly permanent through back door entry, which would not only be contrary to the settlements but also to Articles 14 and 16 of Constitution of India and deprive the chances of original claimants who would Come through proper recruitment procedure. As their rights have been crystallized by operation of the settlements. Hence, there is no question of any Legitimate expectation being violated.

19. Similarly placed ex-employees filed WP No.9206/1995 and the batch before the Hon'ble High Court of A.P. and the learned Single Judge allowed the Writ Petitions. Aggrieved by the same WA No.86/98 and the batch was filed and the Division Bench set aside the order of the Single Judge. Thereafter the ex-temporary employees filed Special Leave Petition No.11886-11888 of 1998 before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India also dismissed the SLP. Therefore, reference to the Judgement of the Learned Single Judge in WP No.9206/97 is of no consequences as the same has already been set aside. The observations made in the Judgements cannot be relied upon for any purpose what so ever. The question of operation of Sec.25F would not come into play. Further the issue is covered by various Judgements of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India and various Hon'ble High Courts. Hence, the reference may be ordered that the Workman is not entitled for any relief.

20. In order to fortify his claim Workman has examined himself as WW1 and also filed documents in evidence which has been exhibited as Ex.W1 to W6. Further, the Workman has filed photocopies of documents in support of his claim which are discussed as under:-

Ex.W1 is the interview call letter. Ex.W2 is the temporary appointment order. Ex.W3 is the service certificate. Ex.W4 is the community certificate. Ex.W5 is the interview call letter. Ex.W6 is the panel list.

21. On the other hand, Respondent has examined witness MW1 Sri I.S. Appa Rao and this witness has exhibited 12 documents, marked as Ex.M1 to M12. The details of these documents are as follows:-

Ex.M.1 is the Settlement dated 17.11.1987. Ex.M2 is the Settlement dated 16.7.1988. Ex.M3 is the Settlement dated 27.10.1988. Ex.M4 is the Settlement dated 9.1.1991. Ex.M5 is the Minutes of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.1995. Ex.M6 is the Settlement dated 30.7.1996. Ex.M7 is the Memorandum of Understanding dt. 27.2.1997. Ex.M8 is the Particulars of 1989 Messengerial Panel. Ex.M9 is the Particulars of 1989 Non-Messengerial Panel. Ex.M10 is the Particulars of 1992 General Attendant Panel. Ex.M11 is the Judgment of Hon'ble High Court of A.P. in Writ Appeal No.86/98 dt.1.5.1998. Ex.M12 is the Judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in SLP No. 11886-11888 of 1998 dt.10.8.1998.

22. Apart from afore mentioned documents, Learned Counsel for Workman has also filed a long list of various judgements of Hon'ble Supreme Court as well as Hon'ble High Court, which we will discuss at appropriate place in this Award.

23. Heard the argument of Learned Counsel for Workman as well as for Respondent.

24. On the basis of rival pleadings of both the parties and submissions made by the Learned Counsel for both the parties, following points arise for determination in the industrial dispute :-

I. Whether the 1st settlement dated 17.11.1987, 2nd settlement dated 16.7.1988, 3rd settlement dated 27.10.1988, 4th settlement dated 9.1.1991 and 5th settlement dated 30.7.1996 entered into between State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and also Memorandum of Understanding are binding upon both the parties?

II. Whether the action of State Bank of India, Addanki ADB branch in terminating the services of Workman Sri J. Rama Rao, a Messenger with effect from 26.7.89 is justified?

III. Whether the Workman is entitled for absorption on permanent post in the Branch of Respondent management as per averments made by him in the claim statement?

IV. To what relief if any the Workman is entitled for?

Findings:-

25. Point No.I:- Undisputedly settlements dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988, 9.1.1991 and 30.7.1996, minutes of conciliation proceedings and memorandum of understanding dated 27.2.1997 were executed between the State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation under section 2(p) and 18 (1) of I.D. Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Disputes (Central Rules), 1957.

Section 2(p) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 as follows:-

(p) "settlement" means a settlement arrived at in the course of conciliation proceeding and includes a written agreement between the employer and workmen arrived at otherwise than in the course of conciliation proceeding where such agreement has been signed by the parties thereto in such manner as may be prescribed and a copy thereof has been sent to an officer authorised in this behalf by the appropriate Government and the conciliation officer;

Section 18(1) provides as follows:-

18. Persons on whom settlements and awards are binding.

- [(1) A settlement arrived at by agreement between the employer and Workman otherwise than in the course of conciliation proceeding shall be binding on the parties to the agreement.

Therefore, in view of the provision contained u/s.18 (1) I.D. Act, 1947, terms and conditions enumerated in the aforesaid settlements are binding on the parties to the agreement. The Learned Counsel for Workman has argued that the Workman after going through the selection procedure has successfully been listed in the panel for appointment on the permanent basis in the Respondent management and the empanelled list has to be valid till last person in the empanelled list is appointed on permanent basis. But the impugned order dated 25.3.97, 27.3.97 and 31.3.97, has been issued by Respondent management thereby the services of the Workman has been terminated and the said order is not in consonance of the terms of the agreement entered into between the parties. Further, Workman submits that the Respondent in the 5th settlement has mentioned the date i.e., 31.3.1997 for lapse of empanel list which is illegal and that is not binding upon the Workman. The condition of lapse of empanelment list on 31.3.97 incorporated in the aforesaid 5th settlement, is arbitrary and illegal.

26. The perusal of the impugned order dated 25.3.1997 goes to reveal that the Chief/Branch Manager, SBI Zonal Office has issued the letter to all the branches with regard to the subject not to make any temporary appointments in the Branch in messengerial category from 26.7.89. The extract of the said letter is given below:-

"We have been advised by the Deputy General Manager, Zonal Office, Hyderabad that as both the panels of temporary employees of 1989 and daily wagers/casual labours of 1992 will lapse by 31.3.1997, it has been decided by Central Office not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial category from 26.7.89."

Thus, from the contents of the aforesaid letter, it manifest that Head Office of State Bank of India vide letter dated 25.3.1997 has issued direction to all its branches not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial category from 26.7.89 due to reason of lapse of both panels i.e., 1989 & 1992 on 31.3.1997 as per terms of settlements entered into by both parties. Further, the contents of the subsequent letter dated 27.3.1997 issued by Respondent Management is also direction to Branch Manager, State Bank of India not to make any temporary messengerial category appointment with effect from 26.7.89 and it has also been communicated to all concerned that the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers maintained by Zonal offices stand lapsed from 31.1.1997. Further, office order dated 31.3.1997 has been issued by Respondent management that goes to reveal that the said office order has been issued to this effect that, "Consequent on absorption of temporary employees in permanent cadre, it has been decided by the competent authority that no one onwards, no further daily labour or temporary employees/appointments should be resorted to/engaged/employed." Therefore, it reflects from the contents of the aforesaid orders that the temporary appointment in messengerial category and daily labour has been stopped by the Respondent management with effect from 26.7.89 because of the lapsed of panel of temporary workers and daily wagers by 31.3.1997. The agreement for lapse of both the panels on 31.3.1997 is contained in the 5th settlement which has been arrived at between the parties on dated 30.7.1996 with the consensus of both the parties. Therefore, Workman can not challenge the terms and conditions contained in settlement dated 30.7.1996 regarding lapse of panel on 31.3.1997 as agreed between State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation. As per provision contained u/s.18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 the said Agreement dated 30.7.1996 is binding on both the parties.

In the case of **Allied Sales Corporation Secunderabad vs.The Authority Under Andhra Pradesh..... 1990 II LLJ 510 AP para 414, Hon'ble Court have held:-**

"*4. There was a settlement between the Management and the workmen under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act on 25th April 1983 under which the age of superannuation of the workmen was fixed at 55 years. The settlement was to be in force upto 30th June 1986 and the next settlement, incorporating practically the same terms, was again entered into on 4th February 1987 under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act. There is no dispute that these settlements are under Section 18(1).*

14. Now the Authority constituted under Section 41(1) of the Act is an authority with very limited jurisdiction. It can only decide in the first appeal whether a termination by the management is valid or not and is within the parameters of Section 40 of the Act. The said Authority, in our view, has absolutely no jurisdiction to decide whether a settlement entered into under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act between the representatives of the Workmen and of the Management, is vitiated by undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion on the part of the Management. The Authority, namely, the Assistant Commissioner of Labour, was never intended by the A.P. Legislature to have jurisdiction to go into the question of the validity of a settlement arrived at under Section 18 of the Industrial Disputes Act by an Industrial Court. That Parliament has, in fact, constituted Industrial Courts under the Industrial Disputes Act, with extensive powers cannot be disputed. What we mean to say is that the Authority under Section 41(1) of the A.P. Act has no jurisdiction what-so-ever either to question or to decide about the validity of any such settlements. If parties to a settlement have a grievance about the validity of a settlement, it is for them to agitate the matter before the appropriate forum and they cannot ask an Authority constituted under Section 41(1) of the A.P. Shops and Establishments Act, 1966 with limited jurisdiction, to go into any such question and, that too, incidentally while deciding whether retirement as per the contract of employment, is legal or not."

It is not the case of Workman that aforesaid settlements are vitiated by undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion on the part of the management. If the Workman feeling aggrieved by any terms of settlement/ agreement on the aforementioned grounds then he can challenge of settlement before a competent authority under the Act, 1947. But here in the instant matter it is not a case of Workman that aforementioned settlement has been entered into between the parties on the ground of undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion. Therefore, Workman is barred to raise any objection in respect of fixing the date of lapse of both panels on 31.3.1997 as agreed between both the parties and Workman can not challenge any terms of said Agreement.

Further in the case of **Herbertsons Limited Vs. Workmen of Herbertsons Limited and Ors, 1977 AIR 322,** Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

The Tribunal thought that the question of the quantum of membership of the 2nd Respondent did not call for a finding at all in view of 1his Court's order. As observed above that was not a correct assumption. On the other hand, we feel that this view of the Tribunal has led it to approach the matter in an entirely erroneous manner. The Tribunal is, rightly enough, conscious that under section 18 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act the settlement was binding on the company and the members of the 3rd Respondent union. Even so, the Tribunal devoted nearly half of its order in scanning the evidence given by the company and Respondent No. 3 to find out whether the terms of the settlement had been explained by the President of the union to the workmen or not and whether the workers voluntarily accepted the settlement knowing all the "consequences". This to our mind is again an entirely wrong approach.

"When a recognised union negotiates with an employer the workers as individuals do not come into the picture. It is not necessary that each individual worker should know the implications of the settlement since a recognised union, which is expected to protect the legitimate interests of labour, enters into a settlement in the best interests of labour. This would be the normal rule. We cannot altogether rule out exceptional cases where there may be allegations of mala fides, fraud or even corruption or other induce- ments. Nothing of that kind has been suggested against the President of the 3rd Respondent in this case. That being the position, prima facie, this is a settlement in the course of collective bargaining and, therefore, is entitled to due weight and consideration.

It is not possible to scan the settlement in bits and pieces and hold some parts good and acceptable and others bad. Unless it can be demonstrated that the objectionable portion is such that it completely outweighs all the other advantages gained the Court will be slow to hold a settle- ment as unfair and unjust. The settlement has to be accepted or rejected as a whole and we are unable to reject it as a whole as unfair or unjust. Even before this Court the 3rd Respondent representing admittedly the large majority of the workmen has stood by this settlement and that is a strong factor which it is difficult to ignore. As stated elsewhere in the judgment, we cannot also be oblivious of the fact that all workmen of the company have accepted the settlement. Besides, the period of settlement has since expired and we are informed that the employer and the 3rd Respondent are negotiating another settlement with further improvements. These factors, apart from what has been stated above, and the need for industrial peace and harmony when a union backed by a large majority of workmen has accepted a settlement in the course of collective bargaining have impelled us not to interfere with this settlement. That being the position, we unhold the settlement as fair and just and order that the award of the Tribunal shall be substituted by the settlement dated October 18, 1973. The said settlement shall be the substituted award. The appeal is disposed of accordingly. There will be no order as to costs."

Therefore, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above, the contention of the Workman that the date fixed for lapse of empanelled list on 31.3.1997 for appointment to the permanent post vide 5th Settlement dated 30.7.1996 is arbitrary, illegal is not untenable. The recognized union of Workmen has negotiated with the Respondent Bank Management representing large number of Workmen and the Workman as individual do not come into picture. Workman in the instant case has work as temporary Workmen in the Respondent Branch and in response of Notification he had applied for inclusion of his name in the panel and he was selected for inclusion his name in the panel list to be utilized for absorption of such Workman to permanent post in order of their seniority in the list. The Settlement dated 30.7.1996 between State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation under Sec.2(p) and Sec.18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 has clearly provided as regard non-messengerial position and it is agreed that all such posts sanctioned fallen vacant upto 31.3.1997 shall be filled before empanel list is allowed to lapse. Thus, in view of law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, in the instant case, Agreement dated 30.7.1996 was entered into between both the parties in respect of lapsing of the both the panels on 31.3.1997 and absorption of the Workmen from panel list was subject to availability of vacancy of post likely to arise upto 31.3.1997, have a binding force on Workman as well as management of State Bank of India in view of provision contained under section 18 (1) of I.D. Act, 1947.

Thus, Point No.I is answered against the Workman and in favour of the Respondent.

27. **Point No.II**:- Firstly, it is submitted on behalf of the Workman that the Respondent has terminated his services by oral order on 26.7.89 without issuing any notice or paying any salary or compensation in lieu thereof. Therefore, the termination order of the Workman from service is in violation of provision contained Under Section 25 F of I.D. Act, 1947. Therefore, the order is liable to be set aside.

28. On the other hand, Respondent counsel contended that Workman has not worked for 240 days in any preceding calendar year. Therefore, reference of the industrial dispute is not relevant. In this context, the Workman has examined himself as WW1 who has reiterated that Workman has been terminated from service by Respondent on 26.7.89 without notice of salary or compensation in lieu thereof. Before examining the claim of the Workman on merit it would be apposite to reproduce the provision contained under section 25 F:-

Section 25F provides:-

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].

Compensation to workmen in case of transfer of undertakings.

Section 25B defines the term continuous service which provides

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 authorized 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;

In order to prove the fact of 240 days of service within 12 months of a calendar year just preceding from the date of termination, the initial burden of proof lies upon the Workman and the Workman has to prove this factum by adducing his oral as well as documentary evidence in support of his claim.

Further, how to calculate 240 days of service by the Workman in a calendar year. In this context the reference of decisions of Hon'ble Supreme Court is relevant and the same are discussed below:-

In Rajasthan State Ganganagar S. Mills Ltd. v. State of Rajasthan and Anr. (2004) Apex Court held:

"It was the case of the Workman that he had worked for more than 240 days in the year concerned. This claim was denied by the appellant. It was for the claimant to lead evidence to show that he had worked for 240 days in the year preceding the date of his termination. He has filed an affidavit. It is statement which is in his favor and that cannot be regarded as sufficient evidence for any Court or Tribunal to come to the conclusion that in fact the claimant had worked for 240 days in a year These aspects were highlighted in Range Forest Officer v. S.T. Hadimani (2002 (3) SCC 25. No proof of receipt of salary or wages for 240 days or order or record in that regard was produced. Mere non-production of the muster roll for a particular period was not sufficient for the Labour Court held that the Workman had worked for 240 days as claimed."

In Municipal Corporation, Faridabad v. Siri Niwas (2004 (8) SCC 195), held "*the burden was on the Workman to show that he was working for more than 240 days in the preceding one year prior to his alleged retrenchment." In M.P. Electricity Board v. Hariram (2004 (8) SCC 246) the position was again reiterated in paragraph 11 as follows: "The above burden having not been discharged and the Labour Court having held so, in our opinion, the Industrial Court and the High Court erred in basing an order of reinstatement solely on an adverse inference drawn erroneously ..*"

In the case of Manager, RBI, Bangalore vs. S Mani (2005) SCC Page 100, the 3 Judges Bench of the Apex Court held that "*the initial burden of proof was on the Workman to show that he had completed 240 days of service."*

Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of Mohan Lal vs Management BEL 1981 SCC page 225 has laid down the principle that how to count 240 days of service within one year it is held: *"Clause (2)(a) provides for a fiction to treat a Workman in continuous service for a period of one year despite the fact that he has not rendered uninterrupted service for a period of one year but he has rendered period of 240 days during the period of 12 calendar service for months counting backwards and just preceding the relevant date being the date of retrenchment. In other words, in order to invoke the fiction enacted in clause (2)(a) it is necessary to determine first the relevant date, ie the date of termination of service which is complained of as retrenchment. After that date is ascertained. move backward to a period of 12 months just preceding the date of retrenchment and then ascertain whether within the period of 12 months, the Workman has rendered service for a period of 240 days. If these three facts are affirmatively answered in favor of the Workman pursuant to the deeming fiction enacted in clause (2)(a) it will have to be assumed that the Workman is in continuous service for a period of one year and he will satisfy the eligibility qualification enacted in Section 25-F"*

"14. We have already extracted section 25B since its amendment and the change in language is the legislative exposition of which note must be taken. In fact, we need not further dilate upon this aspect because in Surendra Kumar Verma and Ors. v. Central Government Industrial-cum-Labour Court, New Delhi and Anr., Chinnappa Reddy. J., after noticing the amendment and referring to the decision in Sur Enamel and Stamping Works (P) Ltd case, held as under:

"These changes brought about by Act 36 of 1964 appear to be clearly designed to provide that a Workman who has actually worked under the employer for not less than 240 days during a period of twelve months shall be deemed to have been in continuous service for a period of one year whether or not he has in fact been in such continuous service for a period of one year. It is enough that he has worked for 240 days in a period of 12 months, it is not necessary that he should have been in the service of the employer for one whole year."

In a concurring judgment Pathak J. agreed with this interpretation of section 25B(2). Therefore, both on principle and on precedent it must be held that section 25B(2) comprehends a situation where a Workman is not in employment for a period of 12 calendar months, but has rendered service for a period of 240 days within the period of 12 calendar months commencing and counting backwards from the relevant date, i.e. the date of retrenchment. If he has, he would be deemed to be in continuous service for a period of one year for the purpose of section 25B and Chapter VA."

Thus, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above the initial burden of proof lies upon the Workman to show that he has completed 240 days of the service with the Respondent just preceding from the date of his termination. Further, in respect of the employment of calculating the 240 days service provision contained under Section 25-F read with Section 25-B of the I.D. Act, 1947.

29. Now, in view of the provision contained under Section 25 F and law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, we have to examine whether the Workman has discharged his initial burden of proof in respect of his claim of 240 days continuous service in a calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination i.e., 26.7.89.

29. Now, in view of the provision contained under Section 25 F and law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, we have to examine whether the Workman has discharged his initial burden of proof in respect of his claim of 240 days continuous service in a calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination i.e., March, 1997.

In this context, WW1 in his cross examination has stated that,

"I was not sponsored by any employment exchange."

"It is not true to suggest that I never worked for 240 days in a year continuously…"

Further, MW1 in his cross examination has stated in cross examination that, "The Petitioner has not completed 240 days of service in a calendar year."

This statement of witness MW1 remained uncontroverted as the Petitioner did not cross examine the witness MW1 on this point. Thus, it is clear from the testimony of WW1 and also MW1 that the Workman had not worked for 240 days continuously in any 12 months of a calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination in the Respondent bank. Therefore, Workman failed to establish his plea by his oral and documentary evidence that he had worked for 240 days continuously in calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination i.e., March, 1997. Thus, the claim of the Workman that he has been terminated by oral order without issuing notice or payment in lieu after termination, in contravention of Section 25 F of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is not tenable. However the documents filed by the Workman in support of his claim, number of days worked with the Respondent goes to reveal that the Workman had worked intermittently as daily wager depending upon availability of work in branch. Workman did not file any document of appointment letter or salary slips in support of his claim for appointment as a non-messenger in the Respondent branch on temporary basis.

30. Per contra, the Learned Counsel for Respondent has submitted the allegation of Workman that he was terminated from services is not correct. As the vacancies were filled up on regular basis in order of their respective seniority the non-engagement of the Workman does not amount to termination. Further, Respondent contended that no law provide that even though there is no work temporary employee should be continued in the bank work as the very engagement of Workman was subject to availability of work. Therefore, the allegation that the bank has indulged in unfair labour practice is incorrect.

31. Thus, in view of the fore gone discussion and contentions made by the Respondent, I find the force in the argument advanced by the Respondent that in the instant matter, Workman was not terminated from service by order dated 26.7.89 rather he was disengaged in view of the non-availability of the work in the branch. Further, there was direction issued by the Head Office of the Respondent authority not to engage any daily wager Workman/ temporary Worker w.e.f. 26.7.89. Thus, such disengagement of Workman does not amount to termination. Moreover, the Workman failed to prove his claim that he was terminated in contravention of provision of Sec.25F of the I.D. Act, 1947 as he failed to establish his plea by any oral or documentary evidence that he had worked for 240 days continuously in a twelve months of calendar year just preceding from date of termination i.e., 26.7.89.

32. Further, perusal of the order dated 25.3.1997 goes to reveal that the Chief Branch Manager, State Bank of India has issued the letter to Zonal Office with direction to all its branches to this effect that they have been advised by the DGM, Zonal Office, Hyderabad that as both the panel of temporary employees of 1989 and daily wagers/casual labour of 1992 will lapse on 31.3.1997 it has been decided by central office not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial cadre from 26.7.89, therefore it was directed to issue suitable instructions not to make temporary appointments from 26.7.89. There is no mention in this order that the Workman herein has been terminated from service by this order.

33. Further, the circular dated 27.3.1997 was issued by DGM, SBI to all branches in commercial network in respect of the non-appointment of temporary employees in subordinate cadre and it has directed not to make any temporary employment in the subordinate cadre with effect from 1.4.97 and further, it has directed to ensure that no

temporary/casual/daily basis appointment of the petty cash. Further, it is directed to all Branch Managers that any deviation in this regard will be viewed seriously. Thus, these circulars do not reflect that the Workman has been terminated from service by this order.

34. Similarly, office order dated 31.3.1997 is simply a direction to all branches of the Respondent bank by DGM that no further daily labour should be engaged or employed. Therefore, the plea of the Workman that he has been terminated by the aforesaid order dated 25.3.1997, 27.3.1997 and 31.3.1997 from the service by the Respondent is not acceptable. The evidence adduced by the Workman clearly goes to reveal that he had worked as a daily wager for which he has been paid wages according to number of working days. As there was an order for prohibition for engaging temporary workmen, in the bank, therefore, Workman could not be engaged by the Respondent for work from 26.7.89 and there after. It is settled law that the daily wagers are engaged by the employer depending upon the availability of work and as the work was not available the Workman was not engaged further by the Respondent management. Therefore, the Workman on the ground of number of days he had worked in the Respondent bank cannot claim any right to reinstate him into the employment. As the Workman failed to prove the mandatory condition of 240 days of continuous service as required under Sec.25F of I.D. Act, 1947. Therefore, the disengagement of Workman from work can not be termed in contravention of provision contained under Sec.25F and 25 B of the I.D. Act, 1947.

Thus, this point is answered against the Workman and in favour of Respondent.

35. **Point No.III**:- In this context, the Workman has contended that the management failed to implement the selected panels during its valid tenure. The management adopted the back door methods contrary to the settlements and filled up the vacancies. The same is evident from the proceedings dated 18.11.1993 a copy of the same is filed in the material papers and the same may be read as part of the claim statement. Further, it is submitted that management has to adhere the procedure issued by the Central Government, the instructions dated 16.8.1990 in the year 1995, but same was not followed in the year 1997 despite there being vacancies. The management has followed the procedure of calling candidates through employment exchange instead of giving chance to the empanelled candidates like the Workman herein. The management sent call letters to the similarly situated candidates like the Workman in the month of June 1997 subsequent to issuance of impugned termination orders. After knowing the fact that they are litigating the issue by way of dispute, the management has refused to engage those candidates, the copies of call letters issued are filed herein along with claim petition. The Workman herein reiterates that the panels are meant for absorption but not for termination. In view of the same a duty is cast upon the Respondent management to engage the empanelled candidates like the Workman herein even in temporary vacancies till they are absorbed permanently in regular vacancies.

36. On the other hand, Respondent has contended that the Federation approached Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) for implementation of bipartite settlement in respect of the absorption of temporary employees. The Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) conducted conciliation proceedings and agreement was arrived at between the Federation and the Management bank. It is submitted that it was agreed between the Federation and the Management that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers /casual labour would be kept alive upto March, 1997 and the vacancies as agreed to under the afore set out settlements will be filled from both the lists concurrently. A copy of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.1995 signed by the parties to the dispute is filed as a material paper. Further, it is submitted that the settlement was arrived at and an agreement was signed between the Federation and the Management bank on 30.7.1996 under Section 2(p) read with Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules 1957 which is binding on the parties. A copy of this agreement which hereinafter may be referred to as 5th settlement for brevity, is also filed as a material paper. The 5th settlement dated 30.7.1996 whereunder the earlier four settlements dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988 and 9.1.1991 were also referred, it was agreed to, by the Federation and the Management bank that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees will be kept alive upto March, 1997 for filling the vacancies existing/arrived at as on 31.12.1994 as per the norms agreed to between the bank and Federation and that thereafter the said panels would lapse. It was also agreed that within the framework of the above settlements the modalities about drawing names from either the panel of temporary employees or the panel of daily wagers and casual labour would be decided administratively on circle to circle basis depending upon the local requirements in consultation with the Federation's affiliate by the Circle management. It was further agreed that all messenger real vacancies/positions in the subordinate cadre including part-time attendants specifically provided as leave reserve will be filled by the end of 31.3.1997. Further, Respondent contended that on 27.2.1997 a memorandum of understanding was also signed between the Federation's affiliate and the bank management regarding the fact that the exercise of identifying the messengerial vacancies as on 31.12.1994 has since been completed by central office and thereby 403 messengerial vacancies were sanctioned to the circle of the Management bank and it was agreed that these vacancies may be filled from 1989 panel of temporary employees after effecting conversion from full time non-messengerial staff in the usual manner and the agreement was reached upon. Further, it was agreed between the Federations affiliate and the management bank that in terms of the settlement dated 30.7.1996 both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers /casual employees would lapse on 31.3.1997.

37. The Workman has contended that the empanelled list prepared by the Respondent management for appointment of temporary and daily wage Workers to the permanent post cannot lapse unless until it is exhausted by appointing all the empanelled persons and it should continue even after 31.3.1997, i.e., the date fixed for the lapse of panel. It is undisputed that the date of lapse of empanelled list of Workmen has been fixed to 31.3.1997 as mentioned in the settlement dated 30.7.1996, and agreed between the parties. It is settled law that and once the life of panel list lapses on the date as agreed between the parties it cannot be extended beyond that date. In the instant case the panel list of the workmen was valid upto 31.3.1997 in view of the terms and conditions enumerated in the 5th Settlement entered into between the parties. As the lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997 has been agreed by State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation through 5th Settlement, the Workman is not competent to challenge the same.

In this context I would like to take reference of the decision of the apex court in the case of **Syndicate Bank and Ors vs. Shankar Paul and Ors , AIR 1997 SC 3091, therein the Hon'ble Apex Court** have held:-

"Till 1982, the branches of the appellant Bank in Calcutta region were recruiting persons locally to work as temporary attenders in leave vacancies. In view of the revised procedure prescribed by the Government of India in respect of such temporary appointments, the Calcutta regional office of the appellant Bank issued a circular to all of its branches on 14.8.1982, instructing all the branches under it to discontinue the old practice from 1.6.1982 and appoint only empanelled candidates. The regional office was to prepare a panel of eligible candidates, after calling names from the local/district employment exchange, and split it up branch-wise. Following that new procedure yearly panels were prepared thereafter. Names of the Respondents were for the first time included in the panel prepared for the period 7.2.1987 to 6.2.1988. By its letter dated 7.2.1987 the Bank had informed the Respondents that the panel was valid for one year only and that inclusion of their names in the panel was not to confer on them any right to seek permanent appointment in the service of the bank. Considering the object with which the panel was prepared and the fact that it was an yearly panel expiring on 6.2.1988, we are of the opinion that the Respondents did not get any right, because of inclusion of their names in the said panel, for permanent absorption in the service of the Bank. Whatever conditional right they had came to an end with the expiry of the panel. The claim of the Respondents, as contained in the writ petition was thus misconceived and therefore the learned single Judge and the Division Bench, when it first decided the appeal, were right in dismissing the writ petition and the appeal respectively."

Thus, in view of the above law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court and in view of the terms and conditions of the 5th Settlement the contention of the Workman that empanelled list should continue even after 31.3.1997 till the last Workman in the panel is absorbed is not tenable. The contention of the Workman is baseless in view of recital in the settlement. Therefore, in view of the fore gone discussion and finding given at Point No. I regarding binding nature of Settlements and terms and conditions enumerated therein, in view of the provision contained u/s.18(1) of the I.D. Act, 1947, I am of the considered view that life of panels lapsed on 31.3.1997 in view of terms of settlement dated 30.7.1996 and plea of Workman that the panel shall continue even after 31.3.1997 till last man absorbed has no legal force and same is untenable.

38. Undisputedly, settlement agreement dated 30.7.1996 was executed between the State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation and in that settlement it was agreed that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/ casual employees will be used for filling vacancies existing as on 31.12.1994 as per the norms agreed between the bank and the Federation. These empanelled workmen were to be given a chance for permanent appointment in the bank against vacancies arising up to December 1994 whereas the daily wagers/ casual employees were to be considered against the vacancies arise from January 1995 to December 1996, whereby the said panel would lapse. It was agreed that the vacancies falls upto 31.3.1997 shall be filled before the empanelled list is allowed to lapse. Thus, the claim of the Workman to the post of permanent non-messenger in the Respondent management was subject to the availability of the sanctioned post and vacancies arising upto 31.3.1997. The workmen given chance to the permanent post were seniors in number of working days in panel list and Workman herein was junior to those workmen. Therefore, Workman could not be given absorption to permanent post being junior to other workmen in the panel list.

39. Moreover, the Respondent management witness MW1 in chief statement has given the evidence that, "The Petitioner did not work continuously for 240 days in any year or over a period of 36 months." Further, he has stated that, " the Petitioner was appointed as temporary messenger and Petitioner's services were discontinued whenever their services were not needed." Although this witness was cross examined by the Petitioner but the above statement of the management witness in chief remained uncontroverted, as the witness MW1 was not cross examined by Petitioner on this point. Therefore, the claim of the Petitioner that he has been removed from service by the management illegally is untenable. Further, witness MW1 in his chief statement has stated that, the workman was engaged in leave vacancies in the bank on Temporary basis. This witness has stated in cross examination that, "The Petitioner has not completed 240 days of service in a calendar year." This statement of witness MW1 remained uncontroverted as the Petitioner did not cross examine the witness MW1 on this point. Therefore, the Petitioner Workman as per number of working days, failed to fulfil eligibility criteria of working days as required for regularisation. Therefore, he was not given regularisation in the employment of the Respondent. Moreover, the

Workman witness WW1 in his cross examination has admitted the fact that he do not know whether any junior to him in 1989 panel were regularised in the services. Further, WW1 states that he do not know particulars of the settlement reached between the management and staff union. Therefore, in view of the statement of WW1 in cross examination, the claim of the Petitioner that he was refused regularization by the Respondent management illegally, is untenable. Thus, there is no evidence on record that bank has given the appointment to the temporary employees as well as daily wagers from the panel list 1989 and 1992 in breach of seniority of the temporary employees in the list. There is no evidence of jumbling in the panel list to make appointment of any permanent Workman in breach of the seniority. Therefore, I am constrained to hold that the Respondent Management has appointed the workmen from panel list in order of seniority and there is no jumbling of workmen in the panel list before it got lapsed on 31.3.1997.

40. However, Workman has taken the plea that the panels of Workmen for absorption in the employment of the Respondent banks (panels of temporary employees and daily wagers) has been lapsed on 31.3.1997 in contravention of terms of settlement as the object of preparing the entire empanelment of temporary and daily wagers was to provide them permanent employment and till the both the panel lists exhausted the panel list cannot be lapsed on 31.3.1997 and the date of lapsing of the panel on 31.3.1997 has been fixed by the Respondent arbitrarily without any authority.

41. In this context, the perusal of Settlement dated 30.7.1996 reveals that the 5th Settlement dated 30.7.1996 was entered under Section 2(p) and 18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Dispute (Central) Rules 1957. This settlement has been entered into by the competent parties and in this settlement parties thereto agreed that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees will lapse on 31.3.1997. Thus the date of lapse of panel was fixed by both the parties with consensus under the settlement dated 30.7.1996 and same is binding upon the Workman under the provision of Section 18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947. Moreover, this issue of binding force of the settlement dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988 and 9.1.1991 has already been discussed, decided at finding in Point No.I of this award. However, the legality and validity of the aforementioned settlement has not been challenged by the Workman before any competent forum. Thus, claim of Workman that the date of lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997 has been fixed arbitrarily by the Respondent bank is untenable. As regard the claim of Workman for his absorption to the permanent post it is settled law that the Workman can not claim his regularization to permanent post merely on the basis of number of working days.

42. In this context the reference of the decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Oil and Natural Gas Corporation vs Krishan Gopal 2020(3) SCALE 272, date of decision 7.2.2020** is relevant therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have has laid down principle regarding regularization of the Workman on permanent posts. Hon'ble Supreme Court have laid down the prepositions of regularization of the workmen to permanent post is as under:-

"*(i) Wide as they are, the powers of the Labour Court and the Industrial Court cannot extend to a direction to order regularisation, where such a direction would in the context of public employment offend the provisions contained in Article 14 of the Constitution;*

(ii) The statutory power of the Labour Court or Industrial Court to grant relief to workmen including the status of permanency continues to exist in circumstances where the employer has indulged in an unfair labour practice by not filling up permanent posts even though such posts are available and by continuing to employ workmen as temporary or daily wage employees despite their performing the same work as regular workmen on lower wages;

(iii) The power to create permanent or sanctioned posts lies outside the judicial domain and where no posts are available, a direction to grant regularisation would be impermissible merely on the basis of the number of years of service;

(iv) Where an employer has regularised similarly situated workmen either in a scheme or otherwise, it would be open to workmen who have been deprived of the same benefit at par with the workmen who have been regularised to make a complaint before the Labour or Industrial Court, since the deprivation of the benefit would amount to a violation of Article 14; and

(v) In order to constitute an unfair labour practice under Section 2(ra) read with Item 10 of the Vth Schedule of the ID Act, the employer should be engaging workmen as badlis, temporaries or casuals, and continuing them for years, with the object of depriving them of the benefits payable to permanent workmen.

Thus, in view of the principles laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court as discussed above, in the instant matter the Workman utterly failed to prove his claim by adducing any documentary or oral evidence that the employer has indulged in unfair labour practice by not filling the permanent posts even though such posts are available and by continuing to employ workmen as temporary or daily wage employees despite their performance was the same work, as regular workmen on lower wages.

43. Respondent has contended that all the vacancies exist and arise upto 31.3.1997 has been filled up from the panel list in order of seniority and no vacancy exists or arises as on 31.3.1997 remained unfilled. Further, it is contended that as per terms of settlement the life of panel lists has been lapsed on 31.3.1997, hence, there is no

occasion to extend the life of panel lists beyond 31.3.1997. However, the workman failed to prove contrary by any evidence to the aforesaid contention of the Respondent that the vacancies were existing as on 31.3.1997 and the workman was not given absorption to the permanent post in order of his seniority. It is settled law that the power to create permanent or sanctioned post lies outside the judicial domain and where no posts are available, a direction to grant regularization would be impermissible merely on the basis of the number of years of service. Therefore, the claim of the workman on this ground also not acceptable.

44. Further, as per the of settlement, panel was prepared for absorption of the workmen on the permanent posts has already been lapsed on 31.3.1997 and the vacancies existing and arising upto 31.12.1994 and upto 31.3.1997 as settlement dated 30.7.1996 has been filled up from the panel by appointing the workmen as per seniority in the panel list. Workman witness WW1 in his cross examination has himself admitted this fact that, some of the temporary employees whose names were included in the panel were given regular appointment in the bank in order of their seniority in the panel. The Workman failed to show that there was any breach of terms of settlement has been committed by the Respondent in appointment to permanent post from aforesaid panel list.

45. As discussed in preceding paragraph of this Award, the life of the panel has not been extended beyond 31.3.1997, by any further settlement hence, the panel list in which name of the Workman was included got expired on 31.3.1997. It is not the case of the Workman that Respondent has regularized similarly situated workmen either in the scheme or otherwise and the Workman has been deprived of same benefit on par with those workmen or the vacancies remained unfilled on the date of lapse of panels i.e., 31.3.1997, Industrial Tribunal has no jurisdiction to extend the date of lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997. This Tribunal can not order for regularization of workmen to the permanent post in contravention of the provision of Article 14 of the Constitution of India.

In the case of **Mahboob Deepak vs. Nagar Panchayat Gajraula & Anr, Civil Appeal No.5875/2007 date of judgement 13.12.2007,** Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

"8. Respondent is a Local Authority. The terms and conditions of employment of the employees are governed by a statute and statutory rules. No appointment can be made by a Local Authority without following the provisions of the recruitment rules. Any appointment made in violation of the said rules as also the constitutional scheme of equality as contained in Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India would be a nullity.

9. Due to some exigency of work, although recruitment on daily wages or on an ad hoc basis was permissible, but by reason thereof an employee cannot claim any right to be permanently absorbed in service or made permanent in absence of any statute or statutory rules. Merely because an employee has completed 240 days of work in a year preceding the date of retrenchment, the same would not mean that his services were liable to be regularized."

Therefore, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, the claim of the Workman for absorption merely on the basis of number of day of work in the Respondent bank Branch is not acceptable. As regard plea of the Workman that the Workman should have been given employment even after 31.3.1997 as temporary Workman, it is the discretion of Respondent to engage the Workman depending upon availability of work and this Tribunal can not direct the Respondent to engage the Workman in the absent of such rule/scheme.

46. In view of principle laid down by Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above, in the instant matter Workman utterly failed to establish the fact of rendering continuous service for a period of 240 days of service within a period of 12 calendar months commencing and coming backward from relevant date i.e., the date of retrenchment, if has he would be denied to be in continuous service for a period of one year. Therefore, the provision contained under Sec.25F of retrenchment is not applicable to Workman.

Counsel for Workman has relied upon number of decisions of Hon'ble High Court and Hon'ble Supreme Court and few of them are discussed herein:-

In the case of **F.C.I., vs. Kamdhenu Cattle Feed Industries 1993 (1) SCC 71,** therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

"7. In contractual sphere as in all other State actions, the State and all its instrumentalities have to conform to Article 14 of the Constitution of which non-arbitrariness is a significant facet. There is no unfettered discretion in public law: A public authority possesses powers only to use them for public good. This impose the duty to act fairly and to adopt a procedure which is `fairplay in action'. Due observance of this obligation as a part of good administration raises a reasonable or legitimate expectation in every citizen to be treated fairly in his interaction with the State and its instrumentalities, with this element forming a necessary component of the decision making process in all State actions. To satisfy this requirement of non- arbitrariness in a State action, it is, therefore, necessary to consider and give due weight to the reasonable or legitimate expectations of the persons likely lo be affected by the decision or else that unfairness in the exercise of the power may amount to an abuse or excess of power apart from affecting the bona fides of the decision in a given case. The decision so made would be exposed to challenge on the ground of arbitrariness. Rule of law does not completely eliminate discretion in the exercise of power, as it is unrealistic, but providers for control of its exercise by judicial review."

In the case of **State Bank of India, R.O., Vijayawada vs. Industrial Tribunal, Hyderabad WP No.193/1997,** therein Hon'ble High Court have held,

"*Sri Krovvidi Narasimham, the learned counsel for the 2nd respondent contends, supporting the award that it was a permanent vacancy and even though the 2nd respondent was appointed on temporary basis, his services were not liable to be terminated and he was to be regularised into service on permanent basis. Shastry award warrants that no temporary appointment can be made to a permanent post. But the matter is now covered by two division bench judgements dated 28.11.1986 in W.A. No.791 of 1986 and 25.8.1987 in W.A. No.270 of 1982. The ratio decided in the two judgements is to the effect that there cannot be any mandate to appoint employees on permanent basis when the requirement was for appointment on temporary basis. But it is held in the said judgements that when a temporary appointee is ousted from service and not for misconduct and, if again temporary appointment is to be made, then, the case of such temporary appointee who was ousted, has got to be considered in accordance with Sec. 25-H of the Act."*

In the case of **State of Haryana and others vs. Piara Singh and others. 1992 (4) SCC 118,** therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

" 49. If for any reason an adhoc or temporary employee is continued for a fairly long spell, the authorities must consider his case for regularization provided he is eligible and qualified according to the rules and his service record is satisfactory and his appointment does not run counter to the reservation policy of the state."

In the above cited judgements by the Workman the facts of the case are different hence do not apply to instant case of Workman.

47. On the other hand, in support of his contention Respondent has examined witness MW1 and MW1 in chief examination states that, Settlements i.e., on 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988, 9.1.1991 were entered into between the SBI and SBI Staff Federation for filling up of the vacancies that arise up to 1994 for those temporary employees who has worked on scale wages. Further, MW1 states that two different panels for messengers and non-messengers as per the eligibility criteria prescribed by the bank. There are four modules in Andhra Pradesh and they are Hyderabad, Tirupathi, Vijayawada and Visakhapatnam. MW1 states that the temporary employees so empanelled were given permanent absorption depending upon the vacancies so arise strictly in terms of the settlement. MW1 states that on 9.6.1995 conciliation proceeding was held before the RLC(C), Hyderabad and in said proceedings it was decided that the panels will be kept live up to 31.3.1997 and vacancies will be filled from both the lists concurrently. A copy of the said minutes of proceedings is Ex.M5. Further, MW1 states that on 30.7.1996 another settlement was entered between the SBI and All India SBI Staff Federation providing for filling up of the vacancies arising up to December 1994 in respect of subordinate cadre and daily wage /casual wage employees out of panel so prepared were to be considered against vacancies arising from January 1995 to December 1996, thereafter the said panels lapse. MW1 states that it was also agreed that all the non- messenger positions in subordinate cadre including part time attendants specially provided as leave reserve will be filled before 31.3.1997 and as regards to non-messengerial positions it is agreed that all such posts sanctioned and fallen vacant up to 31.3.1997 shall be filled before the empanelled list is allowed to lapse. Thus in both the cases empanelled list were lapsed on 26.7.89. Ex.M6 is the copy of the settlement dated 30.7.1996. Further, witness states that on 27.2.1997 a memorandum of understanding was reached between the SBI and SBI Staff Federation providing that both the panels above mentioned will lapse on 31.3.1997. Ex.M7 is the copy of the memorandum of understanding and Ex.M8 is the copy of the statements giving the particulars of 1989 non-messenger panel, Ex.M9 is the copy of the statement of 1989 non-messenger panel, Ex.M10 is the copy of statement of 1992 panel. Further, witness states that petitioner was included in the 1989 panel. As the existing vacancies at that time were exhausted and his turn did not come he could not be given permanent employment in the bank as per the agreements. All the appointments were made strictly in accordance with the settlements reached from time to time between SBI and SBI staff federation and as per seniority, number of days of temporary service put in by them in the bank in the given period. Further, MW1 states petitioner was not sponsored by any employment exchange he did not undergo the regular process of selection required for appointment as a regular non-messenger the petitioner has not worked for 240 days in any year in his entire temporary service in the bank. The petitioner and other temporary employees were terminated from service by the bank. Further, MW1 states that the vacancies were filled up on regular basis with the temporary employees from the panels and these panels were expired in terms of the settlements so reached and there were no vacancies to absorb such employees. Thus, witness MW1 has proved the documents Ex.M1 to Ex.M12 and also contentions made in the counter. However, MW1 was cross examined by the Petitioner Counsel. But nothing has been elicited in his cross examination so as to discredit the testimony of the witness MW1 as regards the date of lapse of both the panels on 31.3.1997 and reasons assigned for non-absorption of the Petitioner from the panel list to the permanent post. Moreover the witness MW1 was re-examined by the Respondent and the witness MW1 states that panels were expired in terms of the settlement send absorptions to the extent of the available vacancies were made. There was no termination of any temporary messenger as such but their services were not utilized after the cut off date as the available vacancies were already filled up and most of these Petitioners were not in the service of the bank as on the date of the expiry date of the panels. Therefore, in view of the aforesaid testimony of the MW1 in re-examination in the absence of cross examination remained uncontraverted, the claim of the Workman that he was entitled for

absorption in permanent post in the branch of Respondent Management on the basis of panel list is found not established.

This point is answered against the Workman.

48. **Point No.IV**:- In view of the discussion and finding given at Point Nos. I, II and III, the Workman is not entitled for any relief and claim statement of Workman sans merit and liable to be dismissed.

This Point is answered accordingly.

AWARD

In view of the fore gone discussion, it is held that the action of the Respondent bank in terminating the services of Sri J. Rama Rao, Ex. Messenger by way of oral orders w.e.f. 26.7.89 is justified. Hence, the Petitioner is not entitled for any relief as prayed for. The claim statement filed by Workman sans merit, hence, dismissed.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, Personal Assistant, transcribed by her, corrected and signed by me on this the 11th day of June, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner	Witnesses examined for the Respondent
WW1: Sri J. Rama Rao	MW1: Sri I.S. Appa Rao

Documents marked for the Petitioner

Ex.W1:	Photocopy of interview call letter
Ex.W2:	Photocopy of temporary appointment order
Ex.W3:	Photocopy of service certificate
Ex.W4:	Photocopy of community certificate
Ex.W5:	Photocopy of interview call letter
Ex.W6:	Photocopy of panel list

Documents marked for the Respondent

Ex.M1:	Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.17.11.87
Ex.M2:	Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.16.7.88
Ex.M3:	Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.27.10.1988
Ex.M4:	Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.9.1.1991
Ex.M5:	Photocopy of conciliation proceedings before the Regional Labour Commissioner(C) dt.9.6.1995
Ex.M6:	Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.30.7.1996
Ex.M7:	Photocopy of Memorandum of understanding dt. 27.1.1997
Ex.M8:	Photocopy of statements giving the particulars of 1989 messenger panel.
Ex.M9:	Photocopy of statement of 1989 Non-messenger panel
Ex.M10:	Photocopy of statement of 1992 panel
Ex.M11:	Photocopy of order of Hon'ble High Court in WA No.86/98 dt. 1.5.98
Ex.M12:	Photocopy of order in SLP No.11886-11888 of 1998 dated 10.8.98

पेट्रोलियम एवं प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 3 अगस्त, 2026

का.आ. 1673.— केंद्र सरकार, तेल उद्योग (विकास) अधिनियम, 1974 (1974 का 47) की धारा 3 की उप-धारा (3) के खंड (क) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए निम्नलिखित अधिकारियों को दिनांक 24.06.2026 से 23.06.2028 तक अथवा अगले आदेशों तक, जो भी पहले हो, को तेल उद्योग विकास बोर्ड (ओआईडीबी) के सदस्यों के रूप में नियुक्त करती है:

(i) श्री तेजवीर सिंह, सचिव, रसायन एवं पेट्रो-रसायन विभाग

(ii) संयुक्त सचिव (अन्वेषण), पेट्रोलियम एवं प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय

[फा. सं. जी-38011/41/2016-फिन.आई (ई-33886)]

रघुराम कृष्णा, अवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF PETROLEUM & NATURAL GAS

New Delhi, the 3rd August, 2026

S.O. 1673.— in exercise of the Powers conferred by Clause (a) of Sub-Section (3) of Section 3 of the Oil Industry (Development) Act, 1974 (47 of 1974), the Central Government hereby appoints the following officers as Members of the Oil Industry Development Board (OIDB) w.e.f. 24.06.2026 to 23.06.2028 or until further orders, whichever is earlier:

(i) Shri Tejveer Singh,Secretary, D/o Chemical & Petrochemicals

(ii) Joint Secretary (Exp.) , Ministry of Petroleum & Natural Gas

[F. No. G-38011/41/2016-Fin.I (E-33886)]

REGHURAM KRISHNA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 3 अगस्त, 2026

का.आ. 1674.— केंद्र सरकार, तेल उद्योग (विकास) अधिनियम, 1974 (1974 का 47) की धारा 3 की उप-धारा (3) के खंड (ग) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए निम्नलिखित अधिकारियों को दिनांक 24.06.2026 से 23.06.2028 तक अथवा अगले आदेशों तक, जो भी पहले हो, को तेल उद्योग विकास बोर्ड (ओआईडीबी) के सदस्यों के रूप में नियुक्त करती है:

(i) सीएमडी, इंजीनियर्स इंडिया लिमिटेड (ईआईएल)

(ii)सीएमडी, गेल (इंडिया) लिमिटेड

[फा.सं. जी-38011/41/2016-फिन.आई (ई-33886)]

रघुराम कृष्णा, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 3rd August, 2026

S.O. 1674.— in exercise of the Powers conferred by Clause (c) of Sub-Section (3) of Section 3 of the Oil Industry (Development) Act, 1974 (47 of 1974), the Central Government hereby appoints the following officers as Members of the Oil Industry Development Board (OIDB) w.e.f. 24.06.2026 to 23.06.2028 or until further orders, whichever is earlier:

(i) CMD, Engineers India Limited (EIL)

(ii) CMD, GAIL (India) Limited

[F. No. G-38011/41/2016-Fin.I (E-33886)]

REGHURAM KRISHNA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 3 अगस्त, 2026

का.आ. 1675.— केंद्र सरकार, तेल उद्योग (विकास) अधिनियम, 1974 (1974 का 47) की धारा 3 की उप-धारा (3) के खंड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए निम्नलिखित अधिकारी को दिनांक 24.06.2026 से 23.06.2028 तक अथवा अगले आदेशों तक, जो भी पहले हो, को तेल उद्योग विकास बोर्ड (ओआईडीबी) के सदस्य के रूप में नियुक्त करती है:

(i) श्री कार्तिकेय दुबे, अध्यक्ष, बीपी इंडिया

[फा. सं. जी-38011/41/2016-फिन.आई (ई-33886)]

रघुराम कृष्णा, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 3rd August, 2026

S.O. 1675.— in exercise of the Powers conferred by Clause (d) of Sub-Section (3) of Section 3 of the Oil Industry (Development) Act, 1974 (47 of 1974), the Central Government hereby appoints the following officer as Member of the Oil Industry Development Board (OIDB) w.e.f. 24.06.2026 to 23.06.2028 or until further orders, whichever is earlier:

(i.) Shri Kartikeya Dube, Chairman, bp India

[F. No. G-38011/41/2016-Fin.I (E-33886)]

REGHURAM KRISHNA, Under Secy.

श्रम और रोजगार मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 29 जुलाई, 2026

का.आ. 1676.— औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार भारतीय स्टेट बैंक के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजको और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण – सह – श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद के पंचाट (सन्दर्भ संख्या 204/200) को प्रकाशित करती है,

[सं. एल.12012/111/2000–आई.आर-(बी-I)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 29th July, 2026

S.O. 1676. — In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Reference.I.D.No.204/2002) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Hyderabad as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the Management of SBI of India and their workmen,

[No. L-12012/111/2000 – IR (B-I)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

In The Central Government Industrial Tribunal Cum Labour Court At Hyderabad

Present: **Sri IRFAN QAMAR**

Presiding Officer

Dated the 7th day of May, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. 204/2002

[Old ID No.103/2000 of Industrial Tribunal No.I, Hyderabad]

Between:

Sri Sudersi Ramesh,

S/o. Chennaiah,

Ulavapadu Post(M),

Prakasham Distt. … Petitioner

And

The Assistant General Manager,

State Bank of India,

Zonal Office,

Region-II,

Tirupathi. …..Respondent

Appearances:

For the Petitioner : Sri Macherla Rangaiah, Advocate

For the Respondent: Sri Y. Ranjeeth Reddy, Advocate

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-12012/111/2000-IR(B.I) dated 31.8.2000/ 4.09.2000 referred the following dispute under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 to Industrial Tribunal No.I, Hyderabad for adjudication and later the same has been transferred to this Tribunal bearing ID No. 103/2000, as per orders of Central Government vide Lr.No.H-11026/1/2001-IR(C.II) dated 18.10.2001, requiring this forum to decide the question:

THE SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of State Bank of India in terminating the services of Sri S. Ramesh, Ex-Temporary Messenger, Chekicherla Branch w.e.f. 31.3.1997 is justified? If not, what relief the workman is entitled?"

After receipt of the reference, it was numbered as ID No. 204/2002 and notices were issued to both the Workman and the management.

2. Before unfolding the factual matrix of the instant industrial dispute it would be apposite to have a bird eye view of a chequered history of the instant industrial dispute. Earlier instant industrial dispute along with the batch cases was decided by this Tribunal vide common award dated 17.5.2005 and the reference was answered in favour of the Respondent and against the Workman. That said common award dated 17.5.2005 was challenged by the aggrieved Workmen in various Writ petition No.6470/2014 along with batch of writ petitions before the Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh and Hon'ble High Court vide its' judgement dated 23.6.2014 allowed all batch of writ petitions and set aside the common award dated 17.5.2005 passed in ID No.222 of 2001 and other batch of ID cases by Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad and the Respondent management of State Bank of India was directed to reengage the Writ Petitioners in position, which they have been occupying prior to their termination and further directed to consider their cases for regularization as and when the substantive vacancy arises. This judgement dated 23.6.2014 of Hon'ble High Court of AP, passed in WP No.6470/2014 and batch petitions was challenged by Respondent management before the Hon'ble High Court in Writ Appeal No. 1268 of 2014. The aforesaid Writ Appeals No.1268/2014 and other Writ Appeals were decided by Division Bench of High Court of Andhra Pradesh by a common judgement dated 20.3.2019. Hon'ble High Court in aforesaid Writ Appeal was pleased to pass the order which is extracted as below:-

" 7. Hearing the learned senior counsel for the SBI and the learned senior counsel for the contesting unofficial Respondents, we see that while the learned single Judge was justified in setting aside the award af the Tribunal, the proper course to be adopted was to remit all the cases to the Tribunal. This we say for reasons more than one. Firstly, in such matters, claims have to be decided on individual basis, as different persons have different claims as to the length of officiation or discharge of duties and functions; quality of engagement, drawings, accounting of the post for each one of them, who have worked etc. AIl these issues will not be the same in all the cases. Therefore, each case ought to have been directed to be decided by the Tribunal afresh on individual basis. The second and most important aspect is the learned single Judge has in one go ordered re-employment of all the workmen. This is not a relief that could have been granted without answering the individual issues; each issue relating to each case could not have been decided by the writ Court within the format of its adjudication procedures and scope. The adjudicating body, which has to do that activity, is the Industrial Tribunal. Therefore, we are of the view that while we would sustain the order of the learned singe Judge insofar as it interfered and sets aside the award of the Tribunal, the further findings and directions, issued through the impugned order have to go and the individual cases have to be sent back for consideration of the Tribunal. Such further procedure before the Tribunal will have to be carried forward with the materials already on record and also by affording an opportunity to the persons, who have claims as well as the management to place their rival contentions and further material before the Tribunal. The learned counsel appearing for the workmen are justified in pointing out that enormous delay has already happened and further action by the Tribunal in this line may be expedited.

9. In the result, these writ appeals are ordered;

(1) affirming the impugned common order of the learned single Judge to the extent it sets aside the common award dated 17.05.2005 of the Industrial Tribuna!;

(2) the further findings and directions issued through the impugned common order are vacated:

(3) all the matters shall be remitted to the Industrial Tribunal with a direction to dispose of them within an outer limit of five (5) months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order; and,

(4) the parties to make appearance before the Tribunal on the given date."

Thus, in view of the above direction of Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh in W.A.No.1268 of 2014 and batch cases. This Tribunal has taken up the matter of industrial dispute for hearing and deciding it afresh in view of the aforesaid guidelines laid down by the Hon'ble High Court in Writ Appeal No.1268/2014 vide judgement dated 20.3.019.

3. The factual matrix of instant industrial dispute as narrated by the Workman in his claim statement are that, the workman joined in the services of the Management Institution as Messenger on 1988 to 1997 and rendered unblemished service spreading over a period of about 6 years, and by dint of hard work till his services where terminated by oral orders with till his services where terminated by oral orders with effect from 1.04.1997. Further, it is submitted that the management of Respondent bank decided to give a chance to temporarily employed personnel "found suitable for permanent appointment" by wait- listing them by offering permanent appointment or waitlisting till such opportunity arises.

4. That on 17.11.1987 a settlement was reached between All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and the Management of State Bank of India - settlement one, under this settlement three categories of employees were listed. That is, A) those who have completed 240 days in 12 months or less after 1.7.1975. B) those who have completed 270 days in any continuous block of 36 calendar months after 1.7.1975. C) (i) those who have completed minimum of 30 days aggregate temporary service in any calendar year after 1.7.1975 or (ii) 70 days aggregate temporary service in continuous block of 36 months after 1.7.1975.

5. The persons who satisfied in all the above 4 categories were to be interviewed by a selection committee and the said selection committee would determine the suitability of the said candidate for permanent appointment. Therefore, the bank prescribed certain qualifications and from among the candidates satisfying the qualifications the suitable candidates were enlisted by a selection committee. The Clause 7 of the said agreement provided with the selected candidate would be wait listed in order of their respective categorization and the selected panel would be valid upto December, 1991. Clause 10 of the settlement specifically provided that henceforth. "there will be no temporary appointments in the subordinate cadre", except on a restrictive basis in the specified category, "from amongst empanelled candidates as per existing guidelines of the bank". The Workman further submits that consequent upon the said agreement and the draft, a notification was issued in the newspapers. The last date for responding to the advertisement was 30.8.1988. A written examination followed by viva-voce in May, 1989 was held. A selected panel was prepared, as per Clause 7 of the agreement, ie. Settlement No.1, the selected panel was to be valid upto December, 1991, the Workman submits that circular was issued on 26.4.91 by the said letter it is mentioned that the terms of the agreement dated 17.11.87 was modified vide second agreement dated 16.7.88 was entered into between the parties. In terms of the said agreement a chance was to be given, "to all eligible temporary employees for permanent appointments. The appointments were against the vacancies likely to arise during the years 1995-96, circular made it clear that in view of the enormity of the problem an extension of the currency of the panel, eligible temporary employees who have been empanelled could not appear in the earlier interviews and have been pursuing their cases thereafter, "will be given another chance to appear for interview".

6. Workman submits that there were total five settlements. The settlement dated 17.11.87 is the 1st settlement (Ex M1), settlement dated 16.7.88 is 2nd settlement (Ex M2), settlement dated 27.10.88 is the 3rd settlement (Ex M3), then settlement dated 9.1.91 is 4th settlement and settlement dated 30.7.96 is 5th settlement (Ex M6). In between there is minutes of conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.95 marked as Ex M5. That due to all these settlements which were extended by subsequent settlements thereby created reasonable expectations in the list of the selected candidates arose with that it's a question of time their appointments or services would be regularized in the services of the bank. The Workman was working with the bank on temporary basis was under the bonafide hope that sooner his services will be regularized with the bank. He is thereby closed all his options elsewhere. It is needless to point out that employing person to whom hope of employment in substantial terms was made is a facet of Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

7. Further Workman submits that the Government of India issued Circular No. F-3/3/104/87-IR, dated 16.8.1990. Under said circular the chief Executives of all public sector banks including the Management herein were specifically instructed that until the problem of existing temporary employees is fully resolved, no bank is permitted to make any permanent appointments. That some of the persons similarly situated like this Workman aggrieved by the inaction on the part of the management of the bank is not regularizing their services from out of the selected panel

and not clearly focusing the vacancy position, filed W.P. No. 4194/97 before Hon'ble High court of A.P.. It is specifically averred in the said writ petition that the Management of the bank had failed to implement the settlement and that it violates the various fundamental rights guaranteed under the constitution of India. The Hon'ble High court of A.P .. by order dated 5.3.97 directed the bank to implement the settlement as amended from time to time. It also directed the bank to carry out the terms of settlement before the expiry of March, 1997. The Hon'ble High Court also recorded finding that the Bank cannot escape its liability of enforcement of the Settlement. In view of the directions given by the High Court all candidates whose names appeared in the select panels prepared on the basis of the agreement entered into on 17.11.87 under which the panel was valid upto December, 1991, and on the basis of a settlement dated 27.10.1988 whereby the panels were made alive upto 31.3.1997 under which the panel was valid upto December, 1999. The other agreement dated 16.7.1988 under which the panel was valid upto 1992 and on the basis of the settlement dated 27.10.1998 whereby the panels were made alive upto 31.3.1997 were under the bonafide impression that their cases will be considered for regularization and were living on the basis of the said reasonable expectation. Unfortunately, contrary to the aforesaid directions given by the High Court and contrary to the settlements entered into between the parties, the bank issued proceedings dated 25.3.1997, dated 27.3.1997 and 31.3.1997 instructing the various authorities of the Management not to continue the temporary employees those who are in services of the bank from 1.4.97. The said order was followed by the Management. Aggrieved by the said action the Workman herein and similarly situated candidates have filed a writ petition before the Hon'ble High Court and by way of Writ Petition No.9206/97 seeking a declaration that the proceedings issued by the Deputy General Manager and the Assistant General Manager (Respondents 3,4 and 5 therein) on 25.3.97, 27.3.97 and 31.3.97 as illegal and also non-continuance of the Workmen therein in service by absorbing them in the services of the bank as violative of Section 2(p) and 18(1) read with Rule 58 of Central Rules and sought for specific direction to the bank to absorb them in service.

8. Further, Workman submits that in the counter affidavit filed in Writ Petition No.9206/97, the bank has submitted that it has about 805 branches in Andhra Pradesh alone. It has stated that due to exigencies of circumstances and on account of the urgent need in its banks, it employed temporary employees in subordinate cadre. It is pertinent to mention that it does not state the urgent or need or the nature of temporary employees that it had engaged. Enquiry into the same would reveal that the stand taken by the bank either on the ground of urgent need or of temporary employees is a façade to perpetuate unfair labour practice. It is designed to on the one hand, keep the employed in the erroneous zone of hope and on the other to ensure that benefits that a model employer will extend under various statutes to its employees is not required to be borne out by the bank. A reading of the counter affidavit would show that the bank would opines that being just fair and reasonable are which obviously is reprehensible and is a facet of unfair labour practice.

9. The Workman submits that the bank had referred in its counter affidavit to three settlements dated 17.11.87, 16.7.88 and 27.10.88. The bank in the guise of extending the benefits of the circular of Government dated 16.8.90 stated in its counter affidavit that as follows:

"Government of India, vide its letter dated 16.8.1990, issued guidelines to all the public sector banks with regard to recruitment and absorption of temporary employees in public sector banks. The said guidelines were issued to implement on the lines of the approach paper on the issue provided by a committee constituted in this regard. The Government of India guidelines made it clear that all the public sector banks may follow the provisions laid down in the approach paper.

The approach paper specified that the cases of temporary employees who had put in not less than 240 days of temporary service in 12 consecutive Months and who are entitled to benefit of Section 25-F may be decided by entering into a settlement with the representative union. In respect of temporary employees who had put in less than 240 days of service in 12 consecutive months or less, a settlement could be avoided and however if the Management so desired, they could enter into a conciliation settlement with the representative union. Para 6(h), it is mentioned that only those temporary employees who had put in temporary service of 90 or more days after 1.1 1982 would be eligible for considering under the scheme. Although the Government guidelines envisaged for a settlement in respect of employees who had put in temporary service of 90 or more days, the bank by way of further concession entered into settlements Even in respect of those who had put in less than 90 days. As such, it could be Seen that the settlements are more beneficial to the temporary employees concerned. The approach paper also specify at para 6(c) that the banks would provide one time opportunity to all the temporary employees and for that purpose temporary employees worked in the bank on or after 1.1.1982 could be considered for re-employment in terms of the scheme. The Respondents have gone further wherein even persons working after 1975 were also considered.

As could be seen from the above, there was a genuine effort on the part of the Respondent bank to provide permanent employment for as many as possible subject to availability of the vacancies.

It is further submitted that at para 6(k) of the approach paper, it was made clear that this would be one time exercise in full and final settlement of all the aims and disputes for the past period in respect of temporary workmen covered by the settlement. This would mean that the Government of India guidelines would cover only those persons who were temporarily employed for the period specified therein and not otherwise. As such, it is submitted that the

Respondents have not only followed the Government of India guidelines but in fact covered cases of the employees who had worked for less than 90 days. As such, question of violation does not arise and in any case those were only broad guidelines and not directives".

10. The Workman submits that the bank also referred a subsequent settlement dated 9.1.1991 wherein there is a clause to the effect- that the panel of temporary employees and the panel of daily wage employees will be operated to a particular period. Therefore, their cases will not be considered. The Management herein relying upon this settlement in their impugned action. It is submitted that even the settlement dated 9.1.1991 will not empower the management to terminate the services of the temporary employees who are working in the bank services like the Workman herein as it does not specify the termination of the employees. In fact there are so many vacancies wherein the Management has engaged several new persons as temporary messengers/ attendars/ sweepers etc., even after the judgment of Hon'ble High Court without considering the cases of the similarly situated candidates like the Workman herein. It is submitted inspite of engaging fresh candidates as is now being done by the Management they would have continued the similarly situated candidates like the Workman herein in the services of the bank and consider their cases for absorption in view of the circulars issued by Central Government as well as the directions of this Hon'ble Court in Writ Petition No.4194/97, dated 5.3.97. In view of the circulars issued by the Central Government, the Management should not have relied upon the settlement dated 9.1.1991. Hence, the impugned action of the Management is illegal, unjust, violative of fundamental rights such as Articles 14,16 and 21 of the Constitution of India.

11. The Workman submits that in W.P. No.4194/97 filed by the union of temporary employees where in they have complained about the non- implementation of the settlements arrived between the parties and sought for absorption. Such employees in the bank services on permanent basis before the date fixed for carrying out the terms of settlement, the Court held that the members of the union had been empanelled in the list, they were not regularized and the time was going to run out to the near future and the Respondent bank and its officers cannot escape from the liability of enforcing the settlement which has been reached and therefore directed that the bank and the officers shall implement the settlement dated 17.11.87 as amended from time to time before the expiry of 31.3.97.

12. Further, it is submitted that in the clause of Settlement it is specifically mentioned that the workmen to be absorbed/appointed in the bank prohibiting any temporary appointments subsequent to the date of settlement even the authorities want to make temporary appointments that should be made only from among the empanelled can be appointed either for temporary vacancy or permanent vacancy except from among the empanelled candidates like the Workman and that should be continued till they are absorbed. The management committed unfair labour practices and terminated the services of the candidates with effect from 1.4.1997 which is arbitrary, discriminatory, contrary to their own guidelines and violative of the constitutional provisions which are guaranteed in Chapter-III of the Constitution of India.

13. The Workman submits that it is strange as to how the panels were allowed to lapse by a so-called Memorandum of Understanding dated 25.2.1997, that the action of terminating such employees like the Workman by virtue of an impugned oral proceedings without implementing the settlement would be illegal and unfair labour practice which cannot be allowed to be perpetuated. That the discontinuance of the Workman after 31.3.97 who had served in the bank in any capacity amounts to retrenchment. It could not have been done without any notice and it violates Sec.25FF of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and the said action is violative of principles of natural justice guaranteed under Chapter III of the Constitution of India. This amounts to retrenchment without one month's notice and taken in view of such notice. Thus, the main proceedings issued by the Respondent is without jurisdiction and is arbitrary, illegal and therefore liable to be quashed. That the alleged Memorandum of Understanding dated 27.2.97, Ex.M5 does not own any legal entity, as the said Memorandum of Understanding is not published anywhere to brought to the notice of the Workman whose rights are being affected. It is submitted that Management did not adhere to the procedure envisaged by the Central Government in its' instructions dated 16.8.90 in the year 1995. The same was not followed in the year 1997 despite there being vacancies. The management has followed the procedure of calling candidates through Employment exchange instead of giving chance to the empanelled candidates like the Workman here. It is pertinent to mention here that the Respondent Management sent letters to the all similarly situated candidates like the Workman in the month of June, 1997, subsequent to the passing of impugned termination orders. After knowing the facts that the candidates are litigating, the Management refused to engage these candidates. It is once again reiterated that the panels are meant for absorption but not for termination. It was the duty of the Management to engage the empanelled candidates like the Workman even in temporary vacancies till they are absorbed permanently in regular vacancies. Hence, the action of the Respondent Management terminating the services of the Workman by oral order dated 31.3.97 is unjust, illegal, violative of principles of natural justice and hence, the Management be directed to reinstate and absorb the Workman and to grant all incidental and consequential benefits.

14. Per contra, Respondent had filed counter and made a contentions that the reference is not tenable and contrary to the provisions of I.D. Act, 1947. Respondent submitted that to tide over severe sub-ordinate staff constraints which arose out of leave vacancies, exigencies, etc., and also owning to the restrictions imposed by the Government of India/Reserve Bank of India on intake of staff, the Respondent bank used to engage sub-ordinate staff

like messengers, sweepers, sweeper cum water boys, etc., depending on the availability of work on purely temporary basis for the smooth and uninterrupted functioning of the branches. It is submitted that the All India State Bank of India Staff Federation which represents majority of the employees in the State Bank of India comprising about 98% of the work force as its' members espoused the cause of temporary employees who have put in less than 240 days of temporary service in 12 calendar months in the bank and who were ineligible for any protection under Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 to give a chance for being considered for absorption and permanent appointments.

15. Discussions were held and on 17.11.1987 an agreement was signed between the federation and the Management bank under Sec. 2(p) read with Sec 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules 1957. A copy of the said settlement dated 17.11.87 which may be herein after referred as first settlement is filed and 4 categories were made as it has already been mentioned in the claim statement above, it need not be repeated here. In the first settlement, it was agreed that the temporary employees as categorized would be given a chance for being considered for permanent appointment in the bank's service against the vacancies which are likely to arise during the period 1987 to 1991. On 16.7.88 second settlement was arrived between the Federation and the Bank whereby it was agreed to substitute the period of consideration of vacancies as 1987 to 1992 in place of 1987 to 1991 as contemplated under the first settlement dated 17.11.1987. This is the second settlement. A 3rd settlement was entered into on 27.10.88 and it was agreed that the bank's service against the vacancies likely to arise from 1988 to 1992 was to be considered. Government of India vide its letter dated 16.8.90 issued guidelines to all the public sector banks with regard to recruitment and absorption of temporary employees in public sector banks. The said guidelines were issued to implement on the lines of approach paper on the issue provided by a committee constituted in this regard. Government of India guidelines made it clear that all the public sector banks may follow the provisions laid down in the approach paper. The approach paper specified that the cases of temporary service in 12 consecutive months and who are entitled to benefit of Sec.25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 may be decided by entering into a settlement with the representative union. In respect of temporary employees who had put in less than 240 days of service in 12 consecutive months or less, a settlement could be avoided and however if the Management so desired they could enter into a conciliation settlement with the representative union. In para. 6(h) it is mentioned that only those temporary employees who had put in temporary service of 90 days or more days after 1.1.82 would be eligible for considering under the scheme. Although the Government guidelines envisaged for a settlement in respect of employees who had put in temporary service of 90 days or more days, the bank by way of a further concession entered into settlements. Even in respect of those who had put in less than 90 days and also the bank went a step further and said those persons who are working after 1975 were also considered. Hence, there was a genuine effort on the part of the Respondent bank to provide as many as possible jobs subject to the availability of the vacancies. However, para 6 (k) of the approach paper made it clear that it is a one time, exercise in full and final, settlement of all the claims and disputes for the past period, in respect of temporary workmen covered by the settlement. Another settlement was entered on 9.1.91 herein after referred as 4th settlement and the time limit was extended upto 1994 and separate panel was prepared for temporary employees, casual/daily wagers. It was agreed that while vacancies arising between 1988 to 1994 in respect of temporary employees and in respect of casual/daily wagers, they can be considered for the vacancies arising between 1995-96 only.

16. It is submitted that the administrative set up of the Hyderabad Local Head Office comprises of four Zonal Offices (Zones) at Hyderabad, Vijayawada, Visakhapatnam and Tirupathi covering all the Districts of Andhra Pradesh. In terms of the settlement the Management after following the procedure laid down therein prepared the panels of qualified candidates of temporary employees denoted as 1989 panel and also panel of casual/daily wagers denoted as 1992 panel for giving a chance for being considered for permanent absorption. These panels were prepared zone-wise separately for messengers and non-messengers in the descending order of temporary service put in by the candidates during the stipulated period i.e., 1.7.1975 to 31.7.1988. That the Federation approached the Regional Labour Commissioner(C) for implementation of bi-partite settlement in respect of absorption of temporary employees. The Regional Labour Commissioner(C) conducted conciliation proceedings and an agreement was arrived between the Federation and the bank. It was agreed that it would be kept alive upto March, 1997. A copy of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.2.1995 signed by the parties is filed as material paper. A settlement was arrived at and an agreement was signed between the Federation and the Management bank on 30.7.1996 under Sec.2 (p) read with Sec.18(1) of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957, which is hereinafter called as 5th settlement. That on 27.2.1997 a Memorandum of understanding was also signed by the federation's affiliate and the bank Management recording the fact that the exercise of identifying the messengerial vacancies as on 31.12.1994 has since been completed by Central Office and thereby 403 messengerial vacancies were sanctioned . It was agreed that these vacancies may be filled from 1989 panel of temporary employees after effecting conversion from full time non-messengerial staff in the usual manner and the agreement was reached accordingly. It was agreed between the Federation's affiliate and the Management bank that in terms of the settlement dated 30.7.1996 both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees would lapse on 31.3.1997. That as agreed upon vacancies were filled from the panels. The Workman who has put in an aggregate temporary service of less than 240 days in a continuous block of 12 months period during 1.7.1975 to 31.7.1988 has no right to seek a direction to consider his candidature for absorption in the Management bank under any rule/law except under the settlement entered into thereon.

17. Respondent contended that, in fact, the case of the Workman can be considered under all the five settlements having got his case considered under provisions of these settlements. All the other provisions and terms of the settlements are also binding on him/her. The Management bank has not violated any of the provisions of the terms of the said settlement. That the very preparation and maintenance of panel is in compliance of the terms agreed under these settlements. These settlements were time bound and they ceased to exist on 31.3.1997. That the bank has never promised that all the candidates in the panel will be absorbed. In the advertisement itself it was made clear that candidates will be considered for absorption in the vacancies that may arise upto 1992. Keeping alive the panels after 31.3.1997 is contrary to the settlements arrived between the State Bank of India Staff Federation and the Management bank. That the settlements are binding on the parties. The Workman is also bound under the terms of the said settlement. The settlement does not suffer from any ambiguity as their language is very clear. The right under the settlements is to give them a chance to be considered for future appointment in the bank's services against the vacancies likely to arise. The settlements were effected to balance the expectations of the temporary employees to be absorbed in permanent service as against the constitutional rights for all eligible persons to be considered for employment every time a vacancy arises. That the alleged dispute including the demand for reinstatement has to be decided in this context. It is submitted that the period of panel list got expired on 31.3.97 and it is an integral term of the settlement and cannot be modified in any proceedings under the law. These temporary employees who unfortunately could not be accommodated for want of vacancies have no further rights to be considered for regularization. That the Hon'ble High Court in WP No.12964/94, held as follows, "It is needless to state that the settlement arrived at between the All India State Bank of India Staff Federation which, is the majority union and the bank Management is binding on the Workmen also. It is not at all the case of the Workman that any of the terms of the settlement has been violated by the bank's Management. If the Workman had worked in the bank on part-time basis before 31.5.94, that itself would not vest in him a right to claim that his services should be regularized on permanent basis against a full time cadre post. The claim put forth by the Workman in the present petition is therefore misconceived and not tenable. However, it is open to the Workman to claim any right which flows from the settlement between the union and the bank Management. As already pointed out that it is not the grievance of the Workman that some right which has flown from the settlement in favour of the Workman has been denied by the bank Management. Therefore, I do not find any ground, let alone substantial ground, to grant the kind of relief sought for by the Workman. Writ Petition fails and is accordingly dismissed. No costs."

18. Further, it is contended that if the panels were not lapsed at the end of designated period and allowed to be continued it would result in making the contracts of temporary employment indirectly permanent through back door entry, which would not only be contrary to the settlements but also to Articles 14 and 16 of Constitution of India and deprive the chances of original claimants who would Come through proper recruitment procedure. As their rights have been crystallized by operation of the settlements. Hence, there is no question of any Legitimate expectation being violated.

19. Similarly placed ex-employees filed WP No.9206/1995 and the batch before the Hon'ble High Court of A.P. and the learned Single Judge allowed the Writ Petitions. Aggrieved by the same WA No.86/98 and the batch was filed and the Division Bench set aside the order of the Single Judge. Thereafter the ex-temporary employees filed Special Leave Petition No.11886-11888 of 1998 before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India also dismissed the SLP. Therefore, reference to the Judgement of the Learned Single Judge in WP No.9206/97 is of no consequences as the same has already been set aside. The observations made in the Judgements cannot be relied upon for any purpose what so ever. The question of operation of Sec.25F would not come into play. Further the issue is covered by various Judgements of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India and various Hon'ble High Courts. Hence, the reference may be ordered that the Workman is not entitled for any relief.

20. In order to fortify his claim Workman has examined himself as WW1 and also filed documents in evidence which has been exhibited as Ex.W1 to W4. Further, the Workman has filed photocopies of documents in support of his claim which are discussed as under:-

Ex.W1 is the Service Certificate dated 23.07.1992. Further Ex.W2 is the Service Certificate dated 25.07.1992. Ex.W3 is the Panel list. Ex. W4 is the Service Certificate.

21. On the other hand, Respondent has examined witness MW1 Sri K. Bala Kotaiah and this witness has exhibited 12 documents, marked as Ex.M1 to M12. The details of these documents are as follows:-

Ex.M.1 is the Settlement dated 17.11.1987. Ex.M2 is the Settlement dated 16.7.1988. Ex.M3 is the Settlement dated 27.10.1988. Ex.M4 is the Settlement dated 9.1.1991. Ex.M5 is the Minutes of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.1995. Ex.M6 is the Settlement dated 30.7.1996. Ex.M7 is the Memorandum of Understanding dt. 27.2.1997. Ex.M8 is the Particulars of 1989 Messengerial Panel. Ex.M9 is the Particulars of 1989 Non-Messengerial Panel. Ex.M10 is the Particulars of 1992 General Attendant Panel. Ex.M11 is the Judgment of Hon’ble High Court of A.P. in Writ Appeal No.86/98 dt.1.5.1998. Ex.M12 is the Judgment of Hon’ble Supreme Court of India in SLP No. 11886-11888 of 1998 dt.10.8.1998.

22. Apart from afore mentioned documents, Learned Counsel for Workman has also filed a long list of various judgements of Hon'ble Supreme Court as well as Hon'ble High Court, which we will discuss at appropriate place in this Award.

23. Heard the argument of Learned Counsel for Workman as well as for Respondent.

24. On the basis of rival pleadings of both the parties and submissions made by the Learned Counsel for both the parties, following points arise for determination in the industrial dispute :-

I. Whether the 1st settlement dated 17.11.1987, 2nd settlement dated 16.7.1988, 3rd settlement dated 27.10.1988, 4th settlement dated 9.1.1991 and 5th settlement dated 30.7.1996 entered into between State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and also Memorandum of Understanding are binding upon both the parties?

II. Whether the action of State Bank of India, in terminating the services of Workman Sri S. Ramesh, a Messenger with effect from 31.3.1997 is justified?

III. Whether the Workman is entitled for absorption on permanent post in the Branch of Respondent management as per averments made by him in the claim statement?

IV. To what relief if any the Workman is entitled for?

Findings:-

25. Point No.I:- Undisputedly settlements dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988, 9.1.1991 and 30.7.1996, minutes of conciliation proceedings and memorandum of understanding dated 27.2.1997 were executed between the State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation under section 2(p) and 18 (1) of I.D. Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Disputes (Central Rules), 1957.

Section 2(p) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 as follows:-

(p) "settlement" means a settlement arrived at in the course of conciliation proceeding and includes a written agreement between the employer and workmen arrived at otherwise than in the course of conciliation proceeding where such agreement has been signed by the parties thereto in such manner as may be prescribed and a copy thereof has been sent to an officer authorised in this behalf by the appropriate Government and the conciliation officer;

Section 18(1) provides as follows:-

18. Persons on whom settlements and awards are binding.

- [(1) A settlement arrived at by agreement between the employer and Workman otherwise than in the course of conciliation proceeding shall be binding on the parties to the agreement.

Therefore, in view of the provision contained u/s.18 (1) I.D. Act, 1947, terms and conditions enumerated in the aforesaid settlements are binding on the parties to the agreement. The Learned Counsel for Workman has argued that the Workman after going through the selection procedure has successfully been listed in the panel for appointment on the permanent basis in the Respondent management and the empanelled list has to be valid till last person in the empanelled list is appointed on permanent basis. But the impugned order dated 25.3.97, 27.3.97 and 31.3.97, has been issued by Respondent management thereby the services of the Workman has been terminated and the said order is not in consonance of the terms of the agreement entered into between the parties. Further, Workman submits that the Respondent in the 5th settlement has mentioned the date i.e., 31.3.1997 for lapse of empanel list which is illegal and that is not binding upon the Workman. The condition of lapse of empanelment list on 31.3.97 incorporated in the aforesaid 5th settlement, is arbitrary and illegal.

26. The perusal of the impugned order dated 25.3.1997 goes to reveal that the Chief/Branch Manager, SBI Zonal Office has issued the letter to all the branches with regard to the subject not to make any temporary appointments in the Branch in messengerial category from 1.4.1997. The extract of the said letter is given below:-

"We have been advised by the Deputy General Manager, Zonal Office, Hyderabad that as both the panels of temporary employees of 1989 and daily wagers/casual labours of 1992 will lapse by 31.3.1997, it has been decided by Central Office not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial category from 1.4.1997."

Thus, from the contents of the aforesaid letter, it manifest that Head Office of State Bank of India vide letter dated 25.3.1997 has issued direction to all its branches not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial category from 1.4.1997 due to reason of lapse of both panels i.e., 1989 & 1992 on 31.3.1997 as per terms of settlements entered into by both parties. Further, the contents of the subsequent letter dated 27.3.1997 issued by Respondent Management is also direction to Branch Manager, State Bank of India not to make any temporary messengerial category appointment with effect from 1.4.1997 and it has also been communicated to all concerned that the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers maintained by Zonal offices stand lapsed from 31.1.1997. Further, office

order dated 31.3.1997 has been issued by Respondent management that goes to reveal that the said office order has been issued to this effect that, "Consequent on absorption of temporary employees in permanent cadre, it has been decided by the competent authority that no one onwards, no further daily labour or temporary employees/appointments should be resorted to/engaged/employed." Therefore, it reflects from the contents of the aforesaid orders that the temporary appointment in messengerial category and daily labour has been stopped by the Respondent management with effect from 1.4.1997 because of the lapsed of panel of temporary workers and daily wagers by 31.3.1997. The agreement for lapse of both the panels on 31.3.1997 is contained in the 5th settlement which has been arrived at between the parties on dated 30.7.1996 with the consensus of both the parties. Therefore, Workman can not challenge the terms and conditions contained in settlement dated 30.7.1996 regarding lapse of panel on 31.3.1997 as agreed between State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation. As per provision contained u/s.18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 the said Agreement dated 30.7.1996 is binding on both the parties.

In the case of **Allied Sales Corporation Secunderabad vs.The Authority Under Andhra Pradesh..... 1990 II LLJ 510 AP para 414, Hon'ble Court have held:-**

"*4. There was a settlement between the Management and the workmen under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act on 25th April 1983 under which the age of superannuation of the workmen was fixed at 55 years. The settlement was to be in force upto 30th June 1986 and the next settlement, incorporating practically the same terms, was again entered into on 4th February 1987 under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act. There is no dispute that these settlements are under Section 18(1).*

14. Now the Authority constituted under Section 41(1) of the Act is an authority with very limited jurisdiction. It can only decide in the first appeal whether a termination by the management is valid or not and is within the parameters of Section 40 of the Act. The said Authority, in our view, has absolutely no jurisdiction to decide whether a settlement entered into under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act between the representatives of the Workmen and of the Management, is vitiated by undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion on the part of the Management. The Authority, namely, the Assistant Commissioner of Labour, was never intended by the A.P. Legislature to have jurisdiction to go into the question of the validity of a settlement arrived at under Section 18 of the Industrial Disputes Act by an Industrial Court. That Parliament has, in fact, constituted Industrial Courts under the Industrial Disputes Act, with extensive powers cannot be disputed. What we mean to say is that the Authority under Section 41(1) of the A.P. Act has no jurisdiction what-so-ever either to question or to decide about the validity of any such settlements. If parties to a settlement have a grievance about the validity of a settlement, it is for them to agitate the matter before the appropriate forum and they cannot ask an Authority constituted under Section 41(1) of the A.P. Shops and Establishments Act, 1966 with limited jurisdiction, to go into any such question and, that too, incidentally while deciding whether retirement as per the contract of employment, is legal or not."

It is not the case of Workman that aforesaid settlements are vitiated by undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion on the part of the management. If the Workman feeling aggrieved by any terms of settlement/ agreement on the aforementioned grounds then he can challenge of settlement before a competent authority under the Act, 1947. But here in the instant matter it is not a case of Workman that aforementioned settlement has been entered into between the parties on the ground of undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion. Therefore, Workman is barred to raise any objection in respect of fixing the date of lapse of both panels on 31.3.1997 as agreed between both the parties and Workman can not challenge any terms of said Agreement.

Further in the case of **Herbertsons Limited Vs. Workmen of Herbertsons Limited and Ors, 1977 AIR 322,** Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

The Tribunal thought that the question of the quantum of membership of the 2nd Respondent did not call for a finding at all in view of 1his Court's order. As observed above that was not a correct assumption. On the other hand, we feel that this view of the Tribunal has led it to approach the matter in an entirely erroneous manner. The Tribunal is, rightly enough, conscious that under section 18 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act the settlement was binding on the company and the members of the 3rd Respondent union. Even so, the Tribunal devoted nearly half of its order in scanning the evidence given by the company and Respondent No. 3 to find out whether the terms of the settlement had been explained by the President of the union to the workmen or not and whether the workers voluntarily accepted the settlement knowing all the "consequences". This to our mind is again an entirely wrong approach.

"When a recognised union negotiates with an employer the workers as individuals do not come into the picture. It is not necessary that each individual worker should know the implications of the settlement since a recognised union, which is expected to protect the legitimate interests of labour, enters into a settlement in the best interests of labour. This would be the normal rule. We cannot altogether rule out exceptional cases where there may be allegations of mala fides, fraud or even corruption or other induce- ments. Nothing of that kind has been suggested against the President of the 3rd Respondent in this case. That being the position, prima facie, this is a settlement in the course of collective bargaining and, therefore, is entitled to due weight and consideration.

It is not possible to scan the settlement in bits and pieces and hold some parts good and acceptable and others bad. Unless it can be demonstrated that the objectionable portion is such that it completely outweighs all the other

advantages gained the Court will be slow to hold a settle- ment as unfair and unjust. The settlement has to be accepted or rejected as a whole and we are unable to reject it as a whole as unfair or unjust. Even before this Court the 3rd Respondent representing admittedly the large majority of the workmen has stood by this settlement and that is a strong factor which it is difficult to ignore. As stated elsewhere in the judgment, we cannot also be oblivious of the fact that all workmen of the company have accepted the settlement. Besides, the period of settlement has since expired and we are informed that the employer and the 3rd Respondent are negotiating another settlement with further improvements. These factors, apart from what has been stated above, and the need for industrial peace and harmony when a union backed by a large majority of workmen has accepted a settlement in the course of collective bargaining have impelled us not to interfere with this settlement. That being the position, we unhold the settlement as fair and just and order that the award of the Tribunal shall be substituted by the settlement dated October 18, 1973. The said settlement shall be the substituted award. The appeal is disposed of accordingly. There will be no order as to costs."

Therefore, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above, the contention of the Workman that the date fixed for lapse of empanelled list on 31.3.1997 for appointment to the permanent post vide 5th Settlement dated 30.7.1996 is arbitrary, illegal is not untenable. The recognized union of Workmen has negotiated with the Respondent Bank Management representing large number of Workmen and the Workman as individual do not come into picture. Workman in the instant case has work as temporary Workmen in the Respondent Branch and in response of Notification he had applied for inclusion of his name in the panel and he was selected for inclusion his name in the panel list to be utilized for absorption of such Workman to permanent post in order of their seniority in the list. The Settlement dated 30.7.1996 between State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation under Sec.2(p) and Sec.18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 has clearly provided as regard non-messengerial position and it is agreed that all such posts sanctioned fallen vacant upto 31.3.1997 shall be filled before empanel list is allowed to lapse. Thus, in view of law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, in the instant case, Agreement dated 30.7.1996 was entered into between both the parties in respect of lapsing of the both the panels on 31.3.1997 and absorption of the Workmen from panel list was subject to availability of vacancy of post likely to arise upto 31.3.1997, have a binding force on Workman as well as management of State Bank of India in view of provision contained under section 18 (1) of I.D. Act, 1947.

Thus, Point No.I is answered against the Workman and in favour of the Respondent.

27. **Point No.II**:- Firstly, it is submitted on behalf of the Workman that the Respondent has terminated his services by oral order on 31.3.1997 without issuing any notice or paying any salary or compensation in lieu thereof. Therefore, the termination order of the Workman from service is in violation of provision contained Under Section 25 F of I.D. Act, 1947. Therefore, the order is liable to be set aside.

28. On the other hand, Respondent counsel contended that Workman has not worked for 240 days in any preceding calendar year. Therefore, reference of the industrial dispute is not relevant. In this context, the Workman has examined himself as WW1 who has reiterated that Workman has been terminated from service by Respondent on 31.3.1997 without notice of salary or compensation in lieu thereof. Before examining the claim of the Workman on merit it would be apposite to reproduce the provision contained under section 25 F:-

Section 25F provides:-

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].

Compensation to workmen in case of transfer of undertakings.

Section 25B defines the term continuous service which provides

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 authorized 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;

In order to prove the fact of 240 days of service within 12 months of a calendar year just preceding from the date of termination, the initial burden of proof lies upon the Workman and the Workman has to prove this factum by adducing his oral as well as documentary evidence in support of his claim.

Further, how to calculate 240 days of service by the Workman in a calendar year. In this context the reference of decisions of Hon'ble Supreme Court is relevant and the same are discussed below:-

In Rajasthan State Ganganagar S. Mills Ltd. v. State of Rajasthan and Anr. (2004) Apex Court held:

"It was the case of the Workman that he had worked for more than 240 days in the year concerned. This claim was denied by the appellant. It was for the claimant to lead evidence to show that he had worked for 240 days in the year preceding the date of his termination. He has filed an affidavit. It is statement which is in his favor and that cannot be regarded as sufficient evidence for any Court or Tribunal to come to the conclusion that in fact the claimant had worked for 240 days in a year These aspects were highlighted in Range Forest Officer v. S.T. Hadimani (2002 (3) SCC 25. No proof of receipt of salary or wages for 240 days or order or record in that regard was produced. Mere non-production of the muster roll for a particular period was not sufficient for the Labour Court held that the Workman had worked for 240 days as claimed."

In Municipal Corporation, Faridabad v. Siri Niwas (2004 (8) SCC 195), held "*the burden was on the Workman to show that he was working for more than 240 days in the preceding one year prior to his alleged retrenchment." In M.P. Electricity Board v. Hariram (2004 (8) SCC 246) the position was again reiterated in paragraph 11 as follows: "The above burden having not been discharged and the Labour Court having held so, in our opinion, the Industrial Court and the High Court erred in basing an order of reinstatement solely on an adverse inference drawn erroneously ..*"

In the case of Manager, RBI, Bangalore vs. S Mani (2005) SCC Page 100, the 3 Judges Bench of the Apex Court held that "*the initial burden of proof was on the Workman to show that he had completed 240 days of service."*

Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of Mohan Lal vs Management BEL 1981 SCC page 225 has laid down the principle that how to count 240 days of service within one year it is held: *"Clause (2)(a) provides for a fiction to treat a Workman in continuous service for a period of one year despite the fact that he has not rendered uninterrupted service for a period of one year but he has rendered period of 240 days during the period of 12 calendar service for months counting backwards and just preceding the relevant date being the date of retrenchment. In other words, in order to invoke the fiction enacted in clause (2)(a) it is necessary to determine first the relevant date, ie the date of termination of service which is complained of as retrenchment. After that date is ascertained. move backward to a period of 12 months just preceding the date of retrenchment and then ascertain whether within the period of 12 months, the Workman has rendered service for a period of 240 days. If these three facts are affirmatively answered in favor of the Workman pursuant to the deeming fiction enacted in clause (2)(a) it will have to be assumed that the Workman is in continuous service for a period of one year and he will satisfy the eligibility qualification enacted in Section 25-F"*

"14. We have already extracted section 25B since its amendment and the change in language is the legislative exposition of which note must be taken. In fact, we need not further dilate upon this aspect because in Surendra Kumar Verma and Ors. v. Central Government Industrial-cum-Labour Court, New Delhi and Anr., Chinnappa Reddy. J., after noticing the amendment and referring to the decision in Sur Enamel and Stamping Works (P) Ltd case, held as under:

"These changes brought about by Act 36 of 1964 appear to be clearly designed to provide that a Workman who has actually worked under the employer for not less than 240 days during a period of twelve months shall be deemed to have been in continuous service for a period of one year whether or not he has in fact been in such continuous service for a period of one year. It is enough that he has worked for 240 days in a period of 12 months, it is not necessary that he should have been in the service of the employer for one whole year."

In a concurring judgment Pathak J. agreed with this interpretation of section 25B(2). Therefore, both on principle and on precedent it must be held that section 25B(2) comprehends a situation where a Workman is not in employment for a period of 12 calendar months, but has rendered service for a period of 240 days within the period of 12 calendar months commencing and counting backwards from the relevant date, i.e. the date of retrenchment. If he has, he would be deemed to be in continuous service for a period of one year for the purpose of section 25B and Chapter VA."

Thus, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above the initial burden of proof lies upon the Workman to show that he has completed 240 days of the service with the Respondent just preceding from the date of his termination. Further, in respect of the employment of calculating the 240 days service provision contained Under Section 25-F read with Section 25-B of the I.D. Act, 1947.

29. Now, in view of the provision contained under Section 25 F and law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, we have to examine whether the Workman has discharged his initial burden of proof in respect of his claim of 240 days continuous service in a calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination i.e., 31.3.1997.

In this context, WW1 in his cross examination has stated that,

"I was not sponsored by any employment exchange. I did not undergo the regular process of selection before my temporary appointment in the bank.."

"I did not work for 240 days in any year in the bank in my entire service."

Thus, it is clear from the testimony of WW1 that the Workman had not worked for 240 days continuously in any 12 months of a calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination in the Respondent bank. Therefore, Workman failed to establish his plea by his oral and documentary evidence that he had worked for 240 days continuously in calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination i.e., 31.3.1997. Thus, the claim of the Workman that he has been terminated by oral order without issuing notice or payment in lieu after termination, in contravention of Section 25 F of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is not tenable. However the documents filed by the Workman in support of his claim, number of days worked with the Respondent goes to reveal that the Workman had worked intermittently as daily wager depending upon availability of work in branch. Workman did not file any document of appointment letter or salary slips in support of his claim for appointment as a non-messenger in the Respondent branch on temporary basis.

30. Per contra, the Learned Counsel for Respondent has submitted the allegation of Workman that he was terminated from services is not correct. As the vacancies were filled up on regular basis in order of their respective seniority the non-engagement of the Workman does not amount to termination. Further, Respondent contended that no law provide that even though there is no work temporary employee should be continued in the bank work as the very engagement of Workman was subject to availability of work. Therefore, the allegation that the bank has indulged in unfair labour practice is incorrect.

31. Thus, in view of the fore gone discussion and contentions made by the Respondent, I find the force in the argument advanced by the Respondent that in the instant matter, Workman was not terminated from service by order dated 31.3.1997 rather he was disengaged in view of the non-availability of the work in the branch. Further, there was direction issued by the Head Office of the Respondent authority not to engage any daily wager Workman/ temporary Worker w.e.f. 1.4.1997. Thus, such disengagement of Workman does not amount to termination. Moreover, the Workman failed to prove his claim that he was terminated in contravention of provision of Sec.25F of the I.D. Act, 1947 as he failed to establish his plea by any oral or documentary evidence that he had worked for 240 days continuously in a twelve months of calendar year just preceding from date of termination i.e., 31.3.1997.

32. Further, perusal of the order dated 25.3.1997 goes to reveal that the Chief Branch Manager, State Bank of India has issued the letter to Zonal Office with direction to all its branches to this effect that they have been advised by the DGM, Zonal Office, Hyderabad that as both the panel of temporary employees of 1989 and daily wagers/casual labour of 1992 will lapse on 31.3.1997 it has been decided by central office not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial cadre from 1.4.1997, therefore it was directed to issue suitable instructions not to make temporary appointments from 1.4.1997. There is no mention in this order that the Workman herein has been terminated from service by this order.

33. Further, the circular dated 27.3.1997 was issued by DGM, SBI to all branches in commercial network in respect of the non-appointment of temporary employees in subordinate cadre and it has directed not to make any temporary employment in the subordinate cadre with effect from 1.4.97 and further, it has directed to ensure that no temporary/casual/daily basis appointment of the petty cash. Further, it is directed to all Branch Managers that any deviation in this regard will be viewed seriously. Thus, these circulars do not reflect that the Workman has been terminated from service by this order.

34. Similarly, office order dated 31.3.1997 is simply a direction to all branches of the Respondent bank by DGM that no further daily labour should be engaged or employed. Therefore, the plea of the Workman that he has been terminated by the aforesaid order dated 25.3.1997, 27.3.1997 and 31.3.1997 from the service by the Respondent is not acceptable. The evidence adduced by the Workman clearly goes to reveal that he had worked as a daily wager for which he has been paid wages according to number of working days. As there was an order for prohibition for engaging temporary workmen, in the bank, therefore, Workman could not be engaged by the Respondent for work from 1.4.1997 and there after. It is settled law that the daily wagers are engaged by the employer depending upon the availability of work and as the work was not available the Workman was not engaged further by the Respondent management. Therefore, the Workman on the ground of number of days he had worked in the Respondent bank

cannot claim any right to reinstate him into the employment. As the Workman failed to prove the mandatory condition of 240 days of continuous service as required under Sec.25F of I.D. Act, 1947. Therefore, the disengagement of Workman from work can not be termed in contravention of provision contained under Sec.25F and 25 B of the I.D. Act, 1947.

Thus, this point is answered against the Workman and in favour of Respondent.

35. **Point No.III**:- In this context, the Workman has contended that the management failed to implement the selected panels during its valid tenure. The management adopted the back door methods contrary to the settlements and filled up the vacancies. The same is evident from the proceedings dated 18.11.1993 a copy of the same is filed in the material papers and the same may be read as part of the claim statement. Further, it is submitted that management has to adhere the procedure issued by the Central Government, the instructions dated 16.8.1990 in the year 1995, but same was not followed in the year 1997 despite there being vacancies. The management has followed the procedure of calling candidates through employment exchange instead of giving chance to the empanelled candidates like the Workman herein. The management sent call letters to the similarly situated candidates like the Workman in the month of June 1997 subsequent to issuance of impugned termination orders. After knowing the fact that they are litigating the issue by way of dispute, the management has refused to engage those candidates, the copies of call letters issued are filed herein along with claim petition. The Workman herein reiterates that the panels are meant for absorption but not for termination. In view of the same a duty is cast upon the Respondent management to engage the empanelled candidates like the Workman herein even in temporary vacancies till they are absorbed permanently in regular vacancies.

36. On the other hand, Respondent has contended that the Federation approached Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) for implementation of bipartite settlement in respect of the absorption of temporary employees. The Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) conducted conciliation proceedings and agreement was arrived at between the Federation and the Management bank. It is submitted that it was agreed between the Federation and the Management that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers /casual labour would be kept alive upto March, 1997 and the vacancies as agreed to under the afore set out settlements will be filled from both the lists concurrently. A copy of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.1995 signed by the parties to the dispute is filed as a material paper. Further, it is submitted that the settlement was arrived at and an agreement was signed between the Federation and the Management bank on 30.7.1996 under Section 2(p) read with Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules 1957 which is binding on the parties. A copy of this agreement which hereinafter may be referred to as 5th settlement for brevity, is also filed as a material paper. The 5th settlement dated 30.7.1996 whereunder the earlier four settlements dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988 and 9.1.1991 were also referred, it was agreed to, by the Federation and the Management bank that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees will be kept alive upto March, 1997 for filling the vacancies existing/arrived at as on 31.12.1994 as per the norms agreed to between the bank and Federation and that thereafter the said panels would lapse. It was also agreed that within the framework of the above settlements the modalities about drawing names from either the panel of temporary employees or the panel of daily wagers and casual labour would be decided administratively on circle to circle basis depending upon the local requirements in consultation with the Federation's affiliate by the Circle management. It was further agreed that all messenger real vacancies/positions in the subordinate cadre including part-time attendants specifically provided as leave reserve will be filled by the end of 31.3.1997. Further, Respondent contended that on 27.2.1997 a memorandum of understanding was also signed between the Federation's affiliate and the bank management regarding the fact that the exercise of identifying the messengerial vacancies as on 31.12.1994 has since been completed by central office and thereby 403 messengerial vacancies were sanctioned to the circle of the Management bank and it was agreed that these vacancies may be filled from 1989 panel of temporary employees after effecting conversion from full time non-messengerial staff in the usual manner and the agreement was reached upon. Further, it was agreed between the Federations affiliate and the management bank that in terms of the settlement dated 30.7.1996 both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers /casual employees would lapse on 31.3.1997.

37. The Workman has contended that the empanelled list prepared by the Respondent management for appointment of temporary and daily wage Workers to the permanent post cannot lapse unless until it is exhausted by appointing all the empanelled persons and it should continue even after 31.3.1997, i.e., the date fixed for the lapse of panel. It is undisputed that the date of lapse of empanelled list of Workmen has been fixed to 31.3.1997 as mentioned in the settlement dated 30.7.1996, and agreed between the parties. It is settled law that and once the life of panel list lapses on the date as agreed between the parties it cannot be extended beyond that date. In the instant case the panel list of the workmen was valid upto 31.3.1997 in view of the terms and conditions enumerated in the 5th Settlement entered into between the parties. As the lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997 has been agreed by State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation through 5th Settlement, the Workman is not competent to challenge the same.

In this context I would like to take reference of the decision of the apex court in the case of **Syndicate Bank and Ors vs. Shankar Paul and Ors , AIR 1997 SC 3091, therein the Hon'ble Apex Court** have held:-

"Till 1982, the branches of the appellant Bank in Calcutta region were recruiting persons locally to work as temporary attenders in leave vacancies. In view of the revised procedure prescribed by the Government of India in respect of such temporary appointments, the Calcutta regional office of the appellant Bank issued a circular to all of its branches on 14.8.1982, instructing all the branches under it to discontinue the old practice from 1.6.1982 and appoint only empanelled candidates. The regional office was to prepare a panel of eligible candidates, after calling names from the local/district employment exchange, and split it up branch-wise. Following that new procedure yearly panels were prepared thereafter. Names of the Respondents were for the first time included in the panel prepared for the period 7.2.1987 to 6.2.1988. By its letter dated 7.2.1987 the Bank had informed the Respondents that the panel was valid for one year only and that inclusion of their names in the panel was not to confer on them any right to seek permanent appointment in the service of the bank. Considering the object with which the panel was prepared and the fact that it was an yearly panel expiring on 6.2.1988, we are of the opinion that the Respondents did not get any right, because of inclusion of their names in the said panel, for permanent absorption in the service of the Bank. Whatever conditional right they had came to an end with the expiry of the panel. The claim of the Respondents, as contained in the writ petition was thus misconceived and therefore the learned single Judge and the Division Bench, when it first decided the appeal, were right in dismissing the writ petition and the appeal respectively."

Thus, in view of the above law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court and in view of the terms and conditions of the 5th Settlement the contention of the Workman that empanelled list should continue even after 31.3.1997 till the last Workman in the panel is absorbed is not tenable. The contention of the Workman is baseless in view of recital in the settlement. Therefore, in view of the fore gone discussion and finding given at Point No. I regarding binding nature of Settlements and terms and conditions enumerated therein, in view of the provision contained u/s.18(1) of the I.D. Act, 1947, I am of the considered view that life of panels lapsed on 31.3.1997 in view of terms of settlement dated 30.7.1996 and plea of Workman that the panel shall continue even after 31.3.1997 till last man absorbed has no legal force and same is untenable.

38. Undisputedly, settlement agreement dated 30.7.1996 was executed between the State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation and in that settlement it was agreed that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/ casual employees will be used for filling vacancies existing as on 31.12.1994 as per the norms agreed between the bank and the Federation. These empanelled workmen were to be given a chance for permanent appointment in the bank against vacancies arising up to December 1994 whereas the daily wagers/ casual employees were to be considered against the vacancies arise from January 1995 to December 1996, whereby the said panel would lapse. It was agreed that the vacancies falls upto 31.3.1997 shall be filled before the empanelled list is allowed to lapse. Thus, the claim of the Workman to the post of permanent non-messenger in the Respondent management was subject to the availability of the sanctioned post and vacancies arising upto 31.3.1997. The workmen given chance to the permanent post were seniors in number of working days in panel list and Workman herein was junior to those workmen. Therefore, Workman could not be given absorption to permanent post being junior to other workmen in the panel list.

39. In this context the Workman witness WW1 was cross examined by the Respondent counsel and in the cross examination the witness WW1 states:-

"I applied in response to the notification issued by the bank as per the settlements between the bank and the union. My name was included in the panel and some of the employees whose names were included in the panel were given regular appointment in the Bank in order of their seniority in number of days. I am not having any papers to show that any of my juniors are working in the Bank."

Thus, from the above statement of the Workman witness WW1 it is clear that the panel was prepared in terms of various settlements entered into between Staff Federation of State Bank of India and State Bank of India and it was prepared on the basis of number of days of work put in by the temporary employees. Further, the Workman himself admitted that some of the temporary employees whose names were included in the panel were given regular appointment in the bank in order of their seniority in the panel and he is not having any document to show that any person who worked for less number of days than the Workman was given appointment in the bank. Therefore, the allegation of the Workman that the regular appointment has been made by the bank from the panel list in breach of the terms of the settlement and violation of seniority of panel list is not proved by this evidence of WW1. Thus, there is no evidence on record that bank has given the appointment to the temporary employees as well as daily wagers from the panel list 1989 and 1992 in breach of seniority of the temporary employees in the list. There is no evidence of jumbling in the panel list to make appointment of any permanent Workman in breach of the seniority. Therefore, I am constrained to hold that the Respondent Management has appointed the workmen from panel list in order of seniority and there is no jumbling of workmen in the panel list before it got lapsed on 31.3.1997.

40. However, Workman has taken the plea that the panels of Workmen for absorption in the employment of the Respondent banks (panels of temporary employees and daily wagers) has been lapsed on 31.3.1997 in contravention of terms of settlement as the object of preparing the entire empanelment of temporary and daily wagers was to provide them permanent employment and till the both the panel lists exhausted the panel list cannot be lapsed on

31.3.1997 and the date of lapsing of the panel on 31.3.1997 has been fixed by the Respondent arbitrarily without any authority.

41. In this context, the perusal of Settlement dated 30.7.1996 reveals that the 5th Settlement dated 30.7.1996 was entered under Section 2(p) and 18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Dispute (Central) Rules 1957. This settlement has been entered into by the competent parties and in this settlement parties thereto agreed that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees will lapse on 31.3.1997. Thus the date of lapse of panel was fixed by both the parties with consensus under the settlement dated 30.7.1996 and same is binding upon the Workman under the provision of Section 18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947. Moreover, this issue of binding force of the settlement dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988 and 9.1.1991 has already been discussed, decided at finding in Point No.I of this award. However, the legality and validity of the aforementioned settlement has not been challenged by the Workman before any competent forum. Thus, claim of Workman that the date of lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997 has been fixed arbitrarily by the Respondent bank is untenable. As regard the claim of Workman for his absorption to the permanent post it is settled law that the Workman can not claim his regularization to permanent post merely on the basis of number of working days.

42. In this context the reference of the decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Oil and Natural Gas Corporation vs Krishan Gopal 2020(3) SCALE 272, date of decision 7.2.2020** is relevant therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have has laid down principle regarding regularization of the Workman on permanent posts. Hon'ble Supreme Court have laid down the prepositions of regularization of the workmen to permanent post is as under:-

"*(i) Wide as they are, the powers of the Labour Court and the Industrial Court cannot extend to a direction to order regularisation, where such a direction would in the context of public employment offend the provisions contained in Article 14 of the Constitution;*

(ii) The statutory power of the Labour Court or Industrial Court to grant relief to workmen including the status of permanency continues to exist in circumstances where the employer has indulged in an unfair labour practice by not filling up permanent posts even though such posts are available and by continuing to employ workmen as temporary or daily wage employees despite their performing the same work as regular workmen on lower wages;

(iii) The power to create permanent or sanctioned posts lies outside the judicial domain and where no posts are available, a direction to grant regularisation would be impermissible merely on the basis of the number of years of service;

(iv) Where an employer has regularised similarly situated workmen either in a scheme or otherwise, it would be open to workmen who have been deprived of the same benefit at par with the workmen who have been regularised to make a complaint before the Labour or Industrial Court, since the deprivation of the benefit would amount to a violation of Article 14; and

(v) In order to constitute an unfair labour practice under Section 2(ra) read with Item 10 of the Vth Schedule of the ID Act, the employer should be engaging workmen as badlis, temporaries or casuals, and continuing them for years, with the object of depriving them of the benefits payable to permanent workmen.

Thus, in view of the principles laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court as discussed above, in the instant matter the Workman utterly failed to prove his claim by adducing any documentary or oral evidence that the employer has indulged in unfair labour practice by not filling the permanent posts even though such posts are available and by continuing to employ workmen as temporary or daily wage employees despite their performance was the same work, as regular workmen on lower wages.

43. Respondent has contended that all the vacancies exist and arise upto 31.3.1997 has been filled up from the panel list in order of seniority and no vacancy exists or arises as on 31.3.1997 remained unfilled. Further, it is contended that as per terms of settlement the life of panel lists has been lapsed on 31.3.1997, hence, there is no occasion to extend the life of panel lists beyond 31.3.1997. However, the workman failed to prove contrary by any evidence to the aforesaid contention of the Respondent that the vacancies were existing as on 31.3.1997 and the workman was not given absorption to the permanent post in order of his seniority. It is settled law that the power to create permanent or sanctioned post lies outside the judicial domain and where no posts are available, a direction to grant regularization would be impermissible merely on the basis of the number of years of service. Therefore, the claim of the workman on this ground also not acceptable.

44. Further, as per the of settlement, panel was prepared for absorption of the workmen on the permanent posts has already been lapsed on 31.3.1997 and the vacancies existing and arising upto 31.12.1994 and upto 31.3.1997 as settlement dated 30.7.1996 has been filled up from the panel by appointing the workmen as per seniority in the panel list. Workman witness WW1 in his cross examination has himself admitted this fact that, some of the temporary employees whose names were included in the panel were given regular appointment in the bank in order of their seniority in the panel. The Workman failed to show that there was any breach of terms of settlement has been committed by the Respondent in appointment to permanent post from aforesaid panel list.

45. As discussed in preceding paragraph of this Award, the life of the panel has not been extended beyond 31.3.1997, by any further settlement hence, the panel list in which name of the Workman was included got expired on 31.3.1997. It is not the case of the Workman that Respondent has regularized similarly situated workmen either in the scheme or otherwise and the Workman has been deprived of same benefit on par with those workmen or the vacancies remained unfilled on the date of lapse of panels i.e., 31.3.1997, Industrial Tribunal has no jurisdiction to extend the date of lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997. This Tribunal can not order for regularization of workmen to the permanent post in contravention of the provision of Article 14 of the Constitution of India.

In the case of **Mahboob Deepak vs. Nagar Panchayat Gajraula & Anr, Civil Appeal No.5875/2007 date of judgement 13.12.2007,** Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

"8. Respondent is a Local Authority. The terms and conditions of employment of the employees are governed by a statute and statutory rules. No appointment can be made by a Local Authority without following the provisions of the recruitment rules. Any appointment made in violation of the said rules as also the constitutional scheme of equality as contained in Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India would be a nullity.

9. Due to some exigency of work, although recruitment on daily wages or on an ad hoc basis was permissible, but by reason thereof an employee cannot claim any right to be permanently absorbed in service or made permanent in absence of any statute or statutory rules. Merely because an employee has completed 240 days of work in a year preceding the date of retrenchment, the same would not mean that his services were liable to be regularized."

Therefore, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, the claim of the Workman for absorption merely on the basis of number of day of work in the Respondent bank Branch is not acceptable. As regard plea of the Workman that the Workman should have been given employment even after 31.3.1997 as temporary Workman, it is the discretion of Respondent to engage the Workman depending upon availability of work and this Tribunal can not direct the Respondent to engage the Workman in the absent of such rule/scheme.

46. In view of principle laid down by Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above, in the instant matter Workman utterly failed to establish the fact of rendering continuous service for a period of 240 days of service within a period of 12 calendar months commencing and coming backward from relevant date i.e., the date of retrenchment, if has he would be denied to be in continuous service for a period of one year. Therefore, the provision contained under Sec.25F of retrenchment is not applicable to Workman.

Counsel for Workman has relied upon number of decisions of Hon'ble High Court and Hon'ble Supreme Court and few of them are discussed herein:-

In the case of **F.C.I., vs. Kamdhenu Cattle Feed Industries 1993 (1) SCC 71,** therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

"7. In contractual sphere as in all other State actions, the State and all its instrumentalities have to conform to Article 14 of the Constitution of which non-arbitrariness is a significant facet. There is no unfettered discretion in public law: A public authority possesses powers only to use them for public good. This impose the duty to act fairly and to adopt a procedure which is `fairplay in action'. Due observance of this obligation as a part of good administration raises a reasonable or legitimate expectation in every citizen to be treated fairly in his interaction with the State and its instrumentalities, with this element forming a necessary component of the decision making process in all State actions. To satisfy this requirement of non- arbitrariness in a State action, it is, therefore, necessary to consider and give due weight to the reasonable or legitimate expectations of the persons likely lo be affected by the decision or else that unfairness in the exercise of the power may amount to an abuse or excess of power apart from affecting the bona fides of the decision in a given case. The decision so made would be exposed to challenge on the ground of arbitrariness. Rule of law does not completely eliminate discretion in the exercise of power, as it is unrealistic, but providers for control of its exercise by judicial review."

In the case of **State Bank of India, R.O., Vijayawada vs. Industrial Tribunal, Hyderabad WP No.193/1997,** therein Hon'ble High Court have held,

"*Sri Krovvidi Narasimham, the learned counsel for the 2nd respondent contends, supporting the award that it was a permanent vacancy and even though the 2nd respondent was appointed on temporary basis, his services were not liable to be terminated and he was to be regularised into service on permanent basis. Shastry award warrants that no temporary appointment can be made to a permanent post. But the matter is now covered by two division bench judgements dated 28.11.1986 in W.A. No.791 of 1986 and 25.8.1987 in W.A. No.270 of 1982. The ratio decided in the two judgements is to the effect that there cannot be any mandate to appoint employees on permanent basis when the requirement was for appointment on temporary basis. But it is held in the said judgements that when a temporary appointee is ousted from service and not for misconduct and, if again temporary appointment is to be made, then, the case of such temporary appointee who was ousted, has got to be considered in accordance with Sec. 25-H of the Act."*

In the case of **State of Haryana and others vs. Piara Singh and others. 1992 (4) SCC 118,** therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

" 49. If for any reason an adhoc or temporary employee is continued for a fairly long spell, the authorities must consider his case for regularization provided he is eligible and qualified according to the rules and his service record is satisfactory and his appointment does not run counter to the reservation policy of the state."

In the above cited judgements by the Workman the facts of the case are different hence do not apply to instant case of Workman.

47. On the other hand, in support of his contention Respondent has examined witness MW1 and MW1 in chief examination states that, Settlements i.e., on 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988, 9.1.1991 were entered into between the SBI and SBI Staff Federation for filling up of the vacancies that arise up to 1994 for those temporary employees who has worked on scale wages. Further, MW1 states that two different panels for messengers and non-messengers as per the eligibility criteria prescribed by the bank. There are four modules in Andhra Pradesh and they are Hyderabad, Tirupathi, Vijayawada and Visakhapatnam. MW1 states that the temporary employees so empanelled were given permanent absorption depending upon the vacancies so arise strictly in terms of the settlement. MW1 states that on 9.6.1995 conciliation proceeding was held before the RLC(C), Hyderabad and in said proceedings it was decided that the panels will be kept live up to 31.3.1997 and vacancies will be filled from both the lists concurrently. A copy of the said minutes of proceedings is Ex.M5. Further, MW1 states that on 30.7.1996 another settlement was entered between the SBI and All India SBI Staff Federation providing for filling up of the vacancies arising up to December 1994 in respect of subordinate cadre and daily wage /casual wage employees out of panel so prepared were to be considered against vacancies arising from January 1995 to December 1996, thereafter the said panels lapse. MW1 states that it was also agreed that all the non- messenger positions in subordinate cadre including part time attendants specially provided as leave reserve will be filled before 31.3.1997 and as regards to non-messengerial positions it is agreed that all such posts sanctioned and fallen vacant up to 31.3.1997 shall be filled before the empanelled list is allowed to lapse. Thus in both the cases empanelled list were lapsed on 1.4.1997. Ex.M6 is the copy of the settlement dated 30.7.1996. Further, witness states that on 27.2.1997 a memorandum of understanding was reached between the SBI and SBI Staff Federation providing that both the panels above mentioned will lapse on 31.3.1997. Ex.M7 is the copy of the memorandum of understanding and Ex.M8 is the copy of the statements giving the particulars of 1989 non-messenger panel, Ex.M9 is the copy of the statement of 1989 non-messenger panel, Ex.M10 is the copy of statement of 1992 panel. Further, witness states that petitioner was included in the 1989 panel. As the existing vacancies at that time were exhausted and his turn did not come he could not be given permanent employment in the bank as per the agreements. All the appointments were made strictly in accordance with the settlements reached from time to time between SBI and SBI staff federation and as per seniority, number of days of temporary service put in by them in the bank in the given period. Further, MW1 states petitioner was not sponsored by any employment exchange he did not undergo the regular process of selection required for appointment as a regular non-messenger the petitioner has not worked for 240 days in any year in his entire temporary service in the bank. The petitioner and other temporary employees were terminated from service by the bank. Further, MW1 states that the vacancies were filled up on regular basis with the temporary employees from the panels and these panels were expired in terms of the settlements so reached and there were no vacancies to absorb such employees. Thus, witness MW1 has proved the documents Ex.M1 to Ex.M12 and also contentions made in the counter. However, MW1 was cross examined by the Petitioner Counsel. But nothing has been elicited in his cross examination so as to discredit the testimony of the witness MW1 as regards the date of lapse of both the panels on 31.3.1997 and reasons assigned for non-absorption of the Petitioner from the panel list to the permanent post. Moreover the witness MW1 was re-examined by the Respondent and the witness MW1 states that panels were expired in terms of the settlement send absorptions to the extent of the available vacancies were made. There was no termination of any temporary messenger as such but their services were not utilized after the cut off date as the available vacancies were already filled up and most of these Petitioners were not in the service of the bank as on the date of the expiry date of the panels. Therefore, in view of the aforesaid testimony of the MW1 in re-examination in the absence of cross examination remained uncontraverted, the claim of the Workman that he was entitled for absorption in permanent post in the branch of Respondent Management on the basis of panel list is found not established.

This point is answered against the Workman.

48. **Point No.IV**:- In view of the discussion and finding given at Point Nos. I, II and III, the Workman is not entitled for any relief and claim statement of Workman sans merit and liable to be dismissed.

This Point is answered accordingly.

AWARD

In view of the fore gone discussion, it is held that the action of the Respondent bank in terminating the services of Sri S. Ramesh, Ex. Messenger by way of oral orders w.e.f. 31.3.1997 is justified. Hence, the Petitioner is not entitled for any relief as prayed for. The claim statement filed by Workman sans merit, hence, dismissed. Reference is answered accordingly.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, Personal Assistant, transcribed by her, corrected and signed by me on this the 7th day of May, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner	Witnesses examined for the Respondent
WW1: Sri S. Ramesh	MW1: Sri Bala Kotaiah

Documents marked for the Petitioner

Ex.W1:	Photocopy of Service Certificate dated 23.07.1992
Ex.W2:	Photocopy of Service Certificate dated 25.071992
Ex.W3:	Photocopy of Panel list
Ex.W4:	Photocopy of Service Certificate

Documents marked for the Respondent

Ex.M1:	Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.17.11.87
Ex.M2:	Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.16.7.88
Ex.M3:	Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.27.10.1988
Ex.M4:	Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.9.1.1991
Ex.M5:	Photocopy of conciliation proceedings before the Regional Labour Commissioner(C) dt.9.6.1995
Ex.M6:	Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.30.7.1996
Ex.M7:	Photocopy of Memorandum of understanding dt. 27.1.1997
Ex.M8:	Photocopy of statements giving the particulars of 1989 messenger panel.
Ex.M9:	Photocopy of statement of 1989 Non-messenger panel
Ex.M10:	Photocopy of statement of 1992 panel
Ex.M11:	Photocopy of order of Hon'ble High Court in WA No.86/98 dt. 1.5.98
Ex.M12:	Photocopy of order in SLP No.11886-11888 of 1998 dated 10.8.98

नई दिल्ली, 27 जुलाई, 2026

का.आ. 1677.— औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार भारतीय स्टेट बैंक के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजको और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण – सह – श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद के पंचाट (सन्दर्भ संख्या 115/2003) को प्रकाशित करती है,

[सं. एल. 39025/01/2026–आई.आर.(बी-II)-93]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 27th July, 2026

S.O. 1677.— In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (LC.No.115/2003) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Hyderabad as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the Management of State Bank of India and their workmen,

[No. L-39025/01/2026- IR (B-II)-93]

SALONI, Dy. Director

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD

Present: - **Sri Irfan Qamar**

Presiding Officer

Dated the 2nd day of July, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE L.C.No.115/2003

Between:

Sri M. Satyanarayana,

S/o Krishna Murty,

D.No.19/405,

Padapeta,

Gudivada

Krishna Distt.

… Petitioner

And

The Dy. General Manager,

State Bank of India,

Zonal Office,

Vijayawada. …..Respondent

Appearances:

For the Petitioner : Sri B. Vikas, Advocate

For the Respondent: Sri Y. Ranjeeth Reddy, Advocate

AWARD

Sri M. Satyanarayana who worked as Messenger (who will be referred to as the workman) has filed this petition under Sec. 2A(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 against the Respondents State Bank of India seeking for reinstatement into service as Messenger duly granting all the consequential benefits such as continuity of service, back wages and all other attendant benefits etc., and such other reliefs as this court may deem fit.

2. Before unfolding the factual matrix of the instant industrial dispute it would be apposite to have a bird eye view of a chequered history of the instant industrial dispute. Earlier instant industrial dispute along with the batch cases was decided by this Tribunal vide common award dated 17.5.2005 and the reference was answered in favour of the Respondent and against the Workman. That said common award dated 17.5.2005 was challenged by the aggrieved Workmen in various Writ petition No.6470/2014 along with batch of writ petitions before the Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh and Hon'ble High Court vide its' judgement dated 23.6.2014 allowed all batch of writ petitions and set aside the common award dated 17.5.2005 passed in ID No.222 of 2001 and other batch of ID cases by Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad and the Respondent management of State Bank of India was directed to reengage the Writ Petitioners in position, which they have been occupying prior to their termination and further directed to consider their cases for regularization as and when the substantive vacancy arises. This judgement dated 23.6.2014 of Hon'ble High Court of AP, passed in WP No.6470/2014 and batch petitions was challenged by Respondent management before the Hon'ble High Court in Writ Appeal No. 1268 of 2014. The aforesaid Writ Appeals No.1268/2014 and other Writ Appeals were decided by Division Bench of High Court of Andhra Pradesh by a common judgement dated 20.3.2019. Hon'ble High Court in aforesaid Writ Appeal was pleased to pass the order which is extracted as below:-

" 7. Hearing the learned senior counsel for the SBI and the learned senior counsel for the contesting unofficial Respondent s, we see that while the learned single Judge was justified in setting aside the award af the Tribunal, the proper course to be adopted was to remit all the cases to the Tribunal. This we say for reasons more than one. Firstly, in such matters, claims have to be decided on individual basis, as different persons have different claims as to the length of officiation or discharge of duties and functions; quality of engagement, drawings, accounting of the post for each one of them, who have worked etc. AIl these issues will not be the same in all the cases. Therefore, each case ought to have been directed to be decided by the Tribunal afresh on individual basis. The second and most important

aspect is the learned single Judge has in one go ordered re-employment of all the workmen. This is not a relief that could have been granted without answering the individual issues; each issue relating to each case could not have been decided by the writ Court within the format of its adjudication procedures and scope. The adjudicating body, which has to do that activity, is the Industrial Tribunal. Therefore, we are of the view that while we would sustain the order of the learned singe Judge insofar as it interfered and sets aside the award of the Tribunal, the further findings and directions, issued through the impugned order have to go and the individual cases have to be sent back for consideration of the Tribunal. Such further procedure before the Tribunal will have to be carried forward with the materials already on record and also by affording an opportunity to the persons, who have claims as well as the management to place their rival contentions and further material before the Tribunal. The learned counsel appearing for the workmen are justified in pointing out that enormous delay has already happened and further action by the Tribunal in this line may be expedited.

9. In the result, these writ appeals are ordered;

(1) affirming the impugned common order of the learned single Judge to the extent it sets aside the common award dated 17.05.2005 of the Industrial Tribunal;

(2) the further findings and directions issued through the impugned common order are vacated:

(3) all the matters shall be remitted to the Industrial Tribunal with a direction to dispose of them within an outer limit of five (5) months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order; and,

(4) the parties to make appearance before the Tribunal on the given date."

Thus, in view of the above direction of Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh in W.A.No.1268 of 2014 and batch cases. This Tribunal has taken up the matter of industrial dispute for hearing and deciding it afresh in view of the aforesaid guidelines laid down by the Hon'ble High Court in Writ Appeal No.1268/2014 vide judgement dated 20.3.019.

3. The factual matrix of instant industrial dispute as narrated by the Workman in his claim statement are that, the he joined the service of the Respondent Bank as a messenger in the year 1985 and he worked upto 1.4.1997. Thereby he worked for about 12 years. Further, it is submitted that the management of Respondent bank decided to give a chance to temporarily employed personnel "found suitable for permanent appointment" by wait- listing them by offering permanent appointment or waitlisting till such opportunity arises.

4. That on 17.11.1987 a settlement was reached between All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and the Management of State Bank of India - settlement one, under this settlement three categories of employees were listed. That is, A) those who have completed 240 days in 12 months or less after 1.7.1975. B) those who have completed 270 days in any continuous block of 36 calendar months after 1.7.1975. C) (i) those who have completed minimum of 30 days aggregate temporary service in any calendar year after 1.7.1975 or (ii) 70 days aggregate temporary service in continuous block of 36 months after 1.7.1975.

5. The persons who satisfied in all the above 4 categories were to be interviewed by a selection committee and the said selection committee would determine the suitability of the said candidate for permanent appointment. Therefore, the bank prescribed certain qualifications and from among the candidates satisfying the qualifications the suitable candidates were enlisted by a selection committee. The Clause 7 of the said agreement provided with the selected candidate would be wait listed in order of their respective categorization and the selected panel would be valid upto December, 1991. Clause 10 of the settlement specifically provided that henceforth. "there will be no temporary appointments in the subordinate cadre", except on a restrictive basis in the specified category, "from amongst empanelled candidates as per existing guidelines of the bank". The Workman further submits that consequent upon the said agreement and the draft, a notification was issued in the newspapers. The last date for responding to the advertisement was 30.8.1988. A written examination followed by viva-voce in May, 1989 was held. A selected panel was prepared, as per Clause 7 of the agreement, ie. Settlement No.1, the selected panel was to be valid upto December, 1991, the Workman submits that circular was issued on 26.4.91 by the said letter it is mentioned that the terms of the agreement dated 17.11.87 was modified vide second agreement dated 16.7.88 was entered into between the parties. In terms of the said agreement a chance was to be given, "to all eligible temporary employees for permanent appointments. The appointments were against the vacancies likely to arise during the years 1995-96, circular made it clear that in view of the enormity of the problem an extension of the currency of the panel, eligible temporary employees who have been empanelled could not appear in the earlier interviews and have been pursuing their cases thereafter, "will be given another chance to appear for interview".

6. Workman submits that there were total five settlements. The settlement dated 17.11.87 is the 1st settlement (Ex M1), settlement dated 16.7.88 is 2nd settlement (Ex M2), settlement dated 27.10.88 is the 3rd settlement (Ex M3), then settlement dated 9.1.91 is 4th settlement and settlement dated 30.7.96 is 5th settlement (Ex M6). In between there is minutes of conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.95 marked as Ex M5. That due to all these settlements which were extended by subsequent settlements thereby created reasonable expectations in the list of the selected candidates arose with that it's a question of time their appointments or services would be

regularized in the services of the bank. The Workman was working with the bank on temporary basis was under the bonafide hope that sooner his services will be regularized with the bank. He is thereby closed all his options elsewhere. It is needless to point out that employing person to whom hope of employment in substantial terms was made is a facet of Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

7. Further Workman submits that the Government of India issued Circular No. F-3/3/104/87-IR, dated 16.8.1990. Under said circular the chief Executives of all public sector banks including the Management herein were specifically instructed that until the problem of existing temporary employees is fully resolved, no bank is permitted to make any permanent appointments. That some of the persons similarly situated like this Workman aggrieved by the inaction on the part of the management of the bank is not regularizing their services from out of the selected panel and not clearly focusing the vacancy position, filed W.P. No. 4194/97 before Hon'ble High court of A.P.. It is specifically averred in the said writ petition that the Management of the bank had failed to implement the settlement and that it violates the various fundamental rights guaranteed under the constitution of India. The Hon'ble High court of A.P .. by order dated 5.3.97 directed the bank to implement the settlement as amended from time to time. It also directed the bank to carry out the terms of settlement before the expiry of March, 1997. The Hon'ble High Court also recorded finding that the Bank cannot escape its liability of enforcement of the Settlement. In view of the directions given by the High Court all candidates whose names appeared in the select panels prepared on the basis of the agreement entered into on 17.11.87 under which the panel was valid upto December, 1991, and on the basis of a settlement dated 27.10.1988 whereby the panels were made alive upto 31.3.1997 under which the panel was valid upto December, 1999. The other agreement dated 16.7.1988 under which the panel was valid upto 1992 and on the basis of the settlement dated 27.10.1998 whereby the panels were made alive upto 31.3.1997 were under the bonafide impression that their cases will be considered for regularization and were living on the basis of the said reasonable expectation. Unfortunately, contrary to the aforesaid directions given by the High Court and contrary to the settlements entered into between the parties, the bank issued proceedings dated 25.3.1997, dated 27.3.1997 and 31.3.1997 instructing the various authorities of the Management not to continue the temporary employees those who are in services of the bank from 1.4.97. The said order was followed by the Management. Aggrieved by the said action the Workman herein and similarly situated candidates have filed a writ petition before the Hon'ble High Court and by way of Writ Petition No.9206/97 seeking a declaration that the proceedings issued by the Deputy General Manager and the Assistant General Manager (Respondent s 3,4 and 5 therein) on 25.3.97, 27.3.97 and 31.3.97 as illegal and also non-continuance of the Workmen therein in service by absorbing them in the services of the bank as violative of Section 2(p) and 18(1) read with Rule 58 of Central Rules and sought for specific direction to the bank to absorb them in service.

8. Further, Workman submits that in the counter affidavit filed in Writ Petition No.9206/97, the bank has submitted that it has about 805 branches in Andhra Pradesh alone. It has stated that due to exigencies of circumstances and on account of the urgent need in its banks, it employed temporary employees in subordinate cadre. It is pertinent to mention that it does not state the urgent or need or the nature of temporary employees that it had engaged. Enquiry into the same would reveal that the stand taken by the bank either on the ground of urgent need or of temporary employees is a façade to perpetuate unfair labour practice. It is designed to on the one hand, keep the employed in the erroneous zone of hope and on the other to ensure that benefits that a model employer will extend under various statutes to its employees is not required to be borne out by the bank. A reading of the counter affidavit would show that the bank would opines that being just fair and reasonable are which obviously is reprehensible and is a facet of unfair labour practice.

9. The Workman submits that the bank had referred in its counter affidavit to three settlements dated 17.11.87, 16.7.88 and 27.10.88. The bank in the guise of extending the benefits of the circular of Government dated 16.8.90 stated in its counter affidavit that as follows:

"Government of India, vide its letter dated 16.8.1990, issued guidelines to all the public sector banks with regard to recruitment and absorption of temporary employees in public sector banks. The said guidelines were issued to implement on the lines of the approach paper on the issue provided by a committee constituted in this regard. The Government of India guidelines made it clear that all the public sector banks may follow the provisions laid down in the approach paper.

The approach paper specified that the cases of temporary employees who had put in not less than 240 days of temporary service in 12 consecutive Months and who are entitled to benefit of Section 25-F may be decided by entering into a settlement with the representative union. In respect of temporary employees who had put in less than 240 days of service in 12 consecutive months or less, a settlement could be avoided and however if the Management so desired, they could enter into a conciliation settlement with the representative union. Para 6(h), it is mentioned that only those temporary employees who had put in temporary service of 90 or more days after 1.1 1982 would be eligible for considering under the scheme. Although the Government guidelines envisaged for a settlement in respect of employees who had put in temporary service of 90 or more days, the bank by way of further concession entered into settlements Even in respect of those who had put in less than 90 days. As such, it could be Seen that the settlements are more beneficial to the temporary employees concerned. The approach paper also specify at para 6(c)

that the banks would provide one time opportunity to all the temporary employees and for that purpose temporary employees worked in the bank on or after 1.1.1982 could be considered for re-employment in terms of the scheme. The Respondent s have gone further wherein even persons working after 1975 were also considered.

As could be seen from the above, there was a genuine effort on the part of the Respondent bank to provide permanent employment for as many as possible subject to availability of the vacancies.

It is further submitted that at para 6(k) of the approach paper, it was made clear that this would be one time exercise in full and final settlement of all the aims and disputes for the past period in respect of temporary workmen covered by the settlement. This would mean that the Government of India guidelines would cover only those persons who were temporarily employed for the period specified therein and not otherwise. As such, it is submitted that the Respondent s have not only followed the Government of India guidelines but in fact covered cases of the employees who had worked for less than 90 days. As such, question of violation does not arise and in any case those were only broad guidelines and not directives".

10. The Workman submits that the bank also referred a subsequent settlement dated 9.1.1991 wherein there is a clause to the effect- that the panel of temporary employees and the panel of daily wage employees will be operated to a particular period. Therefore, their cases will not be considered. The Management herein relying upon this settlement in their impugned action. It is submitted that even the settlement dated 9.1.1991 will not empower the management to terminate the services of the temporary employees who are working in the bank services like the Workman herein as it does not specify the termination of the employees. In fact there are so many vacancies wherein the Management has engaged several new persons as temporary messengers/ attendars/ sweepers etc., even after the judgment of Hon'ble High Court without considering the cases of the similarly situated candidates like the Workman herein. It is submitted inspite of engaging fresh candidates as is now being done by the Management they would have continued the similarly situated candidates like the Workman herein in the services of the bank and consider their cases for absorption in view of the circulars issued by Central Government as well as the directions of this Hon'ble Court in Writ Petition No.4194/97, dated 5.3.97. In view of the circulars issued by the Central Government, the Management should not have relied upon the settlement dated 9.1.1991. Hence, the impugned action of the Management is illegal, unjust, violative of fundamental rights such as Articles 14,16 and 21 of the Constitution of India.

11. The Workman submits that in W.P. No.4194/97 filed by the union of temporary employees where in they have complained about the non- implementation of the settlements arrived between the parties and sought for absorption. Such employees in the bank services on permanent basis before the date fixed for carrying out the terms of settlement, the Court held that the members of the union had been empanelled in the list, they were not regularized and the time was going to run out to the near future and the Respondent bank and its officers cannot escape from the liability of enforcing the settlement which has been reached and therefore directed that the bank and the officers shall implement the settlement dated 17.11.87 as amended from time to time before the expiry of 31.3.97.

12. Further, it is submitted that in the clause of Settlement it is specifically mentioned that the workmen to be absorbed/appointed in the bank prohibiting any temporary appointments subsequent to the date of settlement even the authorities want to make temporary appointments that should be made only from among the empanelled can be appointed either for temporary vacancy or permanent vacancy except from among the empanelled candidates like the Workman and that should be continued till they are absorbed. The management committed unfair labour practices and terminated the services of the candidates with effect from 1.4.1997 which is arbitrary, discriminatory, contrary to their own guidelines and violative of the constitutional provisions which are guaranteed in Chapter-III of the Constitution of India.

13. The Workman submits that it is strange as to how the panels were allowed to lapse by a so-called Memorandum of Understanding dated 25.2.1997, that the action of terminating such employees like the Workman by virtue of an impugned oral proceedings without implementing the settlement would be illegal and unfair labour practice which cannot be allowed to be perpetuated. That the discontinuance of the Workman after 31.3.97 who had served in the bank in any capacity amounts to retrenchment. It could not have been done without any notice and it violates Sec.25FF of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and the said action is violative of principles of natural justice guaranteed under Chapter III of the Constitution of India. This amounts to retrenchment without one month's notice and taken in view of such notice. Thus, the main proceedings issued by the Respondent is without jurisdiction and is arbitrary, illegal and therefore liable to be quashed. That the alleged Memorandum of Understanding dated 27.2.97, Ex.M5 does not own any legal entity, as the said Memorandum of Understanding is not published anywhere to brought to the notice of the Workman whose rights are being affected. It is submitted that Management did not adhere to the procedure envisaged by the Central Government in its' instructions dated 16.8.90 in the year 1995. The same was not followed in the year 1997 despite there being vacancies. The management has followed the procedure of calling candidates through Employment exchange instead of giving chance to the empanelled candidates like the Workman here. It is pertinent to mention here that the Respondent Management sent letters to the all similarly situated candidates like the Workman in the month of June, 1997, subsequent to the passing of impugned termination orders. After knowing the facts that the candidates are litigating, the Management refused to engage these candidates. It is once again reiterated that the panels are meant for

absorption but not for termination. It was the duty of the Management to engage the empanelled candidates like the Workman even in temporary vacancies till they are absorbed permanently in regular vacancies. Hence, the action of the Respondent Management terminating the services of the Workman by oral order dated 31.3.97 is unjust, illegal, violative of principles of natural justice and hence, the Management be directed to reinstate and absorb the Workman and to grant all incidental and consequential benefits.

14. Per contra, Respondent had filed counter and made a contentions that the reference is not tenable and contrary to the provisions of I.D. Act, 1947. Respondent submitted that to tide over severe sub-ordinate staff constraints which arose out of leave vacancies, exigencies, etc., and also owning to the restrictions imposed by the Government of India/Reserve Bank of India on intake of staff, the Respondent bank used to engage sub-ordinate staff like messengers, sweepers, sweeper cum water boys, etc., depending on the availability of work on purely temporary basis for the smooth and uninterrupted functioning of the branches. It is submitted that the All India State Bank of India Staff Federation which represents majority of the employees in the State Bank of India comprising about 98% of the work force as its' members espoused the cause of temporary employees who have put in less than 240 days of temporary service in 12 calendar months in the bank and who were ineligible for any protection under Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 to give a chance for being considered for absorption and permanent appointments.

15. Discussions were held and on 17.11.1987 an agreement was signed between the federation and the Management bank under Sec. 2(p) read with Sec 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules 1957. A copy of the said settlement dated 17.11.87 which may be herein after referred as first settlement is filed and 4 categories were made as it has already been mentioned in the claim statement above, it need not be repeated here. In the first settlement, it was agreed that the temporary employees as categorized would be given a chance for being considered for permanent appointment in the bank's service against the vacancies which are likely to arise during the period 1987 to 1991. On 16.7.88 second settlement was arrived between the Federation and the Bank whereby it was agreed to substitute the period of consideration of vacancies as 1987 to 1992 in place of 1987 to 1991 as contemplated under the first settlement dated 17.11.1987. This is the second settlement. A 3rd settlement was entered into on 27.10.88 and it was agreed that the bank's service against the vacancies likely to arise from 1988 to 1992 was to be considered. Government of India vide its letter dated 16.8.90 issued guidelines to all the public sector banks with regard to recruitment and absorption of temporary employees in public sector banks. The said guidelines were issued to implement on the lines of approach paper on the issue provided by a committee constituted in this regard. Government of India guidelines made it clear that all the public sector banks may follow the provisions laid down in the approach paper. The approach paper specified that the cases of temporary service in 12 consecutive months and who are entitled to benefit of Sec.25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 may be decided by entering into a settlement with the representative union. In respect of temporary employees who had put in less than 240 days of service in 12 consecutive months or less, a settlement could be avoided and however if the Management so desired they could enter into a conciliation settlement with the representative union. In para. 6(h) it is mentioned that only those temporary employees who had put in temporary service of 90 days or more days after 1.1.82 would be eligible for considering under the scheme. Although the Government guidelines envisaged for a settlement in respect of employees who had put in temporary service of 90 days or more days, the bank by way of a further concession entered into settlements. Even in respect of those who had put in less than 90 days and also the bank went a step further and said those persons who are working after 1975 were also considered. Hence, there was a genuine effort on the part of the Respondent bank to provide as many as possible jobs subject to the availability of the vacancies. However, para 6 (k) of the approach paper made it clear that it is a one time, exercise in full and final, settlement of all the claims and disputes for the past period, in respect of temporary workmen covered by the settlement. Another settlement was entered on 9.1.91 herein after referred as 4th settlement and the time limit was extended upto 1994 and separate panel was prepared for temporary employees, casual/daily wagers. It was agreed that while vacancies arising between 1988 to 1994 in respect of temporary employees and in respect of casual/daily wagers, they can be considered for the vacancies arising between 1995-96 only.

16. It is submitted that the administrative set up of the Hyderabad Local Head Office comprises of four Zonal Offices (Zones) at Hyderabad, Vijayawada, Visakhapatnam and Tirupathi covering all the Districts of Andhra Pradesh. In terms of the settlement the Management after following the procedure laid down therein prepared the panels of qualified candidates of temporary employees denoted as 1989 panel and also panel of casual/daily wagers denoted as 1992 panel for giving a chance for being considered for permanent absorption. These panels were prepared zone-wise separately for messengers and non-messengers in the descending order of temporary service put in by the candidates during the stipulated period i.e., 1.7.1975 to 31.7.1988. That the Federation approached the Regional Labour Commissioner(C) for implementation of bi-partite settlement in respect of absorption of temporary employees. The Regional Labour Commissioner(C) conducted conciliation proceedings and an agreement was arrived between the Federation and the bank. It was agreed that it would be kept alive upto March, 1997. A copy of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.2.1995 signed by the parties is filed as material paper. A settlement was arrived at and an agreement was signed between the Federation and the Management bank on 30.7.1996 under Sec.2 (p) read with Sec.18(1) of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957, which is hereinafter called as 5th settlement. That on 27.2.1997 a Memorandum of understanding was also signed by the federation's affiliate and the bank Management

recording the fact that the exercise of identifying the messengerial vacancies as on 31.12.1994 has since been completed by Central Office and thereby 403 messengerial vacancies were sanctioned . It was agreed that these vacancies may be filled from 1989 panel of temporary employees after effecting conversion from full time non-messengerial staff in the usual manner and the agreement was reached accordingly. It was agreed between the Federation's affiliate and the Management bank that in terms of the settlement dated 30.7.1996 both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees would lapse on 31.3.1997. That as agreed upon vacancies were filled from the panels. The Workman who has put in an aggregate temporary service of less than 240 days in a continuous block of 12 months period during 1.7.1975 to 31.7.1988 has no right to seek a direction to consider his candidature for absorption in the Management bank under any rule/law except under the settlement entered into thereon.

17. Respondent contended that, in fact, the case of the Workman can be considered under all the five settlements having got his case considered under provisions of these settlements. All the other provisions and terms of the settlements are also binding on him/her. The Management bank has not violated any of the provisions of the terms of the said settlement. That the very preparation and maintenance of panel is in compliance of the terms agreed under these settlements. These settlements were time bound and they ceased to exist on 31.3.1997. That the bank has never promised that all the candidates in the panel will be absorbed. In the advertisement itself it was made clear that candidates will be considered for absorption in the vacancies that may arise upto 1992. Keeping alive the panels after 31.3.1997 is contrary to the settlements arrived between the State Bank of India Staff Federation and the Management bank. That the settlements are binding on the parties. The Workman is also bound under the terms of the said settlement. The settlement does not suffer from any ambiguity as their language is very clear. The right under the settlements is to give them a chance to be considered for future appointment in the bank's services against the vacancies likely to arise. The settlements were effected to balance the expectations of the temporary employees to be absorbed in permanent service as against the constitutional rights for all eligible persons to be considered for employment every time a vacancy arises. That the alleged dispute including the demand for reinstatement has to be decided in this context. It is submitted that the period of panel list got expired on 31.3.97 and it is an integral term of the settlement and cannot be modified in any proceedings under the law. These temporary employees who unfortunately could not be accommodated for want of vacancies have no further rights to be considered for regularization. That the Hon'ble High Court in WP No.12964/94, held as follows, "It is needless to state that the settlement arrived at between the All India State Bank of India Staff Federation which, is the majority union and the bank Management is binding on the Workmen also. It is not at all the case of the Workman that any of the terms of the settlement has been violated by the bank's Management. If the Workman had worked in the bank on part-time basis before 31.5.94, that itself would not vest in him a right to claim that his services should be regularized on permanent basis against a full time cadre post. The claim put forth by the Workman in the present petition is therefore misconceived and not tenable. However, it is open to the Workman to claim any right which flows from the settlement between the union and the bank Management. As already pointed out that it is not the grievance of the Workman that some right which has flown from the settlement in favour of the Workman has been denied by the bank Management. Therefore, I do not find any ground, let alone substantial ground, to grant the kind of relief sought for by the Workman. Writ Petition fails and is accordingly dismissed. No costs."

18. Further, it is contended that if the panels were not lapsed at the end of designated period and allowed to be continued it would result in making the contracts of temporary employment indirectly permanent through back door entry, which would not only be contrary to the settlements but also to Articles 14 and 16 of Constitution of India and deprive the chances of original claimants who would Come through proper recruitment procedure. As their rights have been crystallized by operation of the settlements. Hence, there is no question of any Legitimate expectation being violated.

19. Similarly placed ex-employees filed WP No.9206/1995 and the batch before the Hon'ble High Court of A.P. and the learned Single Judge allowed the Writ Petitions. Aggrieved by the same WA No.86/98 and the batch was filed and the Division Bench set aside the order of the Single Judge. Thereafter the ex-temporary employees filed Special Leave Petition No.11886-11888 of 1998 before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India also dismissed the SLP. Therefore, reference to the Judgement of the Learned Single Judge in WP No.9206/97 is of no consequences as the same has already been set aside. The observations made in the Judgements cannot be relied upon for any purpose what so ever. The question of operation of Sec.25F would not come into play. Further the issue is covered by various Judgements of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India and various Hon'ble High Courts. Hence, the reference may be ordered that the Workman is not entitled for any relief.

20. In order to fortify his claim Workman has examined himself as WW1 and also filed documents in evidence which has been exhibited as Ex.W1 to W2. Further, the Workman has filed photocopies of documents in support of his claim which are discussed as under:-

Ex.W1 is the service certificate. Ex.W2 is the notification.

21. Though Respondent has filed counter, but the contention made in the counter is not substantiated by any evidence by the Respondent Management.

22. Apart from afore mentioned documents, Learned Counsel for Workman has also filed a long list of various judgements of Hon'ble Supreme Court as well as Hon'ble High Court, which we will discuss at appropriate place in this Award.

23. Heard the argument of Learned Counsel for Workman.

24. On the basis of rival pleadings of both the parties and submissions made by the Learned Counsel for Petitioner following points arise for determination in the industrial dispute :-

I. Whether the 1st settlement dated 17.11.1987, 2nd settlement dated 16.7.1988, 3rd settlement dated 27.10.1988, 4th settlement dated 9.1.1991 and 5th settlement dated 30.7.1996 entered into between State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and also Memorandum of Understanding are binding upon both the parties?

II. Whether the action of State Bank of India, in terminating the services of Workman Sri M. Satyanarayana, a Messenger with effect from 31.3.1997 is justified?

III. Whether the Workman is entitled for absorption on permanent post in the Branch of Respondent management as per averments made by him in the claim statement?

IV. To what relief if any the Workman is entitled for?

Findings:-

25. Point No.I:- Undisputedly settlements dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988, 9.1.1991 and 30.7.1996, minutes of conciliation proceedings and memorandum of understanding dated 27.2.1997 were executed between the State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation under section 2(p) and 18 (1) of I.D. Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Disputes (Central Rules), 1957.

Section 2(p) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 as follows:-

(p) "settlement" means a settlement arrived at in the course of conciliation proceeding and includes a written agreement between the employer and workmen arrived at otherwise than in the course of conciliation proceeding where such agreement has been signed by the parties thereto in such manner as may be prescribed and a copy thereof has been sent to an officer authorised in this behalf by the appropriate Government and the conciliation officer;

Section 18(1) provides as follows:-

18. Persons on whom settlements and awards are binding.

- [(1) A settlement arrived at by agreement between the employer and Workman otherwise than in the course of conciliation proceeding shall be binding on the parties to the agreement.

Therefore, in view of the provision contained u/s.18 (1) I.D. Act, 1947, terms and conditions enumerated in the aforesaid settlements are binding on the parties to the agreement. The Learned Counsel for Workman has argued that the Workman after going through the selection procedure has successfully been listed in the panel for appointment on the permanent basis in the Respondent management and the empanelled list has to be valid till last person in the empanelled list is appointed on permanent basis. But the impugned order dated 25.3.97, 27.3.97 and 31.3.97, has been issued by Respondent management thereby the services of the Workman has been terminated and the said order is not in consonance of the terms of the agreement entered into between the parties. Further, Workman submits that the Respondent in the 5th settlement has mentioned the date i.e., 31.3.1997 for lapse of empanel list which is illegal and that is not binding upon the Workman. The condition of lapse of empanelment list on 31.3.97 incorporated in the aforesaid 5th settlement, is arbitrary and illegal.

26. The perusal of the impugned order dated 25.3.1997 goes to reveal that the Chief/Branch Manager, SBI Zonal Office has issued the letter to all the branches with regard to the subject not to make any temporary appointments in the Branch in messengerial category from 1.4.1997. The extract of the said letter is given below:-

"We have been advised by the Deputy General Manager, Zonal Office, Hyderabad that as both the panels of temporary employees of 1989 and daily wagers/casual labours of 1992 will lapse by 31.3.1997, it has been decided by Central Office not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial category from 1.4.1997."

Thus, from the contents of the aforesaid letter, it manifest that Head Office of State Bank of India vide letter dated 25.3.1997 has issued direction to all its branches not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial category from 1.4.1997 due to reason of lapse of both panels i.e., 1989 & 1992 on 31.3.1997 as per terms of settlements entered into by both parties. Further, the contents of the subsequent letter dated 27.3.1997 issued by Respondent Management is also direction to Branch Manager, State Bank of India not to make any temporary messengerial category appointment with effect from 1.4.1997 and it has also been communicated to all concerned that the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers maintained by Zonal offices stand lapsed from 31.1.1997. Further, office order dated 31.3.1997 has been issued by Respondent management that goes to reveal that the said office order has

been issued to this effect that, "Consequent on absorption of temporary employees in permanent cadre, it has been decided by the competent authority that no one onwards, no further daily labour or temporary employees/appointments should be resorted to/engaged/employed." Therefore, it reflects from the contents of the aforesaid orders that the temporary appointment in messengerial category and daily labour has been stopped by the Respondent management with effect from 1.4.1997 because of the lapsed of panel of temporary workers and daily wagers by 31.3.1997. The agreement for lapse of both the panels on 31.3.1997 is contained in the 5th settlement which has been arrived at between the parties on dated 30.7.1996 with the consensus of both the parties. Therefore, Workman can not challenge the terms and conditions contained in settlement dated 30.7.1996 regarding lapse of panel on 31.3.1997 as agreed between State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation. As per provision contained u/s.18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 the said Agreement dated 30.7.1996 is binding on both the parties.

In the case of **Allied Sales Corporation Secunderabad vs.The Authority Under Andhra Pradesh..... 1990 II LLJ 510 AP para 414, Hon'ble Court have held:-**

"*4. There was a settlement between the Management and the workmen under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act on 25th April 1983 under which the age of superannuation of the workmen was fixed at 55 years. The settlement was to be in force upto 30th June 1986 and the next settlement, incorporating practically the same terms, was again entered into on 4th February 1987 under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act. There is no dispute that these settlements are under Section 18(1).*

14. Now the Authority constituted under Section 41(1) of the Act is an authority with very limited jurisdiction. It can only decide in the first appeal whether a termination by the management is valid or not and is within the parameters of Section 40 of the Act. The said Authority, in our view, has absolutely no jurisdiction to decide whether a settlement entered into under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act between the representatives of the Workmen and of the Management, is vitiated by undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion on the part of the Management. The Authority, namely, the Assistant Commissioner of Labour, was never intended by the A.P. Legislature to have jurisdiction to go into the question of the validity of a settlement arrived at under Section 18 of the Industrial Disputes Act by an Industrial Court. That Parliament has, in fact, constituted Industrial Courts under the Industrial Disputes Act, with extensive powers cannot be disputed. What we mean to say is that the Authority under Section 41(1) of the A.P. Act has no jurisdiction what-so-ever either to question or to decide about the validity of any such settlements. If parties to a settlement have a grievance about the validity of a settlement, it is for them to agitate the matter before the appropriate forum and they cannot ask an Authority constituted under Section 41(1) of the A.P. Shops and Establishments Act, 1966 with limited jurisdiction, to go into any such question and, that too, incidentally while deciding whether retirement as per the contract of employment, is legal or not."

It is not the case of Workman that aforesaid settlements are vitiated by undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion on the part of the management. If the Workman feeling aggrieved by any terms of settlement/ agreement on the aforementioned grounds then he can challenge of settlement before a competent authority under the Act, 1947. But here in the instant matter it is not a case of Workman that aforementioned settlement has been entered into between the parties on the ground of undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion. Therefore, Workman is barred to raise any objection in respect of fixing the date of lapse of both panels on 31.3.1997 as agreed between both the parties and Workman can not challenge any terms of said Agreement.

Further in the case of **Herbertsons Limited Vs. Workmen of Herbertsons Limited and Ors, 1977 AIR 322,** Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

The Tribunal thought that the question of the quantum of membership of the 2nd Respondent did not call for a finding at all in view of 1his Court's order. As observed above that was not a correct assumption. On the other hand, we feel that this view of the Tribunal has led it to approach the matter in an entirely erroneous manner. The Tribunal is, rightly enough, conscious that under section 18 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act the settlement was binding on the company and the members of the 3rd Respondent union. Even so, the Tribunal devoted nearly half of its order in scanning the evidence given by the company and Respondent No. 3 to find out whether the terms of the settlement had been explained by the President of the union to the workmen or not and whether the workers voluntarily accepted the settlement knowing all the "consequences". This to our mind is again an entirely wrong approach.

"When a recognised union negotiates with an employer the workers as individuals do not come into the picture. It is not necessary that each individual worker should know the implications of the settlement since a recognised union, which is expected to protect the legitimate interests of labour, enters into a settlement in the best interests of labour. This would be the normal rule. We cannot altogether rule out exceptional cases where there may be allegations of mala fides, fraud or even corruption or other induce- ments. Nothing of that kind has been suggested against the President of the 3rd Respondent in this case. That being the position, prima facie, this is a settlement in the course of collective bargaining and, therefore, is entitled to due weight and consideration.

It is not possible to scan the settlement in bits and pieces and hold some parts good and acceptable and others bad. Unless it can be demonstrated that the objectionable portion is such that it completely outweighs all the other advantages gained the Court will be slow to hold a settle- ment as unfair and unjust. The settlement has to be

accepted or rejected as a whole and we are unable to reject it as a whole as unfair or unjust. Even before this Court the 3rd Respondent representing admittedly the large majority of the workmen has stood by this settlement and that is a strong factor which it is difficult to ignore. As stated elsewhere in the judgment, we cannot also be oblivious of the fact that all workmen of the company have accepted the settlement. Besides, the period of settlement has since expired and we are informed that the employer and the 3rd Respondent are negotiating another settlement with further improvements. These factors, apart from what has been stated above, and the need for industrial peace and harmony when a union backed by a large majority of workmen has accepted a settlement in the course of collective bargaining have impelled us not to interfere with this settlement. That being the position, we unhold the settlement as fair and just and order that the award of the Tribunal shall be substituted by the settlement dated October 18, 1973. The said settlement shall be the substituted award. The appeal is disposed of accordingly. There will be no order as to costs."

Therefore, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above, the contention of the Workman that the date fixed for lapse of empanelled list on 31.3.1997 for appointment to the permanent post vide 5th Settlement dated 30.7.1996 is arbitrary, illegal is not untenable. The recognized union of Workmen has negotiated with the Respondent Bank Management representing large number of Workmen and the Workman as individual do not come into picture. Workman in the instant case has work as temporary Workmen in the Respondent Branch and in response of Notification he had applied for inclusion of his name in the panel and he was selected for inclusion his name in the panel list to be utilized for absorption of such Workman to permanent post in order of their seniority in the list. The Settlement dated 30.7.1996 between State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation under Sec.2(p) and Sec.18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 has clearly provided as regard non-messengerial position and it is agreed that all such posts sanctioned fallen vacant upto 31.3.1997 shall be filled before empanel list is allowed to lapse. Thus, in view of law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, in the instant case, Agreement dated 30.7.1996 was entered into between both the parties in respect of lapsing of the both the panels on 31.3.1997 and absorption of the Workmen from panel list was subject to availability of vacancy of post likely to arise upto 31.3.1997, have a binding force on Workman as well as management of State Bank of India in view of provision contained under section 18 (1) of I.D. Act, 1947.

Thus, Point No.I is answered against the Workman and in favour of the Respondent .

27. **Point No.II**:- Firstly, it is submitted on behalf of the Workman that the Respondent has terminated his services by oral order on 31.3.1997 without issuing any notice or paying any salary or compensation in lieu thereof. Therefore, the termination order of the Workman from service is in violation of provision contained Under Section 25 F of I.D. Act, 1947. Therefore, the order is liable to be set aside.

28. On the other hand, Respondent counsel contended that Workman has not worked for 240 days in any preceding calendar year. Therefore, reference of the industrial dispute is not relevant. In this context, the Workman has examined himself as WW1 who has reiterated that Workman has been terminated from service by Respondent on 31.3.1997 without notice of salary or compensation in lieu thereof. Before examining the claim of the Workman on merit it would be apposite to reproduce the provision contained under section 25 F:-

Section 25F provides:-

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].

Compensation to workmen in case of transfer of undertakings.

Section 25B defines the term continuous service which provides

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 authorized 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;

In order to prove the fact of 240 days of service within 12 months of a calendar year just preceding from the date of termination, the initial burden of proof lies upon the Workman and the Workman has to prove this factum by adducing his oral as well as documentary evidence in support of his claim.

Further, how to calculate 240 days of service by the Workman in a calendar year. In this context the reference of decisions of Hon'ble Supreme Court is relevant and the same are discussed below:-

In Rajasthan State Ganganagar S. Mills Ltd. v. State of Rajasthan and Anr. (2004) Apex Court held:

"It was the case of the Workman that he had worked for more than 240 days in the year concerned. This claim was denied by the appellant. It was for the claimant to lead evidence to show that he had worked for 240 days in the year preceding the date of his termination. He has filed an affidavit. It is statement which is in his favor and that cannot be regarded as sufficient evidence for any Court or Tribunal to come to the conclusion that in fact the claimant had worked for 240 days in a year These aspects were highlighted in Range Forest Officer v. S.T. Hadimani (2002 (3) SCC 25. No proof of receipt of salary or wages for 240 days or order or record in that regard was produced. Mere non-production of the muster roll for a particular period was not sufficient for the Labour Court held that the Workman had worked for 240 days as claimed."

In Municipal Corporation, Faridabad v. Siri Niwas (2004 (8) SCC 195), held "*the burden was on the Workman to show that he was working for more than 240 days in the preceding one year prior to his alleged retrenchment." In M.P. Electricity Board v. Hariram (2004 (8) SCC 246) the position was again reiterated in paragraph 11 as follows: "The above burden having not been discharged and the Labour Court having held so, in our opinion, the Industrial Court and the High Court erred in basing an order of reinstatement solely on an adverse inference drawn erroneously ..*"

In the case of Manager, RBI, Bangalore vs. S Mani (2005) SCC Page 100, the 3 Judges Bench of the Apex Court held that "*the initial burden of proof was on the Workman to show that he had completed 240 days of service."*

Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of Mohan Lal vs Management BEL 1981 SCC page 225 has laid down the principle that how to count 240 days of service within one year it is held: *"Clause (2)(a) provides for a fiction to treat a Workman in continuous service for a period of one year despite the fact that he has not rendered uninterrupted service for a period of one year but he has rendered period of 240 days during the period of 12 calendar service for months counting backwards and just preceding the relevant date being the date of retrenchment. In other words, in order to invoke the fiction enacted in clause (2)(a) it is necessary to determine first the relevant date, ie the date of termination of service which is complained of as retrenchment. After that date is ascertained. move backward to a period of 12 months just preceding the date of retrenchment and then ascertain whether within the period of 12 months, the Workman has rendered service for a period of 240 days. If these three facts are affirmatively answered in favor of the Workman pursuant to the deeming fiction enacted in clause (2)(a) it will have to be assumed that the Workman is in continuous service for a period of one year and he will satisfy the eligibility qualification enacted in Section 25-F"*

"14. We have already extracted section 25B since its amendment and the change in language is the legislative exposition of which note must be taken. In fact, we need not further dilate upon this aspect because in Surendra Kumar Verma and Ors. v. Central Government Industrial-cum-Labour Court, New Delhi and Anr., Chinnappa Reddy. J., after noticing the amendment and referring to the decision in Sur Enamel and Stamping Works (P) Ltd case, held as under:

"These changes brought about by Act 36 of 1964 appear to be clearly designed to provide that a Workman who has actually worked under the employer for not less than 240 days during a period of twelve months shall be deemed to have been in continuous service for a period of one year whether or not he has in fact been in such continuous service for a period of one year. It is enough that he has worked for 240 days in a period of 12 months, it is not necessary that he should have been in the service of the employer for one whole year."

In a concurring judgment Pathak J. agreed with this interpretation of section 25B(2). Therefore, both on principle and on precedent it must be held that section 25B(2) comprehends a situation where a Workman is not in employment for a period of 12 calendar months, but has rendered service for a period of 240 days within the period of 12 calendar months commencing and counting backwards from the relevant date, i.e. the date of retrenchment. If he has, he would be deemed to be in continuous service for a period of one year for the purpose of section 25B and Chapter VA."

Thus, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above the initial burden of proof lies upon the Workman to show that he has completed 240 days of the service with the Respondent just preceding from the date of his termination. Further, in respect of the employment of calculating the 240 days service provision contained under Section 25-F read with Section 25-B of the I.D. Act, 1947.

29. Now, in view of the provision contained under Section 25 F and law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, we have to examine whether the Workman has discharged his initial burden of proof in respect of his claim of 240 days continuous service in a calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination i.e., 31.3.1997.

In this context, WW1 in his cross examination has stated that,

" I was not sponsored by any employment exchange and did not undergo the regular process of selection before my engagement as temporary Messenger in the branch. ...

It is true that I did not work for 240 days in any year, in my entire service in the bank in any branch."

Thus, it is clear from the testimony of WW1 that the Workman had not worked for 240 days continuously in any 12 months of a calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination in the Respondent bank. Therefore, Workman failed to establish his plea by his oral and documentary evidence that he had worked for 240 days continuously in calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination i.e., 31.3.1997. Thus, the claim of the Workman that he has been terminated by oral order without issuing notice or payment in lieu after termination, in contravention of Section 25 F of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is not tenable. However the documents filed by the Workman in support of his claim, number of days worked with the Respondent goes to reveal that the Workman had worked intermittently as daily wager depending upon availability of work in branch. Workman did not file any document of appointment letter or salary slips in support of his claim for appointment as a non-messenger in the Respondent branch on temporary basis.

30. Per contra, the Learned Counsel for Respondent has submitted the allegation of Workman that he was terminated from services is not correct. As the vacancies were filled up on regular basis in order of their respective seniority the non-engagement of the Workman does not amount to termination. Further, Respondent contended that no law provide that even though there is no work temporary employee should be continued in the bank work as the very engagement of Workman was subject to availability of work. Therefore, the allegation that the bank has indulged in unfair labour practice is incorrect.

31. Thus, in view of the fore gone discussion and contentions made by the Respondent , I find the force in the argument advanced by the Respondent that in the instant matter, Workman was not terminated from service by order dated 31.3.1997 rather he was disengaged in view of the non-availability of the work in the branch. Further, there was direction issued by the Head Office of the Respondent authority not to engage any daily wager Workman/ temporary Worker w.e.f. 1.4.1997. Thus, such disengagement of Workman does not amount to termination. Moreover, the Workman failed to prove his claim that he was terminated in contravention of provision of Sec.25F of the I.D. Act, 1947 as he failed to establish his plea by any oral or documentary evidence that he had worked for 240 days continuously in a twelve months of calendar year just preceding from date of termination i.e., 31.3.1997.

32. Further, perusal of the order dated 25.3.1997 goes to reveal that the Chief Branch Manager, State Bank of India has issued the letter to Zonal Office with direction to all its branches to this effect that they have been advised by the DGM, Zonal Office, Hyderabad that as both the panel of temporary employees of 1989 and daily wagers/casual labour of 1992 will lapse on 31.3.1997 it has been decided by central office not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial cadre from 1.4.1997, therefore it was directed to issue suitable instructions not to make temporary appointments from 1.4.1997. There is no mention in this order that the Workman herein has been terminated from service by this order.

33. Further, the circular dated 27.3.1997 was issued by DGM, SBI to all branches in commercial network in respect of the non-appointment of temporary employees in subordinate cadre and it has directed not to make any temporary employment in the subordinate cadre with effect from 1.4.97 and further, it has directed to ensure that no temporary/casual/daily basis appointment of the petty cash. Further, it is directed to all Branch Managers that any deviation in this regard will be viewed seriously. Thus, these circulars do not reflect that the Workman has been terminated from service by this order.

34. Similarly, office order dated 31.3.1997 is simply a direction to all branches of the Respondent bank by DGM that no further daily labour should be engaged or employed. Therefore, the plea of the Workman that he has been terminated by the aforesaid order dated 25.3.1997, 27.3.1997 and 31.3.1997 from the service by the Respondent is not acceptable. The evidence adduced by the Workman clearly goes to reveal that he had worked as a daily wager for which he has been paid wages according to number of working days. As there was an order for prohibition for engaging temporary workmen, in the bank, therefore, Workman could not be engaged by the Respondent for work from 1.4.1997 and there after. It is settled law that the daily wagers are engaged by the employer depending upon the availability of work and as the work was not available the Workman was not engaged further by the Respondent management. Therefore, the Workman on the ground of number of days he had worked in the Respondent bank

cannot claim any right to reinstate him into the employment. As the Workman failed to prove the mandatory condition of 240 days of continuous service as required under Sec.25F of I.D. Act, 1947. Therefore, the disengagement of Workman from work can not be termed in contravention of provision contained under Sec.25F and 25 B of the I.D. Act, 1947.

Thus, this point is answered against the Workman and in favour of Respondent .

35. **Point No.III**:- In this context, the Workman has contended that the management failed to implement the selected panels during its valid tenure. The management adopted the back door methods contrary to the settlements and filled up the vacancies. The same is evident from the proceedings dated 18.11.1993 a copy of the same is filed in the material papers and the same may be read as part of the claim statement. Further, it is submitted that management has to adhere the procedure issued by the Central Government, the instructions dated 16.8.1990 in the year 1995, but same was not followed in the year 1997 despite there being vacancies. The management has followed the procedure of calling candidates through employment exchange instead of giving chance to the empanelled candidates like the Workman herein. The management sent call letters to the similarly situated candidates like the Workman in the month of June 1997 subsequent to issuance of impugned termination orders. After knowing the fact that they are litigating the issue by way of dispute, the management has refused to engage those candidates, the copies of call letters issued are filed herein along with claim petition. The Workman herein reiterates that the panels are meant for absorption but not for termination. In view of the same a duty is cast upon the Respondent management to engage the empanelled candidates like the Workman herein even in temporary vacancies till they are absorbed permanently in regular vacancies.

36. On the other hand, Respondent has contended that the Federation approached Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) for implementation of bipartite settlement in respect of the absorption of temporary employees. The Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) conducted conciliation proceedings and agreement was arrived at between the Federation and the Management bank. It is submitted that it was agreed between the Federation and the Management that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers /casual labour would be kept alive upto March, 1997 and the vacancies as agreed to under the afore set out settlements will be filled from both the lists concurrently. A copy of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.1995 signed by the parties to the dispute is filed as a material paper. Further, it is submitted that the settlement was arrived at and an agreement was signed between the Federation and the Management bank on 30.7.1996 under Section 2(p) read with Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules 1957 which is binding on the parties. A copy of this agreement which hereinafter may be referred to as 5th settlement for brevity, is also filed as a material paper. The 5th settlement dated 30.7.1996 whereunder the earlier four settlements dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988 and 9.1.1991 were also referred, it was agreed to, by the Federation and the Management bank that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees will be kept alive upto March, 1997 for filling the vacancies existing/arrived at as on 31.12.1994 as per the norms agreed to between the bank and Federation and that thereafter the said panels would lapse. It was also agreed that within the framework of the above settlements the modalities about drawing names from either the panel of temporary employees or the panel of daily wagers and casual labour would be decided administratively on circle to circle basis depending upon the local requirements in consultation with the Federation's affiliate by the Circle management. It was further agreed that all messenger real vacancies/positions in the subordinate cadre including part-time attendants specifically provided as leave reserve will be filled by the end of 31.3.1997. Further, Respondent contended that on 27.2.1997 a memorandum of understanding was also signed between the Federation's affiliate and the bank management regarding the fact that the exercise of identifying the messengerial vacancies as on 31.12.1994 has since been completed by central office and thereby 403 messengerial vacancies were sanctioned to the circle of the Management bank and it was agreed that these vacancies may be filled from 1989 panel of temporary employees after effecting conversion from full time non-messengerial staff in the usual manner and the agreement was reached upon. Further, it was agreed between the Federations affiliate and the management bank that in terms of the settlement dated 30.7.1996 both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers /casual employees would lapse on 31.3.1997.

37. The Workman has contended that the empanelled list prepared by the Respondent management for appointment of temporary and daily wage Workers to the permanent post cannot lapse unless until it is exhausted by appointing all the empanelled persons and it should continue even after 31.3.1997, i.e., the date fixed for the lapse of panel. It is undisputed that the date of lapse of empanelled list of Workmen has been fixed to 31.3.1997 as mentioned in the settlement dated 30.7.1996, and agreed between the parties. It is settled law that and once the life of panel list lapses on the date as agreed between the parties it cannot be extended beyond that date. In the instant case the panel list of the workmen was valid upto 31.3.1997 in view of the terms and conditions enumerated in the 5th Settlement entered into between the parties. As the lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997 has been agreed by State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation through 5th Settlement, the Workman is not competent to challenge the same.

In this context I would like to take reference of the decision of the apex court in the case of **Syndicate Bank and Ors vs. Shankar Paul and Ors , AIR 1997 SC 3091, therein the Hon'ble Apex Court** have held:-

"Till 1982, the branches of the appellant Bank in Calcutta region were recruiting persons locally to work as temporary attenders in leave vacancies. In view of the revised procedure prescribed by the Government of India in respect of such temporary appointments, the Calcutta regional office of the appellant Bank issued a circular to all of its branches on 14.8.1982, instructing all the branches under it to discontinue the old practice from 1.6.1982 and appoint only empanelled candidates. The regional office was to prepare a panel of eligible candidates, after calling names from the local/district employment exchange, and split it up branch-wise. Following that new procedure yearly panels were prepared thereafter. Names of the Respondent s were for the first time included in the panel prepared for the period 7.2.1987 to 6.2.1988. By its letter dated 7.2.1987 the Bank had informed the Respondent s that the panel was valid for one year only and that inclusion of their names in the panel was not to confer on them any right to seek permanent appointment in the service of the bank. Considering the object with which the panel was prepared and the fact that it was an yearly panel expiring on 6.2.1988, we are of the opinion that the Respondent s did not get any right, because of inclusion of their names in the said panel, for permanent absorption in the service of the Bank. Whatever conditional right they had came to an end with the expiry of the panel. The claim of the Respondent s, as contained in the writ petition was thus misconceived and therefore the learned single Judge and the Division Bench, when it first decided the appeal, were right in dismissing the writ petition and the appeal respectively."

Thus, in view of the above law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court and in view of the terms and conditions of the 5th Settlement the contention of the Workman that empanelled list should continue even after 31.3.1997 till the last Workman in the panel is absorbed is not tenable. The contention of the Workman is baseless in view of recital in the settlement. Therefore, in view of the fore gone discussion and finding given at Point No. I regarding binding nature of Settlements and terms and conditions enumerated therein, in view of the provision contained u/s.18(1) of the I.D. Act, 1947, I am of the considered view that life of panels lapsed on 31.3.1997 in view of terms of settlement dated 30.7.1996 and plea of Workman that the panel shall continue even after 31.3.1997 till last man absorbed has no legal force and same is untenable.

38. Undisputedly, settlement agreement dated 30.7.1996 was executed between the State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation and in that settlement it was agreed that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/ casual employees will be used for filling vacancies existing as on 31.12.1994 as per the norms agreed between the bank and the Federation. These empanelled workmen were to be given a chance for permanent appointment in the bank against vacancies arising up to December 1994 whereas the daily wagers/ casual employees were to be considered against the vacancies arise from January 1995 to December 1996, whereby the said panel would lapse. It was agreed that the vacancies falls upto 31.3.1997 shall be filled before the empanelled list is allowed to lapse. Thus, the claim of the Workman to the post of permanent non-messenger in the Respondent management was subject to the availability of the sanctioned post and vacancies arising upto 31.3.1997. The workmen given chance to the permanent post were seniors in number of working days in panel list and Workman herein was junior to those workmen. Therefore, Workman could not be given absorption to permanent post being junior to other workmen in the panel list.

39. In this context the Workman witness WW1 was cross examined by the Respondent counsel and in the cross examination the witness WW1 states:-

"I applied for appointment as Messenger, in response to the advertisement issued by the bank and the union in the year 1992. .....

The panel was prepared basing upon the number of days of service, put in by the temporary employees. Some of the temporary employees whose names were included in the panel were given regular appointment in the bank in order of their seniority in the panel….

It is true that I am not having any documents to show that any of my juniors are continuing in service in the bank."

Thus, from the above statement of the Workman witness WW1 it is clear that the panel was prepared in terms of various settlements entered into between Staff Federation of State Bank of India and State Bank of India and it was prepared on the basis of number of days of work put in by the temporary employees. Further, the Workman himself admitted that some of the temporary employees whose names were included in the panel were given regular appointment in the bank in order of their seniority in the panel and he is not having any document to show that any person who worked for less number of days than the Workman was given appointment in the bank. Therefore, the allegation of the Workman that the regular appointment has been made by the bank from the panel list in breach of the terms of the settlement and violation of seniority of panel list is not proved by this evidence of WW1. Thus, there is no evidence on record that bank has given the appointment to the temporary employees as well as daily wagers from the panel list 1989 and 1992 in breach of seniority of the temporary employees in the list. There is no evidence of jumbling in the panel list to make appointment of any permanent Workman in breach of the seniority. Therefore, I am constrained to hold that the Respondent Management has appointed the workmen from panel list in order of seniority and there is no jumbling of workmen in the panel list before it got lapsed on 31.3.1997.

40. However, Workman has taken the plea that the panels of Workmen for absorption in the employment of the Respondent banks (panels of temporary employees and daily wagers) has been lapsed on 31.3.1997 in contravention

of terms of settlement as the object of preparing the entire empanelment of temporary and daily wagers was to provide them permanent employment and till the both the panel lists exhausted the panel list cannot be lapsed on 31.3.1997 and the date of lapsing of the panel on 31.3.1997 has been fixed by the Respondent arbitrarily without any authority.

41. In this context, the perusal of Settlement dated 30.7.1996 reveals that the 5th Settlement dated 30.7.1996 was entered under Section 2(p) and 18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Dispute (Central) Rules 1957. This settlement has been entered into by the competent parties and in this settlement parties thereto agreed that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees will lapse on 31.3.1997. Thus the date of lapse of panel was fixed by both the parties with consensus under the settlement dated 30.7.1996 and same is binding upon the Workman under the provision of Section 18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947. Moreover, this issue of binding force of the settlement dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988 and 9.1.1991 has already been discussed, decided at finding in Point No.I of this award. However, the legality and validity of the aforementioned settlement has not been challenged by the Workman before any competent forum. Thus, claim of Workman that the date of lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997 has been fixed arbitrarily by the Respondent bank is untenable. As regard the claim of Workman for his absorption to the permanent post it is settled law that the Workman can not claim his regularization to permanent post merely on the basis of number of working days.

42. In this context the reference of the decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Oil and Natural Gas Corporation vs Krishan Gopal 2020(3) SCALE 272, date of decision 7.2.2020** is relevant therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have has laid down principle regarding regularization of the Workman on permanent posts. Hon'ble Supreme Court have laid down the prepositions of regularization of the workmen to permanent post is as under:-

"*(i) Wide as they are, the powers of the Labour Court and the Industrial Court cannot extend to a direction to order regularisation, where such a direction would in the context of public employment offend the provisions contained in Article 14 of the Constitution;*

(ii) The statutory power of the Labour Court or Industrial Court to grant relief to workmen including the status of permanency continues to exist in circumstances where the employer has indulged in an unfair labour practice by not filling up permanent posts even though such posts are available and by continuing to employ workmen as temporary or daily wage employees despite their performing the same work as regular workmen on lower wages;

(iii) The power to create permanent or sanctioned posts lies outside the judicial domain and where no posts are available, a direction to grant regularisation would be impermissible merely on the basis of the number of years of service;

(iv) Where an employer has regularised similarly situated workmen either in a scheme or otherwise, it would be open to workmen who have been deprived of the same benefit at par with the workmen who have been regularised to make a complaint before the Labour or Industrial Court, since the deprivation of the benefit would amount to a violation of Article 14; and

(v) In order to constitute an unfair labour practice under Section 2(ra) read with Item 10 of the Vth Schedule of the ID Act, the employer should be engaging workmen as badlis, temporaries or casuals, and continuing them for years, with the object of depriving them of the benefits payable to permanent workmen.

Thus, in view of the principles laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court as discussed above, in the instant matter the Workman utterly failed to prove his claim by adducing any documentary or oral evidence that the employer has indulged in unfair labour practice by not filling the permanent posts even though such posts are available and by continuing to employ workmen as temporary or daily wage employees despite their performance was the same work, as regular workmen on lower wages.

43. Respondent has contended that all the vacancies exist and arise upto 31.3.1997 has been filled up from the panel list in order of seniority and no vacancy exists or arises as on 31.3.1997 remained unfilled. Further, it is contended that as per terms of settlement the life of panel lists has been lapsed on 31.3.1997, hence, there is no occasion to extend the life of panel lists beyond 31.3.1997. However, the workman failed to prove contrary by any evidence to the aforesaid contention of the Respondent that the vacancies were existing as on 31.3.1997 and the workman was not given absorption to the permanent post in order of his seniority. It is settled law that the power to create permanent or sanctioned post lies outside the judicial domain and where no posts are available, a direction to grant regularization would be impermissible merely on the basis of the number of years of service. Therefore, the claim of the workman on this ground also not acceptable.

44. Further, as per the of settlement, panel was prepared for absorption of the workmen on the permanent posts has already been lapsed on 31.3.1997 and the vacancies existing and arising upto 31.12.1994 and upto 31.3.1997 as settlement dated 30.7.1996 has been filled up from the panel by appointing the workmen as per seniority in the panel list. Workman witness WW1 in his cross examination has himself admitted this fact that, some of the temporary employees whose names were included in the panel were given regular appointment in the bank in order of their

seniority in the panel. The Workman failed to show that there was any breach of terms of settlement has been committed by the Respondent in appointment to permanent post from aforesaid panel list.

45. As discussed in preceding paragraph of this Award, the life of the panel has not been extended beyond 31.3.1997, by any further settlement hence, the panel list in which name of the Workman was included got expired on 31.3.1997. It is not the case of the Workman that Respondent has regularized similarly situated workmen either in the scheme or otherwise and the Workman has been deprived of same benefit on par with those workmen or the vacancies remained unfilled on the date of lapse of panels i.e., 31.3.1997, Industrial Tribunal has no jurisdiction to extend the date of lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997. This Tribunal can not order for regularization of workmen to the permanent post in contravention of the provision of Article 14 of the Constitution of India.

In the case of **Mahboob Deepak vs. Nagar Panchayat Gajraula & Anr, Civil Appeal No.5875/2007 date of judgement 13.12.2007,** Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

"8. Respondent is a Local Authority. The terms and conditions of employment of the employees are governed by a statute and statutory rules. No appointment can be made by a Local Authority without following the provisions of the recruitment rules. Any appointment made in violation of the said rules as also the constitutional scheme of equality as contained in Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India would be a nullity.

9. Due to some exigency of work, although recruitment on daily wages or on an ad hoc basis was permissible, but by reason thereof an employee cannot claim any right to be permanently absorbed in service or made permanent in absence of any statute or statutory rules. Merely because an employee has completed 240 days of work in a year preceding the date of retrenchment, the same would not mean that his services were liable to be regularized."

Therefore, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, the claim of the Workman for absorption merely on the basis of number of day of work in the Respondent bank Branch is not acceptable. As regard plea of the Workman that the Workman should have been given employment even after 31.3.1997 as temporary Workman, it is the discretion of Respondent to engage the Workman depending upon availability of work and this Tribunal can not direct the Respondent to engage the Workman in the absent of such rule/scheme.

46. In view of principle laid down by Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above, in the instant matter Workman utterly failed to establish the fact of rendering continuous service for a period of 240 days of service within a period of 12 calendar months commencing and coming backward from relevant date i.e., the date of retrenchment, if has he would be denied to be in continuous service for a period of one year. Therefore, the provision contained under Sec.25F of retrenchment is not applicable to Workman.

Counsel for Workman has relied upon number of decisions of Hon'ble High Court and Hon'ble Supreme Court and few of them are discussed herein:-

In the case of **F.C.I., vs. Kamdhenu Cattle Feed Industries 1993 (1) SCC 71,** therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

"7. In contractual sphere as in all other State actions, the State and all its instrumentalities have to conform to Article 14 of the Constitution of which non-arbitrariness is a significant facet. There is no unfettered discretion in public law: A public authority possesses powers only to use them for public good. This impose the duty to act fairly and to adopt a procedure which is `fairplay in action'. Due observance of this obligation as a part of good administration raises a reasonable or legitimate expectation in every citizen to be treated fairly in his interaction with the State and its instrumentalities, with this element forming a necessary component of the decision making process in all State actions. To satisfy this requirement of non- arbitrariness in a State action, it is, therefore, necessary to consider and give due weight to the reasonable or legitimate expectations of the persons likely lo be affected by the decision or else that unfairness in the exercise of the power may amount to an abuse or excess of power apart from affecting the bona fides of the decision in a given case. The decision so made would be exposed to challenge on the ground of arbitrariness. Rule of law does not completely eliminate discretion in the exercise of power, as it is unrealistic, but providers for control of its exercise by judicial review."

In the case of **State Bank of India, R.O., Vijayawada vs. Industrial Tribunal, Hyderabad WP No.193/1997,** therein Hon'ble High Court have held,

"*Sri Krovvidi Narasimham, the learned counsel for the 2nd Respondent contends, supporting the award that it was a permanent vacancy and even though the 2nd Respondent was appointed on temporary basis, his services were not liable to be terminated and he was to be regularised into service on permanent basis. Shastry award warrants that no temporary appointment can be made to a permanent post. But the matter is now covered by two division bench judgements dated 28.11.1986 in W.A. No.791 of 1986 and 25.8.1987 in W.A. No.270 of 1982. The ratio decided in the two judgements is to the effect that there cannot be any mandate to appoint employees on permanent basis when the requirement was for appointment on temporary basis. But it is held in the said judgements that when a temporary appointee is ousted from service and not for misconduct and, if again temporary appointment is to be made, then, the case of such temporary appointee who was ousted, has got to be considered in accordance with Sec. 25-H of the Act."*

In the case of **State of Haryana and others vs. Piara Singh and others. 1992 (4) SCC 118,** therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

" 49. If for any reason an adhoc or temporary employee is continued for a fairly long spell, the authorities must consider his case for regularization provided he is eligible and qualified according to the rules and his service record is satisfactory and his appointment does not run counter to the reservation policy of the state."

In the above cited judgements by the Workman the facts of the case are different hence do not apply to instant case of Workman.

47. Thus, in view of fore gone discussion and laws laid down by Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above, the claim of workman of regularization in the employment of Respondent is not substantiated by the evidence of Petitioner, WW1 in his cross examination has admitted that he is not aware of any settlements and he is not having any document to show that any person who worked for less number of days than him was given appointment in the bank and he has no document to show that any of his juniors is continuing in service of the bank as of now. Therefore, the claim of the Petitioner for regularization in the employment of Respondent bank is not tenable. Further, Petitioner failed to produce any document in evidence to establish that any temporary employee junior to him is working in the Respondent bank. Therefore, Petitioner is not entitled for regularization in the service of the Respondent.

This point is answered against the Petitioner Workman and in favour of the Respondent.

48. **Point No.IV**:- In view of the discussion and finding given at Point Nos. I, II and III, the Workman is not entitled for any relief and claim statement of Workman sans merit and liable to be dismissed.

This Point is answered accordingly.

AWARD

In view of the fore gone discussion, it is held that the action of the Respondent bank in terminating the services of Sri M. Satyanarayana, Ex. Messenger by way of oral orders w.e.f. 31.3.1997 is justified. Hence, the Petitioner is not entitled for any relief as prayed for. The claim statement filed by Workman sans merit, hence, dismissed.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, Personal Assistant, transcribed by her, corrected and signed by me on this the 2nd day of July, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner	Witnesses examined for the Respondent
WW1: Sri M. Satyanarayana	NIL

Documents marked for the Petitioner

Ex.W1: Photocopy of service certificate

Ex.W2: Photocopy of News paper advertisement/ notification

Documents marked for the Respondent

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 27 जुलाई, 2026

का.आ. 1678.— औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार भारतीय स्टेट बैंक के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजको और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण – सह – श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद के पंचाट (सन्दर्भ संख्या 119/2003) को प्रकाशित करती है,

[सं. एल. 39025/01/2026–आई.आर.(बी–II)-95]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 27th July, 2026

S.O. 1678.— In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (LC.No.119/2003) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Hyderabad as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the Management of State Bank of India and their workmen,

[No. L-39025/01/2026- IR (B-II)-95]

SALONI, Dy. Director

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD

Present: - **Sri Irfan Qamar**

Presiding Officer

Dated the 3rd day of July, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE L.C.No.119/2003

Between:

Sri T. Venkata Swamy,

S/o Raghava Rao,

Gurazala,

Mudinepally (M),

Krishna Distt.

… Petitioner

And

The Dy. General Manager,

State Bank of India,

Zonal Office,

Vijayawada. …..Respondent

Appearances:

For the Petitioner : Sri B. Vikas, Advocate

For the Respondent: Sri Y. Ranjeeth Reddy, Advocate

AWARD

Sri T. Venkata Swamy who worked as Messenger (who will be referred to as the workman) has filed this petition under Sec. 2A(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 against the Respondents State Bank of India seeking for reinstatement into service as Messenger duly granting all the consequential benefits such as continuity of service, back wages and all other attendant benefits etc., and such other reliefs as this court may deem fit.

2. Before unfolding the factual matrix of the instant industrial dispute it would be apposite to have a bird eye view of a chequered history of the instant industrial dispute. Earlier instant industrial dispute along with the batch cases was decided by this Tribunal vide common award dated 17.5.2005 and the reference was answered in favour of the Respondent and against the Workman. That said common award dated 17.5.2005 was challenged by the aggrieved Workmen in various Writ petition No.6470/2014 along with batch of writ petitions before the Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh and Hon'ble High Court vide its' judgement dated 23.6.2014 allowed all batch of writ petitions and set aside the common award dated 17.5.2005 passed in ID No.222 of 2001 and other batch of ID cases by Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad and the Respondent management of State Bank of India was directed to reengage the Writ Petitioners in position, which they have been occupying prior to their termination and further directed to consider their cases for regularization as and when the substantive vacancy arises. This judgement dated 23.6.2014 of Hon'ble High Court of AP, passed in WP No.6470/2014 and batch petitions was challenged by Respondent management before the Hon'ble High Court in Writ Appeal No. 1268 of 2014. The aforesaid Writ Appeals No.1268/2014 and other Writ Appeals were decided by Division Bench of High Court of Andhra Pradesh by a common judgement dated 20.3.2019. Hon'ble High Court in aforesaid Writ Appeal was pleased to pass the order which is extracted as below:-

" 7. Hearing the learned senior counsel for the SBI and the learned senior counsel for the contesting unofficial Respondent s, we see that while the learned single Judge was justified in setting aside the award af the Tribunal, the proper course to be adopted was to remit all the cases to the Tribunal. This we say for reasons more than one. Firstly, in such matters, claims have to be decided on individual basis, as different persons have different claims as to the length of officiation or discharge of duties and functions; quality of engagement, drawings, accounting of the post for each one of them, who have worked etc. AIl these issues will not be the same in all the cases. Therefore, each case ought to have been directed to be decided by the Tribunal afresh on individual basis. The second and most important aspect is the learned single Judge has in one go ordered re-employment of all the workmen. This is not a relief that could have been granted without answering the individual issues; each issue relating to each case could not have been decided by the writ Court within the format of its adjudication procedures and scope. The adjudicating body, which has to do that activity, is the Industrial Tribunal. Therefore, we are of the view that while we would sustain the order of the learned singe Judge insofar as it interfered and sets aside the award of the Tribunal, the further findings and directions, issued through the impugned order have to go and the individual cases have to be sent back for consideration of the Tribunal. Such further procedure before the Tribunal will have to be carried forward with the materials already on record and also by affording an opportunity to the persons, who have claims as well as the management to place their rival contentions and further material before the Tribunal. The learned counsel appearing for the workmen are justified in pointing out that enormous delay has already happened and further action by the Tribunal in this line may be expedited.

9. In the result, these writ appeals are ordered;

(1) affirming the impugned common order of the learned single Judge to the extent it sets aside the common award dated 17.05.2005 of the Industrial Tribunal;

(2) the further findings and directions issued through the impugned common order are vacated:

(3) all the matters shall be remitted to the Industrial Tribunal with a direction to dispose of them within an outer limit of five (5) months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order; and,

(4) the parties to make appearance before the Tribunal on the given date."

Thus, in view of the above direction of Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh in W.A.No.1268 of 2014 and batch cases. This Tribunal has taken up the matter of industrial dispute for hearing and deciding it afresh in view of the aforesaid guidelines laid down by the Hon'ble High Court in Writ Appeal No.1268/2014 vide judgement dated 20.3.019.

3. The factual matrix of instant industrial dispute as narrated by the Workman in his claim statement are that, the he joined the service of the Respondent Bank as a messenger in the year 1984 and he worked upto 1.4.1997. Thereby he worked for about 13 years. Further, it is submitted that the management of Respondent bank decided to give a chance to temporarily employed personnel "found suitable for permanent appointment" by wait- listing them by offering permanent appointment or waitlisting till such opportunity arises.

4. That on 17.11.1987 a settlement was reached between All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and the Management of State Bank of India - settlement one, under this settlement three categories of employees were listed. That is, A) those who have completed 240 days in 12 months or less after 1.7.1975. B) those who have completed 270 days in any continuous block of 36 calendar months after 1.7.1975. C) (i) those who have completed minimum of 30 days aggregate temporary service in any calendar year after 1.7.1975 or (ii) 70 days aggregate temporary service in continuous block of 36 months after 1.7.1975.

5. The persons who satisfied in all the above 4 categories were to be interviewed by a selection committee and the said selection committee would determine the suitability of the said candidate for permanent appointment. Therefore, the bank prescribed certain qualifications and from among the candidates satisfying the qualifications the suitable candidates were enlisted by a selection committee. The Clause 7 of the said agreement provided with the selected candidate would be wait listed in order of their respective categorization and the selected panel would be valid upto December, 1991. Clause 10 of the settlement specifically provided that henceforth. "there will be no temporary appointments in the subordinate cadre", except on a restrictive basis in the specified category, "from amongst empanelled candidates as per existing guidelines of the bank". The Workman further submits that consequent upon the said agreement and the draft, a notification was issued in the newspapers. The last date for responding to the advertisement was 30.8.1988. A written examination followed by viva-voce in May, 1989 was held. A selected panel was prepared, as per Clause 7 of the agreement, ie. Settlement No.1, the selected panel was to be valid upto December, 1991, the Workman submits that circular was issued on 26.4.91 by the said letter it is mentioned that the terms of the agreement dated 17.11.87 was modified vide second agreement dated 16.7.88 was entered into between the parties. In terms of the said agreement a chance was to be given, "to all eligible temporary employees for permanent appointments. The appointments were against the vacancies likely to arise during the years 1995-96, circular made it clear that in view of the enormity of the problem an extension of the currency of the panel, eligible temporary employees who have been empanelled could not appear in the earlier interviews and have been pursuing their cases thereafter, "will be given another chance to appear for interview".

6. Workman submits that there were total five settlements. The settlement dated 17.11.87 is the 1st settlement (Ex M1), settlement dated 16.7.88 is 2nd settlement (Ex M2), settlement dated 27.10.88 is the 3rd settlement (Ex M3), then settlement dated 9.1.91 is 4th settlement and settlement dated 30.7.96 is 5th settlement (Ex M6). In between there is minutes of conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.95 marked as Ex M5. That due to all these settlements which were extended by subsequent settlements thereby created reasonable expectations in the list of the selected candidates arose with that it's a question of time their appointments or services would be regularized in the services of the bank. The Workman was working with the bank on temporary basis was under the bonafide hope that sooner his services will be regularized with the bank. He is thereby closed all his options elsewhere. It is needless to point out that employing person to whom hope of employment in substantial terms was made is a facet of Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

7. Further Workman submits that the Government of India issued Circular No. F-3/3/104/87-IR, dated 16.8.1990. Under said circular the chief Executives of all public sector banks including the Management herein were specifically instructed that until the problem of existing temporary employees is fully resolved, no bank is permitted to make any permanent appointments. That some of the persons similarly situated like this Workman aggrieved by the inaction on the part of the management of the bank is not regularizing their services from out of the selected panel and not clearly focusing the vacancy position, filed W.P. No. 4194/97 before Hon'ble High court of A.P.. It is specifically averred in the said writ petition that the Management of the bank had failed to implement the settlement and that it violates the various fundamental rights guaranteed under the constitution of India. The Hon'ble High court of A.P .. by order dated 5.3.97 directed the bank to implement the settlement as amended from time to time. It also directed the bank to carry out the terms of settlement before the expiry of March, 1997. The Hon'ble High Court also recorded finding that the Bank cannot escape its liability of enforcement of the Settlement. In view of the directions given by the High Court all candidates whose names appeared in the select panels prepared on the basis of the agreement entered into on 17.11.87 under which the panel was valid upto December, 1991, and on the basis of a settlement dated 27.10.1988 whereby the panels were made alive upto 31.3.1997 under which the panel was valid upto December, 1999. The other agreement dated 16.7.1988 under which the panel was valid upto 1992 and on the basis of the settlement dated 27.10.1998 whereby the panels were made alive upto 31.3.1997 were under the bonafide impression that their cases will be considered for regularization and were living on the basis of the said reasonable expectation. Unfortunately, contrary to the aforesaid directions given by the High Court and contrary to the settlements entered into between the parties, the bank issued proceedings dated 25.3.1997, dated 27.3.1997 and 31.3.1997 instructing the various authorities of the Management not to continue the temporary employees those who are in services of the bank from 1.4.97. The said order was followed by the Management. Aggrieved by the said action the Workman herein and similarly situated candidates have filed a writ petition before the Hon'ble High Court and by way of Writ Petition No.9206/97 seeking a declaration that the proceedings issued by the Deputy General Manager and the Assistant General Manager (Respondent s 3,4 and 5 therein) on 25.3.97, 27.3.97 and 31.3.97 as illegal and also non-continuance of the Workmen therein in service by absorbing them in the services of the bank as violative of Section 2(p) and 18(1) read with Rule 58 of Central Rules and sought for specific direction to the bank to absorb them in service.

8. Further, Workman submits that in the counter affidavit filed in Writ Petition No.9206/97, the bank has submitted that it has about 805 branches in Andhra Pradesh alone. It has stated that due to exigencies of circumstances and on account of the urgent need in its banks, it employed temporary employees in subordinate cadre. It is pertinent to mention that it does not state the urgent or need or the nature of temporary employees that it had engaged. Enquiry into the same would reveal that the stand taken by the bank either on the ground of urgent need or of temporary employees is a façade to perpetuate unfair labour practice. It is designed to on the one hand, keep the employed in the erroneous zone of hope and on the other to ensure that benefits that a model employer will extend under various statutes to its employees is not required to be borne out by the bank. A reading of the counter affidavit would show that the bank would opines that being just fair and reasonable are which obviously is reprehensible and is a facet of unfair labour practice.

9. The Workman submits that the bank had referred in its counter affidavit to three settlements dated 17.11.87, 16.7.88 and 27.10.88. The bank in the guise of extending the benefits of the circular of Government dated 16.8.90 stated in its counter affidavit that as follows:

"Government of India, vide its letter dated 16.8.1990, issued guidelines to all the public sector banks with regard to recruitment and absorption of temporary employees in public sector banks. The said guidelines were issued to implement on the lines of the approach paper on the issue provided by a committee constituted in this regard. The Government of India guidelines made it clear that all the public sector banks may follow the provisions laid down in the approach paper.

The approach paper specified that the cases of temporary employees who had put in not less than 240 days of temporary service in 12 consecutive Months and who are entitled to benefit of Section 25-F may be decided by entering into a settlement with the representative union. In respect of temporary employees who had put in less than 240 days of service in 12 consecutive months or less, a settlement could be avoided and however if the Management

so desired, they could enter into a conciliation settlement with the representative union. Para 6(h), it is mentioned that only those temporary employees who had put in temporary service of 90 or more days after 1.1 1982 would be eligible for considering under the scheme. Although the Government guidelines envisaged for a settlement in respect of employees who had put in temporary service of 90 or more days, the bank by way of further concession entered into settlements Even in respect of those who had put in less than 90 days. As such, it could be Seen that the settlements are more beneficial to the temporary employees concerned. The approach paper also specify at para 6(c) that the banks would provide one time opportunity to all the temporary employees and for that purpose temporary employees worked in the bank on or after 1.1.1982 could be considered for re-employment in terms of the scheme. The Respondent s have gone further wherein even persons working after 1975 were also considered.

As could be seen from the above, there was a genuine effort on the part of the Respondent bank to provide permanent employment for as many as possible subject to availability of the vacancies.

It is further submitted that at para 6(k) of the approach paper, it was made clear that this would be one time exercise in full and final settlement of all the aims and disputes for the past period in respect of temporary workmen covered by the settlement. This would mean that the Government of India guidelines would cover only those persons who were temporarily employed for the period specified therein and not otherwise. As such, it is submitted that the Respondent s have not only followed the Government of India guidelines but in fact covered cases of the employees who had worked for less than 90 days. As such, question of violation does not arise and in any case those were only broad guidelines and not directives".

10. The Workman submits that the bank also referred a subsequent settlement dated 9.1.1991 wherein there is a clause to the effect- that the panel of temporary employees and the panel of daily wage employees will be operated to a particular period. Therefore, their cases will not be considered. The Management herein relying upon this settlement in their impugned action. It is submitted that even the settlement dated 9.1.1991 will not empower the management to terminate the services of the temporary employees who are working in the bank services like the Workman herein as it does not specify the termination of the employees. In fact there are so many vacancies wherein the Management has engaged several new persons as temporary messengers/ attendars/ sweepers etc., even after the judgment of Hon'ble High Court without considering the cases of the similarly situated candidates like the Workman herein. It is submitted inspite of engaging fresh candidates as is now being done by the Management they would have continued the similarly situated candidates like the Workman herein in the services of the bank and consider their cases for absorption in view of the circulars issued by Central Government as well as the directions of this Hon'ble Court in Writ Petition No.4194/97, dated 5.3.97. In view of the circulars issued by the Central Government, the Management should not have relied upon the settlement dated 9.1.1991. Hence, the impugned action of the Management is illegal, unjust, violative of fundamental rights such as Articles 14,16 and 21 of the Constitution of India.

11. The Workman submits that in W.P. No.4194/97 filed by the union of temporary employees where in they have complained about the non- implementation of the settlements arrived between the parties and sought for absorption. Such employees in the bank services on permanent basis before the date fixed for carrying out the terms of settlement, the Court held that the members of the union had been empanelled in the list, they were not regularized and the time was going to run out to the near future and the Respondent bank and its officers cannot escape from the liability of enforcing the settlement which has been reached and therefore directed that the bank and the officers shall implement the settlement dated 17.11.87 as amended from time to time before the expiry of 31.3.97.

12. Further, it is submitted that in the clause of Settlement it is specifically mentioned that the workmen to be absorbed/appointed in the bank prohibiting any temporary appointments subsequent to the date of settlement even the authorities want to make temporary appointments that should be made only from among the empanelled can be appointed either for temporary vacancy or permanent vacancy except from among the empanelled candidates like the Workman and that should be continued till they are absorbed. The management committed unfair labour practices and terminated the services of the candidates with effect from 1.4.1997 which is arbitrary, discriminatory, contrary to their own guidelines and violative of the constitutional provisions which are guaranteed in Chapter-III of the Constitution of India.

13. The Workman submits that it is strange as to how the panels were allowed to lapse by a so-called Memorandum of Understanding dated 25.2.1997, that the action of terminating such employees like the Workman by virtue of an impugned oral proceedings without implementing the settlement would be illegal and unfair labour practice which cannot be allowed to be perpetuated. That the discontinuance of the Workman after 31.3.97 who had served in the bank in any capacity amounts to retrenchment. It could not have been done without any notice and it violates Sec.25FF of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and the said action is violative of principles of natural justice guaranteed under Chapter III of the Constitution of India. This amounts to retrenchment without one month's notice and taken in view of such notice. Thus, the main proceedings issued by the Respondent is without jurisdiction and is arbitrary, illegal and therefore liable to be quashed. That the alleged Memorandum of Understanding dated 27.2.97, Ex.M5 does not own any legal entity, as the said Memorandum of Understanding is not published anywhere to brought to the notice of the Workman whose rights are being affected. It is submitted that Management did not adhere to the procedure envisaged by the Central Government in its' instructions dated 16.8.90

in the year 1995. The same was not followed in the year 1997 despite there being vacancies. The management has followed the procedure of calling candidates through Employment exchange instead of giving chance to the empanelled candidates like the Workman here. It is pertinent to mention here that the Respondent Management sent letters to the all similarly situated candidates like the Workman in the month of June, 1997, subsequent to the passing of impugned termination orders. After knowing the facts that the candidates are litigating, the Management refused to engage these candidates. It is once again reiterated that the panels are meant for absorption but not for termination. It was the duty of the Management to engage the empanelled candidates like the Workman even in temporary vacancies till they are absorbed permanently in regular vacancies. Hence, the action of the Respondent Management terminating the services of the Workman by oral order dated 31.3.97 is unjust, illegal, violative of principles of natural justice and hence, the Management be directed to reinstate and absorb the Workman and to grant all incidental and consequential benefits.

14. Per contra, Respondent had filed counter and made a contentions that the reference is not tenable and contrary to the provisions of I.D. Act, 1947. Respondent submitted that to tide over severe sub-ordinate staff constraints which arose out of leave vacancies, exigencies, etc., and also owning to the restrictions imposed by the Government of India/Reserve Bank of India on intake of staff, the Respondent bank used to engage sub-ordinate staff like messengers, sweepers, sweeper cum water boys, etc., depending on the availability of work on purely temporary basis for the smooth and uninterrupted functioning of the branches. It is submitted that the All India State Bank of India Staff Federation which represents majority of the employees in the State Bank of India comprising about 98% of the work force as its' members espoused the cause of temporary employees who have put in less than 240 days of temporary service in 12 calendar months in the bank and who were ineligible for any protection under Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 to give a chance for being considered for absorption and permanent appointments.

15. Discussions were held and on 17.11.1987 an agreement was signed between the federation and the Management bank under Sec. 2(p) read with Sec 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules 1957. A copy of the said settlement dated 17.11.87 which may be herein after referred as first settlement is filed and 4 categories were made as it has already been mentioned in the claim statement above, it need not be repeated here. In the first settlement, it was agreed that the temporary employees as categorized would be given a chance for being considered for permanent appointment in the bank's service against the vacancies which are likely to arise during the period 1987 to 1991. On 16.7.88 second settlement was arrived between the Federation and the Bank whereby it was agreed to substitute the period of consideration of vacancies as 1987 to 1992 in place of 1987 to 1991 as contemplated under the first settlement dated 17.11.1987. This is the second settlement. A 3rd settlement was entered into on 27.10.88 and it was agreed that the bank's service against the vacancies likely to arise from 1988 to 1992 was to be considered. Government of India vide its letter dated 16.8.90 issued guidelines to all the public sector banks with regard to recruitment and absorption of temporary employees in public sector banks. The said guidelines were issued to implement on the lines of approach paper on the issue provided by a committee constituted in this regard. Government of India guidelines made it clear that all the public sector banks may follow the provisions laid down in the approach paper. The approach paper specified that the cases of temporary service in 12 consecutive months and who are entitled to benefit of Sec.25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 may be decided by entering into a settlement with the representative union. In respect of temporary employees who had put in less than 240 days of service in 12 consecutive months or less, a settlement could be avoided and however if the Management so desired they could enter into a conciliation settlement with the representative union. In para. 6(h) it is mentioned that only those temporary employees who had put in temporary service of 90 days or more days after 1.1.82 would be eligible for considering under the scheme. Although the Government guidelines envisaged for a settlement in respect of employees who had put in temporary service of 90 days or more days, the bank by way of a further concession entered into settlements. Even in respect of those who had put in less than 90 days and also the bank went a step further and said those persons who are working after 1975 were also considered. Hence, there was a genuine effort on the part of the Respondent bank to provide as many as possible jobs subject to the availability of the vacancies. However, para 6 (k) of the approach paper made it clear that it is a one time, exercise in full and final, settlement of all the claims and disputes for the past period, in respect of temporary workmen covered by the settlement. Another settlement was entered on 9.1.91 herein after referred as 4th settlement and the time limit was extended upto 1994 and separate panel was prepared for temporary employees, casual/daily wagers. It was agreed that while vacancies arising between 1988 to 1994 in respect of temporary employees and in respect of casual/daily wagers, they can be considered for the vacancies arising between 1995-96 only.

16. It is submitted that the administrative set up of the Hyderabad Local Head Office comprises of four Zonal Offices (Zones) at Hyderabad, Vijayawada, Visakhapatnam and Tirupathi covering all the Districts of Andhra Pradesh. In terms of the settlement the Management after following the procedure laid down therein prepared the panels of qualified candidates of temporary employees denoted as 1989 panel and also panel of casual/daily wagers denoted as 1992 panel for giving a chance for being considered for permanent absorption. These panels were prepared zone-wise separately for messengers and non-messengers in the descending order of temporary service put in by the candidates during the stipulated period i.e., 1.7.1975 to 31.7.1988. That the Federation approached the Regional Labour Commissioner(C) for implementation of bi-partite settlement in respect of absorption of temporary

employees. The Regional Labour Commissioner(C) conducted conciliation proceedings and an agreement was arrived between the Federation and the bank. It was agreed that it would be kept alive upto March, 1997. A copy of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.2.1995 signed by the parties is filed as material paper. A settlement was arrived at and an agreement was signed between the Federation and the Management bank on 30.7.1996 under Sec.2 (p) read with Sec.18(1) of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957, which is hereinafter called as 5th settlement. That on 27.2.1997 a Memorandum of understanding was also signed by the federation's affiliate and the bank Management recording the fact that the exercise of identifying the messengerial vacancies as on 31.12.1994 has since been completed by Central Office and thereby 403 messengerial vacancies were sanctioned . It was agreed that these vacancies may be filled from 1989 panel of temporary employees after effecting conversion from full time non-messengerial staff in the usual manner and the agreement was reached accordingly. It was agreed between the Federation's affiliate and the Management bank that in terms of the settlement dated 30.7.1996 both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees would lapse on 31.3.1997. That as agreed upon vacancies were filled from the panels. The Workman who has put in an aggregate temporary service of less than 240 days in a continuous block of 12 months period during 1.7.1975 to 31.7.1988 has no right to seek a direction to consider his candidature for absorption in the Management bank under any rule/law except under the settlement entered into thereon.

17. Respondent contended that, in fact, the case of the Workman can be considered under all the five settlements having got his case considered under provisions of these settlements. All the other provisions and terms of the settlements are also binding on him/her. The Management bank has not violated any of the provisions of the terms of the said settlement. That the very preparation and maintenance of panel is in compliance of the terms agreed under these settlements. These settlements were time bound and they ceased to exist on 31.3.1997. That the bank has never promised that all the candidates in the panel will be absorbed. In the advertisement itself it was made clear that candidates will be considered for absorption in the vacancies that may arise upto 1992. Keeping alive the panels after 31.3.1997 is contrary to the settlements arrived between the State Bank of India Staff Federation and the Management bank. That the settlements are binding on the parties. The Workman is also bound under the terms of the said settlement. The settlement does not suffer from any ambiguity as their language is very clear. The right under the settlements is to give them a chance to be considered for future appointment in the bank's services against the vacancies likely to arise. The settlements were effected to balance the expectations of the temporary employees to be absorbed in permanent service as against the constitutional rights for all eligible persons to be considered for employment every time a vacancy arises. That the alleged dispute including the demand for reinstatement has to be decided in this context. It is submitted that the period of panel list got expired on 31.3.97 and it is an integral term of the settlement and cannot be modified in any proceedings under the law. These temporary employees who unfortunately could not be accommodated for want of vacancies have no further rights to be considered for regularization. That the Hon'ble High Court in WP No.12964/94, held as follows, "It is needless to state that the settlement arrived at between the All India State Bank of India Staff Federation which, is the majority union and the bank Management is binding on the Workmen also. It is not at all the case of the Workman that any of the terms of the settlement has been violated by the bank's Management. If the Workman had worked in the bank on part-time basis before 31.5.94, that itself would not vest in him a right to claim that his services should be regularized on permanent basis against a full time cadre post. The claim put forth by the Workman in the present petition is therefore misconceived and not tenable. However, it is open to the Workman to claim any right which flows from the settlement between the union and the bank Management. As already pointed out that it is not the grievance of the Workman that some right which has flown from the settlement in favour of the Workman has been denied by the bank Management. Therefore, I do not find any ground, let alone substantial ground, to grant the kind of relief sought for by the Workman. Writ Petition fails and is accordingly dismissed. No costs."

18. Further, it is contended that if the panels were not lapsed at the end of designated period and allowed to be continued it would result in making the contracts of temporary employment indirectly permanent through back door entry, which would not only be contrary to the settlements but also to Articles 14 and 16 of Constitution of India and deprive the chances of original claimants who would Come through proper recruitment procedure. As their rights have been crystallized by operation of the settlements. Hence, there is no question of any Legitimate expectation being violated.

19. Similarly placed ex-employees filed WP No.9206/1995 and the batch before the Hon'ble High Court of A.P. and the learned Single Judge allowed the Writ Petitions. Aggrieved by the same WA No.86/98 and the batch was filed and the Division Bench set aside the order of the Single Judge. Thereafter the ex-temporary employees filed Special Leave Petition No.11886-11888 of 1998 before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India also dismissed the SLP. Therefore, reference to the Judgement of the Learned Single Judge in WP No.9206/97 is of no consequences as the same has already been set aside. The observations made in the Judgements cannot be relied upon for any purpose what so ever. The question of operation of Sec.25F would not come into play. Further the issue is covered by various Judgements of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India and various Hon'ble High Courts. Hence, the reference may be ordered that the Workman is not entitled for any relief.

20. In order to fortify his claim Workman has examined himself as WW1 and also filed documents in evidence which has been exhibited as Ex.W1 to W2. Further, the Workman has filed photocopies of documents in support of his claim which are discussed as under:-

Ex.W1 is the service certificate. Ex.W2 is the notification.

21. Though Respondent has filed counter, but the contention made in the counter is not substantiated by any evidence by the Respondent Management.

22. Apart from afore mentioned documents, Learned Counsel for Workman has also filed a long list of various judgements of Hon'ble Supreme Court as well as Hon'ble High Court, which we will discuss at appropriate place in this Award.

23. Heard the argument of Learned Counsel for Workman.

24. On the basis of rival pleadings of both the parties and submissions made by the Learned Counsel for Petitioner following points arise for determination in the industrial dispute :-

I. Whether the 1st settlement dated 17.11.1987, 2nd settlement dated 16.7.1988, 3rd settlement dated 27.10.1988, 4th settlement dated 9.1.1991 and 5th settlement dated 30.7.1996 entered into between State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and also Memorandum of Understanding are binding upon both the parties?

II. Whether the action of State Bank of India, in terminating the services of Workman Sri T. Venkata Swamy, a Messenger with effect from 1.4.1997 is justified?

III. Whether the Workman is entitled for absorption on permanent post in the Branch of Respondent management as per averments made by him in the claim statement?

IV. To what relief if any the Workman is entitled for?

Findings:-

25. Point No.I:- Undisputedly settlements dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988, 9.1.1991 and 30.7.1996, minutes of conciliation proceedings and memorandum of understanding dated 27.2.1997 were executed between the State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation under section 2(p) and 18 (1) of I.D. Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Disputes (Central Rules), 1957.

Section 2(p) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 as follows:-

(p) "settlement" means a settlement arrived at in the course of conciliation proceeding and includes a written agreement between the employer and workmen arrived at otherwise than in the course of conciliation proceeding where such agreement has been signed by the parties thereto in such manner as may be prescribed and a copy thereof has been sent to an officer authorised in this behalf by the appropriate Government and the conciliation officer;

Section 18(1) provides as follows:-

18. Persons on whom settlements and awards are binding.

- [(1) A settlement arrived at by agreement between the employer and Workman otherwise than in the course of conciliation proceeding shall be binding on the parties to the agreement.

Therefore, in view of the provision contained u/s.18 (1) I.D. Act, 1947, terms and conditions enumerated in the aforesaid settlements are binding on the parties to the agreement. The Learned Counsel for Workman has argued that the Workman after going through the selection procedure has successfully been listed in the panel for appointment on the permanent basis in the Respondent management and the empanelled list has to be valid till last person in the empanelled list is appointed on permanent basis. But the impugned order dated 25.3.97, 27.3.97 and 31.3.97, has been issued by Respondent management thereby the services of the Workman has been terminated and the said order is not in consonance of the terms of the agreement entered into between the parties. Further, Workman submits that the Respondent in the 5th settlement has mentioned the date i.e., 31.3.1997 for lapse of empanel list which is illegal and that is not binding upon the Workman. The condition of lapse of empanelment list on 31.3.97 incorporated in the aforesaid 5th settlement, is arbitrary and illegal.

26. The perusal of the impugned order dated 25.3.1997 goes to reveal that the Chief/Branch Manager, SBI Zonal Office has issued the letter to all the branches with regard to the subject not to make any temporary appointments in the Branch in messengerial category from 1.4.1997. The extract of the said letter is given below:-

"We have been advised by the Deputy General Manager, Zonal Office, Hyderabad that as both the panels of temporary employees of 1989 and daily wagers/casual labours of 1992 will lapse by 31.3.1997, it has been decided by Central Office not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial category from 1.4.1997."

Thus, from the contents of the aforesaid letter, it manifest that Head Office of State Bank of India vide letter dated 25.3.1997 has issued direction to all its branches not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial category from 1.4.1997 due to reason of lapse of both panels i.e., 1989 & 1992 on 31.3.1997 as per terms of settlements entered into by both parties. Further, the contents of the subsequent letter dated 27.3.1997 issued by Respondent Management is also direction to Branch Manager, State Bank of India not to make any temporary messengerial category appointment with effect from 1.4.1997 and it has also been communicated to all concerned that the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers maintained by Zonal offices stand lapsed from 31.1.1997. Further, office order dated 31.3.1997 has been issued by Respondent management that goes to reveal that the said office order has been issued to this effect that, "Consequent on absorption of temporary employees in permanent cadre, it has been decided by the competent authority that no one onwards, no further daily labour or temporary employees/appointments should be resorted to/engaged/employed." Therefore, it reflects from the contents of the aforesaid orders that the temporary appointment in messengerial category and daily labour has been stopped by the Respondent management with effect from 1.4.1997 because of the lapsed of panel of temporary workers and daily wagers by 31.3.1997. The agreement for lapse of both the panels on 31.3.1997 is contained in the 5th settlement which has been arrived at between the parties on dated 30.7.1996 with the consensus of both the parties. Therefore, Workman can not challenge the terms and conditions contained in settlement dated 30.7.1996 regarding lapse of panel on 31.3.1997 as agreed between State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation. As per provision contained u/s.18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 the said Agreement dated 30.7.1996 is binding on both the parties.

In the case of **Allied Sales Corporation Secunderabad vs.The Authority Under Andhra Pradesh..... 1990 II LLJ 510 AP para 414, Hon'ble Court have held:-**

"*4. There was a settlement between the Management and the workmen under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act on 25th April 1983 under which the age of superannuation of the workmen was fixed at 55 years. The settlement was to be in force upto 30th June 1986 and the next settlement, incorporating practically the same terms, was again entered into on 4th February 1987 under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act. There is no dispute that these settlements are under Section 18(1).*

14. Now the Authority constituted under Section 41(1) of the Act is an authority with very limited jurisdiction. It can only decide in the first appeal whether a termination by the management is valid or not and is within the parameters of Section 40 of the Act. The said Authority, in our view, has absolutely no jurisdiction to decide whether a settlement entered into under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act between the representatives of the Workmen and of the Management, is vitiated by undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion on the part of the Management. The Authority, namely, the Assistant Commissioner of Labour, was never intended by the A.P. Legislature to have jurisdiction to go into the question of the validity of a settlement arrived at under Section 18 of the Industrial Disputes Act by an Industrial Court. That Parliament has, in fact, constituted Industrial Courts under the Industrial Disputes Act, with extensive powers cannot be disputed. What we mean to say is that the Authority under Section 41(1) of the A.P. Act has no jurisdiction what-so-ever either to question or to decide about the validity of any such settlements. If parties to a settlement have a grievance about the validity of a settlement, it is for them to agitate the matter before the appropriate forum and they cannot ask an Authority constituted under Section 41(1) of the A.P. Shops and Establishments Act, 1966 with limited jurisdiction, to go into any such question and, that too, incidentally while deciding whether retirement as per the contract of employment, is legal or not."

It is not the case of Workman that aforesaid settlements are vitiated by undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion on the part of the management. If the Workman feeling aggrieved by any terms of settlement/ agreement on the aforementioned grounds then he can challenge of settlement before a competent authority under the Act, 1947. But here in the instant matter it is not a case of Workman that aforementioned settlement has been entered into between the parties on the ground of undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion. Therefore, Workman is barred to raise any objection in respect of fixing the date of lapse of both panels on 31.3.1997 as agreed between both the parties and Workman can not challenge any terms of said Agreement.

Further in the case of **Herbertsons Limited Vs. Workmen of Herbertsons Limited and Ors, 1977 AIR 322,** Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

The Tribunal thought that the question of the quantum of membership of the 2nd Respondent did not call for a finding at all in view of 1his Court's order. As observed above that was not a correct assumption. On the other hand, we feel that this view of the Tribunal has led it to approach the matter in an entirely erroneous manner. The Tribunal is, rightly enough, conscious that under section 18 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act the settlement was binding on the company and the members of the 3rd Respondent union. Even so, the Tribunal devoted nearly half of its order in scanning the evidence given by the company and Respondent No. 3 to find out whether the terms of the settlement had been explained by the President of the union to the workmen or not and whether the workers voluntarily accepted the settlement knowing all the "consequences". This to our mind is again an entirely wrong approach.

"When a recognised union negotiates with an employer the workers as individuals do not come into the picture. It is not necessary that each individual worker should know the implications of the settlement since a recognised union, which is expected to protect the legitimate interests of labour, enters into a settlement in the best interests of labour.

This would be the normal rule. We cannot altogether rule out exceptional cases where there may be allegations of mala fides, fraud or even corruption or other induce- ments. Nothing of that kind has been suggested against the President of the 3rd Respondent in this case. That being the position, prima facie, this is a settlement in the course of collective bargaining and, therefore, is entitled to due weight and consideration.

It is not possible to scan the settlement in bits and pieces and hold some parts good and acceptable and others bad. Unless it can be demonstrated that the objectionable portion is such that it completely outweighs all the other advantages gained the Court will be slow to hold a settle- ment as unfair and unjust. The settlement has to be accepted or rejected as a whole and we are unable to reject it as a whole as unfair or unjust. Even before this Court the 3rd Respondent representing admittedly the large majority of the workmen has stood by this settlement and that is a strong factor which it is difficult to ignore. As stated elsewhere in the judgment, we cannot also be oblivious of the fact that all workmen of the company have accepted the settlement. Besides, the period of settlement has since expired and we are informed that the employer and the 3rd Respondent are negotiating another settlement with further improvements. These factors, apart from what has been stated above, and the need for industrial peace and harmony when a union backed by a large majority of workmen has accepted a settlement in the course of collective bargaining have impelled us not to interfere with this settlement. That being the position, we unhold the settlement as fair and just and order that the award of the Tribunal shall be substituted by the settlement dated October 18, 1973. The said settlement shall be the substituted award. The appeal is disposed of accordingly. There will be no order as to costs."

Therefore, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above, the contention of the Workman that the date fixed for lapse of empanelled list on 31.3.1997 for appointment to the permanent post vide 5th Settlement dated 30.7.1996 is arbitrary, illegal is not untenable. The recognized union of Workmen has negotiated with the Respondent Bank Management representing large number of Workmen and the Workman as individual do not come into picture. Workman in the instant case has work as temporary Workmen in the Respondent Branch and in response of Notification he had applied for inclusion of his name in the panel and he was selected for inclusion his name in the panel list to be utilized for absorption of such Workman to permanent post in order of their seniority in the list. The Settlement dated 30.7.1996 between State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation under Sec.2(p) and Sec.18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 has clearly provided as regard non-messengerial position and it is agreed that all such posts sanctioned fallen vacant upto 31.3.1997 shall be filled before empanel list is allowed to lapse. Thus, in view of law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, in the instant case, Agreement dated 30.7.1996 was entered into between both the parties in respect of lapsing of the both the panels on 31.3.1997 and absorption of the Workmen from panel list was subject to availability of vacancy of post likely to arise upto 31.3.1997, have a binding force on Workman as well as management of State Bank of India in view of provision contained under section 18 (1) of I.D. Act, 1947.

Thus, Point No.I is answered against the Workman and in favour of the Respondent.

27. **Point No.II**:- Firstly, it is submitted on behalf of the Workman that the Respondent has terminated his services by oral order on 1.4.1997 without issuing any notice or paying any salary or compensation in lieu thereof. Therefore, the termination order of the Workman from service is in violation of provision contained Under Section 25 F of I.D. Act, 1947. Therefore, the order is liable to be set aside.

28. On the other hand, Respondent counsel contended that Workman has not worked for 240 days in any preceding calendar year. Therefore, reference of the industrial dispute is not relevant. In this context, the Workman has examined himself as WW1 who has reiterated that Workman has been terminated from service by Respondent on 1.4.1997 without notice of salary or compensation in lieu thereof. Before examining the claim of the Workman on merit it would be apposite to reproduce the provision contained under section 25 F:-

Section 25F provides:-

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].

Compensation to workmen in case of transfer of undertakings.

Section 25B defines the term continuous service which provides

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 authorized 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;

In order to prove the fact of 240 days of service within 12 months of a calendar year just preceding from the date of termination, the initial burden of proof lies upon the Workman and the Workman has to prove this factum by adducing his oral as well as documentary evidence in support of his claim.

Further, how to calculate 240 days of service by the Workman in a calendar year. In this context the reference of decisions of Hon'ble Supreme Court is relevant and the same are discussed below:-

In Rajasthan State Ganganagar S. Mills Ltd. v. State of Rajasthan and Anr. (2004) Apex Court held:

"It was the case of the Workman that he had worked for more than 240 days in the year concerned. This claim was denied by the appellant. It was for the claimant to lead evidence to show that he had worked for 240 days in the year preceding the date of his termination. He has filed an affidavit. It is statement which is in his favor and that cannot be regarded as sufficient evidence for any Court or Tribunal to come to the conclusion that in fact the claimant had worked for 240 days in a year These aspects were highlighted in Range Forest Officer v. S.T. Hadimani (2002 (3) SCC 25. No proof of receipt of salary or wages for 240 days or order or record in that regard was produced. Mere non-production of the muster roll for a particular period was not sufficient for the Labour Court held that the Workman had worked for 240 days as claimed."

In Municipal Corporation, Faridabad v. Siri Niwas (2004 (8) SCC 195), held "*the burden was on the Workman to show that he was working for more than 240 days in the preceding one year prior to his alleged retrenchment." In M.P. Electricity Board v. Hariram (2004 (8) SCC 246) the position was again reiterated in paragraph 11 as follows: "The above burden having not been discharged and the Labour Court having held so, in our opinion, the Industrial Court and the High Court erred in basing an order of reinstatement solely on an adverse inference drawn erroneously ..*"

In the case of Manager, RBI, Bangalore vs. S Mani (2005) SCC Page 100, the 3 Judges Bench of the Apex Court held that "*the initial burden of proof was on the Workman to show that he had completed 240 days of service."*

Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of Mohan Lal vs Management BEL 1981 SCC page 225 has laid down the principle that how to count 240 days of service within one year it is held: *"Clause (2)(a) provides for a fiction to treat a Workman in continuous service for a period of one year despite the fact that he has not rendered uninterrupted service for a period of one year but he has rendered period of 240 days during the period of 12 calendar service for months counting backwards and just preceding the relevant date being the date of retrenchment. In other words, in order to invoke the fiction enacted in clause (2)(a) it is necessary to determine first the relevant date, ie the date of termination of service which is complained of as retrenchment. After that date is ascertained. move backward to a period of 12 months just preceding the date of retrenchment and then ascertain whether within the period of 12 months, the Workman has rendered service for a period of 240 days. If these three facts are affirmatively answered in favor of the Workman pursuant to the deeming fiction enacted in clause (2)(a) it will have to be assumed that the Workman is in continuous service for a period of one year and he will satisfy the eligibility qualification enacted in Section 25-F"*

"14. We have already extracted section 25B since its amendment and the change in language is the legislative exposition of which note must be taken. In fact, we need not further dilate upon this aspect because in Surendra Kumar Verma and Ors. v. Central Government Industrial-cum-Labour Court, New Delhi and Anr., Chinnappa Reddy. J., after noticing the amendment and referring to the decision in Sur Enamel and Stamping Works (P) Ltd case, held as under:

"These changes brought about by Act 36 of 1964 appear to be clearly designed to provide that a Workman who has actually worked under the employer for not less than 240 days during a period of twelve months shall be deemed to have been in continuous service for a period of one year whether or not he has in fact been in such continuous service for a period of one year. It is enough that he has worked for 240 days in a period of 12 months, it is not necessary that he should have been in the service of the employer for one whole year."

In a concurring judgment Pathak J. agreed with this interpretation of section 25B(2). Therefore, both on principle and on precedent it must be held that section 25B(2) comprehends a situation where a Workman is not in employment

for a period of 12 calendar months, but has rendered service for a period of 240 days within the period of 12 calendar months commencing and counting backwards from the relevant date, i.e. the date of retrenchment. If he has, he would be deemed to be in continuous service for a period of one year for the purpose of section 25B and Chapter VA."

Thus, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above the initial burden of proof lies upon the Workman to show that he has completed 240 days of the service with the Respondent just preceding from the date of his termination. Further, in respect of the employment of calculating the 240 days service provision contained under Section 25-F read with Section 25-B of the I.D. Act, 1947.

29. The Petitioner in his chief examination has reiterated the version of the claim statement. This witness WW1 was cross examined by the Respondent counsel and in his cross examination witness has stated that he joined as messenger at Bazar branch, Machilipatnam of State Bank of India for the first time without any written appointment order. Further, witness states that during the period 19.12.1984 to 22.8.1989 he worked for 59 days. His total working days are 680 days upto 1997. Further, witness states that he stopped attending the bank service from 1997, but he was not issued any written order of removal. He did not give any representation to the bank and he has worked as an agricultural labourer. Further, witness states he was not appointed as per the recruitment selection procedure.

Thus, from the above statement of the witness in cross examination it manifests that Workman was not recruited by any selection procedure rather he had worked as a casual Workman who was engaged by the Respondent for the work intermittently for different periods. Thus, the Workman has not completed 240 days of his service in any calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination. Therefore, he has not fulfilled the condition mentioned under section 25 F of the ID Act, hence, the provision of Section 25F is not applicable to his case. Further, witness in his cross examination has admitted that he did not work continuously for 240 days in any branch, in any year and he used to work depending upon the availability of the work in the branch. Thus, in view of the statement of Petitioner witness, he does not fulfill the condition of continuous service of one year as provided under Section 25F of the Act, therefore, the claim of the Petitioner that he has been terminated from service by the Respondent in violation of the provision of Section 25F of the Act is not maintainable.

30. Per contra, the Learned Counsel for Respondent has submitted the allegation of Workman that he was terminated from services is not correct. As the vacancies were filled up on regular basis in order of their respective seniority the non-engagement of the Workman does not amount to termination. Further, Respondent contended that no law provide that even though there is no work temporary employee should be continued in the bank work as the very engagement of Workman was subject to availability of work. Therefore, the allegation that the bank has indulged in unfair labour practice is incorrect.

31. Thus, in view of the fore gone discussion and contentions made by the Respondent , I find the force in the argument advanced by the Respondent that in the instant matter, Workman was not terminated from service by order dated 1.4.1997 rather he was disengaged in view of the non-availability of the work in the branch. Further, there was direction issued by the Head Office of the Respondent authority not to engage any daily wager Workman/ temporary Worker w.e.f. 1.4.1997. Thus, such disengagement of Workman does not amount to termination. Moreover, the Workman failed to prove his claim that he was terminated in contravention of provision of Sec.25F of the I.D. Act, 1947 as he failed to establish his plea by any oral or documentary evidence that he had worked for 240 days continuously in a twelve months of calendar year just preceding from date of termination i.e., 1.4.1997.

32. Further, perusal of the order dated 25.3.1997 goes to reveal that the Chief Branch Manager, State Bank of India has issued the letter to Zonal Office with direction to all its branches to this effect that they have been advised by the DGM, Zonal Office, Hyderabad that as both the panel of temporary employees of 1989 and daily wagers/casual labour of 1992 will lapse on 31.3.1997 it has been decided by central office not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial cadre from 1.4.1997, therefore it was directed to issue suitable instructions not to make temporary appointments from 1.4.1997. There is no mention in this order that the Workman herein has been terminated from service by this order.

33. Further, the circular dated 27.3.1997 was issued by DGM, SBI to all branches in commercial network in respect of the non-appointment of temporary employees in subordinate cadre and it has directed not to make any temporary employment in the subordinate cadre with effect from 1.4.97 and further, it has directed to ensure that no temporary/casual/daily basis appointment of the petty cash. Further, it is directed to all Branch Managers that any deviation in this regard will be viewed seriously. Thus, these circulars do not reflect that the Workman has been terminated from service by this order.

34. Similarly, office order dated 31.3.1997 is simply a direction to all branches of the Respondent bank by DGM that no further daily labour should be engaged or employed. Therefore, the plea of the Workman that he has been terminated by the aforesaid order dated 25.3.1997, 27.3.1997 and 31.3.1997 from the service by the Respondent is not acceptable. The evidence adduced by the Workman clearly goes to reveal that he had worked as a daily wager for which he has been paid wages according to number of working days. As there was an order for prohibition for engaging temporary workmen, in the bank, therefore, Workman could not be engaged by the Respondent for work

from 1.4.1997 and there after. It is settled law that the daily wagers are engaged by the employer depending upon the availability of work and as the work was not available the Workman was not engaged further by the Respondent management. Therefore, the Workman on the ground of number of days he had worked in the Respondent bank cannot claim any right to reinstate him into the employment. As the Workman failed to prove the mandatory condition of 240 days of continuous service as required under Sec.25F of I.D. Act, 1947. Therefore, the disengagement of Workman from work can not be termed in contravention of provision contained under Sec.25F and 25 B of the I.D. Act, 1947.

Thus, this point is answered against the Workman and in favour of Respondent .

35. **Point No.III**:- In this context, the Workman has contended that the management failed to implement the selected panels during its valid tenure. The management adopted the back door methods contrary to the settlements and filled up the vacancies. The same is evident from the proceedings dated 18.11.1993 a copy of the same is filed in the material papers and the same may be read as part of the claim statement. Further, it is submitted that management has to adhere the procedure issued by the Central Government, the instructions dated 16.8.1990 in the year 1995, but same was not followed in the year 1997 despite there being vacancies. The management has followed the procedure of calling candidates through employment exchange instead of giving chance to the empanelled candidates like the Workman herein. The management sent call letters to the similarly situated candidates like the Workman in the month of June 1997 subsequent to issuance of impugned termination orders. After knowing the fact that they are litigating the issue by way of dispute, the management has refused to engage those candidates, the copies of call letters issued are filed herein along with claim petition. The Workman herein reiterates that the panels are meant for absorption but not for termination. In view of the same a duty is cast upon the Respondent management to engage the empanelled candidates like the Workman herein even in temporary vacancies till they are absorbed permanently in regular vacancies.

36. On the other hand, Respondent has contended that the Federation approached Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) for implementation of bipartite settlement in respect of the absorption of temporary employees. The Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) conducted conciliation proceedings and agreement was arrived at between the Federation and the Management bank. It is submitted that it was agreed between the Federation and the Management that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers /casual labour would be kept alive upto March, 1997 and the vacancies as agreed to under the afore set out settlements will be filled from both the lists concurrently. A copy of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.1995 signed by the parties to the dispute is filed as a material paper. Further, it is submitted that the settlement was arrived at and an agreement was signed between the Federation and the Management bank on 30.7.1996 under Section 2(p) read with Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules 1957 which is binding on the parties. A copy of this agreement which hereinafter may be referred to as 5th settlement for brevity, is also filed as a material paper. The 5th settlement dated 30.7.1996 whereunder the earlier four settlements dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988 and 9.1.1991 were also referred, it was agreed to, by the Federation and the Management bank that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees will be kept alive upto March, 1997 for filling the vacancies existing/arrived at as on 31.12.1994 as per the norms agreed to between the bank and Federation and that thereafter the said panels would lapse. It was also agreed that within the framework of the above settlements the modalities about drawing names from either the panel of temporary employees or the panel of daily wagers and casual labour would be decided administratively on circle to circle basis depending upon the local requirements in consultation with the Federation's affiliate by the Circle management. It was further agreed that all messenger real vacancies/positions in the subordinate cadre including part-time attendants specifically provided as leave reserve will be filled by the end of 31.3.1997. Further, Respondent contended that on 27.2.1997 a memorandum of understanding was also signed between the Federation's affiliate and the bank management regarding the fact that the exercise of identifying the messengerial vacancies as on 31.12.1994 has since been completed by central office and thereby 403 messengerial vacancies were sanctioned to the circle of the Management bank and it was agreed that these vacancies may be filled from 1989 panel of temporary employees after effecting conversion from full time non-messengerial staff in the usual manner and the agreement was reached upon. Further, it was agreed between the Federations affiliate and the management bank that in terms of the settlement dated 30.7.1996 both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers /casual employees would lapse on 31.3.1997.

37. The Workman has contended that the empanelled list prepared by the Respondent management for appointment of temporary and daily wage Workers to the permanent post cannot lapse unless until it is exhausted by appointing all the empanelled persons and it should continue even after 31.3.1997, i.e., the date fixed for the lapse of panel. It is undisputed that the date of lapse of empanelled list of Workmen has been fixed to 31.3.1997 as mentioned in the settlement dated 30.7.1996, and agreed between the parties. It is settled law that and once the life of panel list lapses on the date as agreed between the parties it cannot be extended beyond that date. In the instant case the panel list of the workmen was valid upto 31.3.1997 in view of the terms and conditions enumerated in the 5th Settlement entered into between the parties. As the lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997 has been agreed by State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation through 5th Settlement, the Workman is not competent to challenge the same.

In this context I would like to take reference of the decision of the apex court in the case of **Syndicate Bank and Ors vs. Shankar Paul and Ors , AIR 1997 SC 3091, therein the Hon'ble Apex Court** have held:-

"Till 1982, the branches of the appellant Bank in Calcutta region were recruiting persons locally to work as temporary attenders in leave vacancies. In view of the revised procedure prescribed by the Government of India in respect of such temporary appointments, the Calcutta regional office of the appellant Bank issued a circular to all of its branches on 14.8.1982, instructing all the branches under it to discontinue the old practice from 1.6.1982 and appoint only empanelled candidates. The regional office was to prepare a panel of eligible candidates, after calling names from the local/district employment exchange, and split it up branch-wise. Following that new procedure yearly panels were prepared thereafter. Names of the Respondent s were for the first time included in the panel prepared for the period 7.2.1987 to 6.2.1988. By its letter dated 7.2.1987 the Bank had informed the Respondent s that the panel was valid for one year only and that inclusion of their names in the panel was not to confer on them any right to seek permanent appointment in the service of the bank. Considering the object with which the panel was prepared and the fact that it was an yearly panel expiring on 6.2.1988, we are of the opinion that the Respondent s did not get any right, because of inclusion of their names in the said panel, for permanent absorption in the service of the Bank. Whatever conditional right they had came to an end with the expiry of the panel. The claim of the Respondent s, as contained in the writ petition was thus misconceived and therefore the learned single Judge and the Division Bench, when it first decided the appeal, were right in dismissing the writ petition and the appeal respectively."

Thus, in view of the above law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court and in view of the terms and conditions of the 5th Settlement the contention of the Workman that empanelled list should continue even after 31.3.1997 till the last Workman in the panel is absorbed is not tenable. The contention of the Workman is baseless in view of recital in the settlement. Therefore, in view of the fore gone discussion and finding given at Point No. I regarding binding nature of Settlements and terms and conditions enumerated therein, in view of the provision contained u/s.18(1) of the I.D. Act, 1947, I am of the considered view that life of panels lapsed on 31.3.1997 in view of terms of settlement dated 30.7.1996 and plea of Workman that the panel shall continue even after 31.3.1997 till last man absorbed has no legal force and same is untenable.

38. Undisputedly, settlement agreement dated 30.7.1996 was executed between the State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation and in that settlement it was agreed that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/ casual employees will be used for filling vacancies existing as on 31.12.1994 as per the norms agreed between the bank and the Federation. These empanelled workmen were to be given a chance for permanent appointment in the bank against vacancies arising up to December 1994 whereas the daily wagers/ casual employees were to be considered against the vacancies arise from January 1995 to December 1996, whereby the said panel would lapse. It was agreed that the vacancies falls upto 31.3.1997 shall be filled before the empanelled list is allowed to lapse. Thus, the claim of the Workman to the post of permanent non-messenger in the Respondent management was subject to the availability of the sanctioned post and vacancies arising upto 31.3.1997. The workmen given chance to the permanent post were seniors in number of working days in panel list and Workman herein was junior to those workmen. Therefore, Workman could not be given absorption to permanent post being junior to other workmen in the panel list.

39. As regard the regularization, the witness has stated that he do not have panel list, he is not a member of any employees federation and he do not know whether the settlements between the management and the federation will be applicable to him. Further, this witness states that, he is not aware of the settlements between the federation and management and also stated that he do not have any knowledge about the agreements speaks of the absorption in permanent position. Thus, from the above statement of the witness it manifests that he failed to prove his claim for regularization in the service of the Respondent.

40. However, Workman has taken the plea that the panels of Workmen for absorption in the employment of the Respondent banks (panels of temporary employees and daily wagers) has been lapsed on 31.3.1997 in contravention of terms of settlement as the object of preparing the entire empanelment of temporary and daily wagers was to provide them permanent employment and till the both the panel lists exhausted the panel list cannot be lapsed on 31.3.1997 and the date of lapsing of the panel on 31.3.1997 has been fixed by the Respondent arbitrarily without any authority.

41. In this context, the perusal of Settlement dated 30.7.1996 reveals that the 5th Settlement dated 30.7.1996 was entered under Section 2(p) and 18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Dispute (Central) Rules 1957. This settlement has been entered into by the competent parties and in this settlement parties thereto agreed that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees will lapse on 31.3.1997. Thus the date of lapse of panel was fixed by both the parties with consensus under the settlement dated 30.7.1996 and same is binding upon the Workman under the provision of Section 18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947. Moreover, this issue of binding force of the settlement dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988 and 9.1.1991 has already been discussed, decided at finding in Point No.I of this award. However, the legality and validity of the aforementioned settlement has not been challenged by the Workman before any competent forum. Thus, claim of Workman that the date of lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997 has been fixed arbitrarily by the Respondent bank is untenable. As regard the claim of Workman for

his absorption to the permanent post it is settled law that the Workman can not claim his regularization to permanent post merely on the basis of number of working days.

42. In this context the reference of the decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Oil and Natural Gas Corporation vs Krishan Gopal 2020(3) SCALE 272, date of decision 7.2.2020** is relevant therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have has laid down principle regarding regularization of the Workman on permanent posts. Hon'ble Supreme Court have laid down the prepositions of regularization of the workmen to permanent post is as under:-

"*(i) Wide as they are, the powers of the Labour Court and the Industrial Court cannot extend to a direction to order regularisation, where such a direction would in the context of public employment offend the provisions contained in Article 14 of the Constitution;*

(ii) The statutory power of the Labour Court or Industrial Court to grant relief to workmen including the status of permanency continues to exist in circumstances where the employer has indulged in an unfair labour practice by not filling up permanent posts even though such posts are available and by continuing to employ workmen as temporary or daily wage employees despite their performing the same work as regular workmen on lower wages;

(iii) The power to create permanent or sanctioned posts lies outside the judicial domain and where no posts are available, a direction to grant regularisation would be impermissible merely on the basis of the number of years of service;

(iv) Where an employer has regularised similarly situated workmen either in a scheme or otherwise, it would be open to workmen who have been deprived of the same benefit at par with the workmen who have been regularised to make a complaint before the Labour or Industrial Court, since the deprivation of the benefit would amount to a violation of Article 14; and

(v) In order to constitute an unfair labour practice under Section 2(ra) read with Item 10 of the Vth Schedule of the ID Act, the employer should be engaging workmen as badlis, temporaries or casuals, and continuing them for years, with the object of depriving them of the benefits payable to permanent workmen.

Thus, in view of the principles laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court as discussed above, in the instant matter the Workman utterly failed to prove his claim by adducing any documentary or oral evidence that the employer has indulged in unfair labour practice by not filling the permanent posts even though such posts are available and by continuing to employ workmen as temporary or daily wage employees despite their performance was the same work, as regular workmen on lower wages.

43. Respondent has contended that all the vacancies exist and arise upto 31.3.1997 has been filled up from the panel list in order of seniority and no vacancy exists or arises as on 31.3.1997 remained unfilled. Further, it is contended that as per terms of settlement the life of panel lists has been lapsed on 31.3.1997, hence, there is no occasion to extend the life of panel lists beyond 31.3.1997. However, the workman failed to prove contrary by any evidence to the aforesaid contention of the Respondent that the vacancies were existing as on 31.3.1997 and the workman was not given absorption to the permanent post in order of his seniority. It is settled law that the power to create permanent or sanctioned post lies outside the judicial domain and where no posts are available, a direction to grant regularization would be impermissible merely on the basis of the number of years of service. Therefore, the claim of the workman on this ground also not acceptable.

44. Further, as per the of settlement, panel was prepared for absorption of the workmen on the permanent posts has already been lapsed on 31.3.1997 and the vacancies existing and arising upto 31.12.1994 and upto 31.3.1997 as settlement dated 30.7.1996 has been filled up from the panel by appointing the workmen as per seniority in the panel list. Workman witness WW1 in his cross examination has himself admitted this fact that, some of the temporary employees whose names were included in the panel were given regular appointment in the bank in order of their seniority in the panel. The Workman failed to show that there was any breach of terms of settlement has been committed by the Respondent in appointment to permanent post from aforesaid panel list.

45. As discussed in preceding paragraph of this Award, the life of the panel has not been extended beyond 31.3.1997, by any further settlement hence, the panel list in which name of the Workman was included got expired on 31.3.1997. It is not the case of the Workman that Respondent has regularized similarly situated workmen either in the scheme or otherwise and the Workman has been deprived of same benefit on par with those workmen or the vacancies remained unfilled on the date of lapse of panels i.e., 31.3.1997, Industrial Tribunal has no jurisdiction to extend the date of lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997. This Tribunal can not order for regularization of workmen to the permanent post in contravention of the provision of Article 14 of the Constitution of India.

In the case of **Mahboob Deepak vs. Nagar Panchayat Gajraula & Anr, Civil Appeal No.5875/2007 date of judgement 13.12.2007,** Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

"8. Respondent is a Local Authority. The terms and conditions of employment of the employees are governed by a statute and statutory rules. No appointment can be made by a Local Authority without following the provisions of the recruitment rules. Any appointment made in violation of the said rules as also the constitutional scheme of equality as contained in Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India would be a nullity.

9. Due to some exigency of work, although recruitment on daily wages or on an ad hoc basis was permissible, but by reason thereof an employee cannot claim any right to be permanently absorbed in service or made permanent in absence of any statute or statutory rules. Merely because an employee has completed 240 days of work in a year preceding the date of retrenchment, the same would not mean that his services were liable to be regularized."

Therefore, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, the claim of the Workman for absorption merely on the basis of number of day of work in the Respondent bank Branch is not acceptable. As regard plea of the Workman that the Workman should have been given employment even after 31.3.1997 as temporary Workman, it is the discretion of Respondent to engage the Workman depending upon availability of work and this Tribunal can not direct the Respondent to engage the Workman in the absent of such rule/scheme.

46. In view of principle laid down by Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above, in the instant matter Workman utterly failed to establish the fact of rendering continuous service for a period of 240 days of service within a period of 12 calendar months commencing and coming backward from relevant date i.e., the date of retrenchment, if has he would be denied to be in continuous service for a period of one year. Therefore, the provision contained under Sec.25F of retrenchment is not applicable to Workman.

Counsel for Workman has relied upon number of decisions of Hon'ble High Court and Hon'ble Supreme Court and few of them are discussed herein:-

In the case of **F.C.I., vs. Kamdhenu Cattle Feed Industries 1993 (1) SCC 71,** therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

"7. In contractual sphere as in all other State actions, the State and all its instrumentalities have to conform to Article 14 of the Constitution of which non-arbitrariness is a significant facet. There is no unfettered discretion in public law: A public authority possesses powers only to use them for public good. This impose the duty to act fairly and to adopt a procedure which is `fairplay in action'. Due observance of this obligation as a part of good administration raises a reasonable or legitimate expectation in every citizen to be treated fairly in his interaction with the State and its instrumentalities, with this element forming a necessary component of the decision making process in all State actions. To satisfy this requirement of non- arbitrariness in a State action, it is, therefore, necessary to consider and give due weight to the reasonable or legitimate expectations of the persons likely lo be affected by the decision or else that unfairness in the exercise of the power may amount to an abuse or excess of power apart from affecting the bona fides of the decision in a given case. The decision so made would be exposed to challenge on the ground of arbitrariness. Rule of law does not completely eliminate discretion in the exercise of power, as it is unrealistic, but providers for control of its exercise by judicial review."

In the case of **State Bank of India, R.O., Vijayawada vs. Industrial Tribunal, Hyderabad WP No.193/1997,** therein Hon'ble High Court have held,

"*Sri Krovvidi Narasimham, the learned counsel for the 2nd Respondent contends, supporting the award that it was a permanent vacancy and even though the 2nd Respondent was appointed on temporary basis, his services were not liable to be terminated and he was to be regularised into service on permanent basis. Shastry award warrants that no temporary appointment can be made to a permanent post. But the matter is now covered by two division bench judgements dated 28.11.1986 in W.A. No.791 of 1986 and 25.8.1987 in W.A. No.270 of 1982. The ratio decided in the two judgements is to the effect that there cannot be any mandate to appoint employees on permanent basis when the requirement was for appointment on temporary basis. But it is held in the said judgements that when a temporary appointee is ousted from service and not for misconduct and, if again temporary appointment is to be made, then, the case of such temporary appointee who was ousted, has got to be considered in accordance with Sec. 25-H of the Act."*

In the case of **State of Haryana and others vs. Piara Singh and others. 1992 (4) SCC 118,** therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

" 49. If for any reason an adhoc or temporary employee is continued for a fairly long spell, the authorities must consider his case for regularization provided he is eligible and qualified according to the rules and his service record is satisfactory and his appointment does not run counter to the reservation policy of the state."

In the above cited judgements by the Workman the facts of the case are different hence do not apply to instant case of Workman.

47. Thus, in view of fore gone discussion and laws laid down by Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above, the claim of workman of regularization in the employment of Respondent is not substantiated by the evidence of Petitioner, WW1 in his cross examination has admitted that he is not aware of any settlements and he is not having any document to show that any person who worked for less number of days than him was given appointment in the bank and he has no document to show that any of his juniors is continuing in service of the bank as of now. Therefore, the claim of the Petitioner for regularization in the employment of Respondent bank is not tenable. Further, Petitioner failed to produce any document in evidence to establish that any temporary employee junior to him is working in the Respondent bank. Therefore, Petitioner is not entitled for regularization in the service of the Respondent.

This point is answered against the Petitioner Workman and in favour of the Respondent.

48. **Point No.IV**:- In view of the discussion and finding given at Point Nos. I, II and III, the Workman is not entitled for any relief and claim statement of Workman sans merit and liable to be dismissed.

This Point is answered accordingly.

AWARD

In view of the fore gone discussion, it is held that the action of the Respondent bank in terminating the services of Sri T. Venkata Swamy, Ex. Messenger by way of oral orders w.e.f. 1.4.1997 is justified. Hence, the Petitioner is not entitled for any relief as prayed for. The claim statement filed by Workman sans merit, hence, dismissed.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, Personal Assistant, transcribed by her, corrected and signed by me on this the 3rd day of July, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner	Witnesses examined for the Respondent
WW1: Sri T. Venkata Swamy	NIL

Documents marked for the Petitioner

Ex.W1: Photocopy of service certificate

Ex.W2: Photocopy of News paper advertisement/ notification

Documents marked for the Respondent

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 27 जुलाई, 2026

का.आ. 1679.— औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार भारतीय स्टेट बैंक के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजको और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण – सह – श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद के पंचाट (सन्दर्भ संख्या 117/2003) को प्रकाशित करती है,

[सं. एल. 39025/01/2026-आई.आर.(बी-II)-94]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 27th July, 2026

S.O. 1679.— In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (LC.No.117/2003) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Hyderabad as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the Management of State Bank of India and their workmen,

[No. L-39025/01/2026- IR (B-II)-94]

SALONI, Dy. Director

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD

Present: - **Sri Irfan Qamar**

Presiding Officer

Dated the 3rd day of July, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE L.C.No.117/2003

Between:

Sri M. Venkateswara Rao,

S/o Sundra Rao,

Sankarshanapuram(Vill. & Post),

Mudinepalli mandal,

Krishna Distt.

… Petitioner

And

The Dy. General Manager,

State Bank of India,

Zonal Office,

Vijayawada. …..Respondent

Appearances:

For the Petitioner : Sri B. Vikas, Advocate

For the Respondent: Sri Y. Ranjeeth Reddy, Advocate

AWARD

Sri M. Venkateswara Rao who worked as Messenger (who will be referred to as the workman) has filed this petition under Sec. 2A(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 against the Respondents State Bank of India seeking for reinstatement into service as Messenger duly granting all the consequential benefits such as continuity of service, back wages and all other attendant benefits etc., and such other reliefs as this court may deem fit.

2. Before unfolding the factual matrix of the instant industrial dispute it would be apposite to have a bird eye view of a chequered history of the instant industrial dispute. Earlier instant industrial dispute along with the batch cases was decided by this Tribunal vide common award dated 17.5.2005 and the reference was answered in favour of the Respondent and against the Workman. That said common award dated 17.5.2005 was challenged by the aggrieved Workmen in various Writ petition No.6470/2014 along with batch of writ petitions before the Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh and Hon'ble High Court vide its' judgement dated 23.6.2014 allowed all batch of writ petitions and set aside the common award dated 17.5.2005 passed in ID No.222 of 2001 and other batch of ID cases by Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad and the Respondent management of State Bank of India was directed to reengage the Writ Petitioners in position, which they have been occupying prior to their termination and further directed to consider their cases for regularization as and when the substantive vacancy arises. This judgement dated 23.6.2014 of Hon'ble High Court of AP, passed in WP No.6470/2014 and batch petitions was challenged by Respondent management before the Hon'ble High Court in Writ Appeal No. 1268 of 2014. The aforesaid Writ Appeals No.1268/2014 and other Writ Appeals were decided by Division Bench of High Court of Andhra Pradesh by a common judgement dated 20.3.2019. Hon'ble High Court in aforesaid Writ Appeal was pleased to pass the order which is extracted as below:-

" 7. Hearing the learned senior counsel for the SBI and the learned senior counsel for the contesting unofficial Respondent s, we see that while the learned single Judge was justified in setting aside the award af the Tribunal, the proper course to be adopted was to remit all the cases to the Tribunal. This we say for reasons more than one. Firstly, in such matters, claims have to be decided on individual basis, as different persons have different claims as to the length of officiation or discharge of duties and functions; quality of engagement, drawings, accounting of the post for each one of them, who have worked etc. AIl these issues will not be the same in all the cases. Therefore, each case ought to have been directed to be decided by the Tribunal afresh on individual basis. The second and most important aspect is the learned single Judge has in one go ordered re-employment of all the workmen. This is not a relief that could have been granted without answering the individual issues; each issue relating to each case could not have been decided by the writ Court within the format of its adjudication procedures and scope. The adjudicating body, which has to do that activity, is the Industrial Tribunal. Therefore, we are of the view that while we would sustain the order of the learned singe Judge insofar as it interfered and sets aside the award of the Tribunal, the further findings and directions, issued through the impugned order have to go and the individual cases have to be sent back for consideration of the Tribunal. Such further procedure before the Tribunal will have to be carried forward with the materials already on record and also by affording an opportunity to the persons, who have claims as well as the management to place their rival contentions and further material before the Tribunal. The learned counsel appearing for the workmen are justified in pointing out that enormous delay has already happened and further action by the Tribunal in this line may be expedited.

9. In the result, these writ appeals are ordered;

(1) affirming the impugned common order of the learned single Judge to the extent it sets aside the common award dated 17.05.2005 of the Industrial Tribunal;

(2) the further findings and directions issued through the impugned common order are vacated:

(3) all the matters shall be remitted to the Industrial Tribunal with a direction to dispose of them within an outer limit of five (5) months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order; and,

(4) the parties to make appearance before the Tribunal on the given date."

Thus, in view of the above direction of Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh in W.A.No.1268 of 2014 and batch cases. This Tribunal has taken up the matter of industrial dispute for hearing and deciding it afresh in view of the aforesaid guidelines laid down by the Hon'ble High Court in Writ Appeal No.1268/2014 vide judgement dated 20.3.019.

3. The factual matrix of instant industrial dispute as narrated by the Workman in his claim statement are that, the he joined the service of the Respondent Bank as a messenger in the year 1981 and he worked upto 1.4.1997. Thereby he worked for about 16 years. Further, it is submitted that the management of Respondent bank decided to give a chance to temporarily employed personnel "found suitable for permanent appointment" by wait- listing them by offering permanent appointment or waitlisting till such opportunity arises.

4. That on 17.11.1987 a settlement was reached between All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and the Management of State Bank of India - settlement one, under this settlement three categories of employees were listed. That is, A) those who have completed 240 days in 12 months or less after 1.7.1975. B) those who have completed 270 days in any continuous block of 36 calendar months after 1.7.1975. C) (i) those who have completed minimum of 30 days aggregate temporary service in any calendar year after 1.7.1975 or (ii) 70 days aggregate temporary service in continuous block of 36 months after 1.7.1975.

5. The persons who satisfied in all the above 4 categories were to be interviewed by a selection committee and the said selection committee would determine the suitability of the said candidate for permanent appointment. Therefore, the bank prescribed certain qualifications and from among the candidates satisfying the qualifications the suitable candidates were enlisted by a selection committee. The Clause 7 of the said agreement provided with the selected candidate would be wait listed in order of their respective categorization and the selected panel would be valid upto December, 1991. Clause 10 of the settlement specifically provided that henceforth. "there will be no temporary appointments in the subordinate cadre", except on a restrictive basis in the specified category, "from amongst empanelled candidates as per existing guidelines of the bank". The Workman further submits that consequent upon the said agreement and the draft, a notification was issued in the newspapers. The last date for responding to the advertisement was 30.8.1988. A written examination followed by viva-voce in May, 1989 was held. A selected panel was prepared, as per Clause 7 of the agreement, ie. Settlement No.1, the selected panel was to be valid upto December, 1991, the Workman submits that circular was issued on 26.4.91 by the said letter it is mentioned that the terms of the agreement dated 17.11.87 was modified vide second agreement dated 16.7.88 was entered into between the parties. In terms of the said agreement a chance was to be given, "to all eligible temporary employees for permanent appointments. The appointments were against the vacancies likely to arise during the years 1995-96, circular made it clear that in view of the enormity of the problem an extension of the currency of the panel, eligible temporary employees who have been empanelled could not appear in the earlier interviews and have been pursuing their cases thereafter, "will be given another chance to appear for interview".

6. Workman submits that there were total five settlements. The settlement dated 17.11.87 is the 1st settlement (Ex M1), settlement dated 16.7.88 is 2nd settlement (Ex M2), settlement dated 27.10.88 is the 3rd settlement (Ex M3), then settlement dated 9.1.91 is 4th settlement and settlement dated 30.7.96 is 5th settlement (Ex M6). In between there is minutes of conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.95 marked as Ex M5. That due to all these settlements which were extended by subsequent settlements thereby created reasonable expectations in the list of the selected candidates arose with that it's a question of time their appointments or services would be regularized in the services of the bank. The Workman was working with the bank on temporary basis was under the bonafide hope that sooner his services will be regularized with the bank. He is thereby closed all his options elsewhere. It is needless to point out that employing person to whom hope of employment in substantial terms was made is a facet of Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

7. Further Workman submits that the Government of India issued Circular No. F-3/3/104/87-IR, dated 16.8.1990. Under said circular the chief Executives of all public sector banks including the Management herein were specifically instructed that until the problem of existing temporary employees is fully resolved, no bank is permitted to make any permanent appointments. That some of the persons similarly situated like this Workman aggrieved by the inaction on the part of the management of the bank is not regularizing their services from out of the selected panel and not clearly focusing the vacancy position, filed W.P. No. 4194/97 before Hon'ble High court of A.P.. It is specifically averred in the said writ petition that the Management of the bank had failed to implement the settlement and that it violates the various fundamental rights guaranteed under the constitution of India. The Hon'ble High court of A.P .. by order dated 5.3.97 directed the bank to implement the settlement as amended from time to time. It also directed the bank to carry out the terms of settlement before the expiry of March, 1997. The Hon'ble High Court also recorded finding that the Bank cannot escape its liability of enforcement of the Settlement. In view of the

directions given by the High Court all candidates whose names appeared in the select panels prepared on the basis of the agreement entered into on 17.11.87 under which the panel was valid upto December, 1991, and on the basis of a settlement dated 27.10.1988 whereby the panels were made alive upto 31.3.1997 under which the panel was valid upto December, 1999. The other agreement dated 16.7.1988 under which the panel was valid upto 1992 and on the basis of the settlement dated 27.10.1998 whereby the panels were made alive upto 31.3.1997 were under the bonafide impression that their cases will be considered for regularization and were living on the basis of the said reasonable expectation. Unfortunately, contrary to the aforesaid directions given by the High Court and contrary to the settlements entered into between the parties, the bank issued proceedings dated 25.3.1997, dated 27.3.1997 and 31.3.1997 instructing the various authorities of the Management not to continue the temporary employees those who are in services of the bank from 1.4.97. The said order was followed by the Management. Aggrieved by the said action the Workman herein and similarly situated candidates have filed a writ petition before the Hon'ble High Court and by way of Writ Petition No.9206/97 seeking a declaration that the proceedings issued by the Deputy General Manager and the Assistant General Manager (Respondent s 3,4 and 5 therein) on 25.3.97, 27.3.97 and 31.3.97 as illegal and also non-continuance of the Workmen therein in service by absorbing them in the services of the bank as violative of Section 2(p) and 18(1) read with Rule 58 of Central Rules and sought for specific direction to the bank to absorb them in service.

8. Further, Workman submits that in the counter affidavit filed in Writ Petition No.9206/97, the bank has submitted that it has about 805 branches in Andhra Pradesh alone. It has stated that due to exigencies of circumstances and on account of the urgent need in its banks, it employed temporary employees in subordinate cadre. It is pertinent to mention that it does not state the urgent or need or the nature of temporary employees that it had engaged. Enquiry into the same would reveal that the stand taken by the bank either on the ground of urgent need or of temporary employees is a façade to perpetuate unfair labour practice. It is designed to on the one hand, keep the employed in the erroneous zone of hope and on the other to ensure that benefits that a model employer will extend under various statutes to its employees is not required to be borne out by the bank. A reading of the counter affidavit would show that the bank would opines that being just fair and reasonable are which obviously is reprehensible and is a facet of unfair labour practice.

9. The Workman submits that the bank had referred in its counter affidavit to three settlements dated 17.11.87, 16.7.88 and 27.10.88. The bank in the guise of extending the benefits of the circular of Government dated 16.8.90 stated in its counter affidavit that as follows:

"Government of India, vide its letter dated 16.8.1990, issued guidelines to all the public sector banks with regard to recruitment and absorption of temporary employees in public sector banks. The said guidelines were issued to implement on the lines of the approach paper on the issue provided by a committee constituted in this regard. The Government of India guidelines made it clear that all the public sector banks may follow the provisions laid down in the approach paper.

The approach paper specified that the cases of temporary employees who had put in not less than 240 days of temporary service in 12 consecutive Months and who are entitled to benefit of Section 25-F may be decided by entering into a settlement with the representative union. In respect of temporary employees who had put in less than 240 days of service in 12 consecutive months or less, a settlement could be avoided and however if the Management so desired, they could enter into a conciliation settlement with the representative union. Para 6(h), it is mentioned that only those temporary employees who had put in temporary service of 90 or more days after 1.1 1982 would be eligible for considering under the scheme. Although the Government guidelines envisaged for a settlement in respect of employees who had put in temporary service of 90 or more days, the bank by way of further concession entered into settlements Even in respect of those who had put in less than 90 days. As such, it could be Seen that the settlements are more beneficial to the temporary employees concerned. The approach paper also specify at para 6(c) that the banks would provide one time opportunity to all the temporary employees and for that purpose temporary employees worked in the bank on or after 1.1.1982 could be considered for re-employment in terms of the scheme. The Respondent s have gone further wherein even persons working after 1975 were also considered.

As could be seen from the above, there was a genuine effort on the part of the Respondent bank to provide permanent employment for as many as possible subject to availability of the vacancies.

It is further submitted that at para 6(k) of the approach paper, it was made clear that this would be one time exercise in full and final settlement of all the aims and disputes for the past period in respect of temporary workmen covered by the settlement. This would mean that the Government of India guidelines would cover only those persons who were temporarily employed for the period specified therein and not otherwise. As such, it is submitted that the Respondent s have not only followed the Government of India guidelines but in fact covered cases of the employees who had worked for less than 90 days. As such, question of violation does not arise and in any case those were only broad guidelines and not directives".

10. The Workman submits that the bank also referred a subsequent settlement dated 9.1.1991 wherein there is a clause to the effect- that the panel of temporary employees and the panel of daily wage employees will be operated to

a particular period. Therefore, their cases will not be considered. The Management herein relying upon this settlement in their impugned action. It is submitted that even the settlement dated 9.1.1991 will not empower the management to terminate the services of the temporary employees who are working in the bank services like the Workman herein as it does not specify the termination of the employees. In fact there are so many vacancies wherein the Management has engaged several new persons as temporary messengers/ attendars/ sweepers etc., even after the judgment of Hon'ble High Court without considering the cases of the similarly situated candidates like the Workman herein. It is submitted inspite of engaging fresh candidates as is now being done by the Management they would have continued the similarly situated candidates like the Workman herein in the services of the bank and consider their cases for absorption in view of the circulars issued by Central Government as well as the directions of this Hon'ble Court in Writ Petition No.4194/97, dated 5.3.97. In view of the circulars issued by the Central Government, the Management should not have relied upon the settlement dated 9.1.1991. Hence, the impugned action of the Management is illegal, unjust, violative of fundamental rights such as Articles 14,16 and 21 of the Constitution of India.

11. The Workman submits that in W.P. No.4194/97 filed by the union of temporary employees where in they have complained about the non- implementation of the settlements arrived between the parties and sought for absorption. Such employees in the bank services on permanent basis before the date fixed for carrying out the terms of settlement, the Court held that the members of the union had been empanelled in the list, they were not regularized and the time was going to run out to the near future and the Respondent bank and its officers cannot escape from the liability of enforcing the settlement which has been reached and therefore directed that the bank and the officers shall implement the settlement dated 17.11.87 as amended from time to time before the expiry of 31.3.97.

12. Further, it is submitted that in the clause of Settlement it is specifically mentioned that the workmen to be absorbed/appointed in the bank prohibiting any temporary appointments subsequent to the date of settlement even the authorities want to make temporary appointments that should be made only from among the empanelled can be appointed either for temporary vacancy or permanent vacancy except from among the empanelled candidates like the Workman and that should be continued till they are absorbed. The management committed unfair labour practices and terminated the services of the candidates with effect from 1.4.1997 which is arbitrary, discriminatory, contrary to their own guidelines and violative of the constitutional provisions which are guaranteed in Chapter-III of the Constitution of India.

13. The Workman submits that it is strange as to how the panels were allowed to lapse by a so-called Memorandum of Understanding dated 25.2.1997, that the action of terminating such employees like the Workman by virtue of an impugned oral proceedings without implementing the settlement would be illegal and unfair labour practice which cannot be allowed to be perpetuated. That the discontinuance of the Workman after 31.3.97 who had served in the bank in any capacity amounts to retrenchment. It could not have been done without any notice and it violates Sec.25FF of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and the said action is violative of principles of natural justice guaranteed under Chapter III of the Constitution of India. This amounts to retrenchment without one month's notice and taken in view of such notice. Thus, the main proceedings issued by the Respondent is without jurisdiction and is arbitrary, illegal and therefore liable to be quashed. That the alleged Memorandum of Understanding dated 27.2.97, Ex.M5 does not own any legal entity, as the said Memorandum of Understanding is not published anywhere to brought to the notice of the Workman whose rights are being affected. It is submitted that Management did not adhere to the procedure envisaged by the Central Government in its' instructions dated 16.8.90 in the year 1995. The same was not followed in the year 1997 despite there being vacancies. The management has followed the procedure of calling candidates through Employment exchange instead of giving chance to the empanelled candidates like the Workman here. It is pertinent to mention here that the Respondent Management sent letters to the all similarly situated candidates like the Workman in the month of June, 1997, subsequent to the passing of impugned termination orders. After knowing the facts that the candidates are litigating, the Management refused to engage these candidates. It is once again reiterated that the panels are meant for absorption but not for termination. It was the duty of the Management to engage the empanelled candidates like the Workman even in temporary vacancies till they are absorbed permanently in regular vacancies. Hence, the action of the Respondent Management terminating the services of the Workman by oral order dated 31.3.97 is unjust, illegal, violative of principles of natural justice and hence, the Management be directed to reinstate and absorb the Workman and to grant all incidental and consequential benefits.

14. Per contra, Respondent had filed counter and made a contentions that the reference is not tenable and contrary to the provisions of I.D. Act, 1947. Respondent submitted that to tide over severe sub-ordinate staff constraints which arose out of leave vacancies, exigencies, etc., and also owning to the restrictions imposed by the Government of India/Reserve Bank of India on intake of staff, the Respondent bank used to engage sub-ordinate staff like messengers, sweepers, sweeper cum water boys, etc., depending on the availability of work on purely temporary basis for the smooth and uninterrupted functioning of the branches. It is submitted that the All India State Bank of India Staff Federation which represents majority of the employees in the State Bank of India comprising about 98% of the work force as its' members espoused the cause of temporary employees who have put in less than 240 days of temporary service in 12 calendar months in the bank and who were ineligible for any protection under Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 to give a chance for being considered for absorption and permanent appointments.

15. Discussions were held and on 17.11.1987 an agreement was signed between the federation and the Management bank under Sec. 2(p) read with Sec 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules 1957. A copy of the said settlement dated 17.11.87 which may be herein after referred as first settlement is filed and 4 categories were made as it has already been mentioned in the claim statement above, it need not be repeated here. In the first settlement, it was agreed that the temporary employees as categorized would be given a chance for being considered for permanent appointment in the bank's service against the vacancies which are likely to arise during the period 1987 to 1991. On 16.7.88 second settlement was arrived between the Federation and the Bank whereby it was agreed to substitute the period of consideration of vacancies as 1987 to 1992 in place of 1987 to 1991 as contemplated under the first settlement dated 17.11.1987. This is the second settlement. A 3rd settlement was entered into on 27.10.88 and it was agreed that the bank's service against the vacancies likely to arise from 1988 to 1992 was to be considered. Government of India vide its letter dated 16.8.90 issued guidelines to all the public sector banks with regard to recruitment and absorption of temporary employees in public sector banks. The said guidelines were issued to implement on the lines of approach paper on the issue provided by a committee constituted in this regard. Government of India guidelines made it clear that all the public sector banks may follow the provisions laid down in the approach paper. The approach paper specified that the cases of temporary service in 12 consecutive months and who are entitled to benefit of Sec.25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 may be decided by entering into a settlement with the representative union. In respect of temporary employees who had put in less than 240 days of service in 12 consecutive months or less, a settlement could be avoided and however if the Management so desired they could enter into a conciliation settlement with the representative union. In para. 6(h) it is mentioned that only those temporary employees who had put in temporary service of 90 days or more days after 1.1.82 would be eligible for considering under the scheme. Although the Government guidelines envisaged for a settlement in respect of employees who had put in temporary service of 90 days or more days, the bank by way of a further concession entered into settlements. Even in respect of those who had put in less than 90 days and also the bank went a step further and said those persons who are working after 1975 were also considered. Hence, there was a genuine effort on the part of the Respondent bank to provide as many as possible jobs subject to the availability of the vacancies. However, para 6 (k) of the approach paper made it clear that it is a one time, exercise in full and final, settlement of all the claims and disputes for the past period, in respect of temporary workmen covered by the settlement. Another settlement was entered on 9.1.91 herein after referred as 4th settlement and the time limit was extended upto 1994 and separate panel was prepared for temporary employees, casual/daily wagers. It was agreed that while vacancies arising between 1988 to 1994 in respect of temporary employees and in respect of casual/daily wagers, they can be considered for the vacancies arising between 1995-96 only.

16. It is submitted that the administrative set up of the Hyderabad Local Head Office comprises of four Zonal Offices (Zones) at Hyderabad, Vijayawada, Visakhapatnam and Tirupathi covering all the Districts of Andhra Pradesh. In terms of the settlement the Management after following the procedure laid down therein prepared the panels of qualified candidates of temporary employees denoted as 1989 panel and also panel of casual/daily wagers denoted as 1992 panel for giving a chance for being considered for permanent absorption. These panels were prepared zone-wise separately for messengers and non-messengers in the descending order of temporary service put in by the candidates during the stipulated period i.e., 1.7.1975 to 31.7.1988. That the Federation approached the Regional Labour Commissioner(C) for implementation of bi-partite settlement in respect of absorption of temporary employees. The Regional Labour Commissioner(C) conducted conciliation proceedings and an agreement was arrived between the Federation and the bank. It was agreed that it would be kept alive upto March, 1997. A copy of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.2.1995 signed by the parties is filed as material paper. A settlement was arrived at and an agreement was signed between the Federation and the Management bank on 30.7.1996 under Sec.2 (p) read with Sec.18(1) of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957, which is hereinafter called as 5th settlement. That on 27.2.1997 a Memorandum of understanding was also signed by the federation's affiliate and the bank Management recording the fact that the exercise of identifying the messengerial vacancies as on 31.12.1994 has since been completed by Central Office and thereby 403 messengerial vacancies were sanctioned . It was agreed that these vacancies may be filled from 1989 panel of temporary employees after effecting conversion from full time non-messengerial staff in the usual manner and the agreement was reached accordingly. It was agreed between the Federation's affiliate and the Management bank that in terms of the settlement dated 30.7.1996 both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees would lapse on 31.3.1997. That as agreed upon vacancies were filled from the panels. The Workman who has put in an aggregate temporary service of less than 240 days in a continuous block of 12 months period during 1.7.1975 to 31.7.1988 has no right to seek a direction to consider his candidature for absorption in the Management bank under any rule/law except under the settlement entered into thereon.

17. Respondent contended that, in fact, the case of the Workman can be considered under all the five settlements having got his case considered under provisions of these settlements. All the other provisions and terms of the settlements are also binding on him/her. The Management bank has not violated any of the provisions of the terms of the said settlement. That the very preparation and maintenance of panel is in compliance of the terms agreed under these settlements. These settlements were time bound and they ceased to exist on 31.3.1997. That the bank has never promised that all the candidates in the panel will be absorbed. In the advertisement itself it was made

clear that candidates will be considered for absorption in the vacancies that may arise upto 1992. Keeping alive the panels after 31.3.1997 is contrary to the settlements arrived between the State Bank of India Staff Federation and the Management bank. That the settlements are binding on the parties. The Workman is also bound under the terms of the said settlement. The settlement does not suffer from any ambiguity as their language is very clear. The right under the settlements is to give them a chance to be considered for future appointment in the bank's services against the vacancies likely to arise. The settlements were effected to balance the expectations of the temporary employees to be absorbed in permanent service as against the constitutional rights for all eligible persons to be considered for employment every time a vacancy arises. That the alleged dispute including the demand for reinstatement has to be decided in this context. It is submitted that the period of panel list got expired on 31.3.97 and it is an integral term of the settlement and cannot be modified in any proceedings under the law. These temporary employees who unfortunately could not be accommodated for want of vacancies have no further rights to be considered for regularization. That the Hon'ble High Court in WP No.12964/94, held as follows, "It is needless to state that the settlement arrived at between the All India State Bank of India Staff Federation which, is the majority union and the bank Management is binding on the Workmen also. It is not at all the case of the Workman that any of the terms of the settlement has been violated by the bank's Management. If the Workman had worked in the bank on part-time basis before 31.5.94, that itself would not vest in him a right to claim that his services should be regularized on permanent basis against a full time cadre post. The claim put forth by the Workman in the present petition is therefore misconceived and not tenable. However, it is open to the Workman to claim any right which flows from the settlement between the union and the bank Management. As already pointed out that it is not the grievance of the Workman that some right which has flown from the settlement in favour of the Workman has been denied by the bank Management. Therefore, I do not find any ground, let alone substantial ground, to grant the kind of relief sought for by the Workman. Writ Petition fails and is accordingly dismissed. No costs."

18. Further, it is contended that if the panels were not lapsed at the end of designated period and allowed to be continued it would result in making the contracts of temporary employment indirectly permanent through back door entry, which would not only be contrary to the settlements but also to Articles 14 and 16 of Constitution of India and deprive the chances of original claimants who would Come through proper recruitment procedure. As their rights have been crystallized by operation of the settlements. Hence, there is no question of any Legitimate expectation being violated.

19. Similarly placed ex-employees filed WP No.9206/1995 and the batch before the Hon'ble High Court of A.P. and the learned Single Judge allowed the Writ Petitions. Aggrieved by the same WA No.86/98 and the batch was filed and the Division Bench set aside the order of the Single Judge. Thereafter the ex-temporary employees filed Special Leave Petition No.11886-11888 of 1998 before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India also dismissed the SLP. Therefore, reference to the Judgement of the Learned Single Judge in WP No.9206/97 is of no consequences as the same has already been set aside. The observations made in the Judgements cannot be relied upon for any purpose what so ever. The question of operation of Sec.25F would not come into play. Further the issue is covered by various Judgements of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India and various Hon'ble High Courts. Hence, the reference may be ordered that the Workman is not entitled for any relief.

20. In order to fortify his claim Workman has examined himself as WW1 and also filed documents in evidence which has been exhibited as Ex.W1 to W2. Further, the Workman has filed photocopies of documents in support of his claim which are discussed as under:-

Ex.W1 is the service certificate. Ex.W2 is the notification.

21. Though Respondent has filed counter, but the contention made in the counter is not substantiated by any evidence by the Respondent Management.

22. Apart from afore mentioned documents, Learned Counsel for Workman has also filed a long list of various judgements of Hon’ble Supreme Court as well as Hon’ble High Court, which we will discuss at appropriate place in this Award.

23. Heard the argument of Learned Counsel for Workman.

24. On the basis of rival pleadings of both the parties and submissions made by the Learned Counsel for Petitioner following points arise for determination in the industrial dispute :-

I. Whether the 1st settlement dated 17.11.1987, 2nd settlement dated 16.7.1988, 3rd settlement dated 27.10.1988, 4th settlement dated 9.1.1991 and 5th settlement dated 30.7.1996 entered into between State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and also Memorandum of Understanding are binding upon both the parties?

II. Whether the action of State Bank of India, in terminating the services of Workman Sri M. Venkateswara Rao, a Messenger with effect from 1.4.1997 is justified?

III. Whether the Workman is entitled for absorption on permanent post in the Branch of Respondent management as per averments made by him in the claim statement?

IV. To what relief if any the Workman is entitled for?

Findings:-

25. Point No.I:- Undisputedly settlements dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988, 9.1.1991 and 30.7.1996, minutes of conciliation proceedings and memorandum of understanding dated 27.2.1997 were executed between the State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation under section 2(p) and 18 (1) of I.D. Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Disputes (Central Rules), 1957.

Section 2(p) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 as follows:-

(p) "settlement" means a settlement arrived at in the course of conciliation proceeding and includes a written agreement between the employer and workmen arrived at otherwise than in the course of conciliation proceeding where such agreement has been signed by the parties thereto in such manner as may be prescribed and a copy thereof has been sent to an officer authorised in this behalf by the appropriate Government and the conciliation officer;

Section 18(1) provides as follows:-

18. Persons on whom settlements and awards are binding.

- [(1) A settlement arrived at by agreement between the employer and Workman otherwise than in the course of conciliation proceeding shall be binding on the parties to the agreement.

Therefore, in view of the provision contained u/s.18 (1) I.D. Act, 1947, terms and conditions enumerated in the aforesaid settlements are binding on the parties to the agreement. The Learned Counsel for Workman has argued that the Workman after going through the selection procedure has successfully been listed in the panel for appointment on the permanent basis in the Respondent management and the empanelled list has to be valid till last person in the empanelled list is appointed on permanent basis. But the impugned order dated 25.3.97, 27.3.97 and 31.3.97, has been issued by Respondent management thereby the services of the Workman has been terminated and the said order is not in consonance of the terms of the agreement entered into between the parties. Further, Workman submits that the Respondent in the 5th settlement has mentioned the date i.e., 31.3.1997 for lapse of empanel list which is illegal and that is not binding upon the Workman. The condition of lapse of empanelment list on 31.3.97 incorporated in the aforesaid 5th settlement, is arbitrary and illegal.

26. The perusal of the impugned order dated 25.3.1997 goes to reveal that the Chief/Branch Manager, SBI Zonal Office has issued the letter to all the branches with regard to the subject not to make any temporary appointments in the Branch in messengerial category from 1.4.1997. The extract of the said letter is given below:-

"We have been advised by the Deputy General Manager, Zonal Office, Hyderabad that as both the panels of temporary employees of 1989 and daily wagers/casual labours of 1992 will lapse by 31.3.1997, it has been decided by Central Office not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial category from 1.4.1997."

Thus, from the contents of the aforesaid letter, it manifest that Head Office of State Bank of India vide letter dated 25.3.1997 has issued direction to all its branches not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial category from 1.4.1997 due to reason of lapse of both panels i.e., 1989 & 1992 on 31.3.1997 as per terms of settlements entered into by both parties. Further, the contents of the subsequent letter dated 27.3.1997 issued by Respondent Management is also direction to Branch Manager, State Bank of India not to make any temporary messengerial category appointment with effect from 1.4.1997 and it has also been communicated to all concerned that the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers maintained by Zonal offices stand lapsed from 31.1.1997. Further, office order dated 31.3.1997 has been issued by Respondent management that goes to reveal that the said office order has been issued to this effect that, "Consequent on absorption of temporary employees in permanent cadre, it has been decided by the competent authority that no one onwards, no further daily labour or temporary employees/appointments should be resorted to/engaged/employed." Therefore, it reflects from the contents of the aforesaid orders that the temporary appointment in messengerial category and daily labour has been stopped by the Respondent management with effect from 1.4.1997 because of the lapsed of panel of temporary workers and daily wagers by 31.3.1997. The agreement for lapse of both the panels on 31.3.1997 is contained in the 5th settlement which has been arrived at between the parties on dated 30.7.1996 with the consensus of both the parties. Therefore, Workman can not challenge the terms and conditions contained in settlement dated 30.7.1996 regarding lapse of panel on 31.3.1997 as agreed between State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation. As per provision contained u/s.18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 the said Agreement dated 30.7.1996 is binding on both the parties.

In the case of **Allied Sales Corporation Secunderabad vs.The Authority Under Andhra Pradesh..... 1990 II LLJ 510 AP para 414, Hon'ble Court have held:-**

"*4. There was a settlement between the Management and the workmen under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act on 25th April 1983 under which the age of superannuation of the workmen was fixed at 55 years. The settlement was to be in force upto 30th June 1986 and the next settlement, incorporating practically the same terms, was again*

entered into on 4th February 1987 under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act. There is no dispute that these settlements are under Section 18(1).

14. Now the Authority constituted under Section 41(1) of the Act is an authority with very limited jurisdiction. It can only decide in the first appeal whether a termination by the management is valid or not and is within the parameters of Section 40 of the Act. The said Authority, in our view, has absolutely no jurisdiction to decide whether a settlement entered into under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act between the representatives of the Workmen and of the Management, is vitiated by undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion on the part of the Management. The Authority, namely, the Assistant Commissioner of Labour, was never intended by the A.P. Legislature to have jurisdiction to go into the question of the validity of a settlement arrived at under Section 18 of the Industrial Disputes Act by an Industrial Court. That Parliament has, in fact, constituted Industrial Courts under the Industrial Disputes Act, with extensive powers cannot be disputed. What we mean to say is that the Authority under Section 41(1) of the A.P. Act has no jurisdiction what-so-ever either to question or to decide about the validity of any such settlements. If parties to a settlement have a grievance about the validity of a settlement, it is for them to agitate the matter before the appropriate forum and they cannot ask an Authority constituted under Section 41(1) of the A.P. Shops and Establishments Act, 1966 with limited jurisdiction, to go into any such question and, that too, incidentally while deciding whether retirement as per the contract of employment, is legal or not."

It is not the case of Workman that aforesaid settlements are vitiated by undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion on the part of the management. If the Workman feeling aggrieved by any terms of settlement/ agreement on the aforementioned grounds then he can challenge of settlement before a competent authority under the Act, 1947. But here in the instant matter it is not a case of Workman that aforementioned settlement has been entered into between the parties on the ground of undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion. Therefore, Workman is barred to raise any objection in respect of fixing the date of lapse of both panels on 31.3.1997 as agreed between both the parties and Workman can not challenge any terms of said Agreement.

Further in the case of **Herbertsons Limited Vs. Workmen of Herbertsons Limited and Ors, 1977 AIR 322,** Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

The Tribunal thought that the question of the quantum of membership of the 2nd Respondent did not call for a finding at all in view of 1his Court's order. As observed above that was not a correct assumption. On the other hand, we feel that this view of the Tribunal has led it to approach the matter in an entirely erroneous manner. The Tribunal is, rightly enough, conscious that under section 18 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act the settlement was binding on the company and the members of the 3rd Respondent union. Even so, the Tribunal devoted nearly half of its order in scanning the evidence given by the company and Respondent No. 3 to find out whether the terms of the settlement had been explained by the President of the union to the workmen or not and whether the workers voluntarily accepted the settlement knowing all the "consequences". This to our mind is again an entirely wrong approach.

"When a recognised union negotiates with an employer the workers as individuals do not come into the picture. It is not necessary that each individual worker should know the implications of the settlement since a recognised union, which is expected to protect the legitimate interests of labour, enters into a settlement in the best interests of labour. This would be the normal rule. We cannot altogether rule out exceptional cases where there may be allegations of mala fides, fraud or even corruption or other induce- ments. Nothing of that kind has been suggested against the President of the 3rd Respondent in this case. That being the position, prima facie, this is a settlement in the course of collective bargaining and, therefore, is entitled to due weight and consideration.

It is not possible to scan the settlement in bits and pieces and hold some parts good and acceptable and others bad. Unless it can be demonstrated that the objectionable portion is such that it completely outweighs all the other advantages gained the Court will be slow to hold a settle- ment as unfair and unjust. The settlement has to be accepted or rejected as a whole and we are unable to reject it as a whole as unfair or unjust. Even before this Court the 3rd Respondent representing admittedly the large majority of the workmen has stood by this settlement and that is a strong factor which it is difficult to ignore. As stated elsewhere in the judgment, we cannot also be oblivious of the fact that all workmen of the company have accepted the settlement. Besides, the period of settlement has since expired and we are informed that the employer and the 3rd Respondent are negotiating another settlement with further improvements. These factors, apart from what has been stated above, and the need for industrial peace and harmony when a union backed by a large majority of workmen has accepted a settlement in the course of collective bargaining have impelled us not to interfere with this settlement. That being the position, we unhold the settlement as fair and just and order that the award of the Tribunal shall be substituted by the settlement dated October 18, 1973. The said settlement shall be the substituted award. The appeal is disposed of accordingly. There will be no order as to costs."

Therefore, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above, the contention of the Workman that the date fixed for lapse of empanelled list on 31.3.1997 for appointment to the permanent post vide 5th Settlement dated 30.7.1996 is arbitrary, illegal is not untenable. The recognized union of Workmen has negotiated with the Respondent Bank Management representing large number of Workmen and the Workman as individual do not come into picture. Workman in the instant case has work as temporary Workmen in the Respondent Branch and

in response of Notification he had applied for inclusion of his name in the panel and he was selected for inclusion his name in the panel list to be utilized for absorption of such Workman to permanent post in order of their seniority in the list. The Settlement dated 30.7.1996 between State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation under Sec.2(p) and Sec.18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 has clearly provided as regard non-messengerial position and it is agreed that all such posts sanctioned fallen vacant upto 31.3.1997 shall be filled before empanel list is allowed to lapse. Thus, in view of law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, in the instant case, Agreement dated 30.7.1996 was entered into between both the parties in respect of lapsing of the both the panels on 31.3.1997 and absorption of the Workmen from panel list was subject to availability of vacancy of post likely to arise upto 31.3.1997, have a binding force on Workman as well as management of State Bank of India in view of provision contained under section 18 (1) of I.D. Act, 1947.

Thus, Point No.I is answered against the Workman and in favour of the Respondent .

27. **Point No.II**:- Firstly, it is submitted on behalf of the Workman that the Respondent has terminated his services by oral order on 1.4.1997 without issuing any notice or paying any salary or compensation in lieu thereof. Therefore, the termination order of the Workman from service is in violation of provision contained Under Section 25 F of I.D. Act, 1947. Therefore, the order is liable to be set aside.

28. On the other hand, Respondent counsel contended that Workman has not worked for 240 days in any preceding calendar year. Therefore, reference of the industrial dispute is not relevant. In this context, the Workman has examined himself as WW1 who has reiterated that Workman has been terminated from service by Respondent on 1.4.1997 without notice of salary or compensation in lieu thereof. Before examining the claim of the Workman on merit it would be apposite to reproduce the provision contained under section 25 F:-

Section 25F provides:-

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].

Compensation to workmen in case of transfer of undertakings.

Section 25B defines the term continuous service which provides

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 authorized 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;

In order to prove the fact of 240 days of service within 12 months of a calendar year just preceding from the date of termination, the initial burden of proof lies upon the Workman and the Workman has to prove this factum by adducing his oral as well as documentary evidence in support of his claim.

Further, how to calculate 240 days of service by the Workman in a calendar year. In this context the reference of decisions of Hon'ble Supreme Court is relevant and the same are discussed below:-

In Rajasthan State Ganganagar S. Mills Ltd. v. State of Rajasthan and Anr. (2004) Apex Court held:

"It was the case of the Workman that he had worked for more than 240 days in the year concerned. This claim was denied by the appellant. It was for the claimant to lead evidence to show that he had worked for 240 days in the year preceding the date of his termination. He has filed an affidavit. It is statement which is in his favor and that cannot be regarded as sufficient evidence for any Court or Tribunal to come to the conclusion that in fact the claimant had worked for 240 days in a year These aspects were highlighted in Range Forest Officer v. S.T. Hadimani (2002 (3)

SCC 25. No proof of receipt of salary or wages for 240 days or order or record in that regard was produced. Mere non-production of the muster roll for a particular period was not sufficient for the Labour Court held that the Workman had worked for 240 days as claimed."

In Municipal Corporation, Faridabad v. Siri Niwas (2004 (8) SCC 195), held "*the burden was on the Workman to show that he was working for more than 240 days in the preceding one year prior to his alleged retrenchment." In M.P. Electricity Board v. Hariram (2004 (8) SCC 246) the position was again reiterated in paragraph 11 as follows: "The above burden having not been discharged and the Labour Court having held so, in our opinion, the Industrial Court and the High Court erred in basing an order of reinstatement solely on an adverse inference drawn erroneously ..*"

In the case of Manager, RBI, Bangalore vs. S Mani (2005) SCC Page 100, the 3 Judges Bench of the Apex Court held that "*the initial burden of proof was on the Workman to show that he had completed 240 days of service."*

Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of Mohan Lal vs Management BEL 1981 SCC page 225 has laid down the principle that how to count 240 days of service within one year it is held: *"Clause (2)(a) provides for a fiction to treat a Workman in continuous service for a period of one year despite the fact that he has not rendered uninterrupted service for a period of one year but he has rendered period of 240 days during the period of 12 calendar service for months counting backwards and just preceding the relevant date being the date of retrenchment. In other words, in order to invoke the fiction enacted in clause (2)(a) it is necessary to determine first the relevant date, ie the date of termination of service which is complained of as retrenchment. After that date is ascertained. move backward to a period of 12 months just preceding the date of retrenchment and then ascertain whether within the period of 12 months, the Workman has rendered service for a period of 240 days. If these three facts are affirmatively answered in favor of the Workman pursuant to the deeming fiction enacted in clause (2)(a) it will have to be assumed that the Workman is in continuous service for a period of one year and he will satisfy the eligibility qualification enacted in Section 25-F"*

"14. We have already extracted section 25B since its amendment and the change in language is the legislative exposition of which note must be taken. In fact, we need not further dilate upon this aspect because in Surendra Kumar Verma and Ors. v. Central Government Industrial-cum-Labour Court, New Delhi and Anr., Chinnappa Reddy. J., after noticing the amendment and referring to the decision in Sur Enamel and Stamping Works (P) Ltd case, held as under:

"These changes brought about by Act 36 of 1964 appear to be clearly designed to provide that a Workman who has actually worked under the employer for not less than 240 days during a period of twelve months shall be deemed to have been in continuous service for a period of one year whether or not he has in fact been in such continuous service for a period of one year. It is enough that he has worked for 240 days in a period of 12 months, it is not necessary that he should have been in the service of the employer for one whole year."

In a concurring judgment Pathak J. agreed with this interpretation of section 25B(2). Therefore, both on principle and on precedent it must be held that section 25B(2) comprehends a situation where a Workman is not in employment for a period of 12 calendar months, but has rendered service for a period of 240 days within the period of 12 calendar months commencing and counting backwards from the relevant date, i.e. the date of retrenchment. If he has, he would be deemed to be in continuous service for a period of one year for the purpose of section 25B and Chapter VA."

Thus, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above the initial burden of proof lies upon the Workman to show that he has completed 240 days of the service with the Respondent just preceding from the date of his termination. Further, in respect of the employment of calculating the 240 days service provision contained under Section 25-F read with Section 25-B of the I.D. Act, 1947.

29. The Petitioner in his chief examination has reiterated the version of the claim statement. This witness WW1was cross examined by the Respondent counsel and in his cross examination witness has stated that he joined as messenger at Mudinepally branch of State Bank of India for the first time without any written appointment order. Further, witness states that during the period 1992 to 1996 he worked for 393 days. Further, witness states that he stopped attending the bank service from 1997, but he was not issued any written order of removal. He did not give any representation to the bank and he has worked as an agricultural labourer. Further, witness states he was not appointed as per the recruitment selection procedure.

Thus, from the above statement of the witness in cross examination it manifests that Workman was not recruited by any selection procedure rather he had worked as a casual Workman who was engaged by the Respondent for the work intermittently for different periods. Thus, the Workman has not completed 240 days of his service in any calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination. Therefore, he has not fulfilled the condition mentioned under section 25 F of the ID Act, hence, the provision of Section 25F is not applicable to his case. Further, witness in his cross examination has admitted that he did not work continuously for 240 days in any branch, in any year and he used to work depending upon the availability of the work in the branch. Thus, in view of the statement of Petitioner witness, he does not fulfill the condition of continuous service of one year as provided under Section 25F

of the Act, therefore, the claim of the Petitioner that he has been terminated from service by the Respondent in violation of the provision of Section 25F of the Act is not maintainable.

30. Per contra, the Learned Counsel for Respondent has submitted the allegation of Workman that he was terminated from services is not correct. As the vacancies were filled up on regular basis in order of their respective seniority the non-engagement of the Workman does not amount to termination. Further, Respondent contended that no law provide that even though there is no work temporary employee should be continued in the bank work as the very engagement of Workman was subject to availability of work. Therefore, the allegation that the bank has indulged in unfair labour practice is incorrect.

31. Thus, in view of the fore gone discussion and contentions made by the Respondent , I find the force in the argument advanced by the Respondent that in the instant matter, Workman was not terminated from service by order dated 1.4.1997 rather he was disengaged in view of the non-availability of the work in the branch. Further, there was direction issued by the Head Office of the Respondent authority not to engage any daily wager Workman/ temporary Worker w.e.f. 1.4.1997. Thus, such disengagement of Workman does not amount to termination. Moreover, the Workman failed to prove his claim that he was terminated in contravention of provision of Sec.25F of the I.D. Act, 1947 as he failed to establish his plea by any oral or documentary evidence that he had worked for 240 days continuously in a twelve months of calendar year just preceding from date of termination i.e., 1.4.1997.

32. Further, perusal of the order dated 25.3.1997 goes to reveal that the Chief Branch Manager, State Bank of India has issued the letter to Zonal Office with direction to all its branches to this effect that they have been advised by the DGM, Zonal Office, Hyderabad that as both the panel of temporary employees of 1989 and daily wagers/casual labour of 1992 will lapse on 31.3.1997 it has been decided by central office not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial cadre from 1.4.1997, therefore it was directed to issue suitable instructions not to make temporary appointments from 1.4.1997. There is no mention in this order that the Workman herein has been terminated from service by this order.

33. Further, the circular dated 27.3.1997 was issued by DGM, SBI to all branches in commercial network in respect of the non-appointment of temporary employees in subordinate cadre and it has directed not to make any temporary employment in the subordinate cadre with effect from 1.4.97 and further, it has directed to ensure that no temporary/casual/daily basis appointment of the petty cash. Further, it is directed to all Branch Managers that any deviation in this regard will be viewed seriously. Thus, these circulars do not reflect that the Workman has been terminated from service by this order.

34. Similarly, office order dated 31.3.1997 is simply a direction to all branches of the Respondent bank by DGM that no further daily labour should be engaged or employed. Therefore, the plea of the Workman that he has been terminated by the aforesaid order dated 25.3.1997, 27.3.1997 and 31.3.1997 from the service by the Respondent is not acceptable. The evidence adduced by the Workman clearly goes to reveal that he had worked as a daily wager for which he has been paid wages according to number of working days. As there was an order for prohibition for engaging temporary workmen, in the bank, therefore, Workman could not be engaged by the Respondent for work from 1.4.1997 and there after. It is settled law that the daily wagers are engaged by the employer depending upon the availability of work and as the work was not available the Workman was not engaged further by the Respondent management. Therefore, the Workman on the ground of number of days he had worked in the Respondent bank cannot claim any right to reinstate him into the employment. As the Workman failed to prove the mandatory condition of 240 days of continuous service as required under Sec.25F of I.D. Act, 1947. Therefore, the disengagement of Workman from work can not be termed in contravention of provision contained under Sec.25F and 25 B of the I.D. Act, 1947.

Thus, this point is answered against the Workman and in favour of Respondent .

35. **Point No.III**:- In this context, the Workman has contended that the management failed to implement the selected panels during its valid tenure. The management adopted the back door methods contrary to the settlements and filled up the vacancies. The same is evident from the proceedings dated 18.11.1993 a copy of the same is filed in the material papers and the same may be read as part of the claim statement. Further, it is submitted that management has to adhere the procedure issued by the Central Government, the instructions dated 16.8.1990 in the year 1995, but same was not followed in the year 1997 despite there being vacancies. The management has followed the procedure of calling candidates through employment exchange instead of giving chance to the empanelled candidates like the Workman herein. The management sent call letters to the similarly situated candidates like the Workman in the month of June 1997 subsequent to issuance of impugned termination orders. After knowing the fact that they are litigating the issue by way of dispute, the management has refused to engage those candidates, the copies of call letters issued are filed herein along with claim petition. The Workman herein reiterates that the panels are meant for absorption but not for termination. In view of the same a duty is cast upon the Respondent management to engage the empanelled candidates like the Workman herein even in temporary vacancies till they are absorbed permanently in regular vacancies.

36. On the other hand, Respondent has contended that the Federation approached Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) for implementation of bipartite settlement in respect of the absorption of temporary employees. The Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) conducted conciliation proceedings and agreement was arrived at between the Federation and the Management bank. It is submitted that it was agreed between the Federation and the Management that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers /casual labour would be kept alive upto March, 1997 and the vacancies as agreed to under the afore set out settlements will be filled from both the lists concurrently. A copy of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.1995 signed by the parties to the dispute is filed as a material paper. Further, it is submitted that the settlement was arrived at and an agreement was signed between the Federation and the Management bank on 30.7.1996 under Section 2(p) read with Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules 1957 which is binding on the parties. A copy of this agreement which hereinafter may be referred to as 5th settlement for brevity, is also filed as a material paper. The 5th settlement dated 30.7.1996 whereunder the earlier four settlements dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988 and 9.1.1991 were also referred, it was agreed to, by the Federation and the Management bank that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees will be kept alive upto March, 1997 for filling the vacancies existing/arrived at as on 31.12.1994 as per the norms agreed to between the bank and Federation and that thereafter the said panels would lapse. It was also agreed that within the framework of the above settlements the modalities about drawing names from either the panel of temporary employees or the panel of daily wagers and casual labour would be decided administratively on circle to circle basis depending upon the local requirements in consultation with the Federation's affiliate by the Circle management. It was further agreed that all messenger real vacancies/positions in the subordinate cadre including part-time attendants specifically provided as leave reserve will be filled by the end of 31.3.1997. Further, Respondent contended that on 27.2.1997 a memorandum of understanding was also signed between the Federation's affiliate and the bank management regarding the fact that the exercise of identifying the messengerial vacancies as on 31.12.1994 has since been completed by central office and thereby 403 messengerial vacancies were sanctioned to the circle of the Management bank and it was agreed that these vacancies may be filled from 1989 panel of temporary employees after effecting conversion from full time non-messengerial staff in the usual manner and the agreement was reached upon. Further, it was agreed between the Federations affiliate and the management bank that in terms of the settlement dated 30.7.1996 both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers /casual employees would lapse on 31.3.1997.

37. The Workman has contended that the empanelled list prepared by the Respondent management for appointment of temporary and daily wage Workers to the permanent post cannot lapse unless until it is exhausted by appointing all the empanelled persons and it should continue even after 31.3.1997, i.e., the date fixed for the lapse of panel. It is undisputed that the date of lapse of empanelled list of Workmen has been fixed to 31.3.1997 as mentioned in the settlement dated 30.7.1996, and agreed between the parties. It is settled law that and once the life of panel list lapses on the date as agreed between the parties it cannot be extended beyond that date. In the instant case the panel list of the workmen was valid upto 31.3.1997 in view of the terms and conditions enumerated in the 5th Settlement entered into between the parties. As the lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997 has been agreed by State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation through 5th Settlement, the Workman is not competent to challenge the same.

In this context I would like to take reference of the decision of the apex court in the case of **Syndicate Bank and Ors vs. Shankar Paul and Ors , AIR 1997 SC 3091, therein the Hon'ble Apex Court** have held:-

"Till 1982, the branches of the appellant Bank in Calcutta region were recruiting persons locally to work as temporary attenders in leave vacancies. In view of the revised procedure prescribed by the Government of India in respect of such temporary appointments, the Calcutta regional office of the appellant Bank issued a circular to all of its branches on 14.8.1982, instructing all the branches under it to discontinue the old practice from 1.6.1982 and appoint only empanelled candidates. The regional office was to prepare a panel of eligible candidates, after calling names from the local/district employment exchange, and split it up branch-wise. Following that new procedure yearly panels were prepared thereafter. Names of the Respondent s were for the first time included in the panel prepared for the period 7.2.1987 to 6.2.1988. By its letter dated 7.2.1987 the Bank had informed the Respondent s that the panel was valid for one year only and that inclusion of their names in the panel was not to confer on them any right to seek permanent appointment in the service of the bank. Considering the object with which the panel was prepared and the fact that it was an yearly panel expiring on 6.2.1988, we are of the opinion that the Respondent s did not get any right, because of inclusion of their names in the said panel, for permanent absorption in the service of the Bank. Whatever conditional right they had came to an end with the expiry of the panel. The claim of the Respondent s, as contained in the writ petition was thus misconceived and therefore the learned single Judge and the Division Bench, when it first decided the appeal, were right in dismissing the writ petition and the appeal respectively."

Thus, in view of the above law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court and in view of the terms and conditions of the 5th Settlement the contention of the Workman that empanelled list should continue even after 31.3.1997 till the last Workman in the panel is absorbed is not tenable. The contention of the Workman is baseless in view of recital in the settlement. Therefore, in view of the fore gone discussion and finding given at Point No. I regarding binding nature of Settlements and terms and conditions enumerated therein, in view of the provision contained u/s.18(1) of the

I.D. Act, 1947, I am of the considered view that life of panels lapsed on 31.3.1997 in view of terms of settlement dated 30.7.1996 and plea of Workman that the panel shall continue even after 31.3.1997 till last man absorbed has no legal force and same is untenable.

38. Undisputedly, settlement agreement dated 30.7.1996 was executed between the State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation and in that settlement it was agreed that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/ casual employees will be used for filling vacancies existing as on 31.12.1994 as per the norms agreed between the bank and the Federation. These empanelled workmen were to be given a chance for permanent appointment in the bank against vacancies arising up to December 1994 whereas the daily wagers/ casual employees were to be considered against the vacancies arise from January 1995 to December 1996, whereby the said panel would lapse. It was agreed that the vacancies falls upto 31.3.1997 shall be filled before the empanelled list is allowed to lapse. Thus, the claim of the Workman to the post of permanent non-messenger in the Respondent management was subject to the availability of the sanctioned post and vacancies arising upto 31.3.1997. The workmen given chance to the permanent post were seniors in number of working days in panel list and Workman herein was junior to those workmen. Therefore, Workman could not be given absorption to permanent post being junior to other workmen in the panel list.

39. As regard the regularization, the witness has stated that he do not have panel list, he is not a member of any employees federation and he do not know whether the settlements between the management and the federation will be applicable to him. Further, this witness states that, he is not aware of the settlements between the federation and management and also stated that he do not have any knowledge about the agreements speaks of the absorption in permanent position. Thus, from the above statement of the witness it manifests that he failed to prove his claim for regularization in the service of the Respondent.

40. However, Workman has taken the plea that the panels of Workmen for absorption in the employment of the Respondent banks (panels of temporary employees and daily wagers) has been lapsed on 31.3.1997 in contravention of terms of settlement as the object of preparing the entire empanelment of temporary and daily wagers was to provide them permanent employment and till the both the panel lists exhausted the panel list cannot be lapsed on 31.3.1997 and the date of lapsing of the panel on 31.3.1997 has been fixed by the Respondent arbitrarily without any authority.

41. In this context, the perusal of Settlement dated 30.7.1996 reveals that the 5th Settlement dated 30.7.1996 was entered under Section 2(p) and 18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Dispute (Central) Rules 1957. This settlement has been entered into by the competent parties and in this settlement parties thereto agreed that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees will lapse on 31.3.1997. Thus the date of lapse of panel was fixed by both the parties with consensus under the settlement dated 30.7.1996 and same is binding upon the Workman under the provision of Section 18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947. Moreover, this issue of binding force of the settlement dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988 and 9.1.1991 has already been discussed, decided at finding in Point No.I of this award. However, the legality and validity of the aforementioned settlement has not been challenged by the Workman before any competent forum. Thus, claim of Workman that the date of lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997 has been fixed arbitrarily by the Respondent bank is untenable. As regard the claim of Workman for his absorption to the permanent post it is settled law that the Workman can not claim his regularization to permanent post merely on the basis of number of working days.

42. In this context the reference of the decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Oil and Natural Gas Corporation vs Krishan Gopal 2020(3) SCALE 272, date of decision 7.2.2020** is relevant therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have has laid down principle regarding regularization of the Workman on permanent posts. Hon'ble Supreme Court have laid down the prepositions of regularization of the workmen to permanent post is as under:-

"*(i) Wide as they are, the powers of the Labour Court and the Industrial Court cannot extend to a direction to order regularisation, where such a direction would in the context of public employment offend the provisions contained in Article 14 of the Constitution;*

(ii) The statutory power of the Labour Court or Industrial Court to grant relief to workmen including the status of permanency continues to exist in circumstances where the employer has indulged in an unfair labour practice by not filling up permanent posts even though such posts are available and by continuing to employ workmen as temporary or daily wage employees despite their performing the same work as regular workmen on lower wages;

(iii) The power to create permanent or sanctioned posts lies outside the judicial domain and where no posts are available, a direction to grant regularisation would be impermissible merely on the basis of the number of years of service;

(iv) Where an employer has regularised similarly situated workmen either in a scheme or otherwise, it would be open to workmen who have been deprived of the same benefit at par with the workmen who have been regularised to make a complaint before the Labour or Industrial Court, since the deprivation of the benefit would amount to a violation of Article 14; and

(v) In order to constitute an unfair labour practice under Section 2(ra) read with Item 10 of the Vth Schedule of the ID Act, the employer should be engaging workmen as badlis, temporaries or casuals, and continuing them for years, with the object of depriving them of the benefits payable to permanent workmen.

Thus, in view of the principles laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court as discussed above, in the instant matter the Workman utterly failed to prove his claim by adducing any documentary or oral evidence that the employer has indulged in unfair labour practice by not filling the permanent posts even though such posts are available and by continuing to employ workmen as temporary or daily wage employees despite their performance was the same work, as regular workmen on lower wages.

43. Respondent has contended that all the vacancies exist and arise upto 31.3.1997 has been filled up from the panel list in order of seniority and no vacancy exists or arises as on 31.3.1997 remained unfilled. Further, it is contended that as per terms of settlement the life of panel lists has been lapsed on 31.3.1997, hence, there is no occasion to extend the life of panel lists beyond 31.3.1997. However, the workman failed to prove contrary by any evidence to the aforesaid contention of the Respondent that the vacancies were existing as on 31.3.1997 and the workman was not given absorption to the permanent post in order of his seniority. It is settled law that the power to create permanent or sanctioned post lies outside the judicial domain and where no posts are available, a direction to grant regularization would be impermissible merely on the basis of the number of years of service. Therefore, the claim of the workman on this ground also not acceptable.

44. Further, as per the of settlement, panel was prepared for absorption of the workmen on the permanent posts has already been lapsed on 31.3.1997 and the vacancies existing and arising upto 31.12.1994 and upto 31.3.1997 as settlement dated 30.7.1996 has been filled up from the panel by appointing the workmen as per seniority in the panel list. Workman witness WW1 in his cross examination has himself admitted this fact that, some of the temporary employees whose names were included in the panel were given regular appointment in the bank in order of their seniority in the panel. The Workman failed to show that there was any breach of terms of settlement has been committed by the Respondent in appointment to permanent post from aforesaid panel list.

45. As discussed in preceding paragraph of this Award, the life of the panel has not been extended beyond 31.3.1997, by any further settlement hence, the panel list in which name of the Workman was included got expired on 31.3.1997. It is not the case of the Workman that Respondent has regularized similarly situated workmen either in the scheme or otherwise and the Workman has been deprived of same benefit on par with those workmen or the vacancies remained unfilled on the date of lapse of panels i.e., 31.3.1997, Industrial Tribunal has no jurisdiction to extend the date of lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997. This Tribunal can not order for regularization of workmen to the permanent post in contravention of the provision of Article 14 of the Constitution of India.

In the case of **Mahboob Deepak vs. Nagar Panchayat Gajraula & Anr, Civil Appeal No.5875/2007 date of judgement 13.12.2007,** Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

"8. Respondent is a Local Authority. The terms and conditions of employment of the employees are governed by a statute and statutory rules. No appointment can be made by a Local Authority without following the provisions of the recruitment rules. Any appointment made in violation of the said rules as also the constitutional scheme of equality as contained in Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India would be a nullity.

9. Due to some exigency of work, although recruitment on daily wages or on an ad hoc basis was permissible, but by reason thereof an employee cannot claim any right to be permanently absorbed in service or made permanent in absence of any statute or statutory rules. Merely because an employee has completed 240 days of work in a year preceding the date of retrenchment, the same would not mean that his services were liable to be regularized."

Therefore, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, the claim of the Workman for absorption merely on the basis of number of day of work in the Respondent bank Branch is not acceptable. As regard plea of the Workman that the Workman should have been given employment even after 31.3.1997 as temporary Workman, it is the discretion of Respondent to engage the Workman depending upon availability of work and this Tribunal can not direct the Respondent to engage the Workman in the absent of such rule/scheme.

46. In view of principle laid down by Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above, in the instant matter Workman utterly failed to establish the fact of rendering continuous service for a period of 240 days of service within a period of 12 calendar months commencing and coming backward from relevant date i.e., the date of retrenchment, if has he would be denied to be in continuous service for a period of one year. Therefore, the provision contained under Sec.25F of retrenchment is not applicable to Workman.

Counsel for Workman has relied upon number of decisions of Hon'ble High Court and Hon'ble Supreme Court and few of them are discussed herein:-

In the case of **F.C.I., vs. Kamdhenu Cattle Feed Industries 1993 (1) SCC 71,** therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

"7. In contractual sphere as in all other State actions, the State and all its instrumentalities have to conform to Article 14 of the Constitution of which non-arbitrariness is a significant facet. There is no unfettered discretion in public law: A public authority possesses powers only to use them for public good. This impose the duty to act fairly and to adopt a procedure which is `fairplay in action'. Due observance of this obligation as a part of good administration raises a reasonable or legitimate expectation in every citizen to be treated fairly in his interaction with the State and its instrumentalities, with this element forming a necessary component of the decision making process in all State actions. To satisfy this requirement of non- arbitrariness in a State action, it is, therefore, necessary to consider and give due weight to the reasonable or legitimate expectations of the persons likely lo be affected by the decision or else that unfairness in the exercise of the power may amount to an abuse or excess of power apart from affecting the bona fides of the decision in a given case. The decision so made would be exposed to challenge on the ground of arbitrariness. Rule of law does not completely eliminate discretion in the exercise of power, as it is unrealistic, but providers for control of its exercise by judicial review."

In the case of **State Bank of India, R.O., Vijayawada vs. Industrial Tribunal, Hyderabad WP No.193/1997,** therein Hon'ble High Court have held,

"*Sri Krovvidi Narasimham, the learned counsel for the 2nd Respondent contends, supporting the award that it was a permanent vacancy and even though the 2nd Respondent was appointed on temporary basis, his services were not liable to be terminated and he was to be regularised into service on permanent basis. Shastry award warrants that no temporary appointment can be made to a permanent post. But the matter is now covered by two division bench judgements dated 28.11.1986 in W.A. No.791 of 1986 and 25.8.1987 in W.A. No.270 of 1982. The ratio decided in the two judgements is to the effect that there cannot be any mandate to appoint employees on permanent basis when the requirement was for appointment on temporary basis. But it is held in the said judgements that when a temporary appointee is ousted from service and not for misconduct and, if again temporary appointment is to be made, then, the case of such temporary appointee who was ousted, has got to be considered in accordance with Sec. 25-H of the Act."*

In the case of **State of Haryana and others vs. Piara Singh and others. 1992 (4) SCC 118,** therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

" 49. If for any reason an adhoc or temporary employee is continued for a fairly long spell, the authorities must consider his case for regularization provided he is eligible and qualified according to the rules and his service record is satisfactory and his appointment does not run counter to the reservation policy of the state."

In the above cited judgements by the Workman the facts of the case are different hence do not apply to instant case of Workman.

47. Thus, in view of fore gone discussion and laws laid down by Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above, the claim of workman of regularization in the employment of Respondent is not substantiated by the evidence of Petitioner, WW1 in his cross examination has admitted that he is not aware of any settlements and he is not having any document to show that any person who worked for less number of days than him was given appointment in the bank and he has no document to show that any of his juniors is continuing in service of the bank as of now. Therefore, the claim of the Petitioner for regularization in the employment of Respondent bank is not tenable. Further, Petitioner failed to produce any document in evidence to establish that any temporary employee junior to him is working in the Respondent bank. Therefore, Petitioner is not entitled for regularization in the service of the Respondent.

This point is answered against the Petitioner Workman and in favour of the Respondent.

48. **Point No.IV**:- In view of the discussion and finding given at Point Nos. I, II and III, the Workman is not entitled for any relief and claim statement of Workman sans merit and liable to be dismissed.

This Point is answered accordingly.

AWARD

In view of the fore gone discussion, it is held that the action of the Respondent bank in terminating the services of Sri M. Venkateswara Rao, Ex. Messenger by way of oral orders w.e.f. 1.4.1997 is justified. Hence, the Petitioner is not entitled for any relief as prayed for. The claim statement filed by Workman sans merit, hence, dismissed.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, Personal Assistant, transcribed by her, corrected and signed by me on this the 3rd day of July, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the Witnesses examined for the

Petitioner	Respondent
WW1: Sri M. Venkateswara Rao	NIL

Documents marked for the Petitioner

Ex.W1: Photocopy of service certificate

Ex.W2: Photocopy of News paper advertisement/ notification

Documents marked for the Respondent

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 27 जुलाई, 2026

का.आ. 1680.— औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार भारतीय स्टेट बैंक के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजको और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण – सह – श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद के पंचाट (सन्दर्भ संख्या 82/2003) को प्रकाशित करती है,

[सं. एल. 39025/01/2026–आई.आर.(बी-II)-82]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 27th July, 2026

S.O. 1680.— In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (.No.LC.82/2003) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Hyderabad as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the Management of State Bank of India and their workmen,

[No. L-39025/01/2026- IR (B-II)- 82]

SALONI, Dy. Director

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD

Present: - **Sri Irfan Qamar**

Presiding Officer

Dated the 23rd day of June, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE L.C.No. 82/2003

Between:

Sri Kattepogu Simon,

S/o K. Nageswara Rao,

R/o H.No.1203,

1st Ward, Mangalagiri,

Guntur District.

… Petitioner

And

The Asst. Geneneral Manager (Personal),

State Bank of India,

Zonal Office, Vijayawada.

Krishna district. …..Respondent

Appearances:

For the Petitioner : M/s. V.V.C. Manohar & Nurulla Baig, Advocates

For the Respondent: Sri Y. Ranjeeth Reddy, Advocate

AWARD

Sri Koraganti Ramesh Babu who worked as Messenger (who will be referred to as the workman) has filed this petition under Sec. 2A(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 against the Respondents State Bank of India seeking for reinstatement into service as Messenger duly granting all the consequential benefits such as continuity of service, back wages and all other attendant benefits etc., and such other reliefs as this court may deem fit.

2. Before unfolding the factual matrix of the instant industrial dispute it would be apposite to have a bird eye view of a chequered history of the instant industrial dispute. Earlier instant industrial dispute along with the batch cases was decided by this Tribunal vide common award dated 17.5.2005 and the reference was answered in favour of the Respondent and against the Workman. That said common award dated 17.5.2005 was challenged by the aggrieved Workmen in various Writ petition No.6470/2014 along with batch of writ petitions before the Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh and Hon'ble High Court vide its' judgement dated 23.6.2014 allowed all batch of writ petitions and set aside the common award dated 17.5.2005 passed in ID No.222 of 2001 and other batch of ID cases by Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad and the Respondent management of State Bank of India was directed to reengage the Writ Petitioners in position, which they have been occupying prior to their termination and further directed to consider their cases for regularization as and when the substantive vacancy arises. This judgement dated 23.6.2014 of Hon'ble High Court of AP, passed in WP No.6470/2014 and batch petitions was challenged by Respondent management before the Hon'ble High Court in Writ Appeal No. 1268 of 2014. The aforesaid Writ Appeals No.1268/2014 and other Writ Appeals were decided by Division Bench of High Court of Andhra Pradesh by a common judgement dated 20.3.2019. Hon'ble High Court in aforesaid Writ Appeal was pleased to pass the order which is extracted as below:-

" 7. Hearing the learned senior counsel for the SBI and the learned senior counsel for the contesting unofficial Respondents, we see that while the learned single Judge was justified in setting aside the award af the Tribunal, the proper course to be adopted was to remit all the cases to the Tribunal. This we say for reasons more than one. Firstly, in such matters, claims have to be decided on individual basis, as different persons have different claims as to the length of officiation or discharge of duties and functions; quality of engagement, drawings, accounting of the post for each one of them, who have worked etc. All these issues will not be the same in all the cases. Therefore, each case ought to have been directed to be decided by the Tribunal afresh on individual basis. The second and most important aspect is the learned single Judge has in one go ordered re-employment of all the workmen. This is not a relief that could have been granted without answering the individual issues; each issue relating to each case could not have been decided by the writ Court within the format of its adjudication procedures and scope. The adjudicating body, which has to do that activity, is the Industrial Tribunal. Therefore, we are of the view that while we would sustain the order of the learned singe Judge insofar as it interfered and sets aside the award of the Tribunal, the further findings and directions, issued through the impugned order have to go and the individual cases have to be sent back for consideration of the Tribunal. Such further procedure before the Tribunal will have to be carried forward with the materials already on record and also by affording an opportunity to the persons, who have claims as well as the management to place their rival contentions and further material before the Tribunal. The learned counsel appearing for the workmen are justified in pointing out that enormous delay has already happened and further action by the Tribunal in this line may be expedited.

9. In the result, these writ appeals are ordered;

(1) affirming the impugned common order of the learned single Judge to the extent it sets aside the common award dated 17.05.2005 of the Industrial Tribunal;

(2) the further findings and directions issued through the impugned common order are vacated:

(3) all the matters shall be remitted to the Industrial Tribunal with a direction to dispose of them within an outer limit of five (5) months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order; and,

(4) the parties to make appearance before the Tribunal on the given date."

Thus, in view of the above direction of Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh in W.A.No.1268 of 2014 and batch cases. This Tribunal has taken up the matter of industrial dispute for hearing and deciding it afresh in view of the aforesaid guidelines laid down by the Hon'ble High Court in Writ Appeal No.1268/2014 vide judgement dated 20.3.019.

3. The factual matrix of instant industrial dispute as narrated by the Workman in his claim statement are that, the Workman joined in the service of the management institution as Messenger from 1.1.1986 to March, 1997, and has rendered unblemished service spreading over a period of about 11 years. The Respondent has terminated services of Workman by oral orders with effect from March, 1997. Further, it is submitted that the management of Respondent bank decided to give a chance to temporarily employed personnel "found suitable for permanent appointment" by wait- listing them by offering permanent appointment or waitlisting till such opportunity arises.

4. That on 17.11.1987 a settlement was reached between All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and the Management of State Bank of India - settlement one, under this settlement three categories of employees were listed. That is, A) those who have completed 240 days in 12 months or less after 1.7.1975. B) those who have completed 270 days in any continuous block of 36 calendar months after 1.7.1975. C) (i) those who have completed minimum of 30 days aggregate temporary service in any calendar year after 1.7.1975 or (ii) 70 days aggregate temporary service in continuous block of 36 months after 1.7.1975.

5. The persons who satisfied in all the above 4 categories were to be interviewed by a selection committee and the said selection committee would determine the suitability of the said candidate for permanent appointment. Therefore, the bank prescribed certain qualifications and from among the candidates satisfying the qualifications the suitable candidates were enlisted by a selection committee. The Clause 7 of the said agreement provided with the selected candidate would be wait listed in order of their respective categorization and the selected panel would be valid upto December, 1991. Clause 10 of the settlement specifically provided that henceforth. "there will be no temporary appointments in the subordinate cadre", except on a restrictive basis in the specified category, "from amongst empanelled candidates as per existing guidelines of the bank". The Workman further submits that consequent upon the said agreement and the draft, a notification was issued in the newspapers. The last date for responding to the advertisement was 30.8.1988. A written examination followed by viva-voce in May, 1989 was held. A selected panel was prepared, as per Clause 7 of the agreement, ie. Settlement No.1, the selected panel was to be valid upto December, 1991, the Workman submits that circular was issued on 26.4.91 by the said letter it is mentioned that the terms of the agreement dated 17.11.87 was modified vide second agreement dated 16.7.88 was entered into between the parties. In terms of the said agreement a chance was to be given, "to all eligible temporary employees for permanent appointments. The appointments were against the vacancies likely to arise during the years 1995-96, circular made it clear that in view of the enormity of the problem an extension of the currency of the panel, eligible temporary employees who have been empanelled could not appear in the earlier interviews and have been pursuing their cases thereafter, "will be given another chance to appear for interview".

6. Workman submits that there were total five settlements. The settlement dated 17.11.87 is the 1st settlement (Ex M1), settlement dated 16.7.88 is 2nd settlement (Ex M2), settlement dated 27.10.88 is the 3rd settlement (Ex M3), then settlement dated 9.1.91 is 4th settlement and settlement dated 30.7.96 is 5th settlement (Ex M6). In between there is minutes of conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.95 marked as Ex M5. That due to all these settlements which were extended by subsequent settlements thereby created reasonable expectations in the list of the selected candidates arose with that it's a question of time their appointments or services would be regularized in the services of the bank. The Workman was working with the bank on temporary basis was under the bonafide hope that sooner his services will be regularized with the bank. He is thereby closed all his options elsewhere. It is needless to point out that employing person to whom hope of employment in substantial terms was made is a facet of Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

7. Further Workman submits that the Government of India issued Circular No. F-3/3/104/87-IR, dated 16.8.1990. Under said circular the chief Executives of all public sector banks including the Management herein were specifically instructed that until the problem of existing temporary employees is fully resolved, no bank is permitted to make any permanent appointments. That some of the persons similarly situated like this Workman aggrieved by the inaction on the part of the management of the bank is not regularizing their services from out of the selected panel and not clearly focusing the vacancy position, filed W.P. No. 4194/97 before Hon'ble High court of A.P.. It is specifically averred in the said writ petition that the Management of the bank had failed to implement the settlement and that it violates the various fundamental rights guaranteed under the constitution of India. The Hon'ble High court of A.P .. by order dated 5.3.97 directed the bank to implement the settlement as amended from time to time. It also directed the bank to carry out the terms of settlement before the expiry of March, 1997. The Hon'ble High Court also recorded finding that the Bank cannot escape its liability of enforcement of the Settlement. In view of the directions given by the High Court all candidates whose names appeared in the select panels prepared on the basis of the agreement entered into on 17.11.87 under which the panel was valid upto December, 1991, and on the basis of a settlement dated 27.10.1988 whereby the panels were made alive upto 31.3.1997 under which the panel was valid upto December, 1999. The other agreement dated 16.7.1988 under which the panel was valid upto 1992 and on the basis of the settlement dated 27.10.1998 whereby the panels were made alive upto 31.3.1997 were under the bonafide impression that their cases will be considered for regularization and were living on the basis of the said reasonable expectation. Unfortunately, contrary to the aforesaid directions given by the High Court and contrary to the settlements entered into between the parties, the bank issued proceedings dated 25.3.1997, dated 27.3.1997 and 31.3.1997 instructing the various authorities of the Management not to continue the temporary employees those who are in services of the bank from 1.4.97. The said order was followed by the Management. Aggrieved by the said action the Workman herein and similarly situated candidates have filed a writ petition before the Hon'ble High Court and by way of Writ Petition No.9206/97 seeking a declaration that the proceedings issued by the Deputy General Manager and the Assistant General Manager (Respondents 3,4 and 5 therein) on 25.3.97, 27.3.97 and 31.3.97 as illegal and also non-continuance of the Workmen therein in service by absorbing them in the services of the bank as

violative of Section 2(p) and 18(1) read with Rule 58 of Central Rules and sought for specific direction to the bank to absorb them in service.

8. Further, Workman submits that in the counter affidavit filed in Writ Petition No.9206/97, the bank has submitted that it has about 805 branches in Andhra Pradesh alone. It has stated that due to exigencies of circumstances and on account of the urgent need in its banks, it employed temporary employees in subordinate cadre. It is pertinent to mention that it does not state the urgent or need or the nature of temporary employees that it had engaged. Enquiry into the same would reveal that the stand taken by the bank either on the ground of urgent need or of temporary employees is a façade to perpetuate unfair labour practice. It is designed to on the one hand, keep the employed in the erroneous zone of hope and on the other to ensure that benefits that a model employer will extend under various statutes to its employees is not required to be borne out by the bank. A reading of the counter affidavit would show that the bank would opines that being just fair and reasonable are which obviously is reprehensible and is a facet of unfair labour practice.

9. The Workman submits that the bank had referred in its counter affidavit to three settlements dated 17.11.87, 16.7.88 and 27.10.88. The bank in the guise of extending the benefits of the circular of Government dated 16.8.90 stated in its counter affidavit that as follows:

"Government of India, vide its letter dated 16.8.1990, issued guidelines to all the public sector banks with regard to recruitment and absorption of temporary employees in public sector banks. The said guidelines were issued to implement on the lines of the approach paper on the issue provided by a committee constituted in this regard. The Government of India guidelines made it clear that all the public sector banks may follow the provisions laid down in the approach paper.

The approach paper specified that the cases of temporary employees who had put in not less than 240 days of temporary service in 12 consecutive Months and who are entitled to benefit of Section 25-F may be decided by entering into a settlement with the representative union. In respect of temporary employees who had put in less than 240 days of service in 12 consecutive months or less, a settlement could be avoided and however if the Management so desired, they could enter into a conciliation settlement with the representative union. Para 6(h), it is mentioned that only those temporary employees who had put in temporary service of 90 or more days after 1.1 1982 would be eligible for considering under the scheme. Although the Government guidelines envisaged for a settlement in respect of employees who had put in temporary service of 90 or more days, the bank by way of further concession entered into settlements Even in respect of those who had put in less than 90 days. As such, it could be Seen that the settlements are more beneficial to the temporary employees concerned. The approach paper also specify at para 6(c) that the banks would provide one time opportunity to all the temporary employees and for that purpose temporary employees worked in the bank on or after 1.1.1982 could be considered for re-employment in terms of the scheme. The Respondents have gone further wherein even persons working after 1975 were also considered.

As could be seen from the above, there was a genuine effort on the part of the Respondent bank to provide permanent employment for as many as possible subject to availability of the vacancies.

It is further submitted that at para 6(k) of the approach paper, it was made clear that this would be one time exercise in full and final settlement of all the aims and disputes for the past period in respect of temporary workmen covered by the settlement. This would mean that the Government of India guidelines would cover only those persons who were temporarily employed for the period specified therein and not otherwise. As such, it is submitted that the Respondents have not only followed the Government of India guidelines but in fact covered cases of the employees who had worked for less than 90 days. As such, question of violation does not arise and in any case those were only broad guidelines and not directives".

10. The Workman submits that the bank also referred a subsequent settlement dated 9.1.1991 wherein there is a clause to the effect- that the panel of temporary employees and the panel of daily wage employees will be operated to a particular period. Therefore, their cases will not be considered. The Management herein relying upon this settlement in their impugned action. It is submitted that even the settlement dated 9.1.1991 will not empower the management to terminate the services of the temporary employees who are working in the bank services like the Workman herein as it does not specify the termination of the employees. In fact there are so many vacancies wherein the Management has engaged several new persons as temporary messengers/ attendars/ sweepers etc., even after the judgment of Hon'ble High Court without considering the cases of the similarly situated candidates like the Workman herein. It is submitted inspite of engaging fresh candidates as is now being done by the Management they would have continued the similarly situated candidates like the Workman herein in the services of the bank and consider their cases for absorption in view of the circulars issued by Central Government as well as the directions of this Hon'ble Court in Writ Petition No.4194/97, dated 5.3.97. In view of the circulars issued by the Central Government, the Management should not have relied upon the settlement dated 9.1.1991. Hence, the impugned action of the Management is illegal, unjust, violative of fundamental rights such as Articles 14,16 and 21 of the Constitution of India.

11. The Workman submits that in W.P. No.4194/97 filed by the union of temporary employees where in they have complained about the non- implementation of the settlements arrived between the parties and sought for

absorption. Such employees in the bank services on permanent basis before the date fixed for carrying out the terms of settlement, the Court held that the members of the union had been empanelled in the list, they were not regularized and the time was going to run out to the near future and the Respondent bank and its officers cannot escape from the liability of enforcing the settlement which has been reached and therefore directed that the bank and the officers shall implement the settlement dated 17.11.87 as amended from time to time before the expiry of 31.3.97.

12. Further, it is submitted that in the clause of Settlement it is specifically mentioned that the workmen to be absorbed/appointed in the bank prohibiting any temporary appointments subsequent to the date of settlement even the authorities want to make temporary appointments that should be made only from among the empanelled can be appointed either for temporary vacancy or permanent vacancy except from among the empanelled candidates like the Workman and that should be continued till they are absorbed. The management committed unfair labour practices and terminated the services of the candidates with effect from 31.3.1997 which is arbitrary, discriminatory, contrary to their own guidelines and violative of the constitutional provisions which are guaranteed in Chapter-III of the Constitution of India.

13. The Workman submits that it is strange as to how the panels were allowed to lapse by a so-called Memorandum of Understanding dated 25.2.1997, that the action of terminating such employees like the Workman by virtue of an impugned oral proceedings without implementing the settlement would be illegal and unfair labour practice which cannot be allowed to be perpetuated. That the discontinuance of the Workman after 31.3.97 who had served in the bank in any capacity amounts to retrenchment. It could not have been done without any notice and it violates Sec.25FF of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and the said action is violative of principles of natural justice guaranteed under Chapter III of the Constitution of India. This amounts to retrenchment without one month's notice and taken in view of such notice. Thus, the main proceedings issued by the Respondent is without jurisdiction and is arbitrary, illegal and therefore liable to be quashed. That the alleged Memorandum of Understanding dated 27.2.97, Ex.M5 does not own any legal entity, as the said Memorandum of Understanding is not published anywhere to brought to the notice of the Workman whose rights are being affected. It is submitted that Management did not adhere to the procedure envisaged by the Central Government in its' instructions dated 16.8.90 in the year 1995. The same was not followed in the year 1997 despite there being vacancies. The management has followed the procedure of calling candidates through Employment exchange instead of giving chance to the empanelled candidates like the Workman here. It is pertinent to mention here that the Respondent Management sent letters to the all similarly situated candidates like the Workman in the month of June, 1997, subsequent to the passing of impugned termination orders. After knowing the facts that the candidates are litigating, the Management refused to engage these candidates. It is once again reiterated that the panels are meant for absorption but not for termination. It was the duty of the Management to engage the empanelled candidates like the Workman even in temporary vacancies till they are absorbed permanently in regular vacancies. Hence, the action of the Respondent Management terminating the services of the Workman by oral order dated 31.3.97 is unjust, illegal, violative of principles of natural justice and hence, the Management be directed to reinstate and absorb the Workman and to grant all incidental and consequential benefits.

14. Per contra, Respondent had filed counter and made a contentions that the reference is not tenable and contrary to the provisions of I.D. Act, 1947. Respondent submitted that to tide over severe sub-ordinate staff constraints which arose out of leave vacancies, exigencies, etc., and also owning to the restrictions imposed by the Government of India/Reserve Bank of India on intake of staff, the Respondent bank used to engage sub-ordinate staff like messengers, sweepers, sweeper cum water boys, etc., depending on the availability of work on purely temporary basis for the smooth and uninterrupted functioning of the branches. It is submitted that the All India State Bank of India Staff Federation which represents majority of the employees in the State Bank of India comprising about 98% of the work force as its' members espoused the cause of temporary employees who have put in less than 240 days of temporary service in 12 calendar months in the bank and who were ineligible for any protection under Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 to give a chance for being considered for absorption and permanent appointments.

15. Discussions were held and on 17.11.1987 an agreement was signed between the federation and the Management bank under Sec. 2(p) read with Sec 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules 1957. A copy of the said settlement dated 17.11.87 which may be herein after referred as first settlement is filed and 4 categories were made as it has already been mentioned in the claim statement above, it need not be repeated here. In the first settlement, it was agreed that the temporary employees as categorized would be given a chance for being considered for permanent appointment in the bank's service against the vacancies which are likely to arise during the period 1987 to 1991. On 16.7.88 second settlement was arrived between the Federation and the Bank whereby it was agreed to substitute the period of consideration of vacancies as 1987 to 1992 in place of 1987 to 1991 as contemplated under the first settlement dated 17.11.1987. This is the second settlement. A 3rd settlement was entered into on 27.10.88 and it was agreed that the bank's service against the vacancies likely to arise from 1988 to 1992 was to be considered. Government of India vide its letter dated 16.8.90 issued guidelines to all the public sector banks with regard to recruitment and absorption of temporary employees in public sector banks. The said guidelines were issued to implement on the lines of approach paper on the issue provided by a committee constituted in this regard. Government of India guidelines made it clear that all the public sector banks may follow

the provisions laid down in the approach paper. The approach paper specified that the cases of temporary service in 12 consecutive months and who are entitled to benefit of Sec.25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 may be decided by entering into a settlement with the representative union. In respect of temporary employees who had put in less than 240 days of service in 12 consecutive months or less, a settlement could be avoided and however if the Management so desired they could enter into a conciliation settlement with the representative union. In para. 6(h) it is mentioned that only those temporary employees who had put in temporary service of 90 days or more days after 1.1.82 would be eligible for considering under the scheme. Although the Government guidelines envisaged for a settlement in respect of employees who had put in temporary service of 90 days or more days, the bank by way of a further concession entered into settlements. Even in respect of those who had put in less than 90 days and also the bank went a step further and said those persons who are working after 1975 were also considered. Hence, there was a genuine effort on the part of the Respondent bank to provide as many as possible jobs subject to the availability of the vacancies. However, para 6 (k) of the approach paper made it clear that it is a one time, exercise in full and final, settlement of all the claims and disputes for the past period, in respect of temporary workmen covered by the settlement. Another settlement was entered on 9.1.91 herein after referred as 4th settlement and the time limit was extended upto 1994 and separate panel was prepared for temporary employees, casual/daily wagers. It was agreed that while vacancies arising between 1988 to 1994 in respect of temporary employees and in respect of casual/daily wagers, they can be considered for the vacancies arising between 1995-96 only.

16. It is submitted that the administrative set up of the Hyderabad Local Head Office comprises of four Zonal Offices (Zones) at Hyderabad, Vijayawada, Visakhapatnam and Tirupathi covering all the Districts of Andhra Pradesh. In terms of the settlement the Management after following the procedure laid down therein prepared the panels of qualified candidates of temporary employees denoted as 1989 panel and also panel of casual/daily wagers denoted as 1992 panel for giving a chance for being considered for permanent absorption. These panels were prepared zone-wise separately for messengers and non-messengers in the descending order of temporary service put in by the candidates during the stipulated period i.e., 1.7.1975 to 31.7.1988. That the Federation approached the Regional Labour Commissioner(C) for implementation of bi-partite settlement in respect of absorption of temporary employees. The Regional Labour Commissioner(C) conducted conciliation proceedings and an agreement was arrived between the Federation and the bank. It was agreed that it would be kept alive upto March, 1997. A copy of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.2.1995 signed by the parties is filed as material paper. A settlement was arrived at and an agreement was signed between the Federation and the Management bank on 30.7.1996 under Sec.2 (p) read with Sec.18(1) of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957, which is hereinafter called as 5th settlement. That on 27.2.1997 a Memorandum of understanding was also signed by the federation's affiliate and the bank Management recording the fact that the exercise of identifying the messengerial vacancies as on 31.12.1994 has since been completed by Central Office and thereby 403 messengerial vacancies were sanctioned . It was agreed that these vacancies may be filled from 1989 panel of temporary employees after effecting conversion from full time non-messengerial staff in the usual manner and the agreement was reached accordingly. It was agreed between the Federation's affiliate and the Management bank that in terms of the settlement dated 30.7.1996 both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees would lapse on 31.3.1997. That as agreed upon vacancies were filled from the panels. The Workman who has put in an aggregate temporary service of less than 240 days in a continuous block of 12 months period during 1.7.1975 to 31.7.1988 has no right to seek a direction to consider his candidature for absorption in the Management bank under any rule/law except under the settlement entered into thereon.

17. Respondent contended that, in fact, the case of the Workman can be considered under all the five settlements having got his case considered under provisions of these settlements. All the other provisions and terms of the settlements are also binding on him/her. The Management bank has not violated any of the provisions of the terms of the said settlement. That the very preparation and maintenance of panel is in compliance of the terms agreed under these settlements. These settlements were time bound and they ceased to exist on 31.3.1997. That the bank has never promised that all the candidates in the panel will be absorbed. In the advertisement itself it was made clear that candidates will be considered for absorption in the vacancies that may arise upto 1992. Keeping alive the panels after 31.3.1997 is contrary to the settlements arrived between the State Bank of India Staff Federation and the Management bank. That the settlements are binding on the parties. The Workman is also bound under the terms of the said settlement. The settlement does not suffer from any ambiguity as their language is very clear. The right under the settlements is to give them a chance to be considered for future appointment in the bank's services against the vacancies likely to arise. The settlements were effected to balance the expectations of the temporary employees to be absorbed in permanent service as against the constitutional rights for all eligible persons to be considered for employment every time a vacancy arises. That the alleged dispute including the demand for reinstatement has to be decided in this context. It is submitted that the period of panel list got expired on 31.3.97 and it is an integral term of the settlement and cannot be modified in any proceedings under the law. These temporary employees who unfortunately could not be accommodated for want of vacancies have no further rights to be considered for regularization. That the Hon'ble High Court in WP No.12964/94, held as follows, "It is needless to state that the settlement arrived at between the All India State Bank of India Staff Federation which, is the majority union and the bank Management is binding on the Workmen also. It is not at all the case of the Workman that any of the terms of

the settlement has been violated by the bank's Management. If the Workman had worked in the bank on part-time basis before 31.5.94, that itself would not vest in him a right to claim that his services should be regularized on permanent basis against a full time cadre post. The claim put forth by the Workman in the present petition is therefore misconceived and not tenable. However, it is open to the Workman to claim any right which flows from the settlement between the union and the bank Management. As already pointed out that it is not the grievance of the Workman that some right which has flown from the settlement in favour of the Workman has been denied by the bank Management. Therefore, I do not find any ground, let alone substantial ground, to grant the kind of relief sought for by the Workman. Writ Petition fails and is accordingly dismissed. No costs."

18. Further, it is contended that if the panels were not lapsed at the end of designated period and allowed to be continued it would result in making the contracts of temporary employment indirectly permanent through back door entry, which would not only be contrary to the settlements but also to Articles 14 and 16 of Constitution of India and deprive the chances of original claimants who would Come through proper recruitment procedure. As their rights have been crystallized by operation of the settlements. Hence, there is no question of any Legitimate expectation being violated.

19. Similarly placed ex-employees filed WP No.9206/1995 and the batch before the Hon'ble High Court of A.P. and the learned Single Judge allowed the Writ Petitions. Aggrieved by the same WA No.86/98 and the batch was filed and the Division Bench set aside the order of the Single Judge. Thereafter the ex-temporary employees filed Special Leave Petition No.11886-11888 of 1998 before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India also dismissed the SLP. Therefore, reference to the Judgement of the Learned Single Judge in WP No.9206/97 is of no consequences as the same has already been set aside. The observations made in the Judgements cannot be relied upon for any purpose what so ever. The question of operation of Sec.25F would not come into play. Further the issue is covered by various Judgements of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India and various Hon'ble High Courts. Hence, the reference may be ordered that the Workman is not entitled for any relief.

20. In order to fortify his claim Workman has examined himself as WW1 and also filed documents in evidence which has been exhibited as Ex.W1 to W13. Further, the Workman has filed photocopies of documents in support of his claim which are discussed as under:-

Ex.W1 to Ex.W8 are service certificates. Ex.W9 is the interview call letter. Ex.W10 is the order passed in WP No.7838/1995. Ex.W11 is the paper notification. Ex.W12 is the letter dt. 18.2.93 appointment letter No.797 annexing list of 80 members 2nd panel. Ex.W13 is the transfer certificate.

21. On the other hand, Respondent has examined witness MW1 Sri Rupakula Prakash Babu and this witness has exhibited 12 documents, marked as Ex.M1 to M12. The details of these documents are as follows:-

Ex.M.1 is the Settlement dated 17.11.1987. Ex.M2 is the Settlement dated 16.7.1988. Ex.M3 is the Settlement dated 27.10.1988. Ex.M4 is the Settlement dated 9.1.1991. Ex.M5 is the Minutes of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.1995. Ex.M6 is the Settlement dated 30.7.1996. Ex.M7 is the Memorandum of Understanding dt. 27.2.1997. Ex.M8 is the Particulars of 1989 Messengerial Panel. Ex.M9 is the Particulars of 1989 Non-Messengerial Panel. Ex.M10 is the Particulars of 1992 General Attendant Panel. Ex.M11 is the Judgment of Hon’ble High Court of A.P. in Writ Appeal No.86/98 dt.1.5.1998. Ex.M12 is the Judgment of Hon’ble Supreme Court of India in SLP No. 11886-11888 of 1998 dt.10.8.1998. Ex.M13 is the paper notification.

22. Apart from afore mentioned documents, Learned Counsel for Workman has also filed a long list of various judgements of Hon’ble Supreme Court as well as Hon’ble High Court, which we will discuss at appropriate place in this Award.

23. Heard the argument of Learned Counsel for Workman as well as for Respondent.

24. On the basis of rival pleadings of both the parties and submissions made by the Learned Counsel for both the parties, following points arise for determination in the industrial dispute :-

I. Whether the 1st settlement dated 17.11.1987, 2nd settlement dated 16.7.1988, 3rd settlement dated 27.10.1988, 4th settlement dated 9.1.1991 and 5th settlement dated 30.7.1996 entered into between State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and also Memorandum of Understanding are binding upon both the parties?

II. Whether the action of State Bank of India, in terminating the services of Workman Sri Koraganti Ramesh Babu, a Messenger with effect from March, 1997 is justified?

III. Whether the Workman is entitled for absorption on permanent post in the Branch of Respondent management as per averments made by him in the claim statement?

IV. To what relief if any the Workman is entitled for?

Findings:-

25. **Point No.I**:- Undisputedly settlements dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988, 9.1.1991 and 30.7.1996, minutes of conciliation proceedings and memorandum of understanding dated 27.2.1997 were executed between the State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation under section 2(p) and 18 (1) of I.D. Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Disputes (Central Rules), 1957.

Section 2(p) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 as follows:-

(p) "settlement" means a settlement arrived at in the course of conciliation proceeding and includes a written agreement between the employer and workmen arrived at otherwise than in the course of conciliation proceeding where such agreement has been signed by the parties thereto in such manner as may be prescribed and a copy thereof has been sent to an officer authorised in this behalf by the appropriate Government and the conciliation officer;

Section 18(1) provides as follows:-

18. Persons on whom settlements and awards are binding.

- [(1) A settlement arrived at by agreement between the employer and Workman otherwise than in the course of conciliation proceeding shall be binding on the parties to the agreement.

Therefore, in view of the provision contained u/s.18 (1) I.D. Act, 1947, terms and conditions enumerated in the aforesaid settlements are binding on the parties to the agreement. The Learned Counsel for Workman has argued that the Workman after going through the selection procedure has successfully been listed in the panel for appointment on the permanent basis in the Respondent management and the empanelled list has to be valid till last person in the empanelled list is appointed on permanent basis. But the impugned order dated 25.3.97, 27.3.97 and 31.3.97, has been issued by Respondent management thereby the services of the Workman has been terminated and the said order is not in consonance of the terms of the agreement entered into between the parties. Further, Workman submits that the Respondent in the 5th settlement has mentioned the date i.e., 31.3.1997 for lapse of empanel list which is illegal and that is not binding upon the Workman. The condition of lapse of empanelment list on 31.3.97 incorporated in the aforesaid 5th settlement, is arbitrary and illegal.

26. The perusal of the impugned order dated 25.3.1997 goes to reveal that the Chief/Branch Manager, SBI Zonal Office has issued the letter to all the branches with regard to the subject not to make any temporary appointments in the Branch in messengerial category from 31.3.1997. The extract of the said letter is given below:-

"We have been advised by the Deputy General Manager, Zonal Office, Hyderabad that as both the panels of temporary employees of 1989 and daily wagers/casual labours of 1992 will lapse by 31.3.1997, it has been decided by Central Office not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial category from 31.3.1997."

Thus, from the contents of the aforesaid letter, it manifest that Head Office of State Bank of India vide letter dated 25.3.1997 has issued direction to all its branches not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial category from 31.3.1997 due to reason of lapse of both panels i.e., 1989 & 1992 on 31.3.1997 as per terms of settlements entered into by both parties. Further, the contents of the subsequent letter dated 27.3.1997 issued by Respondent Management is also direction to Branch Manager, State Bank of India not to make any temporary messengerial category appointment with effect from 31.3.1997 and it has also been communicated to all concerned that the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers maintained by Zonal offices stand lapsed from 31.1.1997. Further, office order dated 31.3.1997 has been issued by Respondent management that goes to reveal that the said office order has been issued to this effect that, "Consequent on absorption of temporary employees in permanent cadre, it has been decided by the competent authority that no one onwards, no further daily labour or temporary employees/appointments should be resorted to/engaged/employed." Therefore, it reflects from the contents of the aforesaid orders that the temporary appointment in messengerial category and daily labour has been stopped by the Respondent management with effect from 31.3.1997 because of the lapsed of panel of temporary workers and daily wagers by 31.3.1997. The agreement for lapse of both the panels on 31.3.1997 is contained in the 5th settlement which has been arrived at between the parties on dated 30.7.1996 with the consensus of both the parties. Therefore, Workman can not challenge the terms and conditions contained in settlement dated 30.7.1996 regarding lapse of panel on 31.3.1997 as agreed between State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation. As per provision contained u/s.18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 the said Agreement dated 30.7.1996 is binding on both the parties.

In the case of **Allied Sales Corporation Secunderabad vs.The Authority Under Andhra Pradesh..... 1990 II LLJ 510 AP para 414, Hon'ble Court have held:-**

"*4. There was a settlement between the Management and the workmen under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act on 25th April 1983 under which the age of superannuation of the workmen was fixed at 55 years. The settlement was to be in force upto 30th June 1986 and the next settlement, incorporating practically the same terms, was again entered into on 4th February 1987 under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act. There is no dispute that these settlements are under Section 18(1).*

14. Now the Authority constituted under Section 41(1) of the Act is an authority with very limited jurisdiction. It can only decide in the first appeal whether a termination by the management is valid or not and is within the parameters

of Section 40 of the Act. The said Authority, in our view, has absolutely no jurisdiction to decide whether a settlement entered into under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act between the representatives of the Workmen and of the Management, is vitiated by undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion on the part of the Management. The Authority, namely, the Assistant Commissioner of Labour, was never intended by the A.P. Legislature to have jurisdiction to go into the question of the validity of a settlement arrived at under Section 18 of the Industrial Disputes Act by an Industrial Court. That Parliament has, in fact, constituted Industrial Courts under the Industrial Disputes Act, with extensive powers cannot be disputed. What we mean to say is that the Authority under Section 41(1) of the A.P. Act has no jurisdiction what-so-ever either to question or to decide about the validity of any such settlements. If parties to a settlement have a grievance about the validity of a settlement, it is for them to agitate the matter before the appropriate forum and they cannot ask an Authority constituted under Section 41(1) of the A.P. Shops and Establishments Act, 1966 with limited jurisdiction, to go into any such question and, that too, incidentally while deciding whether retirement as per the contract of employment, is legal or not."

It is not the case of Workman that aforesaid settlements are vitiated by undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion on the part of the management. If the Workman feeling aggrieved by any terms of settlement/ agreement on the aforementioned grounds then he can challenge of settlement before a competent authority under the Act, 1947. But here in the instant matter it is not a case of Workman that aforementioned settlement has been entered into between the parties on the ground of undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion. Therefore, Workman is barred to raise any objection in respect of fixing the date of lapse of both panels on 31.3.1997 as agreed between both the parties and Workman can not challenge any terms of said Agreement.

Further in the case of **Herbertsons Limited Vs. Workmen of Herbertsons Limited and Ors, 1977 AIR 322,** Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

The Tribunal thought that the question of the quantum of membership of the 2nd Respondent did not call for a finding at all in view of 1his Court's order. As observed above that was not a correct assumption. On the other hand, we feel that this view of the Tribunal has led it to approach the matter in an entirely erroneous manner. The Tribunal is, rightly enough, conscious that under section 18 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act the settlement was binding on the company and the members of the 3rd Respondent union. Even so, the Tribunal devoted nearly half of its order in scanning the evidence given by the company and Respondent No. 3 to find out whether the terms of the settlement had been explained by the President of the union to the workmen or not and whether the workers voluntarily accepted the settlement knowing all the "consequences". This to our mind is again an entirely wrong approach.

"When a recognised union negotiates with an employer the workers as individuals do not come into the picture. It is not necessary that each individual worker should know the implications of the settlement since a recognised union, which is expected to protect the legitimate interests of labour, enters into a settlement in the best interests of labour. This would be the normal rule. We cannot altogether rule out exceptional cases where there may be allegations of mala fides, fraud or even corruption or other induce- ments. Nothing of that kind has been suggested against the President of the 3rd Respondent in this case. That being the position, prima facie, this is a settlement in the course of collective bargaining and, therefore, is entitled to due weight and consideration.

It is not possible to scan the settlement in bits and pieces and hold some parts good and acceptable and others bad. Unless it can be demonstrated that the objectionable portion is such that it completely outweighs all the other advantages gained the Court will be slow to hold a settle- ment as unfair and unjust. The settlement has to be accepted or rejected as a whole and we are unable to reject it as a whole as unfair or unjust. Even before this Court the 3rd Respondent representing admittedly the large majority of the workmen has stood by this settlement and that is a strong factor which it is difficult to ignore. As stated elsewhere in the judgment, we cannot also be oblivious of the fact that all workmen of the company have accepted the settlement. Besides, the period of settlement has since expired and we are informed that the employer and the 3rd Respondent are negotiating another settlement with further improvements. These factors, apart from what has been stated above, and the need for industrial peace and harmony when a union backed by a large majority of workmen has accepted a settlement in the course of collective bargaining have impelled us not to interfere with this settlement. That being the position, we unhold the settlement as fair and just and order that the award of the Tribunal shall be substituted by the settlement dated October 18, 1973. The said settlement shall be the substituted award. The appeal is disposed of accordingly. There will be no order as to costs."

Therefore, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above, the contention of the Workman that the date fixed for lapse of empanelled list on 31.3.1997 for appointment to the permanent post vide 5th Settlement dated 30.7.1996 is arbitrary, illegal is not untenable. The recognized union of Workmen has negotiated with the Respondent Bank Management representing large number of Workmen and the Workman as individual do not come into picture. Workman in the instant case has work as temporary Workmen in the Respondent Branch and in response of Notification he had applied for inclusion of his name in the panel and he was selected for inclusion his name in the panel list to be utilized for absorption of such Workman to permanent post in order of their seniority in the list. The Settlement dated 30.7.1996 between State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation under Sec.2(p) and Sec.18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 has clearly provided as regard non-messengerial position and it is agreed that all such posts sanctioned fallen vacant upto 31.3.1997 shall be filled before empanel list is

allowed to lapse. Thus, in view of law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, in the instant case, Agreement dated 30.7.1996 was entered into between both the parties in respect of lapsing of the both the panels on 31.3.1997 and absorption of the Workmen from panel list was subject to availability of vacancy of post likely to arise upto 31.3.1997, have a binding force on Workman as well as management of State Bank of India in view of provision contained under section 18 (1) of I.D. Act, 1947.

Thus, Point No.I is answered against the Workman and in favour of the Respondent.

27. **Point No.II**:- Firstly, it is submitted on behalf of the Workman that the Respondent has terminated his services by oral order on March, 1997 without issuing any notice or paying any salary or compensation in lieu thereof. Therefore, the termination order of the Workman from service is in violation of provision contained Under Section 25 F of I.D. Act, 1947. Therefore, the order is liable to be set aside.

28. On the other hand, Respondent counsel contended that Workman has not worked for 240 days in any preceding calendar year. Therefore, reference of the industrial dispute is not relevant. In this context, the Workman has examined himself as WW1 who has reiterated that Workman has been terminated from service by Respondent on March, 1997 without notice of salary or compensation in lieu thereof. Before examining the claim of the Workman on merit it would be apposite to reproduce the provision contained under section 25 F:-

Section 25F provides:-

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].

Compensation to workmen in case of transfer of undertakings.

Section 25B defines the term continuous service which provides

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 authorized 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;

In order to prove the fact of 240 days of service within 12 months of a calendar year just preceding from the date of termination, the initial burden of proof lies upon the Workman and the Workman has to prove this factum by adducing his oral as well as documentary evidence in support of his claim.

Further, how to calculate 240 days of service by the Workman in a calendar year. In this context the reference of decisions of Hon'ble Supreme Court is relevant and the same are discussed below:-

In Rajasthan State Ganganagar S. Mills Ltd. v. State of Rajasthan and Anr. (2004) Apex Court held:

"It was the case of the Workman that he had worked for more than 240 days in the year concerned. This claim was denied by the appellant. It was for the claimant to lead evidence to show that he had worked for 240 days in the year preceding the date of his termination. He has filed an affidavit. It is statement which is in his favor and that cannot be regarded as sufficient evidence for any Court or Tribunal to come to the conclusion that in fact the claimant had worked for 240 days in a year These aspects were highlighted in Range Forest Officer v. S.T. Hadimani (2002 (3) SCC 25. No proof of receipt of salary or wages for 240 days or order or record in that regard was produced. Mere non-production of the muster roll for a particular period was not sufficient for the Labour Court held that the Workman had worked for 240 days as claimed."

In Municipal Corporation, Faridabad v. Siri Niwas (2004 (8) SCC 195), held "*the burden was on the Workman to show that he was working for more than 240 days in the preceding one year prior to his alleged retrenchment." In M.P. Electricity Board v. Hariram (2004 (8) SCC 246) the position was again reiterated in paragraph 11 as follows: "The above burden having not been discharged and the Labour Court having held so, in our opinion, the Industrial Court and the High Court erred in basing an order of reinstatement solely on an adverse inference drawn erroneously ..*"

In the case of Manager, RBI, Bangalore vs. S Mani (2005) SCC Page 100, the 3 Judges Bench of the Apex Court held that "*the initial burden of proof was on the Workman to show that he had completed 240 days of service."*

Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of Mohan Lal vs Management BEL 1981 SCC page 225 has laid down the principle that how to count 240 days of service within one year it is held: *"Clause (2)(a) provides for a fiction to treat a Workman in continuous service for a period of one year despite the fact that he has not rendered uninterrupted service for a period of one year but he has rendered period of 240 days during the period of 12 calendar service for months counting backwards and just preceding the relevant date being the date of retrenchment. In other words, in order to invoke the fiction enacted in clause (2)(a) it is necessary to determine first the relevant date, ie the date of termination of service which is complained of as retrenchment. After that date is ascertained. move backward to a period of 12 months just preceding the date of retrenchment and then ascertain whether within the period of 12 months, the Workman has rendered service for a period of 240 days. If these three facts are affirmatively answered in favor of the Workman pursuant to the deeming fiction enacted in clause (2)(a) it will have to be assumed that the Workman is in continuous service for a period of one year and he will satisfy the eligibility qualification enacted in Section 25-F"*

"14. We have already extracted section 25B since its amendment and the change in language is the legislative exposition of which note must be taken. In fact, we need not further dilate upon this aspect because in Surendra Kumar Verma and Ors. v. Central Government Industrial-cum-Labour Court, New Delhi and Anr., Chinnappa Reddy. J., after noticing the amendment and referring to the decision in Sur Enamel and Stamping Works (P) Ltd case, held as under:

"These changes brought about by Act 36 of 1964 appear to be clearly designed to provide that a Workman who has actually worked under the employer for not less than 240 days during a period of twelve months shall be deemed to have been in continuous service for a period of one year whether or not he has in fact been in such continuous service for a period of one year. It is enough that he has worked for 240 days in a period of 12 months, it is not necessary that he should have been in the service of the employer for one whole year."

In a concurring judgment Pathak J. agreed with this interpretation of section 25B(2). Therefore, both on principle and on precedent it must be held that section 25B(2) comprehends a situation where a Workman is not in employment for a period of 12 calendar months, but has rendered service for a period of 240 days within the period of 12 calendar months commencing and counting backwards from the relevant date, i.e. the date of retrenchment. If he has, he would be deemed to be in continuous service for a period of one year for the purpose of section 25B and Chapter VA."

Thus, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above the initial burden of proof lies upon the Workman to show that he has completed 240 days of the service with the Respondent just preceding from the date of his termination. Further, in respect of the employment of calculating the 240 days service provision contained under Section 25-F read with Section 25-B of the I.D. Act, 1947.

29. Now, in view of the provision contained under Section 25 F and law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, we have to examine whether the Workman has discharged his initial burden of proof in respect of his claim of 240 days continuous service in a calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination i.e., March, 1997.

In this context, WW1 in his cross examination has stated that,

"I was not sponsored by any employment exchange..."

"I did not work continuously for 240 days in any year of my service."

Thus, it is clear from the testimony of WW1 that the Workman had not worked for 240 days continuously in any 12 months of a calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination in the Respondent bank. Therefore, Workman failed to establish his plea by his oral and documentary evidence that he had worked for 240 days continuously in calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination i.e., March, 1997. Thus, the claim of the Workman that he has been terminated by oral order without issuing notice or payment in lieu after termination, in contravention of Section 25 F of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is not tenable. However the documents filed by the Workman in support of his claim, number of days worked with the Respondent goes to reveal that the Workman had worked intermittently as daily wager depending upon availability of work in branch. Workman did not file any document of appointment letter or salary slips in support of his claim for appointment as a non-messenger in the Respondent branch on temporary basis.

30. Per contra, the Learned Counsel for Respondent has submitted the allegation of Workman that he was terminated from services is not correct. As the vacancies were filled up on regular basis in order of their respective seniority the non-engagement of the Workman does not amount to termination. Further, Respondent contended that no law provide that even though there is no work temporary employee should be continued in the bank work as the very engagement of Workman was subject to availability of work. Therefore, the allegation that the bank has indulged in unfair labour practice is incorrect.

31. Thus, in view of the fore gone discussion and contentions made by the Respondent, I find the force in the argument advanced by the Respondent that in the instant matter, Workman was not terminated from service by order dated March, 1997 rather he was disengaged in view of the non-availability of the work in the branch. Further, there was direction issued by the Head Office of the Respondent authority not to engage any daily wager Workman/ temporary Worker w.e.f. 31.3.1997. Thus, such disengagement of Workman does not amount to termination. Moreover, the Workman failed to prove his claim that he was terminated in contravention of provision of Sec.25F of the I.D. Act, 1947 as he failed to establish his plea by any oral or documentary evidence that he had worked for 240 days continuously in a twelve months of calendar year just preceding from date of termination i.e., 31.3.1997.

32. Further, perusal of the order dated 25.3.1997 goes to reveal that the Chief Branch Manager, State Bank of India has issued the letter to Zonal Office with direction to all its branches to this effect that they have been advised by the DGM, Zonal Office, Hyderabad that as both the panel of temporary employees of 1989 and daily wagers/casual labour of 1992 will lapse on 31.3.1997 it has been decided by central office not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial cadre from 31.3.1997, therefore it was directed to issue suitable instructions not to make temporary appointments from 31.3.1997. There is no mention in this order that the Workman herein has been terminated from service by this order.

33. Further, the circular dated 27.3.1997 was issued by DGM, SBI to all branches in commercial network in respect of the non-appointment of temporary employees in subordinate cadre and it has directed not to make any temporary employment in the subordinate cadre with effect from 1.4.97 and further, it has directed to ensure that no temporary/casual/daily basis appointment of the petty cash. Further, it is directed to all Branch Managers that any deviation in this regard will be viewed seriously. Thus, these circulars do not reflect that the Workman has been terminated from service by this order.

34. Similarly, office order dated 31.3.1997 is simply a direction to all branches of the Respondent bank by DGM that no further daily labour should be engaged or employed. Therefore, the plea of the Workman that he has been terminated by the aforesaid order dated 25.3.1997, 27.3.1997 and 31.3.1997 from the service by the Respondent is not acceptable. The evidence adduced by the Workman clearly goes to reveal that he had worked as a daily wager for which he has been paid wages according to number of working days. As there was an order for prohibition for engaging temporary workmen, in the bank, therefore, Workman could not be engaged by the Respondent for work from March, 1997 and there after. It is settled law that the daily wagers are engaged by the employer depending upon the availability of work and as the work was not available the Workman was not engaged further by the Respondent management. Therefore, the Workman on the ground of number of days he had worked in the Respondent bank cannot claim any right to reinstate him into the employment. As the Workman failed to prove the mandatory condition of 240 days of continuous service as required under Sec.25F of I.D. Act, 1947. Therefore, the disengagement of Workman from work can not be termed in contravention of provision contained under Sec.25F and 25 B of the I.D. Act, 1947.

Thus, this point is answered against the Workman and in favour of Respondent.

35. **Point No.III**:- In this context, the Workman has contended that the management failed to implement the selected panels during its valid tenure. The management adopted the back door methods contrary to the settlements and filled up the vacancies. The same is evident from the proceedings dated 18.11.1993 a copy of the same is filed in the material papers and the same may be read as part of the claim statement. Further, it is submitted that management has to adhere the procedure issued by the Central Government, the instructions dated 16.8.1990 in the year 1995, but same was not followed in the year 1997 despite there being vacancies. The management has followed the procedure of calling candidates through employment exchange instead of giving chance to the empanelled candidates like the Workman herein. The management sent call letters to the similarly situated candidates like the Workman in the month of June 1997 subsequent to issuance of impugned termination orders. After knowing the fact that they are litigating the issue by way of dispute, the management has refused to engage those candidates, the copies of call letters issued are filed herein along with claim petition. The Workman herein reiterates that the panels are meant for absorption but not for termination. In view of the same a duty is cast upon the Respondent management to engage the empanelled candidates like the Workman herein even in temporary vacancies till they are absorbed permanently in regular vacancies.

36. On the other hand, Respondent has contended that the Federation approached Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) for implementation of bipartite settlement in respect of the absorption of temporary employees. The Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) conducted conciliation proceedings and agreement was

arrived at between the Federation and the Management bank. It is submitted that it was agreed between the Federation and the Management that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers /casual labour would be kept alive upto March, 1997 and the vacancies as agreed to under the afore set out settlements will be filled from both the lists concurrently. A copy of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.1995 signed by the parties to the dispute is filed as a material paper. Further, it is submitted that the settlement was arrived at and an agreement was signed between the Federation and the Management bank on 30.7.1996 under Section 2(p) read with Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules 1957 which is binding on the parties. A copy of this agreement which hereinafter may be referred to as 5th settlement for brevity, is also filed as a material paper. The 5th settlement dated 30.7.1996 whereunder the earlier four settlements dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988 and 9.1.1991 were also referred, it was agreed to, by the Federation and the Management bank that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees will be kept alive upto March, 1997 for filling the vacancies existing/arrived at as on 31.12.1994 as per the norms agreed to between the bank and Federation and that thereafter the said panels would lapse. It was also agreed that within the framework of the above settlements the modalities about drawing names from either the panel of temporary employees or the panel of daily wagers and casual labour would be decided administratively on circle to circle basis depending upon the local requirements in consultation with the Federation's affiliate by the Circle management. It was further agreed that all messenger real vacancies/positions in the subordinate cadre including part-time attendants specifically provided as leave reserve will be filled by the end of 31.3.1997. Further, Respondent contended that on 27.2.1997 a memorandum of understanding was also signed between the Federation's affiliate and the bank management regarding the fact that the exercise of identifying the messengerial vacancies as on 31.12.1994 has since been completed by central office and thereby 403 messengerial vacancies were sanctioned to the circle of the Management bank and it was agreed that these vacancies may be filled from 1989 panel of temporary employees after effecting conversion from full time non-messengerial staff in the usual manner and the agreement was reached upon. Further, it was agreed between the Federations affiliate and the management bank that in terms of the settlement dated 30.7.1996 both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers /casual employees would lapse on 31.3.1997.

37. The Workman has contended that the empanelled list prepared by the Respondent management for appointment of temporary and daily wage Workers to the permanent post cannot lapse unless until it is exhausted by appointing all the empanelled persons and it should continue even after 31.3.1997, i.e., the date fixed for the lapse of panel. It is undisputed that the date of lapse of empanelled list of Workmen has been fixed to 31.3.1997 as mentioned in the settlement dated 30.7.1996, and agreed between the parties. It is settled law that and once the life of panel list lapses on the date as agreed between the parties it cannot be extended beyond that date. In the instant case the panel list of the workmen was valid upto 31.3.1997 in view of the terms and conditions enumerated in the 5th Settlement entered into between the parties. As the lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997 has been agreed by State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation through 5th Settlement, the Workman is not competent to challenge the same.

In this context I would like to take reference of the decision of the apex court in the case of **Syndicate Bank and Ors vs. Shankar Paul and Ors , AIR 1997 SC 3091, therein the Hon'ble Apex Court** have held:-

"Till 1982, the branches of the appellant Bank in Calcutta region were recruiting persons locally to work as temporary attenders in leave vacancies. In view of the revised procedure prescribed by the Government of India in respect of such temporary appointments, the Calcutta regional office of the appellant Bank issued a circular to all of its branches on 14.8.1982, instructing all the branches under it to discontinue the old practice from 1.6.1982 and appoint only empanelled candidates. The regional office was to prepare a panel of eligible candidates, after calling names from the local/district employment exchange, and split it up branch-wise. Following that new procedure yearly panels were prepared thereafter. Names of the Respondents were for the first time included in the panel prepared for the period 7.2.1987 to 6.2.1988. By its letter dated 7.2.1987 the Bank had informed the Respondents that the panel was valid for one year only and that inclusion of their names in the panel was not to confer on them any right to seek permanent appointment in the service of the bank. Considering the object with which the panel was prepared and the fact that it was an yearly panel expiring on 6.2.1988, we are of the opinion that the Respondents did not get any right, because of inclusion of their names in the said panel, for permanent absorption in the service of the Bank. Whatever conditional right they had came to an end with the expiry of the panel. The claim of the Respondents, as contained in the writ petition was thus misconceived and therefore the learned single Judge and the Division Bench, when it first decided the appeal, were right in dismissing the writ petition and the appeal respectively."

Thus, in view of the above law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court and in view of the terms and conditions of the 5th Settlement the contention of the Workman that empanelled list should continue even after 31.3.1997 till the last Workman in the panel is absorbed is not tenable. The contention of the Workman is baseless in view of recital in the settlement. Therefore, in view of the fore gone discussion and finding given at Point No. I regarding binding nature of Settlements and terms and conditions enumerated therein, in view of the provision contained u/s.18(1) of the I.D. Act, 1947, I am of the considered view that life of panels lapsed on 31.3.1997 in view of terms of settlement dated 30.7.1996 and plea of Workman that the panel shall continue even after 31.3.1997 till last man absorbed has no legal force and same is untenable.

38. Undisputedly, settlement agreement dated 30.7.1996 was executed between the State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation and in that settlement it was agreed that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/ casual employees will be used for filling vacancies existing as on 31.12.1994 as per the norms agreed between the bank and the Federation. These empanelled workmen were to be given a chance for permanent appointment in the bank against vacancies arising up to December 1994 whereas the daily wagers/ casual employees were to be considered against the vacancies arise from January 1995 to December 1996, whereby the said panel would lapse. It was agreed that the vacancies falls upto 31.3.1997 shall be filled before the empanelled list is allowed to lapse. Thus, the claim of the Workman to the post of permanent non-messenger in the Respondent management was subject to the availability of the sanctioned post and vacancies arising upto 31.3.1997. The workmen given chance to the permanent post were seniors in number of working days in panel list and Workman herein was junior to those workmen. Therefore, Workman could not be given absorption to permanent post being junior to other workmen in the panel list.

39. Moreover, the Respondent management witness MW1 in chief statement has given the evidence that, "The Petitioner has not worked for 240 days of in any year iin is entire temporary service in the bank. The Petitioner and other temporary employees were not terminated from service by the bank. The vacancies were filled up on regular basis with the temporary employees from the panels and these panels were expired in terms of the setttlements so reached and there were no vacancies to absorb such employees." Although this witness was cross examined by the Petitioner but the above statement of the management witness in chief remained uncontroverted, as the witness MW1 was not cross examined by Petitioner on this point. Therefore, the claim of the Petitioner that he has been removed from service by the management illegally is untenable. Further, witness MW1 in his chief statement has stated that, the workman was engaged in leave vacancies in the bank on Temporary basis. Therefore, the Petitioner Workman as per number of working days, failed to fulfil eligibility criteria of working days as required for regularisation. Therefore, he was not given regularisation in the employment of the Respondent. Moreover, the Workman witness WW1 in his cross examination has admitted that he do not know particulars of the settlement reached between the management and staff union. Therefore, in view of the statement of WW1 in cross examination, the claim of the Petitioner that he was refused regularization by the Respondent management illegally, is untenable.

40. However, Workman has taken the plea that the panels of Workmen for absorption in the employment of the Respondent banks (panels of temporary employees and daily wagers) has been lapsed on 31.3.1997 in contravention of terms of settlement as the object of preparing the entire empanelment of temporary and daily wagers was to provide them permanent employment and till the both the panel lists exhausted the panel list cannot be lapsed on 31.3.1997 and the date of lapsing of the panel on 31.3.1997 has been fixed by the Respondent arbitrarily without any authority.

41. In this context, the perusal of Settlement dated 30.7.1996 reveals that the 5th Settlement dated 30.7.1996 was entered under Section 2(p) and 18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Dispute (Central) Rules 1957. This settlement has been entered into by the competent parties and in this settlement parties thereto agreed that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees will lapse on 31.3.1997. Thus the date of lapse of panel was fixed by both the parties with consensus under the settlement dated 30.7.1996 and same is binding upon the Workman under the provision of Section 18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947. Moreover, this issue of binding force of the settlement dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988 and 9.1.1991 has already been discussed, decided at finding in Point No.I of this award. However, the legality and validity of the aforementioned settlement has not been challenged by the Workman before any competent forum. Thus, claim of Workman that the date of lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997 has been fixed arbitrarily by the Respondent bank is untenable. As regard the claim of Workman for his absorption to the permanent post it is settled law that the Workman can not claim his regularization to permanent post merely on the basis of number of working days.

42. In this context the reference of the decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Oil and Natural Gas Corporation vs Krishan Gopal 2020(3) SCALE 272, date of decision 7.2.2020** is relevant therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have has laid down principle regarding regularization of the Workman on permanent posts. Hon'ble Supreme Court have laid down the prepositions of regularization of the workmen to permanent post is as under:-

"*(i) Wide as they are, the powers of the Labour Court and the Industrial Court cannot extend to a direction to order regularisation, where such a direction would in the context of public employment offend the provisions contained in Article 14 of the Constitution;*

(ii) The statutory power of the Labour Court or Industrial Court to grant relief to workmen including the status of permanency continues to exist in circumstances where the employer has indulged in an unfair labour practice by not filling up permanent posts even though such posts are available and by continuing to employ workmen as temporary or daily wage employees despite their performing the same work as regular workmen on lower wages;

(iii) The power to create permanent or sanctioned posts lies outside the judicial domain and where no posts are available, a direction to grant regularisation would be impermissible merely on the basis of the number of years of service;

(iv) Where an employer has regularised similarly situated workmen either in a scheme or otherwise, it would be open to workmen who have been deprived of the same benefit at par with the workmen who have been regularised to make a complaint before the Labour or Industrial Court, since the deprivation of the benefit would amount to a violation of Article 14; and

(v) In order to constitute an unfair labour practice under Section 2(ra) read with Item 10 of the Vth Schedule of the ID Act, the employer should be engaging workmen as badlis, temporaries or casuals, and continuing them for years, with the object of depriving them of the benefits payable to permanent workmen.

Thus, in view of the principles laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court as discussed above, in the instant matter the Workman utterly failed to prove his claim by adducing any documentary or oral evidence that the employer has indulged in unfair labour practice by not filling the permanent posts even though such posts are available and by continuing to employ workmen as temporary or daily wage employees despite their performance was the same work, as regular workmen on lower wages.

43. Respondent has contended that all the vacancies exist and arise upto 31.3.1997 has been filled up from the panel list in order of seniority and no vacancy exists or arises as on 31.3.1997 remained unfilled. Further, it is contended that as per terms of settlement the life of panel lists has been lapsed on 31.3.1997, hence, there is no occasion to extend the life of panel lists beyond 31.3.1997. However, the workman failed to prove contrary by any evidence to the aforesaid contention of the Respondent that the vacancies were existing as on 31.3.1997 and the workman was not given absorption to the permanent post in order of his seniority. It is settled law that the power to create permanent or sanctioned post lies outside the judicial domain and where no posts are available, a direction to grant regularization would be impermissible merely on the basis of the number of years of service. Therefore, the claim of the workman on this ground also not acceptable.

44. Further, as per the of settlement, panel was prepared for absorption of the workmen on the permanent posts has already been lapsed on 31.3.1997 and the vacancies existing and arising upto 31.12.1994 and upto 31.3.1997 as settlement dated 30.7.1996 has been filled up from the panel by appointing the workmen as per seniority in the panel list. Workman witness WW1 in his cross examination has himself admitted this fact that, some of the temporary employees whose names were included in the panel were given regular appointment in the bank in order of their seniority in the panel. The Workman failed to show that there was any breach of terms of settlement has been committed by the Respondent in appointment to permanent post from aforesaid panel list.

45. As discussed in preceding paragraph of this Award, the life of the panel has not been extended beyond 31.3.1997, by any further settlement hence, the panel list in which name of the Workman was included got expired on 31.3.1997. It is not the case of the Workman that Respondent has regularized similarly situated workmen either in the scheme or otherwise and the Workman has been deprived of same benefit on par with those workmen or the vacancies remained unfilled on the date of lapse of panels i.e., 31.3.1997, Industrial Tribunal has no jurisdiction to extend the date of lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997. This Tribunal can not order for regularization of workmen to the permanent post in contravention of the provision of Article 14 of the Constitution of India.

In the case of **Mahboob Deepak vs. Nagar Panchayat Gajraula & Anr, Civil Appeal No.5875/2007 date of judgement 13.12.2007,** Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

"8. Respondent is a Local Authority. The terms and conditions of employment of the employees are governed by a statute and statutory rules. No appointment can be made by a Local Authority without following the provisions of the recruitment rules. Any appointment made in violation of the said rules as also the constitutional scheme of equality as contained in Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India would be a nullity.

9. Due to some exigency of work, although recruitment on daily wages or on an ad hoc basis was permissible, but by reason thereof an employee cannot claim any right to be permanently absorbed in service or made permanent in absence of any statute or statutory rules. Merely because an employee has completed 240 days of work in a year preceding the date of retrenchment, the same would not mean that his services were liable to be regularized."

Therefore, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, the claim of the Workman for absorption merely on the basis of number of day of work in the Respondent bank Branch is not acceptable. As regard plea of the Workman that the Workman should have been given employment even after 31.3.1997 as temporary Workman, it is the discretion of Respondent to engage the Workman depending upon availability of work and this Tribunal can not direct the Respondent to engage the Workman in the absent of such rule/scheme.

46. In view of principle laid down by Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above, in the instant matter Workman utterly failed to establish the fact of rendering continuous service for a period of 240 days of service within a period of 12 calendar months commencing and coming backward from relevant date i.e., the date of retrenchment, if has he would be denied to be in continuous service for a period of one year. Therefore, the provision contained under Sec.25F of retrenchment is not applicable to Workman.

Counsel for Workman has relied upon number of decisions of Hon'ble High Court and Hon'ble Supreme Court and few of them are discussed herein:-

In the case of **F.C.I., vs. Kamdhenu Cattle Feed Industries 1993 (1) SCC 71,** therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

"7. In contractual sphere as in all other State actions, the State and all its instrumentalities have to conform to Article 14 of the Constitution of which non-arbitrariness is a significant facet. There is no unfettered discretion in public law: A public authority possesses powers only to use them for public good. This impose the duty to act fairly and to adopt a procedure which is `fairplay in action'. Due observance of this obligation as a part of good administration raises a reasonable or legitimate expectation in every citizen to be treated fairly in his interaction with the State and its instrumentalities, with this element forming a necessary component of the decision making process in all State actions. To satisfy this requirement of non- arbitrariness in a State action, it is, therefore, necessary to consider and give due weight to the reasonable or legitimate expectations of the persons likely lo be affected by the decision or else that unfairness in the exercise of the power may amount to an abuse or excess of power apart from affecting the bona fides of the decision in a given case. The decision so made would be exposed to challenge on the ground of arbitrariness. Rule of law does not completely eliminate discretion in the exercise of power, as it is unrealistic, but providers for control of its exercise by judicial review."

In the case of **State Bank of India, R.O., Vijayawada vs. Industrial Tribunal, Hyderabad WP No.193/1997,** therein Hon'ble High Court have held,

"*Sri Krovvidi Narasimham, the learned counsel for the 2nd respondent contends, supporting the award that it was a permanent vacancy and even though the 2nd respondent was appointed on temporary basis, his services were not liable to be terminated and he was to be regularised into service on permanent basis. Shastry award warrants that no temporary appointment can be made to a permanent post. But the matter is now covered by two division bench judgements dated 28.11.1986 in W.A. No.791 of 1986 and 25.8.1987 in W.A. No.270 of 1982. The ratio decided in the two judgements is to the effect that there cannot be any mandate to appoint employees on permanent basis when the requirement was for appointment on temporary basis. But it is held in the said judgements that when a temporary appointee is ousted from service and not for misconduct and, if again temporary appointment is to be made, then, the case of such temporary appointee who was ousted, has got to be considered in accordance with Sec. 25-H of the Act."*

In the case of **State of Haryana and others vs. Piara Singh and others. 1992 (4) SCC 118,** therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

" 49. If for any reason an adhoc or temporary employee is continued for a fairly long spell, the authorities must consider his case for regularization provided he is eligible and qualified according to the rules and his service record is satisfactory and his appointment does not run counter to the reservation policy of the state."

In the above cited judgements by the Workman the facts of the case are different hence do not apply to instant case of Workman.

47. On the other hand, in support of his contention Respondent has examined witness MW1 and MW1 in chief examination states that, Settlements i.e., on 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988, 9.1.1991 were entered into between the SBI and SBI Staff Federation for filling up of the vacancies that arise up to 1994 for those temporary employees who has worked on scale wages. Further, MW1 states that two different panels for messengers and non-messengers as per the eligibility criteria prescribed by the bank. There are four modules in Andhra Pradesh and they are Hyderabad, Tirupathi, Vijayawada and Visakhapatnam. MW1 states that the temporary employees so empanelled were given permanent absorption depending upon the vacancies so arise strictly in terms of the settlement. MW1 states that on 9.6.1995 conciliation proceeding was held before the RLC(C), Hyderabad and in said proceedings it was decided that the panels will be kept live up to 31.3.1997 and vacancies will be filled from both the lists concurrently. A copy of the said minutes of proceedings is Ex.M5. Further, MW1 states that on 30.7.1996 another settlement was entered between the SBI and All India SBI Staff Federation providing for filling up of the vacancies arising up to December 1994 in respect of subordinate cadre and daily wage /casual wage employees out of panel so prepared were to be considered against vacancies arising from January 1995 to December 1996, thereafter the said panels lapse. MW1 states that it was also agreed that all the non- messenger positions in subordinate cadre including part time attendants specially provided as leave reserve will be filled before 31.3.1997 and as regards to non-messengerial positions it is agreed that all such posts sanctioned and fallen vacant up to 31.3.1997 shall be filled before the empanelled list is allowed to lapse. Thus in both the cases empanelled list were lapsed on 31.3.1997. Ex.M6 is the copy of the settlement dated 30.7.1996. Further, witness states that on 27.2.1997 a memorandum of understanding was reached between the SBI and SBI Staff Federation providing that both the panels above mentioned will lapse on 31.3.1997. Ex.M7 is the copy of the memorandum of understanding and Ex.M8 is the copy of the statements giving the particulars of 1989 non-messenger panel, Ex.M9 is the copy of the statement of 1989 non-messenger panel, Ex.M10 is the copy of statement of 1992 panel. Further, witness states that petitioner was included in the 1989 panel. As the existing vacancies at that time were exhausted and his turn did not come he could not be given permanent employment in the bank as per the agreements. All the appointments were made strictly in accordance with the settlements reached from time to time between SBI and SBI staff federation and as per seniority,

number of days of temporary service put in by them in the bank in the given period. Further, MW1 states petitioner was not sponsored by any employment exchange he did not undergo the regular process of selection required for appointment as a regular non-messenger the petitioner has not worked for 240 days in any year in his entire temporary service in the bank. The petitioner and other temporary employees were terminated from service by the bank. Further, MW1 states that the vacancies were filled up on regular basis with the temporary employees from the panels and these panels were expired in terms of the settlements so reached and there were no vacancies to absorb such employees. Thus, witness MW1 has proved the documents Ex.M1 to Ex.M12 and also contentions made in the counter. However, MW1 was cross examined by the Petitioner Counsel. But nothing has been elicited in his cross examination so as to discredit the testimony of the witness MW1 as regards the date of lapse of both the panels on 31.3.1997 and reasons assigned for non-absorption of the Petitioner from the panel list to the permanent post. Moreover, the witness MW1 was re-examined by the Respondent and the witness MW1 states that panels were expired in terms of the settlement send absorptions to the extent of the available vacancies were made. There was no termination of any temporary messenger as such but their services were not utilized after the cut off date as the available vacancies were already filled up and most of these Petitioners were not in the service of the bank as on the date of the expiry date of the panels. Therefore, in view of the aforesaid testimony of the MW1 in re-examination in the absence of cross examination remained uncontraverted, the claim of the Workman that he was entitled for absorption in permanent post in the branch of Respondent Management on the basis of panel list is found not established.

This point is answered against the Workman.

48. **Point No.IV**:- In view of the discussion and finding given at Point Nos. I, II and III, the Workman is not entitled for any relief and claim statement of Workman sans merit and liable to be dismissed.

This Point is answered accordingly.

AWARD

In view of the fore gone discussion, it is held that the action of the Respondent bank in terminating the services of Sri Koraganti Ramesh Babu, Ex. Messenger by way of oral orders w.e.f. March, 1997 is justified. Hence, the Petitioner is not entitled for any relief as prayed for. The claim statement filed by Workman sans merit, hence, dismissed.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, Personal Assistant, transcribed by her, corrected and signed by me on this the 23rd day of June, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR. Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner	Witnesses examined for the Respondent
WW1: Sri Koraganti Ramesh Babu	MW1: Sri Rupakula Prakash Babu

Documents marked for the Petitioner

Ex.W1 to Ex.W8:	Photocopies of service certificates
Ex.W9:	Photocopy of interview call letter
Ex.W10:	Photocopy of order passed in WP No.7838/1995
Ex.W11:	Photocopy of paper notification
Ex.W12:	Photocopy of letter dt. 18.2.93 appointment letter No.797 annexing list of 80 members 2nd panel
Ex.W13:	Photocopy of transfer certificate

Documents marked for the Respondent

Ex.M1:	Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.17.11.87
Ex.M2:	Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.16.7.88
Ex.M3:	Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.27.10.1988
Ex.M4:	Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.9.1.1991
Ex.M5:	Photocopy of conciliation proceedings before the Regional Labour Commissioner(C) dt.9.6.1995
Ex.M6:	Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.30.7.1996
Ex.M7:	Photocopy of Memorandum of understanding dt. 27.1.1997
Ex.M8:	Photocopy of statements giving the particulars of 1989 messenger panel.
Ex.M9:	Photocopy of statement of 1989 Non-messenger panel
Ex.M10:	Photocopy of statement of 1992 panel
Ex.M11:	Photocopy of order of Hon'ble High Court in WA No.86/98 dt. 1.5.98
Ex.M12:	Photocopy of order in SLP No.11886-11888 of 1998 dated 10.8.98

नई दिल्ली, 27 जुलाई, 2026

का.आ. 1681.— औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947(1947 का 14)की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार भारतीय स्टेट बैंक के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजको और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण – सह – श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद के पंचाट (सन्दर्भ संख्या 47/2002) को प्रकाशित करती है,

[सं. एल. 39025/01/2026–आई.आर.(बी–II)-74]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 27th July, 2026

S.O. 1681.— In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (.No.LC. 47/2002) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Hyderabad as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the Management of State Bank of India and their workmen,

[No. L-39025/01/2026- IR (B-II)- 74]

SALONI, Dy. Director

In The Central Government Industrial Tribunal Cum Labour Court At Hyderabad

Present: **Sri IRFAN QAMAR**

Presiding Officer

Dated the 11th day of May, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. 47/2002

[Old ID No. 139/2000 of Industrial Tribunal No.I, Hyderabad]

Between:

Sri G. Anil Kumar,

S/o G. Surya Narayana,

R/o. 16-6-652, Osmanpura,

Chaderghat,

Hyderabad-500024. A.P. … Petitioner

And

The Assistant General Manager,

(Personnel & HRD Deptt.),

State Bank of India,

Local Head Office,

Bank street Koti,

Hyderabad – 500 095. …...Respondent

Appearances:

For the Petitioner : Sri Macherla Rangaiah, Advocate

For the Respondent: Sri Y. Ranjeeth Reddy, Advocate

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-12012/251/2000-IR(B.I) dated 16.10.2000 referred the following dispute under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 to Industrial Tribunal No.I, Hyderabad for adjudication and later the same has been transferred to this Tribunal bearing ID No.139/2000, as per orders of Central Government vide Lr.No.H-11026/1/2001-IR(C.II) dated 18.10.2001, requiring this forum to decide the question:

THE SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of State Bank of India, Local Head Office, Hyderabad in terminating the services of Sri G. Anil Kumar, Temporary-Non Messenger, by way of oral orders w.e.f. 31.3.1997 is justified? If not, what relief the workman is entitled?"

After receipt of the reference, it was numbered as ID No. 47/2002 and notices were issued to both the Workman and the management.

2. Before unfolding the factual matrix of the instant industrial dispute it would be apposite to have a bird eye view of a chequered history of the instant industrial dispute. Earlier instant industrial dispute along with the batch cases was decided by this Tribunal vide common award dated 17.5.2005 and the reference was answered in favour of the Respondent and against the Workman. That said common award dated 17.5.2005 was challenged by the aggrieved Workmen in various Writ petition No.6470/2014 along with batch of writ petitions before the Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh and Hon'ble High Court vide its' judgement dated 23.6.2014 allowed all batch of writ petitions and set aside the common award dated 17.5.2005 passed in ID No.222 of 2001 and other batch of ID cases by Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad and the Respondent management of State Bank of India was directed to reengage the Writ Petitioners in position, which they have been occupying prior to their termination and further directed to consider their cases for regularization as and when the substantive vacancy arises. This judgement dated 23.6.2014 of Hon'ble High Court of AP, passed in WP No.6470/2014 and batch petitions was challenged by Respondent management before the Hon'ble High Court in Writ Appeal No. 1268 of 2014. The aforesaid Writ Appeals No.1268/2014 and other Writ Appeals were decided by Division Bench of High Court of Andhra Pradesh by a common judgement dated 20.3.2019. Hon'ble High Court in aforesaid Writ Appeal was pleased to pass the order which is extracted as below:-

" 7. Hearing the learned senior counsel for the SBI and the learned senior counsel for the contesting unofficial Respondents, we see that while the learned single Judge was justified in setting aside the award af the Tribunal, the proper course to be adopted was to remit all the cases to the Tribunal. This we say for reasons more than one. Firstly, in such matters, claims have to be decided on individual basis, as different persons have different claims as to the length of officiation or discharge of duties and functions; quality of engagement, drawings, accounting of the post for each one of them, who have worked etc. AIl these issues will not be the same in all the cases. Therefore, each case ought to have been directed to be decided by the Tribunal afresh on individual basis. The second and most important aspect is the learned single Judge has in one go ordered re-employment of all the workmen. This is not a relief that could have been granted without answering the individual issues; each issue relating to each case could not have been decided by the writ Court within the format of its adjudication procedures and scope. The adjudicating body, which has to do that activity, is the Industrial Tribunal. Therefore, we are of the view that while we would sustain the order of the learned singe Judge insofar as it interfered and sets aside the award of the Tribunal, the further findings

and directions, issued through the impugned order have to go and the individual cases have to be sent back for consideration of the Tribunal. Such further procedure before the Tribunal will have to be carried forward with the materials already on record and also by affording an opportunity to the persons, who have claims as well as the management to place their rival contentions and further material before the Tribunal. The learned counsel appearing for the workmen are justified in pointing out that enormous delay has already happened and further action by the Tribunal in this line may be expedited.

9. In the result, these writ appeals are ordered;

(1) affirming the impugned common order of the learned single Judge to the extent it sets aside the common award dated 17.05.2005 of the Industrial Tribunal;

(2) the further findings and directions issued through the impugned common order are vacated:

(3) all the matters shall be remitted to the Industrial Tribunal with a direction to dispose of them within an outer limit of five (5) months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order; and,

(4) the parties to make appearance before the Tribunal on the given date."

Thus, in view of the above direction of Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh in W.A.No.1268 of 2014 and batch cases. This Tribunal has taken up the matter of industrial dispute for hearing and deciding it afresh in view of the aforesaid guidelines laid down by the Hon'ble High Court in Writ Appeal No.1268/2014 vide judgement dated 20.3.019.

3. The factual matrix of instant industrial dispute as narrated by the Workman in his claim statement are that, the he joined the service of the Respondent Bank at the workman joined in the services of the Management Institution as Non-Messenger on 1988 to 1997 and rendered unblemished service spreading over a period of about 10 years, and by dint of hard work till his services were terminated by oral orders with till his services where terminated by oral orders with effect from 1.04.1997. Further, it is submitted that the management of Respondent bank decided to give a chance to temporarily employed personnel "found suitable for permanent appointment" by wait- listing them by offering permanent appointment or waitlisting till such opportunity arises.

4. That on 17.11.1987 a settlement was reached between All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and the Management of State Bank of India - settlement one, under this settlement three categories of employees were listed. That is, A) those who have completed 240 days in 12 months or less after 1.7.1975. B) those who have completed 270 days in any continuous block of 36 calendar months after 1.7.1975. C) (i) those who have completed minimum of 30 days aggregate temporary service in any calendar year after 1.7.1975 or (ii) 70 days aggregate temporary service in continuous block of 36 months after 1.7.1975.

5. The persons who satisfied in all the above 4 categories were to be interviewed by a selection committee and the said selection committee would determine the suitability of the said candidate for permanent appointment. Therefore, the bank prescribed certain qualifications and from among the candidates satisfying the qualifications the suitable candidates were enlisted by a selection committee. The Clause 7 of the said agreement provided with the selected candidate would be wait listed in order of their respective categorization and the selected panel would be valid upto December, 1991. Clause 10 of the settlement specifically provided that henceforth. "there will be no temporary appointments in the subordinate cadre", except on a restrictive basis in the specified category, "from amongst empanelled candidates as per existing guidelines of the bank". The Workman further submits that consequent upon the said agreement and the draft, a notification was issued in the newspapers. The last date for responding to the advertisement was 30.8.1988. A written examination followed by viva-voce in May, 1989 was held. A selected panel was prepared, as per Clause 7 of the agreement, ie. Settlement No.1, the selected panel was to be valid upto December, 1991, the Workman submits that circular was issued on 26.4.91 by the said letter it is mentioned that the terms of the agreement dated 17.11.87 was modified vide second agreement dated 16.7.88 was entered into between the parties. In terms of the said agreement a chance was to be given, "to all eligible temporary employees for permanent appointments. The appointments were against the vacancies likely to arise during the years 1995-96, circular made it clear that in view of the enormity of the problem an extension of the currency of the panel, eligible temporary employees who have been empanelled could not appear in the earlier interviews and have been pursuing their cases thereafter, "will be given another chance to appear for interview".

6. Workman submits that there were total five settlements. The settlement dated 17.11.87 is the 1st settlement (Ex M1), settlement dated 16.7.88 is 2nd settlement (Ex M2), settlement dated 27.10.88 is the 3rd settlement (Ex M3), then settlement dated 9.1.91 is 4th settlement and settlement dated 30.7.96 is 5th settlement (Ex M6). In between there is minutes of conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.95 marked as Ex M5. That due to all these settlements which were extended by subsequent settlements thereby created reasonable expectations in the list of the selected candidates arose with that it's a question of time their appointments or services would be regularized in the services of the bank. The Workman was working with the bank on temporary basis was under

the bonafide hope that sooner his services will be regularized with the bank. He is thereby closed all his options elsewhere. It is needless to point out that employing person to whom hope of employment in substantial terms was made is a facet of Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

7. Further Workman submits that the Government of India issued Circular No. F-3/3/104/87-IR, dated 16.8.1990. Under said circular the chief Executives of all public sector banks including the Management herein were specifically instructed that until the problem of existing temporary employees is fully resolved, no bank is permitted to make any permanent appointments. That some of the persons similarly situated like this Workman aggrieved by the inaction on the part of the management of the bank is not regularizing their services from out of the selected panel and not clearly focusing the vacancy position, filed W.P. No. 4194/97 before Hon'ble High court of A.P.. It is specifically averred in the said writ petition that the Management of the bank had failed to implement the settlement and that it violates the various fundamental rights guaranteed under the constitution of India. The Hon'ble High court of A.P .. by order dated 5.3.97 directed the bank to implement the settlement as amended from time to time. It also directed the bank to carry out the terms of settlement before the expiry of March, 1997. The Hon'ble High Court also recorded finding that the Bank cannot escape its liability of enforcement of the Settlement. In view of the directions given by the High Court all candidates whose names appeared in the select panels prepared on the basis of the agreement entered into on 17.11.87 under which the panel was valid upto December, 1991, and on the basis of a settlement dated 27.10.1988 whereby the panels were made alive upto 31.3.1997 under which the panel was valid upto December, 1999. The other agreement dated 16.7.1988 under which the panel was valid upto 1992 and on the basis of the settlement dated 27.10.1998 whereby the panels were made alive upto 31.3.1997 were under the bonafide impression that their cases will be considered for regularization and were living on the basis of the said reasonable expectation. Unfortunately, contrary to the aforesaid directions given by the High Court and contrary to the settlements entered into between the parties, the bank issued proceedings dated 25.3.1997, dated 27.3.1997 and 31.3.1997 instructing the various authorities of the Management not to continue the temporary employees those who are in services of the bank from 1.4.97. The said order was followed by the Management. Aggrieved by the said action the Workman herein and similarly situated candidates have filed a writ petition before the Hon'ble High Court and by way of Writ Petition No.9206/97 seeking a declaration that the proceedings issued by the Deputy General Manager and the Assistant General Manager (Respondents 3,4 and 5 therein) on 25.3.97, 27.3.97 and 31.3.97 as illegal and also non-continuance of the Workmen therein in service by absorbing them in the services of the bank as violative of Section 2(p) and 18(1) read with Rule 58 of Central Rules and sought for specific direction to the bank to absorb them in service.

8. Further, Workman submits that in the counter affidavit filed in Writ Petition No.9206/97, the bank has submitted that it has about 805 branches in Andhra Pradesh alone. It has stated that due to exigencies of circumstances and on account of the urgent need in its banks, it employed temporary employees in subordinate cadre. It is pertinent to mention that it does not state the urgent or need or the nature of temporary employees that it had engaged. Enquiry into the same would reveal that the stand taken by the bank either on the ground of urgent need or of temporary employees is a façade to perpetuate unfair labour practice. It is designed to on the one hand, keep the employed in the erroneous zone of hope and on the other to ensure that benefits that a model employer will extend under various statutes to its employees is not required to be borne out by the bank. A reading of the counter affidavit would show that the bank would opines that being just fair and reasonable are which obviously is reprehensible and is a facet of unfair labour practice.

9. The Workman submits that the bank had referred in its counter affidavit to three settlements dated 17.11.87, 16.7.88 and 27.10.88. The bank in the guise of extending the benefits of the circular of Government dated 16.8.90 stated in its counter affidavit that as follows:

"Government of India, vide its letter dated 16.8.1990, issued guidelines to all the public sector banks with regard to recruitment and absorption of temporary employees in public sector banks. The said guidelines were issued to implement on the lines of the approach paper on the issue provided by a committee constituted in this regard. The Government of India guidelines made it clear that all the public sector banks may follow the provisions laid down in the approach paper.

The approach paper specified that the cases of temporary employees who had put in not less than 240 days of temporary service in 12 consecutive Months and who are entitled to benefit of Section 25-F may be decided by entering into a settlement with the representative union. In respect of temporary employees who had put in less than 240 days of service in 12 consecutive months or less, a settlement could be avoided and however if the Management so desired, they could enter into a conciliation settlement with the representative union. Para 6(h), it is mentioned that only those temporary employees who had put in temporary service of 90 or more days after 1.1 1982 would be eligible for considering under the scheme. Although the Government guidelines envisaged for a settlement in respect of employees who had put in temporary service of 90 or more days, the bank by way of further concession entered into settlements Even in respect of those who had put in less than 90 days. As such, it could be Seen that the settlements are more beneficial to the temporary employees concerned. The approach paper also specify at para 6(c) that the banks would provide one time opportunity to all the temporary employees and for that purpose temporary

employees worked in the bank on or after 1.1.1982 could be considered for re-employment in terms of the scheme. The Respondents have gone further wherein even persons working after 1975 were also considered.

As could be seen from the above, there was a genuine effort on the part of the Respondent bank to provide permanent employment for as many as possible subject to availability of the vacancies.

It is further submitted that at para 6(k) of the approach paper, it was made clear that this would be one time exercise in full and final settlement of all the aims and disputes for the past period in respect of temporary workmen covered by the settlement. This would mean that the Government of India guidelines would cover only those persons who were temporarily employed for the period specified therein and not otherwise. As such, it is submitted that the Respondents have not only followed the Government of India guidelines but in fact covered cases of the employees who had worked for less than 90 days. As such, question of violation does not arise and in any case those were only broad guidelines and not directives".

10. The Workman submits that the bank also referred a subsequent settlement dated 9.1.1991 wherein there is a clause to the effect- that the panel of temporary employees and the panel of daily wage employees will be operated to a particular period. Therefore, their cases will not be considered. The Management herein relying upon this settlement in their impugned action. It is submitted that even the settlement dated 9.1.1991 will not empower the management to terminate the services of the temporary employees who are working in the bank services like the Workman herein as it does not specify the termination of the employees. In fact there are so many vacancies wherein the Management has engaged several new persons as temporary messengers/ attendars/ sweepers etc., even after the judgment of Hon'ble High Court without considering the cases of the similarly situated candidates like the Workman herein. It is submitted inspite of engaging fresh candidates as is now being done by the Management they would have continued the similarly situated candidates like the Workman herein in the services of the bank and consider their cases for absorption in view of the circulars issued by Central Government as well as the directions of this Hon'ble Court in Writ Petition No.4194/97, dated 5.3.97. In view of the circulars issued by the Central Government, the Management should not have relied upon the settlement dated 9.1.1991. Hence, the impugned action of the Management is illegal, unjust, violative of fundamental rights such as Articles 14,16 and 21 of the Constitution of India.

11. The Workman submits that in W.P. No.4194/97 filed by the union of temporary employees where in they have complained about the non- implementation of the settlements arrived between the parties and sought for absorption. Such employees in the bank services on permanent basis before the date fixed for carrying out the terms of settlement, the Court held that the members of the union had been empanelled in the list, they were not regularized and the time was going to run out to the near future and the Respondent bank and its officers cannot escape from the liability of enforcing the settlement which has been reached and therefore directed that the bank and the officers shall implement the settlement dated 17.11.87 as amended from time to time before the expiry of 31.3.97.

12. Further, it is submitted that in the clause of Settlement it is specifically mentioned that the workmen to be absorbed/appointed in the bank prohibiting any temporary appointments subsequent to the date of settlement even the authorities want to make temporary appointments that should be made only from among the empanelled can be appointed either for temporary vacancy or permanent vacancy except from among the empanelled candidates like the Workman and that should be continued till they are absorbed. The management committed unfair labour practices and terminated the services of the candidates with effect from 1.4.1997 which is arbitrary, discriminatory, contrary to their own guidelines and violative of the constitutional provisions which are guaranteed in Chapter-III of the Constitution of India.

13. The Workman submits that it is strange as to how the panels were allowed to lapse by a so-called Memorandum of Understanding dated 25.2.1997, that the action of terminating such employees like the Workman by virtue of an impugned oral proceedings without implementing the settlement would be illegal and unfair labour practice which cannot be allowed to be perpetuated. That the discontinuance of the Workman after 31.3.97 who had served in the bank in any capacity amounts to retrenchment. It could not have been done without any notice and it violates Sec.25FF of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and the said action is violative of principles of natural justice guaranteed under Chapter III of the Constitution of India. This amounts to retrenchment without one month's notice and taken in view of such notice. Thus, the main proceedings issued by the Respondent is without jurisdiction and is arbitrary, illegal and therefore liable to be quashed. That the alleged Memorandum of Understanding dated 27.2.97, Ex.M5 does not own any legal entity, as the said Memorandum of Understanding is not published anywhere to brought to the notice of the Workman whose rights are being affected. It is submitted that Management did not adhere to the procedure envisaged by the Central Government in its' instructions dated 16.8.90 in the year 1995. The same was not followed in the year 1997 despite there being vacancies. The management has followed the procedure of calling candidates through Employment exchange instead of giving chance to the empanelled candidates like the Workman here. It is pertinent to mention here that the Respondent Management sent letters to the all similarly situated candidates like the Workman in the month of June, 1997, subsequent to the passing of impugned termination orders. After knowing the facts that the candidates are litigating, the Management refused to engage these candidates. It is once again reiterated that the panels are meant for absorption but not for termination. It was the duty of the Management to engage the empanelled candidates like the

Workman even in temporary vacancies till they are absorbed permanently in regular vacancies. Hence, the action of the Respondent Management terminating the services of the Workman by oral order dated 31.3.97 is unjust, illegal, violative of principles of natural justice and hence, the Management be directed to reinstate and absorb the Workman and to grant all incidental and consequential benefits.

14. Per contra, Respondent had filed counter and made a contentions that the reference is not tenable and contrary to the provisions of I.D. Act, 1947. Respondent submitted that to tide over severe sub-ordinate staff constraints which arose out of leave vacancies, exigencies, etc., and also owning to the restrictions imposed by the Government of India/Reserve Bank of India on intake of staff, the Respondent bank used to engage sub-ordinate staff like messengers, sweepers, sweeper cum water boys, etc., depending on the availability of work on purely temporary basis for the smooth and uninterrupted functioning of the branches. It is submitted that the All India State Bank of India Staff Federation which represents majority of the employees in the State Bank of India comprising about 98% of the work force as its' members espoused the cause of temporary employees who have put in less than 240 days of temporary service in 12 calendar months in the bank and who were ineligible for any protection under Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 to give a chance for being considered for absorption and permanent appointments.

15. Discussions were held and on 17.11.1987 an agreement was signed between the federation and the Management bank under Sec. 2(p) read with Sec 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules 1957. A copy of the said settlement dated 17.11.87 which may be herein after referred as first settlement is filed and 4 categories were made as it has already been mentioned in the claim statement above, it need not be repeated here. In the first settlement, it was agreed that the temporary employees as categorized would be given a chance for being considered for permanent appointment in the bank's service against the vacancies which are likely to arise during the period 1987 to 1991. On 16.7.88 second settlement was arrived between the Federation and the Bank whereby it was agreed to substitute the period of consideration of vacancies as 1987 to 1992 in place of 1987 to 1991 as contemplated under the first settlement dated 17.11.1987. This is the second settlement. A 3rd settlement was entered into on 27.10.88 and it was agreed that the bank's service against the vacancies likely to arise from 1988 to 1992 was to be considered. Government of India vide its letter dated 16.8.90 issued guidelines to all the public sector banks with regard to recruitment and absorption of temporary employees in public sector banks. The said guidelines were issued to implement on the lines of approach paper on the issue provided by a committee constituted in this regard. Government of India guidelines made it clear that all the public sector banks may follow the provisions laid down in the approach paper. The approach paper specified that the cases of temporary service in 12 consecutive months and who are entitled to benefit of Sec.25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 may be decided by entering into a settlement with the representative union. In respect of temporary employees who had put in less than 240 days of service in 12 consecutive months or less, a settlement could be avoided and however if the Management so desired they could enter into a conciliation settlement with the representative union. In para. 6(h) it is mentioned that only those temporary employees who had put in temporary service of 90 days or more days after 1.1.82 would be eligible for considering under the scheme. Although the Government guidelines envisaged for a settlement in respect of employees who had put in temporary service of 90 days or more days, the bank by way of a further concession entered into settlements. Even in respect of those who had put in less than 90 days and also the bank went a step further and said those persons who are working after 1975 were also considered. Hence, there was a genuine effort on the part of the Respondent bank to provide as many as possible jobs subject to the availability of the vacancies. However, para 6 (k) of the approach paper made it clear that it is a one time, exercise in full and final, settlement of all the claims and disputes for the past period, in respect of temporary workmen covered by the settlement. Another settlement was entered on 9.1.91 herein after referred as 4th settlement and the time limit was extended upto 1994 and separate panel was prepared for temporary employees, casual/daily wagers. It was agreed that while vacancies arising between 1988 to 1994 in respect of temporary employees and in respect of casual/daily wagers, they can be considered for the vacancies arising between 1995-96 only.

16. It is submitted that the administrative set up of the Hyderabad Local Head Office comprises of four Zonal Offices (Zones) at Hyderabad, Vijayawada, Visakhapatnam and Tirupathi covering all the Districts of Andhra Pradesh. In terms of the settlement the Management after following the procedure laid down therein prepared the panels of qualified candidates of temporary employees denoted as 1989 panel and also panel of casual/daily wagers denoted as 1992 panel for giving a chance for being considered for permanent absorption. These panels were prepared zone-wise separately for messengers and non-messengers in the descending order of temporary service put in by the candidates during the stipulated period i.e., 1.7.1975 to 31.7.1988. That the Federation approached the Regional Labour Commissioner(C) for implementation of bi-partite settlement in respect of absorption of temporary employees. The Regional Labour Commissioner(C) conducted conciliation proceedings and an agreement was arrived between the Federation and the bank. It was agreed that it would be kept alive upto March, 1997. A copy of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.2.1995 signed by the parties is filed as material paper. A settlement was arrived at and an agreement was signed between the Federation and the Management bank on 30.7.1996 under Sec.2 (p) read with Sec.18(1) of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957, which is hereinafter called as 5th settlement. That on 27.2.1997 a Memorandum of understanding was also signed by the federation's affiliate and the bank Management recording the fact that the exercise of identifying the messengerial vacancies as on 31.12.1994 has since been completed by Central Office and thereby 403 messengerial vacancies were sanctioned . It was agreed that these

vacancies may be filled from 1989 panel of temporary employees after effecting conversion from full time non-messengerial staff in the usual manner and the agreement was reached accordingly. It was agreed between the Federation's affiliate and the Management bank that in terms of the settlement dated 30.7.1996 both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees would lapse on 31.3.1997. That as agreed upon vacancies were filled from the panels. The Workman who has put in an aggregate temporary service of less than 240 days in a continuous block of 12 months period during 1.7.1975 to 31.7.1988 has no right to seek a direction to consider his candidature for absorption in the Management bank under any rule/law except under the settlement entered into thereon.

17. Respondent contended that, in fact, the case of the Workman can be considered under all the five settlements having got his case considered under provisions of these settlements. All the other provisions and terms of the settlements are also binding on him/her. The Management bank has not violated any of the provisions of the terms of the said settlement. That the very preparation and maintenance of panel is in compliance of the terms agreed under these settlements. These settlements were time bound and they ceased to exist on 31.3.1997. That the bank has never promised that all the candidates in the panel will be absorbed. In the advertisement itself it was made clear that candidates will be considered for absorption in the vacancies that may arise upto 1992. Keeping alive the panels after 31.3.1997 is contrary to the settlements arrived between the State Bank of India Staff Federation and the Management bank. That the settlements are binding on the parties. The Workman is also bound under the terms of the said settlement. The settlement does not suffer from any ambiguity as their language is very clear. The right under the settlements is to give them a chance to be considered for future appointment in the bank's services against the vacancies likely to arise. The settlements were effected to balance the expectations of the temporary employees to be absorbed in permanent service as against the constitutional rights for all eligible persons to be considered for employment every time a vacancy arises. That the alleged dispute including the demand for reinstatement has to be decided in this context. It is submitted that the period of panel list got expired on 31.3.97 and it is an integral term of the settlement and cannot be modified in any proceedings under the law. These temporary employees who unfortunately could not be accommodated for want of vacancies have no further rights to be considered for regularization. That the Hon'ble High Court in WP No.12964/94, held as follows, "It is needless to state that the settlement arrived at between the All India State Bank of India Staff Federation which, is the majority union and the bank Management is binding on the Workmen also. It is not at all the case of the Workman that any of the terms of the settlement has been violated by the bank's Management. If the Workman had worked in the bank on part-time basis before 31.5.94, that itself would not vest in him a right to claim that his services should be regularized on permanent basis against a full time cadre post. The claim put forth by the Workman in the present petition is therefore misconceived and not tenable. However, it is open to the Workman to claim any right which flows from the settlement between the union and the bank Management. As already pointed out that it is not the grievance of the Workman that some right which has flown from the settlement in favour of the Workman has been denied by the bank Management. Therefore, I do not find any ground, let alone substantial ground, to grant the kind of relief sought for by the Workman. Writ Petition fails and is accordingly dismissed. No costs."

18. Further, it is contended that if the panels were not lapsed at the end of designated period and allowed to be continued it would result in making the contracts of temporary employment indirectly permanent through back door entry, which would not only be contrary to the settlements but also to Articles 14 and 16 of Constitution of India and deprive the chances of original claimants who would Come through proper recruitment procedure. As their rights have been crystallized by operation of the settlements. Hence, there is no question of any Legitimate expectation being violated.

19. Similarly placed ex-employees filed WP No.9206/1995 and the batch before the Hon'ble High Court of A.P. and the learned Single Judge allowed the Writ Petitions. Aggrieved by the same WA No.86/98 and the batch was filed and the Division Bench set aside the order of the Single Judge. Thereafter the ex-temporary employees filed Special Leave Petition No.11886-11888 of 1998 before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India also dismissed the SLP. Therefore, reference to the Judgement of the Learned Single Judge in WP No.9206/97 is of no consequences as the same has already been set aside. The observations made in the Judgements cannot be relied upon for any purpose what so ever. The question of operation of Sec.25F would not come into play. Further the issue is covered by various Judgements of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India and various Hon'ble High Courts. Hence, the reference may be ordered that the Workman is not entitled for any relief.

20. In order to fortify his claim Workman has examined himself as WW1 and also filed documents in evidence which has been exhibited as Ex.W1 to W24. Further, the Workman has filed photocopies of documents in support of his claim which are discussed as under:-

Ex.W1 is the Service Certificate. Ex.W1A is the Service Certificate. Ex. W1B is the Service Certificate dated 21.07.1992. Ex. W2 is the Notification. Ex. W3 is the Interview call letter. Ex. W4 is the Service Certificate dated 12.04.1993. Ex. W5 is the Service Certificate dated 11.05.1993. Ex. W6 is the Service Certificate dated 11.06.1993. Ex. W7 is the Service Certificate dated 7.10.1993. Ex. W8 is the Service Certificate dated 7.12.1993. Ex. W9 is the Service Certificate dated 13.05.1994. Ex. W10 is the Service Certificate dated 18.05.1994. Ex. W11 is the Service

Certificate dated2.02.1995. Ex. W12 is the Service Certificate dated 05.12.1994. Ex. W13 is the Service Certificate dated 21.03.1994. Ex. W14 is the Service Certificate dated 13.05.1994. Ex. W15 is the Service Certificate dated 08.01.1994. Ex. W16 is the Service Certificate dated 17.05.1995. Ex. W17 is the Service Certificate dated 02.02.1995. Ex. W18 is the Service Certificate dated 15.03.1996. Ex. W19 is the Service Certificate dated 08.10.1996. Ex. W20 is the Service Certificate dated 23.11.1999. Ex. W21 is the Service Certificate dated 08.11.1996. Ex. W22 is the Service Certificate dated 23.11.1999. Ex. W23 is the letter to Employment exchange by Respondent. Ex. W24 is the Circular letter dated 14.07.1999.

21. On the other hand, Respondent has examined witness MW1 Sri Aluru Rama Rao and this witness has exhibited 12 documents, marked as Ex.M1 to M12. The details of these documents are as follows:-

Ex.M.1 is the Settlement dated 17.11.1987. Ex.M2 is the Settlement dated 16.7.1988. Ex.M3 is the Settlement dated 27.10.1988. Ex.M4 is the Settlement dated 9.1.1991. Ex.M5 is the Minutes of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.1995. Ex.M6 is the Settlement dated 30.7.1996. Ex.M7 is the Memorandum of Understanding dt. 27.2.1997. Ex.M8 is the Particulars of 1989 Messengerial Panel. Ex.M9 is the Particulars of 1989 Non-Messengerial Panel. Ex.M10 is the Particulars of 1992 General Attendant Panel. Ex.M11 is the Judgment of Hon'ble High Court of A.P. in Writ Appeal No.86/98 dt.1.5.1998. Ex.M12 is the Judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in SLP No. 11886-11888 of 1998 dt.10.8.1998.

22. Apart from afore mentioned documents, Learned Counsel for Workman has also filed a long list of various judgements of Hon'ble Supreme Court as well as Hon'ble High Court, which we will discuss at appropriate place in this Award.

23. Heard the argument of Learned Counsel for Workman as well as for Respondent.

24. On the basis of rival pleadings of both the parties and submissions made by the Learned Counsel for both the parties, following points arise for determination in the industrial dispute :-

I. Whether the 1st settlement dated 17.11.1987, 2nd settlement dated 16.7.1988, 3rd settlement dated 27.10.1988, 4th settlement dated 9.1.1991 and 5th settlement dated 30.7.1996 entered into between State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and also Memorandum of Understanding are binding upon both the parties?

II. Whether the action of State Bank of India, Local Head Office, Hyderabad in terminating the services of Workman Sri G. Anil Kumar, a Messenger with effect from 31.3.1997 is justified?

III. Whether the Workman is entitled for absorption on permanent post in the Branch of Respondent management as per averments made by him in the claim statement?

IV. To what relief if any the Workman is entitled for?

Findings:-

25. Point No.I:- Undisputedly settlements dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988, 9.1.1991 and 30.7.1996, minutes of conciliation proceedings and memorandum of understanding dated 27.2.1997 were executed between the State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation under section 2(p) and 18 (1) of I.D. Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Disputes (Central Rules), 1957.

Section 2(p) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 as follows:-

(p) "settlement" means a settlement arrived at in the course of conciliation proceeding and includes a written agreement between the employer and workmen arrived at otherwise than in the course of conciliation proceeding where such agreement has been signed by the parties thereto in such manner as may be prescribed and a copy thereof has been sent to an officer authorised in this behalf by the appropriate Government and the conciliation officer;

Section 18(1) provides as follows:-

18. Persons on whom settlements and awards are binding.

- [(1) A settlement arrived at by agreement between the employer and Workman otherwise than in the course of conciliation proceeding shall be binding on the parties to the agreement.

Therefore, in view of the provision contained u/s.18 (1) I.D. Act, 1947, terms and conditions enumerated in the aforesaid settlements are binding on the parties to the agreement. The Learned Counsel for Workman has argued that the Workman after going through the selection procedure has successfully been listed in the panel for appointment on the permanent basis in the Respondent management and the empanelled list has to be valid till last person in the empanelled list is appointed on permanent basis. But the impugned order dated 25.3.97, 27.3.97 and 31.3.97, has been issued by Respondent management thereby the services of the Workman has been terminated and the said order is not in consonance of the terms of the agreement entered into between the parties. Further, Workman submits that the

Respondent in the 5th settlement has mentioned the date i.e., 31.3.1997 for lapse of empanel list which is illegal and that is not binding upon the Workman. The condition of lapse of empanelment list on 31.3.97 incorporated in the aforesaid 5th settlement, is arbitrary and illegal.

26. The perusal of the impugned order dated 25.3.1997 goes to reveal that the Chief/Branch Manager, SBI Zonal Office has issued the letter to all the branches with regard to the subject not to make any temporary appointments in the Branch in messengerial category from 1.4.1997. The extract of the said letter is given below:-

"We have been advised by the Deputy General Manager, Zonal Office, Hyderabad that as both the panels of temporary employees of 1989 and daily wagers/casual labours of 1992 will lapse by 31.3.1997, it has been decided by Central Office not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial category from 1.4.1997."

Thus, from the contents of the aforesaid letter, it manifest that Head Office of State Bank of India vide letter dated 25.3.1997 has issued direction to all its branches not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial category from 1.4.1997 due to reason of lapse of both panels i.e., 1989 & 1992 on 31.3.1997 as per terms of settlements entered into by both parties. Further, the contents of the subsequent letter dated 27.3.1997 issued by Respondent Management is also direction to Branch Manager, State Bank of India not to make any temporary messengerial category appointment with effect from 1.4.1997 and it has also been communicated to all concerned that the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers maintained by Zonal offices stand lapsed from 31.1.1997. Further, office order dated 31.3.1997 has been issued by Respondent management that goes to reveal that the said office order has been issued to this effect that, "Consequent on absorption of temporary employees in permanent cadre, it has been decided by the competent authority that no one onwards, no further daily labour or temporary employees/appointments should be resorted to/engaged/employed." Therefore, it reflects from the contents of the aforesaid orders that the temporary appointment in messengerial category and daily labour has been stopped by the Respondent management with effect from 1.4.1997 because of the lapsed of panel of temporary workers and daily wagers by 31.3.1997. The agreement for lapse of both the panels on 31.3.1997 is contained in the 5th settlement which has been arrived at between the parties on dated 30.7.1996 with the consensus of both the parties. Therefore, Workman can not challenge the terms and conditions contained in settlement dated 30.7.1996 regarding lapse of panel on 31.3.1997 as agreed between State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation. As per provision contained u/s.18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 the said Agreement dated 30.7.1996 is binding on both the parties.

In the case of **Allied Sales Corporation Secunderabad vs.The Authority Under Andhra Pradesh..... 1990 II LLJ 510 AP para 414, Hon'ble Court have held:-**

"*4. There was a settlement between the Management and the workmen under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act on 25th April 1983 under which the age of superannuation of the workmen was fixed at 55 years. The settlement was to be in force upto 30th June 1986 and the next settlement, incorporating practically the same terms, was again entered into on 4th February 1987 under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act. There is no dispute that these settlements are under Section 18(1).*

14. Now the Authority constituted under Section 41(1) of the Act is an authority with very limited jurisdiction. It can only decide in the first appeal whether a termination by the management is valid or not and is within the parameters of Section 40 of the Act. The said Authority, in our view, has absolutely no jurisdiction to decide whether a settlement entered into under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act between the representatives of the Workmen and of the Management, is vitiated by undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion on the part of the Management. The Authority, namely, the Assistant Commissioner of Labour, was never intended by the A.P. Legislature to have jurisdiction to go into the question of the validity of a settlement arrived at under Section 18 of the Industrial Disputes Act by an Industrial Court. That Parliament has, in fact, constituted Industrial Courts under the Industrial Disputes Act, with extensive powers cannot be disputed. What we mean to say is that the Authority under Section 41(1) of the A.P. Act has no jurisdiction what-so-ever either to question or to decide about the validity of any such settlements. If parties to a settlement have a grievance about the validity of a settlement, it is for them to agitate the matter before the appropriate forum and they cannot ask an Authority constituted under Section 41(1) of the A.P. Shops and Establishments Act, 1966 with limited jurisdiction, to go into any such question and, that too, incidentally while deciding whether retirement as per the contract of employment, is legal or not."

It is not the case of Workman that aforesaid settlements are vitiated by undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion on the part of the management. If the Workman feeling aggrieved by any terms of settlement/ agreement on the aforementioned grounds then he can challenge of settlement before a competent authority under the Act, 1947. But here in the instant matter it is not a case of Workman that aforementioned settlement has been entered into between the parties on the ground of undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion. Therefore, Workman is barred to raise any objection in respect of fixing the date of lapse of both panels on 31.3.1997 as agreed between both the parties and Workman can not challenge any terms of said Agreement.

Further in the case of **Herbertsons Limited Vs. Workmen of Herbertsons Limited and Ors, 1977 AIR 322,** Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

The Tribunal thought that the question of the quantum of membership of the 2nd Respondent did not call for a finding at all in view of 1his Court's order. As observed above that was not a correct assumption. On the other hand, we feel that this view of the Tribunal has led it to approach the matter in an entirely erroneous manner. The Tribunal is, rightly enough, conscious that under section 18 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act the settlement was binding on the company and the members of the 3rd Respondent union. Even so, the Tribunal devoted nearly half of its order in scanning the evidence given by the company and Respondent No. 3 to find out whether the terms of the settlement had been explained by the President of the union to the workmen or not and whether the workers voluntarily accepted the settlement knowing all the "consequences". This to our mind is again an entirely wrong approach.

"When a recognised union negotiates with an employer the workers as individuals do not come into the picture. It is not necessary that each individual worker should know the implications of the settlement since a recognised union, which is expected to protect the legitimate interests of labour, enters into a settlement in the best interests of labour. This would be the normal rule. We cannot altogether rule out exceptional cases where there may be allegations of mala fides, fraud or even corruption or other induce- ments. Nothing of that kind has been suggested against the President of the 3rd Respondent in this case. That being the position, prima facie, this is a settlement in the course of collective bargaining and, therefore, is entitled to due weight and consideration.

It is not possible to scan the settlement in bits and pieces and hold some parts good and acceptable and others bad. Unless it can be demonstrated that the objectionable portion is such that it completely outweighs all the other advantages gained the Court will be slow to hold a settle- ment as unfair and unjust. The settlement has to be accepted or rejected as a whole and we are unable to reject it as a whole as unfair or unjust. Even before this Court the 3rd Respondent representing admittedly the large majority of the workmen has stood by this settlement and that is a strong factor which it is difficult to ignore. As stated elsewhere in the judgment, we cannot also be oblivious of the fact that all workmen of the company have accepted the settlement. Besides, the period of settlement has since expired and we are informed that the employer and the 3rd Respondent are negotiating another settlement with further improvements. These factors, apart from what has been stated above, and the need for industrial peace and harmony when a union backed by a large majority of workmen has accepted a settlement in the course of collective bargaining have impelled us not to interfere with this settlement. That being the position, we unhold the settlement as fair and just and order that the award of the Tribunal shall be substituted by the settlement dated October 18, 1973. The said settlement shall be the substituted award. The appeal is disposed of accordingly. There will be no order as to costs."

Therefore, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above, the contention of the Workman that the date fixed for lapse of empanelled list on 31.3.1997 for appointment to the permanent post vide 5th Settlement dated 30.7.1996 is arbitrary, illegal is not untenable. The recognized union of Workmen has negotiated with the Respondent Bank Management representing large number of Workmen and the Workman as individual do not come into picture. Workman in the instant case has work as temporary Workmen in the Respondent Branch and in response of Notification he had applied for inclusion of his name in the panel and he was selected for inclusion his name in the panel list to be utilized for absorption of such Workman to permanent post in order of their seniority in the list. The Settlement dated 30.7.1996 between State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation under Sec.2(p) and Sec.18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 has clearly provided as regard non-messengerial position and it is agreed that all such posts sanctioned fallen vacant upto 31.3.1997 shall be filled before empanel list is allowed to lapse. Thus, in view of law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, in the instant case, Agreement dated 30.7.1996 was entered into between both the parties in respect of lapsing of the both the panels on 31.3.1997 and absorption of the Workmen from panel list was subject to availability of vacancy of post likely to arise upto 31.3.1997, have a binding force on Workman as well as management of State Bank of India in view of provision contained under section 18 (1) of I.D. Act, 1947.

Thus, Point No.I is answered against the Workman and in favour of the Respondent.

27. **Point No.II**:- Firstly, it is submitted on behalf of the Workman that the Respondent has terminated his services by oral order on 31.3.1997 without issuing any notice or paying any salary or compensation in lieu thereof. Therefore, the termination order of the Workman from service is in violation of provision contained Under Section 25 F of I.D. Act, 1947. Therefore, the order is liable to be set aside.

28. On the other hand, Respondent counsel contended that Workman has not worked for 240 days in any preceding calendar year. Therefore, reference of the industrial dispute is not relevant. In this context, the Workman has examined himself as WW1 who has reiterated that Workman has been terminated from service by Respondent on 31.3.1997 without notice of salary or compensation in lieu thereof. Before examining the claim of the Workman on merit it would be apposite to reproduce the provision contained under section 25 F:-

Section 25F provides:-

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].

Compensation to workmen in case of transfer of undertakings.

Section 25B defines the term continuous service which provides

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 authorized 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;

In order to prove the fact of 240 days of service within 12 months of a calendar year just preceding from the date of termination, the initial burden of proof lies upon the Workman and the Workman has to prove this factum by adducing his oral as well as documentary evidence in support of his claim.

Further, how to calculate 240 days of service by the Workman in a calendar year. In this context the reference of decisions of Hon'ble Supreme Court is relevant and the same are discussed below:-

In Rajasthan State Ganganagar S. Mills Ltd. v. State of Rajasthan and Anr. (2004) Apex Court held:

"It was the case of the Workman that he had worked for more than 240 days in the year concerned. This claim was denied by the appellant. It was for the claimant to lead evidence to show that he had worked for 240 days in the year preceding the date of his termination. He has filed an affidavit. It is statement which is in his favor and that cannot be regarded as sufficient evidence for any Court or Tribunal to come to the conclusion that in fact the claimant had worked for 240 days in a year These aspects were highlighted in Range Forest Officer v. S.T. Hadimani (2002 (3) SCC 25. No proof of receipt of salary or wages for 240 days or order or record in that regard was produced. Mere non-production of the muster roll for a particular period was not sufficient for the Labour Court held that the Workman had worked for 240 days as claimed."

In Municipal Corporation, Faridabad v. Siri Niwas (2004 (8) SCC 195), held "*the burden was on the Workman to show that he was working for more than 240 days in the preceding one year prior to his alleged retrenchment." In M.P. Electricity Board v. Hariram (2004 (8) SCC 246) the position was again reiterated in paragraph 11 as follows: "The above burden having not been discharged and the Labour Court having held so, in our opinion, the Industrial Court and the High Court erred in basing an order of reinstatement solely on an adverse inference drawn erroneously ..*"

In the case of Manager, RBI, Bangalore vs. S Mani (2005) SCC Page 100, the 3 Judges Bench of the Apex Court held that "*the initial burden of proof was on the Workman to show that he had completed 240 days of service."*

Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of Mohan Lal vs Management BEL 1981 SCC page 225 has laid down the principle that how to count 240 days of service within one year it is held: *"Clause (2)(a) provides for a fiction to treat a Workman in continuous service for a period of one year despite the fact that he has not rendered uninterrupted service for a period of one year but he has rendered period of 240 days during the period of 12 calendar service for months counting backwards and just preceding the relevant date being the date of retrenchment. In other words, in order to invoke the fiction enacted in clause (2)(a) it is necessary to determine first the relevant date, ie the date of termination of service which is complained of as retrenchment. After that date is ascertained. move backward to a period of 12 months just preceding the date of retrenchment and then ascertain whether within the period of 12 months, the Workman has rendered service for a period of 240 days. If these three facts are affirmatively answered in favor of the Workman pursuant to the deeming fiction enacted in clause (2)(a) it will have to be assumed that the Workman is in continuous service for a period of one year and he will satisfy the eligibility qualification enacted in Section 25-F"*

"14. We have already extracted section 25B since its amendment and the change in language is the legislative exposition of which note must be taken. In fact, we need not further dilate upon this aspect because in Surendra Kumar Verma and Ors. v. Central Government Industrial-cum-Labour Court, New Delhi and Anr., Chinnappa

Reddy. J., after noticing the amendment and referring to the decision in Sur Enamel and Stamping Works (P) Ltd case, held as under:

"These changes brought about by Act 36 of 1964 appear to be clearly designed to provide that a Workman who has actually worked under the employer for not less than 240 days during a period of twelve months shall be deemed to have been in continuous service for a period of one year whether or not he has in fact been in such continuous service for a period of one year. It is enough that he has worked for 240 days in a period of 12 months, it is not necessary that he should have been in the service of the employer for one whole year."

In a concurring judgment Pathak J. agreed with this interpretation of section 25B(2). Therefore, both on principle and on precedent it must be held that section 25B(2) comprehends a situation where a Workman is not in employment for a period of 12 calendar months, but has rendered service for a period of 240 days within the period of 12 calendar months commencing and counting backwards from the relevant date, i.e. the date of retrenchment. If he has, he would be deemed to be in continuous service for a period of one year for the purpose of section 25B and Chapter VA."

Thus, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above the initial burden of proof lies upon the Workman to show that he has completed 240 days of the service with the Respondent just preceding from the date of his termination. Further, in respect of the employment of calculating the 240 days service provision contained Under Section 25-F read with Section 25-B of the I.D. Act, 1947.

29. Now, in view of the provision contained under Section 25 F and law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, we have to examine whether the Workman has discharged his initial burden of proof in respect of his claim of 240 days continuous service in a calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination i.e., 31.3.1997.

In this context, WW1 in his cross examination has stated that,

"I was not sponsored by any employment exchange did not undergo regular process of selection before my engagement as temporary Messenger in the branch.."

"It is true that I did not work for 240 days in any year, in my entire service in the bank in any branch."

Thus, it is clear from the testimony of WW1 that the Workman had not worked for 240 days continuously in any 12 months of a calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination in the Respondent bank. Therefore, Workman failed to establish his plea by his oral and documentary evidence that he had worked for 240 days continuously in calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination i.e., 31.3.1997. Thus, the claim of the Workman that he has been terminated by oral order without issuing notice or payment in lieu after termination, in contravention of Section 25 F of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is not tenable. However the documents filed by the Workman in support of his claim, number of days worked with the Respondent goes to reveal that the Workman had worked intermittently as daily wager depending upon availability of work in branch. Workman did not file any document of appointment letter or salary slips in support of his claim for appointment as a non-messenger in the Respondent branch on temporary basis.

30. Per contra, the Learned Counsel for Respondent has submitted the allegation of Workman that he was terminated from services is not correct. As the vacancies were filled up on regular basis in order of their respective seniority the non-engagement of the Workman does not amount to termination. Further, Respondent contended that no law provide that even though there is no work temporary employee should be continued in the bank work as the very engagement of Workman was subject to availability of work. Therefore, the allegation that the bank has indulged in unfair labour practice is incorrect.

31. Thus, in view of the fore gone discussion and contentions made by the Respondent, I find the force in the argument advanced by the Respondent that in the instant matter, Workman was not terminated from service by order dated 31.3.1997 rather he was disengaged in view of the non-availability of the work in the branch. Further, there was direction issued by the Head Office of the Respondent authority not to engage any daily wager Workman/ temporary Worker w.e.f. 1.4.1997. Thus, such disengagement of Workman does not amount to termination. Moreover, the Workman failed to prove his claim that he was terminated in contravention of provision of Sec.25F of the I.D. Act, 1947 as he failed to establish his plea by any oral or documentary evidence that he had worked for 240 days continuously in a twelve months of calendar year just preceding from date of termination i.e., 31.3.1997.

32. Further, perusal of the order dated 25.3.1997 goes to reveal that the Chief Branch Manager, State Bank of India has issued the letter to Zonal Office with direction to all its branches to this effect that they have been advised by the DGM, Zonal Office, Hyderabad that as both the panel of temporary employees of 1989 and daily wagers/casual labour of 1992 will lapse on 31.3.1997 it has been decided by central office not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial cadre from 1.4.1997, therefore it was directed to issue suitable instructions not to make temporary appointments from 1.4.1997. There is no mention in this order that the Workman herein has been terminated from service by this order.

33. Further, the circular dated 27.3.1997 was issued by DGM, SBI to all branches in commercial network in respect of the non-appointment of temporary employees in subordinate cadre and it has directed not to make any temporary employment in the subordinate cadre with effect from 1.4.97 and further, it has directed to ensure that no temporary/casual/daily basis appointment of the petty cash. Further, it is directed to all Branch Managers that any deviation in this regard will be viewed seriously. Thus, these circulars do not reflect that the Workman has been terminated from service by this order.

34. Similarly, office order dated 31.3.1997 is simply a direction to all branches of the Respondent bank by DGM that no further daily labour should be engaged or employed. Therefore, the plea of the Workman that he has been terminated by the aforesaid order dated 25.3.1997, 27.3.1997 and 31.3.1997 from the service by the Respondent is not acceptable. The evidence adduced by the Workman clearly goes to reveal that he had worked as a daily wager for which he has been paid wages according to number of working days. As there was an order for prohibition for engaging temporary workmen, in the bank, therefore, Workman could not be engaged by the Respondent for work from 1.4.1997 and there after. It is settled law that the daily wagers are engaged by the employer depending upon the availability of work and as the work was not available the Workman was not engaged further by the Respondent management. Therefore, the Workman on the ground of number of days he had worked in the Respondent bank cannot claim any right to reinstate him into the employment. As the Workman failed to prove the mandatory condition of 240 days of continuous service as required under Sec.25F of I.D. Act, 1947. Therefore, the disengagement of Workman from work can not be termed in contravention of provision contained under Sec.25F and 25 B of the I.D. Act, 1947.

Thus, this point is answered against the Workman and in favour of Respondent.

35. **Point No.III**:- In this context, the Workman has contended that the management failed to implement the selected panels during its valid tenure. The management adopted the back door methods contrary to the settlements and filled up the vacancies. The same is evident from the proceedings dated 18.11.1993 a copy of the same is filed in the material papers and the same may be read as part of the claim statement. Further, it is submitted that management has to adhere the procedure issued by the Central Government, the instructions dated 16.8.1990 in the year 1995, but same was not followed in the year 1997 despite there being vacancies. The management has followed the procedure of calling candidates through employment exchange instead of giving chance to the empanelled candidates like the Workman herein. The management sent call letters to the similarly situated candidates like the Workman in the month of June 1997 subsequent to issuance of impugned termination orders. After knowing the fact that they are litigating the issue by way of dispute, the management has refused to engage those candidates, the copies of call letters issued are filed herein along with claim petition. The Workman herein reiterates that the panels are meant for absorption but not for termination. In view of the same a duty is cast upon the Respondent management to engage the empanelled candidates like the Workman herein even in temporary vacancies till they are absorbed permanently in regular vacancies.

36. On the other hand, Respondent has contended that the Federation approached Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) for implementation of bipartite settlement in respect of the absorption of temporary employees. The Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) conducted conciliation proceedings and agreement was arrived at between the Federation and the Management bank. It is submitted that it was agreed between the Federation and the Management that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers /casual labour would be kept alive upto March, 1997 and the vacancies as agreed to under the afore set out settlements will be filled from both the lists concurrently. A copy of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.1995 signed by the parties to the dispute is filed as a material paper. Further, it is submitted that the settlement was arrived at and an agreement was signed between the Federation and the Management bank on 30.7.1996 under Section 2(p) read with Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules 1957 which is binding on the parties. A copy of this agreement which hereinafter may be referred to as 5th settlement for brevity, is also filed as a material paper. The 5th settlement dated 30.7.1996 whereunder the earlier four settlements dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988 and 9.1.1991 were also referred, it was agreed to, by the Federation and the Management bank that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees will be kept alive upto March, 1997 for filling the vacancies existing/arrived at as on 31.12.1994 as per the norms agreed to between the bank and Federation and that thereafter the said panels would lapse. It was also agreed that within the framework of the above settlements the modalities about drawing names from either the panel of temporary employees or the panel of daily wagers and casual labour would be decided administratively on circle to circle basis depending upon the local requirements in consultation with the Federation's affiliate by the Circle management. It was further agreed that all messenger real vacancies/positions in the subordinate cadre including part-time attendants specifically provided as leave reserve will be filled by the end of 31.3.1997. Further, Respondent contended that on 27.2.1997 a memorandum of understanding was also signed between the Federation's affiliate and the bank management regarding the fact that the exercise of identifying the messengerial vacancies as on 31.12.1994 has since been completed by central office and thereby 403 messengerial vacancies were sanctioned to the circle of the Management bank and it was agreed that these vacancies may be filled from 1989 panel of temporary employees after effecting conversion from full time non-messengerial staff in the usual manner and the agreement was reached upon. Further, it was agreed between the Federations affiliate and the management bank

that in terms of the settlement dated 30.7.1996 both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers /casual employees would lapse on 31.3.1997.

37. The Workman has contended that the empanelled list prepared by the Respondent management for appointment of temporary and daily wage Workers to the permanent post cannot lapse unless until it is exhausted by appointing all the empanelled persons and it should continue even after 31.3.1997, i.e., the date fixed for the lapse of panel. It is undisputed that the date of lapse of empanelled list of Workmen has been fixed to 31.3.1997 as mentioned in the settlement dated 30.7.1996, and agreed between the parties. It is settled law that and once the life of panel list lapses on the date as agreed between the parties it cannot be extended beyond that date. In the instant case the panel list of the workmen was valid upto 31.3.1997 in view of the terms and conditions enumerated in the 5th Settlement entered into between the parties. As the lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997 has been agreed by State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation through 5th Settlement, the Workman is not competent to challenge the same.

In this context I would like to take reference of the decision of the apex court in the case of **Syndicate Bank and Ors vs. Shankar Paul and Ors , AIR 1997 SC 3091, therein the Hon'ble Apex Court** have held:-

"Till 1982, the branches of the appellant Bank in Calcutta region were recruiting persons locally to work as temporary attenders in leave vacancies. In view of the revised procedure prescribed by the Government of India in respect of such temporary appointments, the Calcutta regional office of the appellant Bank issued a circular to all of its branches on 14.8.1982, instructing all the branches under it to discontinue the old practice from 1.6.1982 and appoint only empanelled candidates. The regional office was to prepare a panel of eligible candidates, after calling names from the local/district employment exchange, and split it up branch-wise. Following that new procedure yearly panels were prepared thereafter. Names of the Respondents were for the first time included in the panel prepared for the period 7.2.1987 to 6.2.1988. By its letter dated 7.2.1987 the Bank had informed the Respondents that the panel was valid for one year only and that inclusion of their names in the panel was not to confer on them any right to seek permanent appointment in the service of the bank. Considering the object with which the panel was prepared and the fact that it was an yearly panel expiring on 6.2.1988, we are of the opinion that the Respondents did not get any right, because of inclusion of their names in the said panel, for permanent absorption in the service of the Bank. Whatever conditional right they had came to an end with the expiry of the panel. The claim of the Respondents, as contained in the writ petition was thus misconceived and therefore the learned single Judge and the Division Bench, when it first decided the appeal, were right in dismissing the writ petition and the appeal respectively."

Thus, in view of the above law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court and in view of the terms and conditions of the 5th Settlement the contention of the Workman that empanelled list should continue even after 31.3.1997 till the last Workman in the panel is absorbed is not tenable. The contention of the Workman is baseless in view of recital in the settlement. Therefore, in view of the fore gone discussion and finding given at Point No. I regarding binding nature of Settlements and terms and conditions enumerated therein, in view of the provision contained u/s.18(1) of the I.D. Act, 1947, I am of the considered view that life of panels lapsed on 31.3.1997 in view of terms of settlement dated 30.7.1996 and plea of Workman that the panel shall continue even after 31.3.1997 till last man absorbed has no legal force and same is untenable.

38. Undisputedly, settlement agreement dated 30.7.1996 was executed between the State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation and in that settlement it was agreed that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/ casual employees will be used for filling vacancies existing as on 31.12.1994 as per the norms agreed between the bank and the Federation. These empanelled workmen were to be given a chance for permanent appointment in the bank against vacancies arising up to December 1994 whereas the daily wagers/ casual employees were to be considered against the vacancies arise from January 1995 to December 1996, whereby the said panel would lapse. It was agreed that the vacancies falls upto 31.3.1997 shall be filled before the empanelled list is allowed to lapse. Thus, the claim of the Workman to the post of permanent non-messenger in the Respondent management was subject to the availability of the sanctioned post and vacancies arising upto 31.3.1997. The workmen given chance to the permanent post were seniors in number of working days in panel list and Workman herein was junior to those workmen. Therefore, Workman could not be given absorption to permanent post being junior to other workmen in the panel list.

39. In this context the Workman witness WW1 was cross examined by the Respondent counsel and in the cross examination the witness WW1 states:-

"I applied for appointment as Messenger, in response to the advertisement issued by the bank and the union in the year 1991….. Further, witness states*, " The panel was prepared basing upon the number of days of service, put in by the temporary employees. Some of the temporary employees whose names were included in the panel were given regular appointment in the bank order of their seniority in the panel….* Further witness states*, "It is true that I am not having any documents to show that any of my juniors are continuing in service in the bank."*

Thus, from the above statement of the Workman witness WW1 it is clear that the panel was prepared in terms of various settlements entered into between Staff Federation of State Bank of India and State Bank of India and it was

prepared on the basis of number of days of work put in by the temporary employees. Further, the Workman himself admitted that some of the temporary employees whose names were included in the panel were given regular appointment in the bank in order of their seniority in the panel and he is not having any document to show that any person who worked for less number of days than the Workman was given appointment in the bank. Therefore, the allegation of the Workman that the regular appointment has been made by the bank from the panel list in breach of the terms of the settlement and violation of seniority of panel list is not proved by this evidence of WW1. Thus, there is no evidence on record that bank has given the appointment to the temporary employees as well as daily wagers from the panel list 1989 and 1992 in breach of seniority of the temporary employees in the list. There is no evidence of jumbling in the panel list to make appointment of any permanent Workman in breach of the seniority. Therefore, I am constrained to hold that the Respondent Management has appointed the workmen from panel list in order of seniority and there is no jumbling of workmen in the panel list before it got lapsed on 31.3.1997.

40. However, Workman has taken the plea that the panels of Workmen for absorption in the employment of the Respondent banks (panels of temporary employees and daily wagers) has been lapsed on 31.3.1997 in contravention of terms of settlement as the object of preparing the entire empanelment of temporary and daily wagers was to provide them permanent employment and till the both the panel lists exhausted the panel list cannot be lapsed on 31.3.1997 and the date of lapsing of the panel on 31.3.1997 has been fixed by the Respondent arbitrarily without any authority.

41. In this context, the perusal of Settlement dated 30.7.1996 reveals that the 5th Settlement dated 30.7.1996 was entered under Section 2(p) and 18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Dispute (Central) Rules 1957. This settlement has been entered into by the competent parties and in this settlement parties thereto agreed that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees will lapse on 31.3.1997. Thus the date of lapse of panel was fixed by both the parties with consensus under the settlement dated 30.7.1996 and same is binding upon the Workman under the provision of Section 18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947. Moreover, this issue of binding force of the settlement dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988 and 9.1.1991 has already been discussed, decided at finding in Point No.I of this award. However, the legality and validity of the aforementioned settlement has not been challenged by the Workman before any competent forum. Thus, claim of Workman that the date of lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997 has been fixed arbitrarily by the Respondent bank is untenable. As regard the claim of Workman for his absorption to the permanent post it is settled law that the Workman can not claim his regularization to permanent post merely on the basis of number of working days.

42. In this context the reference of the decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Oil and Natural Gas Corporation vs Krishan Gopal 2020(3) SCALE 272, date of decision 7.2.2020** is relevant therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have has laid down principle regarding regularization of the Workman on permanent posts. Hon'ble Supreme Court have laid down the prepositions of regularization of the workmen to permanent post is as under:-

"*(i) Wide as they are, the powers of the Labour Court and the Industrial Court cannot extend to a direction to order regularisation, where such a direction would in the context of public employment offend the provisions contained in Article 14 of the Constitution;*

(ii) The statutory power of the Labour Court or Industrial Court to grant relief to workmen including the status of permanency continues to exist in circumstances where the employer has indulged in an unfair labour practice by not filling up permanent posts even though such posts are available and by continuing to employ workmen as temporary or daily wage employees despite their performing the same work as regular workmen on lower wages;

(iii) The power to create permanent or sanctioned posts lies outside the judicial domain and where no posts are available, a direction to grant regularisation would be impermissible merely on the basis of the number of years of service;

(iv) Where an employer has regularised similarly situated workmen either in a scheme or otherwise, it would be open to workmen who have been deprived of the same benefit at par with the workmen who have been regularised to make a complaint before the Labour or Industrial Court, since the deprivation of the benefit would amount to a violation of Article 14; and

(v) In order to constitute an unfair labour practice under Section 2(ra) read with Item 10 of the Vth Schedule of the ID Act, the employer should be engaging workmen as badlis, temporaries or casuals, and continuing them for years, with the object of depriving them of the benefits payable to permanent workmen.

Thus, in view of the principles laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court as discussed above, in the instant matter the Workman utterly failed to prove his claim by adducing any documentary or oral evidence that the employer has indulged in unfair labour practice by not filling the permanent posts even though such posts are available and by continuing to employ workmen as temporary or daily wage employees despite their performance was the same work, as regular workmen on lower wages.

43. Respondent has contended that all the vacancies exist and arise upto 31.3.1997 has been filled up from the panel list in order of seniority and no vacancy exists or arises as on 31.3.1997 remained unfilled. Further, it is

contended that as per terms of settlement the life of panel lists has been lapsed on 31.3.1997, hence, there is no occasion to extend the life of panel lists beyond 31.3.1997. However, the workman failed to prove contrary by any evidence to the aforesaid contention of the Respondent that the vacancies were existing as on 31.3.1997 and the workman was not given absorption to the permanent post in order of his seniority. It is settled law that the power to create permanent or sanctioned post lies outside the judicial domain and where no posts are available, a direction to grant regularization would be impermissible merely on the basis of the number of years of service. Therefore, the claim of the workman on this ground also not acceptable.

44. Further, as per the of settlement, panel was prepared for absorption of the workmen on the permanent posts has already been lapsed on 31.3.1997 and the vacancies existing and arising upto 31.12.1994 and upto 31.3.1997 as settlement dated 30.7.1996 has been filled up from the panel by appointing the workmen as per seniority in the panel list. Workman witness WW1 in his cross examination has himself admitted this fact that, some of the temporary employees whose names were included in the panel were given regular appointment in the bank in order of their seniority in the panel. The Workman failed to show that there was any breach of terms of settlement has been committed by the Respondent in appointment to permanent post from aforesaid panel list.

45. As discussed in preceding paragraph of this Award, the life of the panel has not been extended beyond 31.3.1997, by any further settlement hence, the panel list in which name of the Workman was included got expired on 31.3.1997. It is not the case of the Workman that Respondent has regularized similarly situated workmen either in the scheme or otherwise and the Workman has been deprived of same benefit on par with those workmen or the vacancies remained unfilled on the date of lapse of panels i.e., 31.3.1997, Industrial Tribunal has no jurisdiction to extend the date of lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997. This Tribunal can not order for regularization of workmen to the permanent post in contravention of the provision of Article 14 of the Constitution of India.

In the case of **Mahboob Deepak vs. Nagar Panchayat Gajraula & Anr, Civil Appeal No.5875/2007 date of judgement 13.12.2007,** Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

"8. Respondent is a Local Authority. The terms and conditions of employment of the employees are governed by a statute and statutory rules. No appointment can be made by a Local Authority without following the provisions of the recruitment rules. Any appointment made in violation of the said rules as also the constitutional scheme of equality as contained in Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India would be a nullity.

9. Due to some exigency of work, although recruitment on daily wages or on an ad hoc basis was permissible, but by reason thereof an employee cannot claim any right to be permanently absorbed in service or made permanent in absence of any statute or statutory rules. Merely because an employee has completed 240 days of work in a year preceding the date of retrenchment, the same would not mean that his services were liable to be regularized."

Therefore, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, the claim of the Workman for absorption merely on the basis of number of day of work in the Respondent bank Branch is not acceptable. As regard plea of the Workman that the Workman should have been given employment even after 31.3.1997 as temporary Workman, it is the discretion of Respondent to engage the Workman depending upon availability of work and this Tribunal can not direct the Respondent to engage the Workman in the absent of such rule/scheme.

46. In view of principle laid down by Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above, in the instant matter Workman utterly failed to establish the fact of rendering continuous service for a period of 240 days of service within a period of 12 calendar months commencing and coming backward from relevant date i.e., the date of retrenchment, if has he would be denied to be in continuous service for a period of one year. Therefore, the provision contained under Sec.25F of retrenchment is not applicable to Workman.

Counsel for Workman has relied upon number of decisions of Hon'ble High Court and Hon'ble Supreme Court and few of them are discussed herein:-

In the case of **F.C.I., vs. Kamdhenu Cattle Feed Industries 1993 (1) SCC 71,** therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

"7. In contractual sphere as in all other State actions, the State and all its instrumentalities have to conform to Article 14 of the Constitution of which non-arbitrariness is a significant facet. There is no unfettered discretion in public law: A public authority possesses powers only to use them for public good. This impose the duty to act fairly and to adopt a procedure which is `fairplay in action'. Due observance of this obligation as a part of good administration raises a reasonable or legitimate expectation in every citizen to be treated fairly in his interaction with the State and its instrumentalities, with this element forming a necessary component of the decision making process in all State actions. To satisfy this requirement of non- arbitrariness in a State action, it is, therefore, necessary to consider and give due weight to the reasonable or legitimate expectations of the persons likely lo be affected by the decision or else that unfairness in the exercise of the power may amount to an abuse or excess of power apart from affecting the bona fides of the decision in a given case. The decision so made would be exposed to challenge on the ground of

arbitrariness. Rule of law does not completely eliminate discretion in the exercise of power, as it is unrealistic, but providers for control of its exercise by judicial review."

In the case of **State Bank of India, R.O., Vijayawada vs. Industrial Tribunal, Hyderabad WP No.193/1997,** therein Hon'ble High Court have held,

"*Sri Krovvidi Narasimham, the learned counsel for the 2nd respondent contends, supporting the award that it was a permanent vacancy and even though the 2nd respondent was appointed on temporary basis, his services were not liable to be terminated and he was to be regularised into service on permanent basis. Shastry award warrants that no temporary appointment can be made to a permanent post. But the matter is now covered by two division bench judgements dated 28.11.1986 in W.A. No.791 of 1986 and 25.8.1987 in W.A. No.270 of 1982. The ratio decided in the two judgements is to the effect that there cannot be any mandate to appoint employees on permanent basis when the requirement was for appointment on temporary basis. But it is held in the said judgements that when a temporary appointee is ousted from service and not for misconduct and, if again temporary appointment is to be made, then, the case of such temporary appointee who was ousted, has got to be considered in accordance with Sec. 25-H of the Act."*

In the case of **State of Haryana and others vs. Piara Singh and others. 1992 (4) SCC 118,** therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

" 49. If for any reason an adhoc or temporary employee is continued for a fairly long spell, the authorities must consider his case for regularization provided he is eligible and qualified according to the rules and his service record is satisfactory and his appointment does not run counter to the reservation policy of the state."

In the above cited judgements by the Workman the facts of the case are different hence do not apply to instant case of Workman.

47. On the other hand, in support of his contention Respondent has examined witness MW1 and MW1 in chief examination states that, Settlements i.e., on 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988, 9.1.1991 were entered into between the SBI and SBI Staff Federation for filling up of the vacancies that arise up to 1994 for those temporary employees who has worked on scale wages. Further, MW1 states that two different panels for messengers and non-messengers as per the eligibility criteria prescribed by the bank. There are four modules in Andhra Pradesh and they are Hyderabad, Tirupathi, Vijayawada and Visakhapatnam. MW1 states that the temporary employees so empanelled were given permanent absorption depending upon the vacancies so arise strictly in terms of the settlement. MW1 states that on 9.6.1995 conciliation proceeding was held before the RLC(C), Hyderabad and in said proceedings it was decided that the panels will be kept live up to 31.3.1997 and vacancies will be filled from both the lists concurrently. A copy of the said minutes of proceedings is Ex.M5. Further, MW1 states that on 30.7.1996 another settlement was entered between the SBI and All India SBI Staff Federation providing for filling up of the vacancies arising up to December 1994 in respect of subordinate cadre and daily wage /casual wage employees out of panel so prepared were to be considered against vacancies arising from January 1995 to December 1996, thereafter the said panels lapse. MW1 states that it was also agreed that all the non- messenger positions in subordinate cadre including part time attendants specially provided as leave reserve will be filled before 31.3.1997 and as regards to non-messengerial positions it is agreed that all such posts sanctioned and fallen vacant up to 31.3.1997 shall be filled before the empanelled list is allowed to lapse. Thus in both the cases empanelled list were lapsed on 1.4.1997. Ex.M6 is the copy of the settlement dated 30.7.1996. Further, witness states that on 27.2.1997 a memorandum of understanding was reached between the SBI and SBI Staff Federation providing that both the panels above mentioned will lapse on 31.3.1997. Ex.M7 is the copy of the memorandum of understanding and Ex.M8 is the copy of the statements giving the particulars of 1989 non-messenger panel, Ex.M9 is the copy of the statement of 1989 non-messenger panel, Ex.M10 is the copy of statement of 1992 panel. Further, witness states that petitioner was included in the 1989 panel. As the existing vacancies at that time were exhausted and his turn did not come he could not be given permanent employment in the bank as per the agreements. All the appointments were made strictly in accordance with the settlements reached from time to time between SBI and SBI staff federation and as per seniority, number of days of temporary service put in by them in the bank in the given period. Further, MW1 states petitioner was not sponsored by any employment exchange he did not undergo the regular process of selection required for appointment as a regular non-messenger the petitioner has not worked for 240 days in any year in his entire temporary service in the bank. The petitioner and other temporary employees were terminated from service by the bank. Further, MW1 states that the vacancies were filled up on regular basis with the temporary employees from the panels and these panels were expired in terms of the settlements so reached and there were no vacancies to absorb such employees. Thus, witness MW1 has proved the documents Ex.M1 to Ex.M12 and also contentions made in the counter. However, MW1 was cross examined by the Petitioner Counsel. But nothing has been elicited in his cross examination so as to discredit the testimony of the witness MW1 as regards the date of lapse of both the panels on 31.3.1997 and reasons assigned for non-absorption of the Petitioner from the panel list to the permanent post.

Moreover the witness MW1 was re-examined by the Respondent and the witness MW1 states that panels were expired in terms of the settlement send absorptions to the extent of the available vacancies were made. There was no termination of any temporary messenger as such but their services were not utilized after the cut off date as the available vacancies were already filled up and most of these Petitioners were not in the service of the bank as on the date of the expiry date of the panels. Therefore, in view of the aforesaid testimony of the MW1 in re-examination in the absence of cross examination remained uncontraverted, the claim of the Workman that he was entitled for absorption in permanent post in the branch of Respondent Management on the basis of panel list is found not established.

This point is answered against the Workman.

48. **Point No.IV**:- In view of the discussion and finding given at Point Nos. I, II and III, the Workman is not entitled for any relief and claim statement of Workman sans merit and liable to be dismissed.

This Point is answered accordingly.

AWARD

In view of the fore gone discussion, it is held that the action of the Respondent bank in terminating the services of Sri Karanam Gowrinaidu, Ex. Messenger by way of oral orders w.e.f. 31.1.1995 is justified. Hence, the Petitioner is not entitled for any relief as prayed for. The claim statement filed by Workman sans merit, hence, dismissed.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, Personal Assistant, transcribed by her, corrected and signed by me on this the 21ssst day of May, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR. Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner	Witnesses examined for the Respondent
WW1: Sri G. Anil Kumar	MW1: Sri C.R.M. Sastry

Documents marked for the Petitioner

Ex.W1:	Photocopy of Service Certificate
Ex.W2:	Photocopy of employment notification
Ex.W3:	Photocopy of letter to CGM(Per) dated 10.10.1990
Ex.W4:	Photocopy of letter from Government of India reg. recruitment and absorption of temporary employees dt. 19.08.90
Ex.W5:	Photocopy of the letter from Government of India to Respondent dt. 30.1187
Ex.W21:	Photocopy of Service Certificate dated 08.11.1996
Ex.W22:	Photocopy of Service Certificate dated 23.11.1999
Ex.W23:	Photocopy of letter to employment Exchange by the Respondent
Ex.W24:	Photocopy of Circular letter dated 14.07.1999

Documents marked for the Respondent

Ex.M1:	Photocopy of printed book containing settlement between the staff federation and Management for regularization of services of the temporary employees and casual employees.

नई दिल्ली, 29 जुलाई, 2026

का.आ. 1682.— औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार भारतीय स्टेट बैंक के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजको और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण - सह - श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद के पंचाट (सन्दर्भ संख्या 200/2002) को प्रकाशित करती है,

[सं. एल.12012/42/2000–आई.आर-(बी-I)]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 29th July, 2026

S.O. 1682.— In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Reference.I.D.No.200/2002) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Hyderabad as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the Management of SBI of India and their workmen,

[No. L-12012/42/2000 – IR (B-I)]

SALONI, Dy. Director

In The Central Government Industrial Tribunal Cum Labour Court At Hyderabad

Present: **Sri IRFAN QAMAR**

Presiding Officer

Dated the 7th day of May, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. 200/2002

[Old ID No.32/2000 of Industrial Tribunal No.I, Hyderabad]

Between:

Sri A. Ramasekhar,

Bukkarayasamudram,

Dist. Anantapur (A.P). … Petitioner

And

The Dy. General Manager,

State Bank of India,

Zonal Office,

Renigunta Road,

Tirupathi (A.P). …..Respondent

Appearances:

For the Petitioner : Sri Macherla Rangaiah, Advocate

For the Respondent: Sri Y. Ranjeeth Reddy, Advocate

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-12012/42/2000-IR(B.I) dated 06.07.2000 referred the following dispute under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 to Industrial Tribunal No.I, Hyderabad for adjudication and later the same has been transferred to this Tribunal bearing ID No.32/2000, as per orders of Central Government vide Lr.No.H-11026/1/2001-IR(C.II) dated 18.10.2001, requiring this forum to decide the question:

THE SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the of State Bank of India, Bukkarayasamudram Branch in terminating Sri A. Ramasekhar, Messenger, from the services of the Bank by way of oral orders w.e.f. 31.3.97 is justified? If not, what relief he is entitled to?"

After receipt of the reference, it was numbered as ID No. 200/2002 and notices were issued to both the Workman and the management.

2. Before unfolding the factual matrix of the instant industrial dispute it would be apposite to have a bird eye view of a chequered history of the instant industrial dispute. Earlier instant industrial dispute along with the batch cases was decided by this Tribunal vide common award dated 17.5.2005 and the reference was answered in favour of the Respondent and against the Workman. That said common award dated 17.5.2005 was challenged by the aggrieved Workmen in various Writ petition No.6470/2014 along with batch of writ petitions before the Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh and Hon'ble High Court vide its' judgement dated 23.6.2014 allowed all batch of writ petitions and set aside the common award dated 17.5.2005 passed in ID No.222 of 2001 and other batch of ID cases by Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad and the Respondent management of State Bank of India was directed to reengage the Writ Petitioners in position, which they have been occupying prior to their termination and further directed to consider their cases for regularization as and when the substantive vacancy arises. This judgement dated 23.6.2014 of Hon'ble High Court of AP, passed in WP No.6470/2014 and batch petitions was challenged by Respondent management before the Hon'ble High Court in Writ Appeal No. 1268 of 2014. The aforesaid Writ Appeals No.1268/2014 and other Writ Appeals were decided by Division Bench of High Court of Andhra Pradesh by a common judgement dated 20.3.2019. Hon'ble High Court in aforesaid Writ Appeal was pleased to pass the order which is extracted as below:-

" 7. Hearing the learned senior counsel for the SBI and the learned senior counsel for the contesting unofficial Respondents, we see that while the learned single Judge was justified in setting aside the award af the Tribunal, the proper course to be adopted was to remit all the cases to the Tribunal. This we say for reasons more than one. Firstly, in such matters, claims have to be decided on individual basis, as different persons have different claims as to the length of officiation or discharge of duties and functions; quality of engagement, drawings, accounting of the post for each one of them, who have worked etc. All these issues will not be the same in all the cases. Therefore, each case ought to have been directed to be decided by the Tribunal afresh on individual basis. The second and most important aspect is the learned single Judge has in one go ordered re-employment of all the workmen. This is not a relief that could have been granted without answering the individual issues; each issue relating to each case could not have been decided by the writ Court within the format of its adjudication procedures and scope. The adjudicating body, which has to do that activity, is the Industrial Tribunal. Therefore, we are of the view that while we would sustain the order of the learned singe Judge insofar as it interfered and sets aside the award of the Tribunal, the further findings and directions, issued through the impugned order have to go and the individual cases have to be sent back for consideration of the Tribunal. Such further procedure before the Tribunal will have to be carried forward with the materials already on record and also by affording an opportunity to the persons, who have claims as well as the management to place their rival contentions and further material before the Tribunal. The learned counsel appearing for the workmen are justified in pointing out that enormous delay has already happened and further action by the Tribunal in this line may be expedited.

9. In the result, these writ appeals are ordered;

(1) affirming the impugned common order of the learned single Judge to the extent it sets aside the common award dated 17.05.2005 of the Industrial Tribunal;

(2) the further findings and directions issued through the impugned common order are vacated:

(3) all the matters shall be remitted to the Industrial Tribunal with a direction to dispose of them within an outer limit of five (5) months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order; and,

(4) the parties to make appearance before the Tribunal on the given date."

Thus, in view of the above direction of Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh in W.A.No.1268 of 2014 and batch cases. This Tribunal has taken up the matter of industrial dispute for hearing and deciding it afresh in view of the aforesaid guidelines laid down by the Hon'ble High Court in Writ Appeal No.1268/2014 vide judgement dated 20.3.019.

3. The factual matrix of instant industrial dispute as narrated by the Workman in his claim statement are that, the Workman joined in the service of the management institution as Messenger from 1986 to 1997, and has rendered unblemished service spreading over a period of about 11 years. The Respondent has terminated services of Workman by oral orders with effect from 1.4.1997. Further, it is submitted that the management of Respondent bank decided to give a chance to temporarily employed personnel "found suitable for permanent appointment" by wait- listing them by offering permanent appointment or waitlisting till such opportunity arises.

4. That on 17.11.1987 a settlement was reached between All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and the Management of State Bank of India - settlement one, under this settlement three categories of employees were listed. That is, A) those who have completed 240 days in 12 months or less after 1.7.1975. B) those who have completed 270 days in any continuous block of 36 calendar months after 1.7.1975. C) (i) those who have completed minimum of 30 days aggregate temporary service in any calendar year after 1.7.1975 or (ii) 70 days aggregate temporary service in continuous block of 36 months after 1.7.1975.

5. The persons who satisfied in all the above 4 categories were to be interviewed by a selection committee and the said selection committee would determine the suitability of the said candidate for permanent appointment. Therefore, the bank prescribed certain qualifications and from among the candidates satisfying the qualifications the suitable candidates were enlisted by a selection committee. The Clause 7 of the said agreement provided with the selected candidate would be wait listed in order of their respective categorization and the selected panel would be valid upto December, 1991. Clause 10 of the settlement specifically provided that henceforth. "there will be no temporary appointments in the subordinate cadre", except on a restrictive basis in the specified category, "from amongst empanelled candidates as per existing guidelines of the bank". The Workman further submits that consequent upon the said agreement and the draft, a notification was issued in the newspapers. The last date for responding to the advertisement was 30.8.1988. A written examination followed by viva-voce in May, 1989 was held. A selected panel was prepared, as per Clause 7 of the agreement, ie. Settlement No.1, the selected panel was to be valid upto December, 1991, the Workman submits that circular was issued on 26.4.91 by the said letter it is mentioned that the terms of the agreement dated 17.11.87 was modified vide second agreement dated 16.7.88 was entered into between the parties. In terms of the said agreement a chance was to be given, "to all eligible temporary employees for permanent appointments. The appointments were against the vacancies likely to arise during the years 1995-96, circular made it clear that in view of the enormity of the problem an extension of the currency of the panel, eligible temporary employees who have been empanelled could not appear in the earlier interviews and have been pursuing their cases thereafter, "will be given another chance to appear for interview".

6. Workman submits that there were total five settlements. The settlement dated 17.11.87 is the 1st settlement (Ex M1), settlement dated 16.7.88 is 2nd settlement (Ex M2), settlement dated 27.10.88 is the 3rd settlement (Ex M3), then settlement dated 9.1.91 is 4th settlement and settlement dated 30.7.96 is 5th settlement (Ex M6). In between there is minutes of conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.95 marked as Ex M5. That due to all these settlements which were extended by subsequent settlements thereby created reasonable expectations in the list of the selected candidates arose with that it's a question of time their appointments or services would be regularized in the services of the bank. The Workman was working with the bank on temporary basis was under the bonafide hope that sooner his services will be regularized with the bank. He is thereby closed all his options elsewhere. It is needless to point out that employing person to whom hope of employment in substantial terms was made is a facet of Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

7. Further Workman submits that the Government of India issued Circular No. F-3/3/104/87-IR, dated 16.8.1990. Under said circular the chief Executives of all public sector banks including the Management herein were specifically instructed that until the problem of existing temporary employees is fully resolved, no bank is permitted to make any permanent appointments. That some of the persons similarly situated like this Workman aggrieved by the inaction on the part of the management of the bank is not regularizing their services from out of the selected panel and not clearly focusing the vacancy position, filed W.P. No. 4194/97 before Hon'ble High court of A.P.. It is specifically averred in the said writ petition that the Management of the bank had failed to implement the settlement and that it violates the various fundamental rights guaranteed under the constitution of India. The Hon'ble High court of A.P .. by order dated 5.3.97 directed the bank to implement the settlement as amended from time to time. It also directed the bank to carry out the terms of settlement before the expiry of March, 1997. The Hon'ble High Court also recorded finding that the Bank cannot escape its liability of enforcement of the Settlement. In view of the directions given by the High Court all candidates whose names appeared in the select panels prepared on the basis of the agreement entered into on 17.11.87 under which the panel was valid upto December, 1991, and on the basis of a settlement dated 27.10.1988 whereby the panels were made alive upto 31.3.1997 under which the panel was valid upto December, 1999. The other agreement dated 16.7.1988 under which the panel was valid upto 1992 and on the basis of the settlement dated 27.10.1998 whereby the panels were made alive upto 31.3.1997 were under the bonafide impression that their cases will be considered for regularization and were living on the basis of the said reasonable expectation. Unfortunately, contrary to the aforesaid directions given by the High Court and contrary to the settlements entered into between the parties, the bank issued proceedings dated 25.3.1997, dated 27.3.1997 and 31.3.1997 instructing the various authorities of the Management not to continue the temporary employees those who are in services of the bank from 1.4.97. The said order was followed by the Management. Aggrieved by the said action the Workman herein and similarly situated candidates have filed a writ petition before the Hon'ble High Court and by way of Writ Petition No.9206/97 seeking a declaration that the proceedings issued by the Deputy General Manager and the Assistant General Manager (Respondents 3,4 and 5 therein) on 25.3.97, 27.3.97 and 31.3.97 as illegal and also non-continuance of the Workmen therein in service by absorbing them in the services of the bank as

violative of Section 2(p) and 18(1) read with Rule 58 of Central Rules and sought for specific direction to the bank to absorb them in service.

8. Further, Workman submits that in the counter affidavit filed in Writ Petition No.9206/97, the bank has submitted that it has about 805 branches in Andhra Pradesh alone. It has stated that due to exigencies of circumstances and on account of the urgent need in its banks, it employed temporary employees in subordinate cadre. It is pertinent to mention that it does not state the urgent or need or the nature of temporary employees that it had engaged. Enquiry into the same would reveal that the stand taken by the bank either on the ground of urgent need or of temporary employees is a façade to perpetuate unfair labour practice. It is designed to on the one hand, keep the employed in the erroneous zone of hope and on the other to ensure that benefits that a model employer will extend under various statutes to its employees is not required to be borne out by the bank. A reading of the counter affidavit would show that the bank would opines that being just fair and reasonable are which obviously is reprehensible and is a facet of unfair labour practice.

9. The Workman submits that the bank had referred in its counter affidavit to three settlements dated 17.11.87, 16.7.88 and 27.10.88. The bank in the guise of extending the benefits of the circular of Government dated 16.8.90 stated in its counter affidavit that as follows:

"Government of India, vide its letter dated 16.8.1990, issued guidelines to all the public sector banks with regard to recruitment and absorption of temporary employees in public sector banks. The said guidelines were issued to implement on the lines of the approach paper on the issue provided by a committee constituted in this regard. The Government of India guidelines made it clear that all the public sector banks may follow the provisions laid down in the approach paper.

The approach paper specified that the cases of temporary employees who had put in not less than 240 days of temporary service in 12 consecutive Months and who are entitled to benefit of Section 25-F may be decided by entering into a settlement with the representative union. In respect of temporary employees who had put in less than 240 days of service in 12 consecutive months or less, a settlement could be avoided and however if the Management so desired, they could enter into a conciliation settlement with the representative union. Para 6(h), it is mentioned that only those temporary employees who had put in temporary service of 90 or more days after 1.1 1982 would be eligible for considering under the scheme. Although the Government guidelines envisaged for a settlement in respect of employees who had put in temporary service of 90 or more days, the bank by way of further concession entered into settlements Even in respect of those who had put in less than 90 days. As such, it could be Seen that the settlements are more beneficial to the temporary employees concerned. The approach paper also specify at para 6(c) that the banks would provide one time opportunity to all the temporary employees and for that purpose temporary employees worked in the bank on or after 1.1.1982 could be considered for re-employment in terms of the scheme. The Respondents have gone further wherein even persons working after 1975 were also considered.

As could be seen from the above, there was a genuine effort on the part of the Respondent bank to provide permanent employment for as many as possible subject to availability of the vacancies.

It is further submitted that at para 6(k) of the approach paper, it was made clear that this would be one time exercise in full and final settlement of all the aims and disputes for the past period in respect of temporary workmen covered by the settlement. This would mean that the Government of India guidelines would cover only those persons who were temporarily employed for the period specified therein and not otherwise. As such, it is submitted that the Respondents have not only followed the Government of India guidelines but in fact covered cases of the employees who had worked for less than 90 days. As such, question of violation does not arise and in any case those were only broad guidelines and not directives".

10. The Workman submits that the bank also referred a subsequent settlement dated 9.1.1991 wherein there is a clause to the effect- that the panel of temporary employees and the panel of daily wage employees will be operated to a particular period. Therefore, their cases will not be considered. The Management herein relying upon this settlement in their impugned action. It is submitted that even the settlement dated 9.1.1991 will not empower the management to terminate the services of the temporary employees who are working in the bank services like the Workman herein as it does not specify the termination of the employees. In fact there are so many vacancies wherein the Management has engaged several new persons as temporary messengers/ attendars/ sweepers etc., even after the judgment of Hon'ble High Court without considering the cases of the similarly situated candidates like the Workman herein. It is submitted inspite of engaging fresh candidates as is now being done by the Management they would have continued the similarly situated candidates like the Workman herein in the services of the bank and consider their cases for absorption in view of the circulars issued by Central Government as well as the directions of this Hon'ble Court in Writ Petition No.4194/97, dated 5.3.97. In view of the circulars issued by the Central Government, the Management should not have relied upon the settlement dated 9.1.1991. Hence, the impugned action of the Management is illegal, unjust, violative of fundamental rights such as Articles 14,16 and 21 of the Constitution of India.

11. The Workman submits that in W.P. No.4194/97 filed by the union of temporary employees where in they have complained about the non- implementation of the settlements arrived between the parties and sought for

absorption. Such employees in the bank services on permanent basis before the date fixed for carrying out the terms of settlement, the Court held that the members of the union had been empanelled in the list, they were not regularized and the time was going to run out to the near future and the Respondent bank and its officers cannot escape from the liability of enforcing the settlement which has been reached and therefore directed that the bank and the officers shall implement the settlement dated 17.11.87 as amended from time to time before the expiry of 31.3.97.

12. Further, it is submitted that in the clause of Settlement it is specifically mentioned that the workmen to be absorbed/appointed in the bank prohibiting any temporary appointments subsequent to the date of settlement even the authorities want to make temporary appointments that should be made only from among the empanelled can be appointed either for temporary vacancy or permanent vacancy except from among the empanelled candidates like the Workman and that should be continued till they are absorbed. The management committed unfair labour practices and terminated the services of the candidates with effect from 1.4.1997 which is arbitrary, discriminatory, contrary to their own guidelines and violative of the constitutional provisions which are guaranteed in Chapter-III of the Constitution of India.

13. The Workman submits that it is strange as to how the panels were allowed to lapse by a so-called Memorandum of Understanding dated 25.2.1997, that the action of terminating such employees like the Workman by virtue of an impugned oral proceedings without implementing the settlement would be illegal and unfair labour practice which cannot be allowed to be perpetuated. That the discontinuance of the Workman after 31.3.97 who had served in the bank in any capacity amounts to retrenchment. It could not have been done without any notice and it violates Sec.25FF of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and the said action is violative of principles of natural justice guaranteed under Chapter III of the Constitution of India. This amounts to retrenchment without one month's notice and taken in view of such notice. Thus, the main proceedings issued by the Respondent is without jurisdiction and is arbitrary, illegal and therefore liable to be quashed. That the alleged Memorandum of Understanding dated 27.2.97, Ex.M5 does not own any legal entity, as the said Memorandum of Understanding is not published anywhere to brought to the notice of the Workman whose rights are being affected. It is submitted that Management did not adhere to the procedure envisaged by the Central Government in its' instructions dated 16.8.90 in the year 1995. The same was not followed in the year 1997 despite there being vacancies. The management has followed the procedure of calling candidates through Employment exchange instead of giving chance to the empanelled candidates like the Workman here. It is pertinent to mention here that the Respondent Management sent letters to the all similarly situated candidates like the Workman in the month of June, 1997, subsequent to the passing of impugned termination orders. After knowing the facts that the candidates are litigating, the Management refused to engage these candidates. It is once again reiterated that the panels are meant for absorption but not for termination. It was the duty of the Management to engage the empanelled candidates like the Workman even in temporary vacancies till they are absorbed permanently in regular vacancies. Hence, the action of the Respondent Management terminating the services of the Workman by oral order dated 31.3.97 is unjust, illegal, violative of principles of natural justice and hence, the Management be directed to reinstate and absorb the Workman and to grant all incidental and consequential benefits.

14. Per contra, Respondent had filed counter and made a contentions that the reference is not tenable and contrary to the provisions of I.D. Act, 1947. Respondent submitted that to tide over severe sub-ordinate staff constraints which arose out of leave vacancies, exigencies, etc., and also owning to the restrictions imposed by the Government of India/Reserve Bank of India on intake of staff, the Respondent bank used to engage sub-ordinate staff like messengers, sweepers, sweeper cum water boys, etc., depending on the availability of work on purely temporary basis for the smooth and uninterrupted functioning of the branches. It is submitted that the All India State Bank of India Staff Federation which represents majority of the employees in the State Bank of India comprising about 98% of the work force as its' members espoused the cause of temporary employees who have put in less than 240 days of temporary service in 12 calendar months in the bank and who were ineligible for any protection under Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 to give a chance for being considered for absorption and permanent appointments.

15. Discussions were held and on 17.11.1987 an agreement was signed between the federation and the Management bank under Sec. 2(p) read with Sec 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules 1957. A copy of the said settlement dated 17.11.87 which may be herein after referred as first settlement is filed and 4 categories were made as it has already been mentioned in the claim statement above, it need not be repeated here. In the first settlement, it was agreed that the temporary employees as categorized would be given a chance for being considered for permanent appointment in the bank's service against the vacancies which are likely to arise during the period 1987 to 1991. On 16.7.88 second settlement was arrived between the Federation and the Bank whereby it was agreed to substitute the period of consideration of vacancies as 1987 to 1992 in place of 1987 to 1991 as contemplated under the first settlement dated 17.11.1987. This is the second settlement. A 3rd settlement was entered into on 27.10.88 and it was agreed that the bank's service against the vacancies likely to arise from 1988 to 1992 was to be considered. Government of India vide its letter dated 16.8.90 issued guidelines to all the public sector banks with regard to recruitment and absorption of temporary employees in public sector banks. The said guidelines were issued to implement on the lines of approach paper on the issue provided by a committee constituted in this regard. Government of India guidelines made it clear that all the public sector banks may follow

the provisions laid down in the approach paper. The approach paper specified that the cases of temporary service in 12 consecutive months and who are entitled to benefit of Sec.25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 may be decided by entering into a settlement with the representative union. In respect of temporary employees who had put in less than 240 days of service in 12 consecutive months or less, a settlement could be avoided and however if the Management so desired they could enter into a conciliation settlement with the representative union. In para. 6(h) it is mentioned that only those temporary employees who had put in temporary service of 90 days or more days after 1.1.82 would be eligible for considering under the scheme. Although the Government guidelines envisaged for a settlement in respect of employees who had put in temporary service of 90 days or more days, the bank by way of a further concession entered into settlements. Even in respect of those who had put in less than 90 days and also the bank went a step further and said those persons who are working after 1975 were also considered. Hence, there was a genuine effort on the part of the Respondent bank to provide as many as possible jobs subject to the availability of the vacancies. However, para 6 (k) of the approach paper made it clear that it is a one time, exercise in full and final, settlement of all the claims and disputes for the past period, in respect of temporary workmen covered by the settlement. Another settlement was entered on 9.1.91 herein after referred as 4th settlement and the time limit was extended upto 1994 and separate panel was prepared for temporary employees, casual/daily wagers. It was agreed that while vacancies arising between 1988 to 1994 in respect of temporary employees and in respect of casual/daily wagers, they can be considered for the vacancies arising between 1995-96 only.

16. It is submitted that the administrative set up of the Hyderabad Local Head Office comprises of four Zonal Offices (Zones) at Hyderabad, Vijayawada, Visakhapatnam and Tirupathi covering all the Districts of Andhra Pradesh. In terms of the settlement the Management after following the procedure laid down therein prepared the panels of qualified candidates of temporary employees denoted as 1989 panel and also panel of casual/daily wagers denoted as 1992 panel for giving a chance for being considered for permanent absorption. These panels were prepared zone-wise separately for messengers and non-messengers in the descending order of temporary service put in by the candidates during the stipulated period i.e., 1.7.1975 to 31.7.1988. That the Federation approached the Regional Labour Commissioner(C) for implementation of bi-partite settlement in respect of absorption of temporary employees. The Regional Labour Commissioner(C) conducted conciliation proceedings and an agreement was arrived between the Federation and the bank. It was agreed that it would be kept alive upto March, 1997. A copy of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.2.1995 signed by the parties is filed as material paper. A settlement was arrived at and an agreement was signed between the Federation and the Management bank on 30.7.1996 under Sec.2 (p) read with Sec.18(1) of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957, which is hereinafter called as 5th settlement. That on 27.2.1997 a Memorandum of understanding was also signed by the federation's affiliate and the bank Management recording the fact that the exercise of identifying the messengerial vacancies as on 31.12.1994 has since been completed by Central Office and thereby 403 messengerial vacancies were sanctioned . It was agreed that these vacancies may be filled from 1989 panel of temporary employees after effecting conversion from full time non-messengerial staff in the usual manner and the agreement was reached accordingly. It was agreed between the Federation's affiliate and the Management bank that in terms of the settlement dated 30.7.1996 both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees would lapse on 31.3.1997. That as agreed upon vacancies were filled from the panels. The Workman who has put in an aggregate temporary service of less than 240 days in a continuous block of 12 months period during 1.7.1975 to 31.7.1988 has no right to seek a direction to consider his candidature for absorption in the Management bank under any rule/law except under the settlement entered into thereon.

17. Respondent contended that, in fact, the case of the Workman can be considered under all the five settlements having got his case considered under provisions of these settlements. All the other provisions and terms of the settlements are also binding on him/her. The Management bank has not violated any of the provisions of the terms of the said settlement. That the very preparation and maintenance of panel is in compliance of the terms agreed under these settlements. These settlements were time bound and they ceased to exist on 31.3.1997. That the bank has never promised that all the candidates in the panel will be absorbed. In the advertisement itself it was made clear that candidates will be considered for absorption in the vacancies that may arise upto 1992. Keeping alive the panels after 31.3.1997 is contrary to the settlements arrived between the State Bank of India Staff Federation and the Management bank. That the settlements are binding on the parties. The Workman is also bound under the terms of the said settlement. The settlement does not suffer from any ambiguity as their language is very clear. The right under the settlements is to give them a chance to be considered for future appointment in the bank's services against the vacancies likely to arise. The settlements were effected to balance the expectations of the temporary employees to be absorbed in permanent service as against the constitutional rights for all eligible persons to be considered for employment every time a vacancy arises. That the alleged dispute including the demand for reinstatement has to be decided in this context. It is submitted that the period of panel list got expired on 31.3.97 and it is an integral term of the settlement and cannot be modified in any proceedings under the law. These temporary employees who unfortunately could not be accommodated for want of vacancies have no further rights to be considered for regularization. That the Hon'ble High Court in WP No.12964/94, held as follows, "It is needless to state that the settlement arrived at between the All India State Bank of India Staff Federation which, is the majority union and the bank Management is binding on the Workmen also. It is not at all the case of the Workman that any of the terms of

the settlement has been violated by the bank's Management. If the Workman had worked in the bank on part-time basis before 31.5.94, that itself would not vest in him a right to claim that his services should be regularized on permanent basis against a full time cadre post. The claim put forth by the Workman in the present petition is therefore misconceived and not tenable. However, it is open to the Workman to claim any right which flows from the settlement between the union and the bank Management. As already pointed out that it is not the grievance of the Workman that some right which has flown from the settlement in favour of the Workman has been denied by the bank Management. Therefore, I do not find any ground, let alone substantial ground, to grant the kind of relief sought for by the Workman. Writ Petition fails and is accordingly dismissed. No costs."

18. Further, it is contended that if the panels were not lapsed at the end of designated period and allowed to be continued it would result in making the contracts of temporary employment indirectly permanent through back door entry, which would not only be contrary to the settlements but also to Articles 14 and 16 of Constitution of India and deprive the chances of original claimants who would Come through proper recruitment procedure. As their rights have been crystallized by operation of the settlements. Hence, there is no question of any Legitimate expectation being violated.

19. Similarly placed ex-employees filed WP No.9206/1995 and the batch before the Hon'ble High Court of A.P. and the learned Single Judge allowed the Writ Petitions. Aggrieved by the same WA No.86/98 and the batch was filed and the Division Bench set aside the order of the Single Judge. Thereafter the ex-temporary employees filed Special Leave Petition No.11886-11888 of 1998 before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India also dismissed the SLP. Therefore, reference to the Judgement of the Learned Single Judge in WP No.9206/97 is of no consequences as the same has already been set aside. The observations made in the Judgements cannot be relied upon for any purpose what so ever. The question of operation of Sec.25F would not come into play. Further the issue is covered by various Judgements of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India and various Hon'ble High Courts. Hence, the reference may be ordered that the Workman is not entitled for any relief.

20. In order to fortify his claim Workman has examined himself as WW1 and also filed documents in evidence which has been exhibited as Ex.W1 to W7. Further, the Workman has filed photocopies of documents in support of his claim which are discussed as under:-

Ex.W1 is the notification. Further Ex.W2 is the interview call letter. Ex.W3 is the panel list. Ex.W4 is the service certificate. Ex.W5 is the service certificate. Ex.W6 is the service certificate. Ex. W7 is the Service certificate.

21. On the other hand, Respondent has examined witness MW1 Sri K. Bala Kotaiah and this witness has exhibited 12 documents, marked as Ex.M1 to M12. The details of these documents are as follows:-

Ex.M.1 is the Settlement dated 17.11.1987. Ex.M2 is the Settlement dated 16.7.1988. Ex.M3 is the Settlement dated 27.10.1988. Ex.M4 is the Settlement dated 9.1.1991. Ex.M5 is the Minutes of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.1995. Ex.M6 is the Settlement dated 30.7.1996. Ex.M7 is the Memorandum of Understanding dt. 27.2.1997. Ex.M8 is the Particulars of 1989 Messengerial Panel. Ex.M9 is the Particulars of 1989 Non-Messengerial Panel. Ex.M10 is the Particulars of 1992 General Attendant Panel. Ex.M11 is the Judgment of Hon’ble High Court of A.P. in Writ Appeal No.86/98 dt.1.5.1998. Ex.M12 is the Judgment of Hon’ble Supreme Court of India in SLP No. 11886-11888 of 1998 dt.10.8.1998.

22. Apart from afore mentioned documents, Learned Counsel for Workman has also filed a long list of various judgements of Hon’ble Supreme Court as well as Hon’ble High Court, which we will discuss at appropriate place in this Award.

23. Heard the argument of Learned Counsel for Workman as well as for Respondent.

24. On the basis of rival pleadings of both the parties and submissions made by the Learned Counsel for both the parties, following points arise for determination in the industrial dispute :-

I. Whether the 1st settlement dated 17.11.1987, 2nd settlement dated 16.7.1988, 3rd settlement dated 27.10.1988, 4th settlement dated 9.1.1991 and 5th settlement dated 30.7.1996 entered into between State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and also Memorandum of Understanding are binding upon both the parties?

II. Whether the action of State Bank of India, Bukkarayasamudram branch in terminating the services of Workman Sri A. Ramasekhar, a Messenger with effect from 31.3.1997 is justified?

III. Whether the Workman is entitled for absorption on permanent post in the Branch of Respondent management as per averments made by him in the claim statement?

IV. To what relief if any the Workman is entitled for?

Findings:-

25. **Point No.I**:- Undisputedly settlements dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988, 9.1.1991 and 30.7.1996, minutes of conciliation proceedings and memorandum of understanding dated 27.2.1997 were executed between the State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation under section 2(p) and 18 (1) of I.D. Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Disputes (Central Rules), 1957.

Section 2(p) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 as follows:-

(p) "settlement" means a settlement arrived at in the course of conciliation proceeding and includes a written agreement between the employer and workmen arrived at otherwise than in the course of conciliation proceeding where such agreement has been signed by the parties thereto in such manner as may be prescribed and a copy thereof has been sent to an officer authorised in this behalf by the appropriate Government and the conciliation officer;

Section 18(1) provides as follows:-

18. Persons on whom settlements and awards are binding.

- [(1) A settlement arrived at by agreement between the employer and Workman otherwise than in the course of conciliation proceeding shall be binding on the parties to the agreement.

Therefore, in view of the provision contained u/s.18 (1) I.D. Act, 1947, terms and conditions enumerated in the aforesaid settlements are binding on the parties to the agreement. The Learned Counsel for Workman has argued that the Workman after going through the selection procedure has successfully been listed in the panel for appointment on the permanent basis in the Respondent management and the empanelled list has to be valid till last person in the empanelled list is appointed on permanent basis. But the impugned order dated 25.3.97, 27.3.97 and 31.3.97, has been issued by Respondent management thereby the services of the Workman has been terminated and the said order is not in consonance of the terms of the agreement entered into between the parties. Further, Workman submits that the Respondent in the 5th settlement has mentioned the date i.e., 31.3.1997 for lapse of empanel list which is illegal and that is not binding upon the Workman. The condition of lapse of empanelment list on 31.3.97 incorporated in the aforesaid 5th settlement, is arbitrary and illegal.

26. The perusal of the impugned order dated 25.3.1997 goes to reveal that the Chief/Branch Manager, SBI Zonal Office has issued the letter to all the branches with regard to the subject not to make any temporary appointments in the Branch in messengerial category from 1.4.1997. The extract of the said letter is given below:-

"We have been advised by the Deputy General Manager, Zonal Office, Hyderabad that as both the panels of temporary employees of 1989 and daily wagers/casual labours of 1992 will lapse by 31.3.1997, it has been decided by Central Office not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial category from 1.4.1997."

Thus, from the contents of the aforesaid letter, it manifest that Head Office of State Bank of India vide letter dated 25.3.1997 has issued direction to all its branches not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial category from 1.4.1997 due to reason of lapse of both panels i.e., 1989 & 1992 on 31.3.1997 as per terms of settlements entered into by both parties. Further, the contents of the subsequent letter dated 27.3.1997 issued by Respondent Management is also direction to Branch Manager, State Bank of India not to make any temporary messengerial category appointment with effect from 1.4.1997 and it has also been communicated to all concerned that the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers maintained by Zonal offices stand lapsed from 31.1.1997. Further, office order dated 31.3.1997 has been issued by Respondent management that goes to reveal that the said office order has been issued to this effect that, "Consequent on absorption of temporary employees in permanent cadre, it has been decided by the competent authority that no one onwards, no further daily labour or temporary employees/appointments should be resorted to/engaged/employed." Therefore, it reflects from the contents of the aforesaid orders that the temporary appointment in messengerial category and daily labour has been stopped by the Respondent management with effect from 1.4.1997 because of the lapsed of panel of temporary workers and daily wagers by 31.3.1997. The agreement for lapse of both the panels on 31.3.1997 is contained in the 5th settlement which has been arrived at between the parties on dated 30.7.1996 with the consensus of both the parties. Therefore, Workman can not challenge the terms and conditions contained in settlement dated 30.7.1996 regarding lapse of panel on 31.3.1997 as agreed between State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation. As per provision contained u/s.18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 the said Agreement dated 30.7.1996 is binding on both the parties.

In the case of **Allied Sales Corporation Secunderabad vs.The Authority Under Andhra Pradesh..... 1990 II LLJ 510 AP para 414, Hon'ble Court have held:-**

"*4. There was a settlement between the Management and the workmen under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act on 25th April 1983 under which the age of superannuation of the workmen was fixed at 55 years. The settlement was to be in force upto 30th June 1986 and the next settlement, incorporating practically the same terms, was again entered into on 4th February 1987 under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act. There is no dispute that these settlements are under Section 18(1).*

14. Now the Authority constituted under Section 41(1) of the Act is an authority with very limited jurisdiction. It can only decide in the first appeal whether a termination by the management is valid or not and is within the parameters of Section 40 of the Act. The said Authority, in our view, has absolutely no jurisdiction to decide whether a settlement entered into under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act between the representatives of the Workmen and of the Management, is vitiated by undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion on the part of the Management. The Authority, namely, the Assistant Commissioner of Labour, was never intended by the A.P. Legislature to have jurisdiction to go into the question of the validity of a settlement arrived at under Section 18 of the Industrial Disputes Act by an Industrial Court. That Parliament has, in fact, constituted Industrial Courts under the Industrial Disputes Act, with extensive powers cannot be disputed. What we mean to say is that the Authority under Section 41(1) of the A.P. Act has no jurisdiction what-so-ever either to question or to decide about the validity of any such settlements. If parties to a settlement have a grievance about the validity of a settlement, it is for them to agitate the matter before the appropriate forum and they cannot ask an Authority constituted under Section 41(1) of the A.P. Shops and Establishments Act, 1966 with limited jurisdiction, to go into any such question and, that too, incidentally while deciding whether retirement as per the contract of employment, is legal or not."

It is not the case of Workman that aforesaid settlements are vitiated by undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion on the part of the management. If the Workman feeling aggrieved by any terms of settlement/ agreement on the aforementioned grounds then he can challenge of settlement before a competent authority under the Act, 1947. But here in the instant matter it is not a case of Workman that aforementioned settlement has been entered into between the parties on the ground of undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion. Therefore, Workman is barred to raise any objection in respect of fixing the date of lapse of both panels on 31.3.1997 as agreed between both the parties and Workman can not challenge any terms of said Agreement.

Further in the case of **Herbertsons Limited Vs. Workmen of Herbertsons Limited and Ors, 1977 AIR 322,** Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

The Tribunal thought that the question of the quantum of membership of the 2nd Respondent did not call for a finding at all in view of 1his Court's order. As observed above that was not a correct assumption. On the other hand, we feel that this view of the Tribunal has led it to approach the matter in an entirely erroneous manner. The Tribunal is, rightly enough, conscious that under section 18 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act the settlement was binding on the company and the members of the 3rd Respondent union. Even so, the Tribunal devoted nearly half of its order in scanning the evidence given by the company and Respondent No. 3 to find out whether the terms of the settlement had been explained by the President of the union to the workmen or not and whether the workers voluntarily accepted the settlement knowing all the "consequences". This to our mind is again an entirely wrong approach.

"When a recognised union negotiates with an employer the workers as individuals do not come into the picture. It is not necessary that each individual worker should know the implications of the settlement since a recognised union, which is expected to protect the legitimate interests of labour, enters into a settlement in the best interests of labour. This would be the normal rule. We cannot altogether rule out exceptional cases where there may be allegations of mala fides, fraud or even corruption or other induce- ments. Nothing of that kind has been suggested against the President of the 3rd Respondent in this case. That being the position, prima facie, this is a settlement in the course of collective bargaining and, therefore, is entitled to due weight and consideration.

It is not possible to scan the settlement in bits and pieces and hold some parts good and acceptable and others bad. Unless it can be demonstrated that the objectionable portion is such that it completely outweighs all the other advantages gained the Court will be slow to hold a settle- ment as unfair and unjust. The settlement has to be accepted or rejected as a whole and we are unable to reject it as a whole as unfair or unjust. Even before this Court the 3rd Respondent representing admittedly the large majority of the workmen has stood by this settlement and that is a strong factor which it is difficult to ignore. As stated elsewhere in the judgment, we cannot also be oblivious of the fact that all workmen of the company have accepted the settlement. Besides, the period of settlement has since expired and we are informed that the employer and the 3rd Respondent are negotiating another settlement with further improvements. These factors, apart from what has been stated above, and the need for industrial peace and harmony when a union backed by a large majority of workmen has accepted a settlement in the course of collective bargaining have impelled us not to interfere with this settlement. That being the position, we unhold the settlement as fair and just and order that the award of the Tribunal shall be substituted by the settlement dated October 18, 1973. The said settlement shall be the substituted award. The appeal is disposed of accordingly. There will be no order as to costs."

Therefore, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above, the contention of the Workman that the date fixed for lapse of empanelled list on 31.3.1997 for appointment to the permanent post vide 5th Settlement dated 30.7.1996 is arbitrary, illegal is not untenable. The recognized union of Workmen has negotiated with the Respondent Bank Management representing large number of Workmen and the Workman as individual do not come into picture. Workman in the instant case has work as temporary Workmen in the Respondent Branch and in response of Notification he had applied for inclusion of his name in the panel and he was selected for inclusion his name in the panel list to be utilized for absorption of such Workman to permanent post in order of their seniority in the list. The Settlement dated 30.7.1996 between State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff

Federation under Sec.2(p) and Sec.18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 has clearly provided as regard non-messengerial position and it is agreed that all such posts sanctioned fallen vacant upto 31.3.1997 shall be filled before empanel list is allowed to lapse. Thus, in view of law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, in the instant case, Agreement dated 30.7.1996 was entered into between both the parties in respect of lapsing of the both the panels on 31.3.1997 and absorption of the Workmen from panel list was subject to availability of vacancy of post likely to arise upto 31.3.1997, have a binding force on Workman as well as management of State Bank of India in view of provision contained under section 18 (1) of I.D. Act, 1947.

Thus, Point No.I is answered against the Workman and in favour of the Respondent.

27. **Point No.II**:- Firstly, it is submitted on behalf of the Workman that the Respondent has terminated his services by oral order on 31.3.1997 without issuing any notice or paying any salary or compensation in lieu thereof. Therefore, the termination order of the Workman from service is in violation of provision contained Under Section 25 F of I.D. Act, 1947. Therefore, the order is liable to be set aside.

28. On the other hand, Respondent counsel contended that Workman has not worked for 240 days in any preceding calendar year. Therefore, reference of the industrial dispute is not relevant. In this context, the Workman has examined himself as WW1 who has reiterated that Workman has been terminated from service by Respondent on 31.3.1997 without notice of salary or compensation in lieu thereof. Before examining the claim of the Workman on merit it would be apposite to reproduce the provision contained under section 25 F:-

Section 25F provides:-

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].

Compensation to workmen in case of transfer of undertakings.

Section 25B defines the term continuous service which provides

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 authorized 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;

In order to prove the fact of 240 days of service within 12 months of a calendar year just preceding from the date of termination, the initial burden of proof lies upon the Workman and the Workman has to prove this factum by adducing his oral as well as documentary evidence in support of his claim.

Further, how to calculate 240 days of service by the Workman in a calendar year. In this context the reference of decisions of Hon'ble Supreme Court is relevant and the same are discussed below:-

In Rajasthan State Ganganagar S. Mills Ltd. v. State of Rajasthan and Anr. (2004) Apex Court held:

"It was the case of the Workman that he had worked for more than 240 days in the year concerned. This claim was denied by the appellant. It was for the claimant to lead evidence to show that he had worked for 240 days in the year preceding the date of his termination. He has filed an affidavit. It is statement which is in his favor and that cannot be regarded as sufficient evidence for any Court or Tribunal to come to the conclusion that in fact the claimant had worked for 240 days in a year These aspects were highlighted in Range Forest Officer v. S.T. Hadimani (2002 (3) SCC 25. No proof of receipt of salary or wages for 240 days or order or record in that regard was produced. Mere non-production of the muster roll for a particular period was not sufficient for the Labour Court held that the Workman had worked for 240 days as claimed."

In Municipal Corporation, Faridabad v. Siri Niwas (2004 (8) SCC 195), held "*the burden was on the Workman to show that he was working for more than 240 days in the preceding one year prior to his alleged retrenchment." In M.P. Electricity Board v. Hariram (2004 (8) SCC 246) the position was again reiterated in paragraph 11 as follows: "The above burden having not been discharged and the Labour Court having held so, in our opinion, the Industrial Court and the High Court erred in basing an order of reinstatement solely on an adverse inference drawn erroneously ..*"

In the case of Manager, RBI, Bangalore vs. S Mani (2005) SCC Page 100, the 3 Judges Bench of the Apex Court held that "*the initial burden of proof was on the Workman to show that he had completed 240 days of service."*

Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of Mohan Lal vs Management BEL 1981 SCC page 225 has laid down the principle that how to count 240 days of service within one year it is held: *"Clause (2)(a) provides for a fiction to treat a Workman in continuous service for a period of one year despite the fact that he has not rendered uninterrupted service for a period of one year but he has rendered period of 240 days during the period of 12 calendar service for months counting backwards and just preceding the relevant date being the date of retrenchment. In other words, in order to invoke the fiction enacted in clause (2)(a) it is necessary to determine first the relevant date, ie the date of termination of service which is complained of as retrenchment. After that date is ascertained. move backward to a period of 12 months just preceding the date of retrenchment and then ascertain whether within the period of 12 months, the Workman has rendered service for a period of 240 days. If these three facts are affirmatively answered in favor of the Workman pursuant to the deeming fiction enacted in clause (2)(a) it will have to be assumed that the Workman is in continuous service for a period of one year and he will satisfy the eligibility qualification enacted in Section 25-F"*

"14. We have already extracted section 25B since its amendment and the change in language is the legislative exposition of which note must be taken. In fact, we need not further dilate upon this aspect because in Surendra Kumar Verma and Ors. v. Central Government Industrial-cum-Labour Court, New Delhi and Anr., Chinnappa Reddy. J., after noticing the amendment and referring to the decision in Sur Enamel and Stamping Works (P) Ltd case, held as under:

"These changes brought about by Act 36 of 1964 appear to be clearly designed to provide that a Workman who has actually worked under the employer for not less than 240 days during a period of twelve months shall be deemed to have been in continuous service for a period of one year whether or not he has in fact been in such continuous service for a period of one year. It is enough that he has worked for 240 days in a period of 12 months, it is not necessary that he should have been in the service of the employer for one whole year."

In a concurring judgment Pathak J. agreed with this interpretation of section 25B(2). Therefore, both on principle and on precedent it must be held that section 25B(2) comprehends a situation where a Workman is not in employment for a period of 12 calendar months, but has rendered service for a period of 240 days within the period of 12 calendar months commencing and counting backwards from the relevant date, i.e. the date of retrenchment. If he has, he would be deemed to be in continuous service for a period of one year for the purpose of section 25B and Chapter VA."

Thus, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above the initial burden of proof lies upon the Workman to show that he has completed 240 days of the service with the Respondent just preceding from the date of his termination. Further, in respect of the employment of calculating the 240 days service provision contained under Section 25-F read with Section 25-B of the I.D. Act, 1947.

29. Now, in view of the provision contained under Section 25 F and law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, we have to examine whether the Workman has discharged his initial burden of proof in respect of his claim of 240 days continuous service in a calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination i.e., 31.3.1997.

In this context, WW1 in his cross examination has stated that,

"I was not sponsored by any employment exchange. I was subjected to any regular process of selection required for appointment in the Bank."

"I did not work for 240 days in any year in my entire service."

Thus, it is clear from the testimony of WW1 that the Workman had not worked for 240 days continuously in any 12 months of a calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination in the Respondent bank. Therefore, Workman failed to establish his plea by his oral and documentary evidence that he had worked for 240 days continuously in calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination i.e., 31.3.1997. Thus, the claim of the Workman that he has been terminated by oral order without issuing notice or payment in lieu after termination, in contravention of Section 25 F of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is not tenable. However the documents filed by the Workman in support of his claim, number of days worked with the Respondent goes to reveal that the Workman had worked intermittently as daily wager depending upon availability of work in branch. Workman did not file any

document of appointment letter or salary slips in support of his claim for appointment as a non-messenger in the Respondent branch on temporary basis.

30. Per contra, the Learned Counsel for Respondent has submitted the allegation of Workman that he was terminated from services is not correct. As the vacancies were filled up on regular basis in order of their respective seniority the non-engagement of the Workman does not amount to termination. Further, Respondent contended that no law provide that even though there is no work temporary employee should be continued in the bank work as the very engagement of Workman was subject to availability of work. Therefore, the allegation that the bank has indulged in unfair labour practice is incorrect.

31. Thus, in view of the fore gone discussion and contentions made by the Respondent, I find the force in the argument advanced by the Respondent that in the instant matter, Workman was not terminated from service by order dated 31.3.1997 rather he was disengaged in view of the non-availability of the work in the branch. Further, there was direction issued by the Head Office of the Respondent authority not to engage any daily wager Workman/ temporary Worker w.e.f. 1.4.1997. Thus, such disengagement of Workman does not amount to termination. Moreover, the Workman failed to prove his claim that he was terminated in contravention of provision of Sec.25F of the I.D. Act, 1947 as he failed to establish his plea by any oral or documentary evidence that he had worked for 240 days continuously in a twelve months of calendar year just preceding from date of termination i.e., 31.3.1997.

32. Further, perusal of the order dated 25.3.1997 goes to reveal that the Chief Branch Manager, State Bank of India has issued the letter to Zonal Office with direction to all its branches to this effect that they have been advised by the DGM, Zonal Office, Hyderabad that as both the panel of temporary employees of 1989 and daily wagers/casual labour of 1992 will lapse on 31.3.1997 it has been decided by central office not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial cadre from 1.4.1997, therefore it was directed to issue suitable instructions not to make temporary appointments from 1.4.1997. There is no mention in this order that the Workman herein has been terminated from service by this order.

33. Further, the circular dated 27.3.1997 was issued by DGM, SBI to all branches in commercial network in respect of the non-appointment of temporary employees in subordinate cadre and it has directed not to make any temporary employment in the subordinate cadre with effect from 1.4.97 and further, it has directed to ensure that no temporary/casual/daily basis appointment of the petty cash. Further, it is directed to all Branch Managers that any deviation in this regard will be viewed seriously. Thus, these circulars do not reflect that the Workman has been terminated from service by this order.

34. Similarly, office order dated 31.3.1997 is simply a direction to all branches of the Respondent bank by DGM that no further daily labour should be engaged or employed. Therefore, the plea of the Workman that he has been terminated by the aforesaid order dated 25.3.1997, 27.3.1997 and 31.3.1997 from the service by the Respondent is not acceptable. The evidence adduced by the Workman clearly goes to reveal that he had worked as a daily wager for which he has been paid wages according to number of working days. As there was an order for prohibition for engaging temporary workmen, in the bank, therefore, Workman could not be engaged by the Respondent for work from 1.4.1997 and there after. It is settled law that the daily wagers are engaged by the employer depending upon the availability of work and as the work was not available the Workman was not engaged further by the Respondent management. Therefore, the Workman on the ground of number of days he had worked in the Respondent bank cannot claim any right to reinstate him into the employment. As the Workman failed to prove the mandatory condition of 240 days of continuous service as required under Sec.25F of I.D. Act, 1947. Therefore, the disengagement of Workman from work can not be termed in contravention of provision contained under Sec.25F and 25 B of the I.D. Act, 1947.

Thus, this point is answered against the Workman and in favour of Respondent.

35. **Point No.III**:- In this context, the Workman has contended that the management failed to implement the selected panels during its valid tenure. The management adopted the back door methods contrary to the settlements and filled up the vacancies. The same is evident from the proceedings dated 18.11.1993 a copy of the same is filed in the material papers and the same may be read as part of the claim statement. Further, it is submitted that management has to adhere the procedure issued by the Central Government, the instructions dated 16.8.1990 in the year 1995, but same was not followed in the year 1997 despite there being vacancies. The management has followed the procedure of calling candidates through employment exchange instead of giving chance to the empanelled candidates like the Workman herein. The management sent call letters to the similarly situated candidates like the Workman in the month of June 1997 subsequent to issuance of impugned termination orders. After knowing the fact that they are litigating the issue by way of dispute, the management has refused to engage those candidates, the copies of call letters issued are filed herein along with claim petition. The Workman herein reiterates that the panels are meant for absorption but not for termination. In view of the same a duty is cast upon the Respondent management to engage the empanelled candidates like the Workman herein even in temporary vacancies till they are absorbed permanently in regular vacancies.

36. On the other hand, Respondent has contended that the Federation approached Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) for implementation of bipartite settlement in respect of the absorption of temporary employees. The Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) conducted conciliation proceedings and agreement was arrived at between the Federation and the Management bank. It is submitted that it was agreed between the Federation and the Management that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers /casual labour would be kept alive upto March, 1997 and the vacancies as agreed to under the afore set out settlements will be filled from both the lists concurrently. A copy of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.1995 signed by the parties to the dispute is filed as a material paper. Further, it is submitted that the settlement was arrived at and an agreement was signed between the Federation and the Management bank on 30.7.1996 under Section 2(p) read with Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules 1957 which is binding on the parties. A copy of this agreement which hereinafter may be referred to as 5th settlement for brevity, is also filed as a material paper. The 5th settlement dated 30.7.1996 whereunder the earlier four settlements dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988 and 9.1.1991 were also referred, it was agreed to, by the Federation and the Management bank that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees will be kept alive upto March, 1997 for filling the vacancies existing/arrived at as on 31.12.1994 as per the norms agreed to between the bank and Federation and that thereafter the said panels would lapse. It was also agreed that within the framework of the above settlements the modalities about drawing names from either the panel of temporary employees or the panel of daily wagers and casual labour would be decided administratively on circle to circle basis depending upon the local requirements in consultation with the Federation's affiliate by the Circle management. It was further agreed that all messenger real vacancies/positions in the subordinate cadre including part-time attendants specifically provided as leave reserve will be filled by the end of 31.3.1997. Further, Respondent contended that on 27.2.1997 a memorandum of understanding was also signed between the Federation's affiliate and the bank management regarding the fact that the exercise of identifying the messengerial vacancies as on 31.12.1994 has since been completed by central office and thereby 403 messengerial vacancies were sanctioned to the circle of the Management bank and it was agreed that these vacancies may be filled from 1989 panel of temporary employees after effecting conversion from full time non-messengerial staff in the usual manner and the agreement was reached upon. Further, it was agreed between the Federations affiliate and the management bank that in terms of the settlement dated 30.7.1996 both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers /casual employees would lapse on 31.3.1997.

37. The Workman has contended that the empanelled list prepared by the Respondent management for appointment of temporary and daily wage Workers to the permanent post cannot lapse unless until it is exhausted by appointing all the empanelled persons and it should continue even after 31.3.1997, i.e., the date fixed for the lapse of panel. It is undisputed that the date of lapse of empanelled list of Workmen has been fixed to 31.3.1997 as mentioned in the settlement dated 30.7.1996, and agreed between the parties. It is settled law that and once the life of panel list lapses on the date as agreed between the parties it cannot be extended beyond that date. In the instant case the panel list of the workmen was valid upto 31.3.1997 in view of the terms and conditions enumerated in the 5th Settlement entered into between the parties. As the lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997 has been agreed by State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation through 5th Settlement, the Workman is not competent to challenge the same.

In this context I would like to take reference of the decision of the apex court in the case of **Syndicate Bank and Ors vs. Shankar Paul and Ors , AIR 1997 SC 3091, therein the Hon'ble Apex Court** have held:-

"Till 1982, the branches of the appellant Bank in Calcutta region were recruiting persons locally to work as temporary attenders in leave vacancies. In view of the revised procedure prescribed by the Government of India in respect of such temporary appointments, the Calcutta regional office of the appellant Bank issued a circular to all of its branches on 14.8.1982, instructing all the branches under it to discontinue the old practice from 1.6.1982 and appoint only empanelled candidates. The regional office was to prepare a panel of eligible candidates, after calling names from the local/district employment exchange, and split it up branch-wise. Following that new procedure yearly panels were prepared thereafter. Names of the Respondents were for the first time included in the panel prepared for the period 7.2.1987 to 6.2.1988. By its letter dated 7.2.1987 the Bank had informed the Respondents that the panel was valid for one year only and that inclusion of their names in the panel was not to confer on them any right to seek permanent appointment in the service of the bank. Considering the object with which the panel was prepared and the fact that it was an yearly panel expiring on 6.2.1988, we are of the opinion that the Respondents did not get any right, because of inclusion of their names in the said panel, for permanent absorption in the service of the Bank. Whatever conditional right they had came to an end with the expiry of the panel. The claim of the Respondents, as contained in the writ petition was thus misconceived and therefore the learned single Judge and the Division Bench, when it first decided the appeal, were right in dismissing the writ petition and the appeal respectively."

Thus, in view of the above law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court and in view of the terms and conditions of the 5th Settlement the contention of the Workman that empanelled list should continue even after 31.3.1997 till the last Workman in the panel is absorbed is not tenable. The contention of the Workman is baseless in view of recital in the settlement. Therefore, in view of the fore gone discussion and finding given at Point No. I regarding binding nature of Settlements and terms and conditions enumerated therein, in view of the provision contained u/s.18(1) of the I.D.

Act, 1947, I am of the considered view that life of panels lapsed on 31.3.1997 in view of terms of settlement dated 30.7.1996 and plea of Workman that the panel shall continue even after 31.3.1997 till last man absorbed has no legal force and same is untenable.

38. Undisputedly, settlement agreement dated 30.7.1996 was executed between the State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation and in that settlement it was agreed that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/ casual employees will be used for filling vacancies existing as on 31.12.1994 as per the norms agreed between the bank and the Federation. These empanelled workmen were to be given a chance for permanent appointment in the bank against vacancies arising up to December 1994 whereas the daily wagers/ casual employees were to be considered against the vacancies arise from January 1995 to December 1996, whereby the said panel would lapse. It was agreed that the vacancies falls upto 31.3.1997 shall be filled before the empanelled list is allowed to lapse. Thus, the claim of the Workman to the post of permanent non-messenger in the Respondent management was subject to the availability of the sanctioned post and vacancies arising upto 31.3.1997. The workmen given chance to the permanent post were seniors in number of working days in panel list and Workman herein was junior to those workmen. Therefore, Workman could not be given absorption to permanent post being junior to other workmen in the panel list.

39. In this context the Workman witness WW1 was cross examined by the Respondent counsel and in the cross examination the witness WW1 states:-

"I applied in response to an advertisement issued by the bank .... Further, witness states*, "The panel was prepared on the basis of number of days of service of the temporary employees. Some of the employees whose names were included in the panel were given appointment on regular basis as per the settlements in order of seniority....* Further witness states*, " I am not having any proof to show that any of my juniors are continuing in service."*

Thus, from the above statement of the Workman witness WW1 it is clear that the panel was prepared in terms of various settlements entered into between Staff Federation of State Bank of India and State Bank of India and it was prepared on the basis of number of days of work put in by the temporary employees. Further, the Workman himself admitted that some of the temporary employees whose names were included in the panel were given regular appointment in the bank in order of their seniority in the panel and he is not having any document to show that any person who worked for less number of days than the Workman was given appointment in the bank. Therefore, the allegation of the Workman that the regular appointment has been made by the bank from the panel list in breach of the terms of the settlement and violation of seniority of panel list is not proved by this evidence of WW1. Thus, there is no evidence on record that bank has given the appointment to the temporary employees as well as daily wagers from the panel list 1989 and 1992 in breach of seniority of the temporary employees in the list. There is no evidence of jumbling in the panel list to make appointment of any permanent Workman in breach of the seniority. Therefore, I am constrained to hold that the Respondent Management has appointed the workmen from panel list in order of seniority and there is no jumbling of workmen in the panel list before it got lapsed on 31.3.1997.

40. However, Workman has taken the plea that the panels of Workmen for absorption in the employment of the Respondent banks (panels of temporary employees and daily wagers) has been lapsed on 31.3.1997 in contravention of terms of settlement as the object of preparing the entire empanelment of temporary and daily wagers was to provide them permanent employment and till the both the panel lists exhausted the panel list cannot be lapsed on 31.3.1997 and the date of lapsing of the panel on 31.3.1997 has been fixed by the Respondent arbitrarily without any authority.

41. In this context, the perusal of Settlement dated 30.7.1996 reveals that the 5th Settlement dated 30.7.1996 was entered under Section 2(p) and 18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Dispute (Central) Rules 1957. This settlement has been entered into by the competent parties and in this settlement parties thereto agreed that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees will lapse on 31.3.1997. Thus the date of lapse of panel was fixed by both the parties with consensus under the settlement dated 30.7.1996 and same is binding upon the Workman under the provision of Section 18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947. Moreover, this issue of binding force of the settlement dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988 and 9.1.1991 has already been discussed, decided at finding in Point No.I of this award. However, the legality and validity of the aforementioned settlement has not been challenged by the Workman before any competent forum. Thus, claim of Workman that the date of lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997 has been fixed arbitrarily by the Respondent bank is untenable. As regard the claim of Workman for his absorption to the permanent post it is settled law that the Workman can not claim his regularization to permanent post merely on the basis of number of working days.

42. In this context the reference of the decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Oil and Natural Gas Corporation vs Krishan Gopal 2020(3) SCALE 272, date of decision 7.2.2020** is relevant therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have has laid down principle regarding regularization of the Workman on permanent posts. Hon'ble Supreme Court have laid down the prepositions of regularization of the workmen to permanent post is as under:-

"*(i) Wide as they are, the powers of the Labour Court and the Industrial Court cannot extend to a direction to order regularisation, where such a direction would in the context of public employment offend the provisions contained in Article 14 of the Constitution;*

(ii) The statutory power of the Labour Court or Industrial Court to grant relief to workmen including the status of permanency continues to exist in circumstances where the employer has indulged in an unfair labour practice by not filling up permanent posts even though such posts are available and by continuing to employ workmen as temporary or daily wage employees despite their performing the same work as regular workmen on lower wages;

(iii) The power to create permanent or sanctioned posts lies outside the judicial domain and where no posts are available, a direction to grant regularisation would be impermissible merely on the basis of the number of years of service;

(iv) Where an employer has regularised similarly situated workmen either in a scheme or otherwise, it would be open to workmen who have been deprived of the same benefit at par with the workmen who have been regularised to make a complaint before the Labour or Industrial Court, since the deprivation of the benefit would amount to a violation of Article 14; and

(v) In order to constitute an unfair labour practice under Section 2(ra) read with Item 10 of the Vth Schedule of the ID Act, the employer should be engaging workmen as badlis, temporaries or casuals, and continuing them for years, with the object of depriving them of the benefits payable to permanent workmen.

Thus, in view of the principles laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court as discussed above, in the instant matter the Workman utterly failed to prove his claim by adducing any documentary or oral evidence that the employer has indulged in unfair labour practice by not filling the permanent posts even though such posts are available and by continuing to employ workmen as temporary or daily wage employees despite their performance was the same work, as regular workmen on lower wages.

43. Respondent has contended that all the vacancies exist and arise upto 31.3.1997 has been filled up from the panel list in order of seniority and no vacancy exists or arises as on 31.3.1997 remained unfilled. Further, it is contended that as per terms of settlement the life of panel lists has been lapsed on 31.3.1997, hence, there is no occasion to extend the life of panel lists beyond 31.3.1997. However, the workman failed to prove contrary by any evidence to the aforesaid contention of the Respondent that the vacancies were existing as on 31.3.1997 and the workman was not given absorption to the permanent post in order of his seniority. It is settled law that the power to create permanent or sanctioned post lies outside the judicial domain and where no posts are available, a direction to grant regularization would be impermissible merely on the basis of the number of years of service. Therefore, the claim of the workman on this ground also not acceptable.

44. Further, as per the of settlement, panel was prepared for absorption of the workmen on the permanent posts has already been lapsed on 31.3.1997 and the vacancies existing and arising upto 31.12.1994 and upto 31.3.1997 as settlement dated 30.7.1996 has been filled up from the panel by appointing the workmen as per seniority in the panel list. Workman witness WW1 in his cross examination has himself admitted this fact that, some of the temporary employees whose names were included in the panel were given regular appointment in the bank in order of their seniority in the panel. The Workman failed to show that there was any breach of terms of settlement has been committed by the Respondent in appointment to permanent post from aforesaid panel list.

45. As discussed in preceding paragraph of this Award, the life of the panel has not been extended beyond 31.3.1997, by any further settlement hence, the panel list in which name of the Workman was included got expired on 31.3.1997. It is not the case of the Workman that Respondent has regularized similarly situated workmen either in the scheme or otherwise and the Workman has been deprived of same benefit on par with those workmen or the vacancies remained unfilled on the date of lapse of panels i.e., 31.3.1997, Industrial Tribunal has no jurisdiction to extend the date of lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997. This Tribunal can not order for regularization of workmen to the permanent post in contravention of the provision of Article 14 of the Constitution of India.

In the case of **Mahboob Deepak vs. Nagar Panchayat Gajraula & Anr, Civil Appeal No.5875/2007 date of judgement 13.12.2007,** Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

"8. Respondent is a Local Authority. The terms and conditions of employment of the employees are governed by a statute and statutory rules. No appointment can be made by a Local Authority without following the provisions of the recruitment rules. Any appointment made in violation of the said rules as also the constitutional scheme of equality as contained in Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India would be a nullity.

9. Due to some exigency of work, although recruitment on daily wages or on an ad hoc basis was permissible, but by reason thereof an employee cannot claim any right to be permanently absorbed in service or made permanent in absence of any statute or statutory rules. Merely because an employee has completed 240 days of work in a year preceding the date of retrenchment, the same would not mean that his services were liable to be regularized."

Therefore, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, the claim of the Workman for absorption merely on the basis of number of day of work in the Respondent bank Branch is not acceptable. As regard plea of the Workman that the Workman should have been given employment even after 31.3.1997 as temporary Workman, it is the discretion of Respondent to engage the Workman depending upon availability of work and this Tribunal can not direct the Respondent to engage the Workman in the absent of such rule/scheme.

46. In view of principle laid down by Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above, in the instant matter Workman utterly failed to establish the fact of rendering continuous service for a period of 240 days of service within a period of 12 calendar months commencing and coming backward from relevant date i.e., the date of retrenchment, if has he would be denied to be in continuous service for a period of one year. Therefore, the provision contained under Sec.25F of retrenchment is not applicable to Workman.

Counsel for Workman has relied upon number of decisions of Hon'ble High Court and Hon'ble Supreme Court and few of them are discussed herein:-

In the case of **F.C.I., vs. Kamdhenu Cattle Feed Industries 1993 (1) SCC 71,** therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

"7. In contractual sphere as in all other State actions, the State and all its instrumentalities have to conform to Article 14 of the Constitution of which non-arbitrariness is a significant facet. There is no unfettered discretion in public law: A public authority possesses powers only to use them for public good. This impose the duty to act fairly and to adopt a procedure which is `fairplay in action'. Due observance of this obligation as a part of good administration raises a reasonable or legitimate expectation in every citizen to be treated fairly in his interaction with the State and its instrumentalities, with this element forming a necessary component of the decision making process in all State actions. To satisfy this requirement of non- arbitrariness in a State action, it is, therefore, necessary to consider and give due weight to the reasonable or legitimate expectations of the persons likely lo be affected by the decision or else that unfairness in the exercise of the power may amount to an abuse or excess of power apart from affecting the bona fides of the decision in a given case. The decision so made would be exposed to challenge on the ground of arbitrariness. Rule of law does not completely eliminate discretion in the exercise of power, as it is unrealistic, but providers for control of its exercise by judicial review."

In the case of **State Bank of India, R.O., Vijayawada vs. Industrial Tribunal, Hyderabad WP No.193/1997,** therein Hon'ble High Court have held,

"*Sri Krovvidi Narasimham, the learned counsel for the 2nd respondent contends, supporting the award that it was a permanent vacancy and even though the 2nd respondent was appointed on temporary basis, his services were not liable to be terminated and he was to be regularised into service on permanent basis. Shastry award warrants that no temporary appointment can be made to a permanent post. But the matter is now covered by two division bench judgements dated 28.11.1986 in W.A. No.791 of 1986 and 25.8.1987 in W.A. No.270 of 1982. The ratio decided in the two judgements is to the effect that there cannot be any mandate to appoint employees on permanent basis when the requirement was for appointment on temporary basis. But it is held in the said judgements that when a temporary appointee is ousted from service and not for misconduct and, if again temporary appointment is to be made, then, the case of such temporary appointee who was ousted, has got to be considered in accordance with Sec. 25-H of the Act."*

In the case of **State of Haryana and others vs. Piara Singh and others. 1992 (4) SCC 118,** therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

" 49. If for any reason an adhoc or temporary employee is continued for a fairly long spell, the authorities must consider his case for regularization provided he is eligible and qualified according to the rules and his service record is satisfactory and his appointment does not run counter to the reservation policy of the state."

In the above cited judgements by the Workman the facts of the case are different hence do not apply to instant case of Workman.

47. On the other hand, in support of his contention Respondent has examined witness MW1 and MW1 in chief examination states that, Settlements i.e., on 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988, 9.1.1991 were entered into between the SBI and SBI Staff Federation for filling up of the vacancies that arise up to 1994 for those temporary employees who has worked on scale wages. Further, MW1 states that two different panels for messengers and non-messengers as per the eligibility criteria prescribed by the bank. There are four modules in Andhra Pradesh and they are Hyderabad, Tirupathi, Vijayawada and Visakhapatnam. MW1 states that the temporary employees so empanelled were given permanent absorption depending upon the vacancies so arise strictly in terms of the settlement. MW1 states that on 9.6.1995 conciliation proceeding was held before the RLC(C), Hyderabad and in said proceedings it was decided that the panels will be kept live up to 31.3.1997 and vacancies will be filled from both the lists concurrently. A copy of the said minutes of proceedings is Ex.M5. Further, MW1 states that on 30.7.1996 another settlement was entered between the SBI and All India SBI Staff Federation providing for filling up of the vacancies arising up to December 1994 in respect of subordinate cadre and daily wage /casual wage employees out of panel so

prepared were to be considered against vacancies arising from January 1995 to December 1996, thereafter the said panels lapse. MW1 states that it was also agreed that all the non- messenger positions in subordinate cadre including part time attendants specially provided as leave reserve will be filled before 31.3.1997 and as regards to non-messengerial positions it is agreed that all such posts sanctioned and fallen vacant up to 31.3.1997 shall be filled before the empanelled list is allowed to lapse. Thus in both the cases empanelled list were lapsed on 1.4.1997. Ex.M6 is the copy of the settlement dated 30.7.1996. Further, witness states that on 27.2.1997 a memorandum of understanding was reached between the SBI and SBI Staff Federation providing that both the panels above mentioned will lapse on 31.3.1997. Ex.M7 is the copy of the memorandum of understanding and Ex.M8 is the copy of the statements giving the particulars of 1989 non-messenger panel, Ex.M9 is the copy of the statement of 1989 non-messenger panel, Ex.M10 is the copy of statement of 1992 panel. Further, witness states that petitioner was included in the 1989 panel. As the existing vacancies at that time were exhausted and his turn did not come he could not be given permanent employment in the bank as per the agreements. All the appointments were made strictly in accordance with the settlements reached from time to time between SBI and SBI staff federation and as per seniority, number of days of temporary service put in by them in the bank in the given period. Further, MW1 states petitioner was not sponsored by any employment exchange he did not undergo the regular process of selection required for appointment as a regular non-messenger the petitioner has not worked for 240 days in any year in his entire temporary service in the bank. The petitioner and other temporary employees were terminated from service by the bank. Further, MW1 states that the vacancies were filled up on regular basis with the temporary employees from the panels and these panels were expired in terms of the settlements so reached and there were no vacancies to absorb such employees. Thus, witness MW1 has proved the documents Ex.M1 to Ex.M12 and also contentions made in the counter. However, MW1 was cross examined by the Petitioner Counsel. But nothing has been elicited in his cross examination so as to discredit the testimony of the witness MW1 as regards the date of lapse of both the panels on 31.3.1997 and reasons assigned for non-absorption of the Petitioner from the panel list to the permanent post. Moreover the witness MW1 was re-examined by the Respondent and the witness MW1 states that panels were expired in terms of the settlement send absorptions to the extent of the available vacancies were made. There was no termination of any temporary messenger as such but their services were not utilized after the cut off date as the available vacancies were already filled up and most of these Petitioners were not in the service of the bank as on the date of the expiry date of the panels. Therefore, in view of the aforesaid testimony of the MW1 in re-examination in the absence of cross examination remained uncontraverted, the claim of the Workman that he was entitled for absorption in permanent post in the branch of Respondent Management on the basis of panel list is found not established.

This point is answered against the Workman.

48. **Point No.IV**:- In view of the discussion and finding given at Point Nos. I, II and III, the Workman is not entitled for any relief and claim statement of Workman sans merit and liable to be dismissed.

This Point is answered accordingly.

AWARD

In view of the fore gone discussion, it is held that the action of the Respondent bank in terminating the services of Sri A. Ramasekhar, Ex. Messenger by way of oral orders w.e.f. 31.3.1997 is justified. Hence, the Petitioner is not entitled for any relief as prayed for. The claim statement filed by Workman sans merit, hence, dismissed. Reference is answered accordingly.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, Personal Assistant, transcribed by her, corrected and signed by me on this the 7th day of May, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner	Witnesses examined for the Respondent
WW1: Sri A. Ramasekhar	MW1: Sri K. Bala Kotaiah

Documents marked for the Petitioner

Ex.W1:	Photocopy of notification
Ex.W2:	Photocopy of interview call letter
Ex.W3:	Photocopy of Panel list
Ex.W4:	Photocopy of Service certificate

Ex.W5: Photocopy of Service certificate

Ex.W6: Photocopy of service certificate

Ex.W7: Photocopy of Service certificate

Documents marked for the Respondent

Ex.M1: Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.17.11.87

Ex.M2: Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.16.7.88

Ex.M3: Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.27.10.1988

Ex.M4: Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.9.1.1991

Ex.M5: Photocopy of conciliation proceedings before the Regional Labour Commissioner(C) dt.9.6.1995

Ex.M6: Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.30.7.1996

Ex.M7: Photocopy of Memorandum of understanding dt. 27.1.1997

Ex.M8: Photocopy of statements giving the particulars of 1989 messenger panel.

Ex.M9: Photocopy of statement of 1989 Non-messenger panel

Ex.M10: Photocopy of statement of 1992 panel

Ex.M11: Photocopy of order of Hon'ble High Court in WA No.86/98 dt. 1.5.98

Ex.M12: Photocopy of order in SLP No.11886-11888 of 1998 dated 10.8.98

नई दिल्ली, 27 जुलाई, 2026

का.आ. 1683.— औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार भारतीय स्टेट बैंक के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजको और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण – सह – श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद के पंचाट (सन्दर्भ संख्या 45/2002) को प्रकाशित करती है,

[सं. एल. 39025/01/2026–आई.आर.(बी–II)-73]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 27th July, 2026

S.O. 1683.— In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (.No.LC.45/2002) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Hyderabad as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the Management of State Bank of India and their workmen,

[No. L-39025/01/2026- IR (B-II)-73]

SALONI, Dy. Director

In The Central Government Industrial Tribunal Cum Labour Court At Hyderabad

Present: **Sri IRFAN QAMAR**

Presiding Officer

Dated the 19th day of May, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. 45/2002

[Old ID No. 26/2001 of Labour court cum Industrial Tribunal, Visakhapatnam]

Between:

Sri Routhu Vasudeva Rao,

S/o Narayana Das,

R/o Bhogapuram,

Vizianagaram District. … Petitioner

And

The Dy. General Manager,

State Bank of India,

Personnel section

Zonal Office Region-II,

Visakhapatnam. …..Respondent

Appearances:

For the Petitioner : Sri Macherla Rangaiah, Advocate

For the Respondent: Sri Y. Ranjeeth Reddy, Advocate

AWARD

Sri Routhu Vasudeva Rao who worked as Messenger (who will be reffered to as the workman) has filed this petition under Sec. 2A(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 against the Respondents State Bank of India seeking for reinstatement into service as Messenger/Sweeper duly granting all the consequential benefits such as continuity of service, back wages and all other attendant benefits etc., and such other reliefs as this court may deem fit. Earlier Petitioner has filed this dispute before the Labour Court cum Industrial Tribunal, Visakhapatnam for adjudication and later the same has been transferred to this Tribunal bearing ITID(C) No. 26/2001, as per orders of Central Government vide lr. No. H-11026/1/2001-IR(C.II) dated 18.10.2001 and registered, numbered in this Tribunal as LC No. 45/2002.

2. Before unfolding the factual matrix of the instant industrial dispute it would be apposite to have a bird eye view of a chequered history of the instant industrial dispute. Earlier instant industrial dispute along with the batch cases was decided by this Tribunal vide common award dated 17.5.2005 and the reference was answered in favour of the Respondent and against the Workman. That said common award dated 17.5.2005 was challenged by the aggrieved Workmen in various Writ petition No.6470/2014 along with batch of writ petitions before the Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh and Hon'ble High Court vide its' judgement dated 23.6.2014 allowed all batch of writ petitions and set aside the common award dated 17.5.2005 passed in ID No.222 of 2001 and other batch of ID cases by Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad and the Respondent management of State Bank of India was directed to reengage the Writ Petitioners in position, which they have been occupying prior to their termination and further directed to consider their cases for regularization as and when the substantive vacancy arises. This judgement dated 23.6.2014 of Hon'ble High Court of AP, passed in WP No.6470/2014 and batch petitions was challenged by Respondent management before the Hon'ble High Court in Writ Appeal No. 1268 of 2014. The aforesaid Writ Appeals No.1268/2014 and other Writ Appeals were decided by Division Bench of High Court of Andhra Pradesh by a common judgement dated 20.3.2019. Hon'ble High Court in aforesaid Writ Appeal was pleased to pass the order which is extracted as below:-

" 7. Hearing the learned senior counsel for the SBI and the learned senior counsel for the contesting unofficial Respondents, we see that while the learned single Judge was justified in setting aside the award af the Tribunal, the proper course to be adopted was to remit all the cases to the Tribunal. This we say for reasons more than one. Firstly, in such matters, claims have to be decided on individual basis, as different persons have different claims as to the length of officiation or discharge of duties and functions; quality of engagement, drawings, accounting of the post for each one of them, who have worked etc. All these issues will not be the same in all the cases. Therefore, each case ought to have been directed to be decided by the Tribunal afresh on individual basis. The second and most important aspect is the learned single Judge has in one go ordered re-employment of all the workmen. This is not a relief that could have been granted without answering the individual issues; each issue relating to each case could not have been decided by the writ Court within the format of its adjudication procedures and scope. The adjudicating body, which has to do that activity, is the Industrial Tribunal. Therefore, we are of the view that while we would sustain the order of the learned singe Judge insofar as it interfered and sets aside the award of the Tribunal, the further findings and directions, issued through the impugned order have to go and the individual cases have to be sent back for consideration of the Tribunal. Such further procedure before the Tribunal will have to be carried forward with the materials already on record and also by affording an opportunity to the persons, who have claims as well as the management to place their rival contentions and further material before the Tribunal. The learned counsel appearing for the workmen are justified in pointing out that enormous delay has already happened and further action by the Tribunal in this line may be expedited.

9. In the result, these writ appeals are ordered;

(1) affirming the impugned common order of the learned single Judge to the extent it sets aside the common award dated 17.05.2005 of the Industrial Tribunal;

(2) the further findings and directions issued through the impugned common order are vacated:

(3) all the matters shall be remitted to the Industrial Tribunal with a direction to dispose of them within an outer limit of five (5) months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order; and,

(4) the parties to make appearance before the Tribunal on the given date."

Thus, in view of the above direction of Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh in W.A.No.1268 of 2014 and batch cases. This Tribunal has taken up the matter of industrial dispute for hearing and deciding it afresh in view of the aforesaid guidelines laid down by the Hon'ble High Court in Writ Appeal No.1268/2014 vide judgement dated 20.3.019.

3. The factual matrix of instant industrial dispute as narrated by the Workman in his claim statement are that, the Workman joined in the service of the management institution as Messenger from 1.1.86 to 31.12.86 and has rendered unblemished service spreading over a period of about one year. The Respondent has terminated services of Workman by oral orders with effect from 1.4.1997. Further, it is submitted that the management of Respondent bank decided to give a chance to temporarily employed personnel "found suitable for permanent appointment" by wait- listing them by offering permanent appointment or waitlisting till such opportunity arises.

4. That on 17.11.1987 a settlement was reached between All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and the Management of State Bank of India - settlement one, under this settlement three categories of employees were listed. That is, A) those who have completed 240 days in 12 months or less after 1.7.1975. B) those who have completed 270 days in any continuous block of 36 calendar months after 1.7.1975. C) (i) those who have completed minimum of 30 days aggregate temporary service in any calendar year after 1.7.1975 or (ii) 70 days aggregate temporary service in continuous block of 36 months after 1.7.1975.

5. The persons who satisfied in all the above 4 categories were to be interviewed by a selection committee and the said selection committee would determine the suitability of the said candidate for permanent appointment. Therefore, the bank prescribed certain qualifications and from among the candidates satisfying the qualifications the suitable candidates were enlisted by a selection committee. The Clause 7 of the said agreement provided with the selected candidate would be wait listed in order of their respective categorization and the selected panel would be valid upto December, 1991. Clause 10 of the settlement specifically provided that henceforth. "there will be no temporary appointments in the subordinate cadre", except on a restrictive basis in the specified category, "from amongst empanelled candidates as per existing guidelines of the bank". The Workman further submits that consequent upon the said agreement and the draft, a notification was issued in the newspapers. The last date for responding to the advertisement was 30.8.1988. A written examination followed by viva-voce in May, 1989 was held. A selected panel was prepared, as per Clause 7 of the agreement, ie. Settlement No.1, the selected panel was to be valid upto December, 1991, the Workman submits that circular was issued on 26.4.91 by the said letter it is mentioned that the terms of the agreement dated 17.11.87 was modified vide second agreement dated 16.7.88 was entered into between the parties. In terms of the said agreement a chance was to be given, "to all eligible temporary employees for permanent appointments. The appointments were against the vacancies likely to arise during the years 1995-96, circular made it clear that in view of the enormity of the problem an extension of the currency of the panel, eligible temporary employees who have been empanelled could not appear in the earlier interviews and have been pursuing their cases thereafter, "will be given another chance to appear for interview".

6. Workman submits that there were total five settlements. The settlement dated 17.11.87 is the 1st settlement (Ex M1), settlement dated 16.7.88 is 2nd settlement (Ex M2), settlement dated 27.10.88 is the 3rd settlement (Ex M3), then settlement dated 9.1.91 is 4th settlement and settlement dated 30.7.96 is 5th settlement (Ex M6). In between there is minutes of conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.95 marked as Ex M5. That due to all these settlements which were extended by subsequent settlements thereby created reasonable expectations in the list of the selected candidates arose with that it's a question of time their appointments or services would be regularized in the services of the bank. The Workman was working with the bank on temporary basis was under the bonafide hope that sooner his services will be regularized with the bank. He is thereby closed all his options elsewhere. It is needless to point out that employing person to whom hope of employment in substantial terms was made is a facet of Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

7. Further Workman submits that the Government of India issued Circular No. F-3/3/104/87-IR, dated 16.8.1990. Under said circular the chief Executives of all public sector banks including the Management herein were specifically instructed that until the problem of existing temporary employees is fully resolved, no bank is permitted to make any permanent appointments. That some of the persons similarly situated like this Workman aggrieved by the inaction on the part of the management of the bank is not regularizing their services from out of the selected panel and not clearly focusing the vacancy position, filed W.P. No. 4194/97 before Hon'ble High court of A.P.. It is

specifically averred in the said writ petition that the Management of the bank had failed to implement the settlement and that it violates the various fundamental rights guaranteed under the constitution of India. The Hon'ble High court of A.P .. by order dated 5.3.97 directed the bank to implement the settlement as amended from time to time. It also directed the bank to carry out the terms of settlement before the expiry of March, 1997. The Hon'ble High Court also recorded finding that the Bank cannot escape its liability of enforcement of the Settlement. In view of the directions given by the High Court all candidates whose names appeared in the select panels prepared on the basis of the agreement entered into on 17.11.87 under which the panel was valid upto December, 1991, and on the basis of a settlement dated 27.10.1988 whereby the panels were made alive upto 31.3.1997 under which the panel was valid upto December, 1999. The other agreement dated 16.7.1988 under which the panel was valid upto 1992 and on the basis of the settlement dated 27.10.1998 whereby the panels were made alive upto 31.3.1997 were under the bonafide impression that their cases will be considered for regularization and were living on the basis of the said reasonable expectation. Unfortunately, contrary to the aforesaid directions given by the High Court and contrary to the settlements entered into between the parties, the bank issued proceedings dated 25.3.1997, dated 27.3.1997 and 31.3.1997 instructing the various authorities of the Management not to continue the temporary employees those who are in services of the bank from 1.4.97. The said order was followed by the Management. Aggrieved by the said action the Workman herein and similarly situated candidates have filed a writ petition before the Hon'ble High Court and by way of Writ Petition No.9206/97 seeking a declaration that the proceedings issued by the Deputy General Manager and the Assistant General Manager (Respondents 3,4 and 5 therein) on 25.3.97, 27.3.97 and 31.3.97 as illegal and also non-continuance of the Workmen therein in service by absorbing them in the services of the bank as violative of Section 2(p) and 18(1) read with Rule 58 of Central Rules and sought for specific direction to the bank to absorb them in service.

8. Further, Workman submits that in the counter affidavit filed in Writ Petition No.9206/97, the bank has submitted that it has about 805 branches in Andhra Pradesh alone. It has stated that due to exigencies of circumstances and on account of the urgent need in its banks, it employed temporary employees in subordinate cadre. It is pertinent to mention that it does not state the urgent or need or the nature of temporary employees that it had engaged. Enquiry into the same would reveal that the stand taken by the bank either on the ground of urgent need or of temporary employees is a façade to perpetuate unfair labour practice. It is designed to on the one hand, keep the employed in the erroneous zone of hope and on the other to ensure that benefits that a model employer will extend under various statutes to its employees is not required to be borne out by the bank. A reading of the counter affidavit would show that the bank would opines that being just fair and reasonable are which obviously is reprehensible and is a facet of unfair labour practice.

9. The Workman submits that the bank had referred in its counter affidavit to three settlements dated 17.11.87, 16.7.88 and 27.10.88. The bank in the guise of extending the benefits of the circular of Government dated 16.8.90 stated in its counter affidavit that as follows:

"Government of India, vide its letter dated 16.8.1990, issued guidelines to all the public sector banks with regard to recruitment and absorption of temporary employees in public sector banks. The said guidelines were issued to implement on the lines of the approach paper on the issue provided by a committee constituted in this regard. The Government of India guidelines made it clear that all the public sector banks may follow the provisions laid down in the approach paper.

The approach paper specified that the cases of temporary employees who had put in not less than 240 days of temporary service in 12 consecutive Months and who are entitled to benefit of Section 25-F may be decided by entering into a settlement with the representative union. In respect of temporary employees who had put in less than 240 days of service in 12 consecutive months or less, a settlement could be avoided and however if the Management so desired, they could enter into a conciliation settlement with the representative union. Para 6(h), it is mentioned that only those temporary employees who had put in temporary service of 90 or more days after 1.1 1982 would be eligible for considering under the scheme. Although the Government guidelines envisaged for a settlement in respect of employees who had put in temporary service of 90 or more days, the bank by way of further concession entered into settlements Even in respect of those who had put in less than 90 days. As such, it could be Seen that the settlements are more beneficial to the temporary employees concerned. The approach paper also specify at para 6(c) that the banks would provide one time opportunity to all the temporary employees and for that purpose temporary employees worked in the bank on or after 1.1.1982 could be considered for re-employment in terms of the scheme. The Respondents have gone further wherein even persons working after 1975 were also considered.

As could be seen from the above, there was a genuine effort on the part of the Respondent bank to provide permanent employment for as many as possible subject to availability of the vacancies.

It is further submitted that at para 6(k) of the approach paper, it was made clear that this would be one time exercise in full and final settlement of all the aims and disputes for the past period in respect of temporary workmen covered by the settlement. This would mean that the Government of India guidelines would cover only those persons who were temporarily employed for the period specified therein and not otherwise. As such, it is submitted that the Respondents have not only followed the Government of India guidelines but in fact covered cases of the employees

who had worked for less than 90 days. As such, question of violation does not arise and in any case those were only broad guidelines and not directives".

10. The Workman submits that the bank also referred a subsequent settlement dated 9.1.1991 wherein there is a clause to the effect- that the panel of temporary employees and the panel of daily wage employees will be operated to a particular period. Therefore, their cases will not be considered. The Management herein relying upon this settlement in their impugned action. It is submitted that even the settlement dated 9.1.1991 will not empower the management to terminate the services of the temporary employees who are working in the bank services like the Workman herein as it does not specify the termination of the employees. In fact there are so many vacancies wherein the Management has engaged several new persons as temporary messengers/ attendars/ sweepers etc., even after the judgment of Hon'ble High Court without considering the cases of the similarly situated candidates like the Workman herein. It is submitted inspite of engaging fresh candidates as is now being done by the Management they would have continued the similarly situated candidates like the Workman herein in the services of the bank and consider their cases for absorption in view of the circulars issued by Central Government as well as the directions of this Hon'ble Court in Writ Petition No.4194/97, dated 5.3.97. In view of the circulars issued by the Central Government, the Management should not have relied upon the settlement dated 9.1.1991. Hence, the impugned action of the Management is illegal, unjust, violative of fundamental rights such as Articles 14,16 and 21 of the Constitution of India.

11. The Workman submits that in W.P. No.4194/97 filed by the union of temporary employees where in they have complained about the non- implementation of the settlements arrived between the parties and sought for absorption. Such employees in the bank services on permanent basis before the date fixed for carrying out the terms of settlement, the Court held that the members of the union had been empanelled in the list, they were not regularized and the time was going to run out to the near future and the Respondent bank and its officers cannot escape from the liability of enforcing the settlement which has been reached and therefore directed that the bank and the officers shall implement the settlement dated 17.11.87 as amended from time to time before the expiry of 31.3.97.

12. Further, it is submitted that in the clause of Settlement it is specifically mentioned that the workmen to be absorbed/appointed in the bank prohibiting any temporary appointments subsequent to the date of settlement even the authorities want to make temporary appointments that should be made only from among the empanelled can be appointed either for temporary vacancy or permanent vacancy except from among the empanelled candidates like the Workman and that should be continued till they are absorbed. The management committed unfair labour practices and terminated the services of the candidates with effect from 1.4.1997 which is arbitrary, discriminatory, contrary to their own guidelines and violative of the constitutional provisions which are guaranteed in Chapter-III of the Constitution of India.

13. The Workman submits that it is strange as to how the panels were allowed to lapse by a so-called Memorandum of Understanding dated 25.2.1997, that the action of terminating such employees like the Workman by virtue of an impugned oral proceedings without implementing the settlement would be illegal and unfair labour practice which cannot be allowed to be perpetuated. That the discontinuance of the Workman after 31.3.97 who had served in the bank in any capacity amounts to retrenchment. It could not have been done without any notice and it violates Sec.25FF of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and the said action is violative of principles of natural justice guaranteed under Chapter III of the Constitution of India. This amounts to retrenchment without one month's notice and taken in view of such notice. Thus, the main proceedings issued by the Respondent is without jurisdiction and is arbitrary, illegal and therefore liable to be quashed. That the alleged Memorandum of Understanding dated 27.2.97, Ex.M5 does not own any legal entity, as the said Memorandum of Understanding is not published anywhere to brought to the notice of the Workman whose rights are being affected. It is submitted that Management did not adhere to the procedure envisaged by the Central Government in its' instructions dated 16.8.90 in the year 1995. The same was not followed in the year 1997 despite there being vacancies. The management has followed the procedure of calling candidates through Employment exchange instead of giving chance to the empanelled candidates like the Workman here. It is pertinent to mention here that the Respondent Management sent letters to the all similarly situated candidates like the Workman in the month of June, 1997, subsequent to the passing of impugned termination orders. After knowing the facts that the candidates are litigating, the Management refused to engage these candidates. It is once again reiterated that the panels are meant for absorption but not for termination. It was the duty of the Management to engage the empanelled candidates like the Workman even in temporary vacancies till they are absorbed permanently in regular vacancies. Hence, the action of the Respondent Management terminating the services of the Workman by oral order dated 31.3.97 is unjust, illegal, violative of principles of natural justice and hence, the Management be directed to reinstate and absorb the Workman and to grant all incidental and consequential benefits.

14. Per contra, Respondent had filed counter and made a contentions that the reference is not tenable and contrary to the provisions of I.D. Act, 1947. Respondent submitted that to tide over severe sub-ordinate staff constraints which arose out of leave vacancies, exigencies, etc., and also owning to the restrictions imposed by the Government of India/Reserve Bank of India on intake of staff, the Respondent bank used to engage sub-ordinate staff like messengers, sweepers, sweeper cum water boys, etc., depending on the availability of work on purely temporary basis for the smooth and uninterrupted functioning of the branches. It is submitted that the All India State Bank of India Staff Federation which represents majority of the employees in the State Bank of India comprising about 98% of

the work force as its' members espoused the cause of temporary employees who have put in less than 240 days of temporary service in 12 calendar months in the bank and who were ineligible for any protection under Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 to give a chance for being considered for absorption and permanent appointments.

15. Discussions were held and on 17.11.1987 an agreement was signed between the federation and the Management bank under Sec. 2(p) read with Sec 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules 1957. A copy of the said settlement dated 17.11.87 which may be herein after referred as first settlement is filed and 4 categories were made as it has already been mentioned in the claim statement above, it need not be repeated here. In the first settlement, it was agreed that the temporary employees as categorized would be given a chance for being considered for permanent appointment in the bank's service against the vacancies which are likely to arise during the period 1987 to 1991. On 16.7.88 second settlement was arrived between the Federation and the Bank whereby it was agreed to substitute the period of consideration of vacancies as 1987 to 1992 in place of 1987 to 1991 as contemplated under the first settlement dated 17.11.1987. This is the second settlement. A 3rd settlement was entered into on 27.10.88 and it was agreed that the bank's service against the vacancies likely to arise from 1988 to 1992 was to be considered. Government of India vide its letter dated 16.8.90 issued guidelines to all the public sector banks with regard to recruitment and absorption of temporary employees in public sector banks. The said guidelines were issued to implement on the lines of approach paper on the issue provided by a committee constituted in this regard. Government of India guidelines made it clear that all the public sector banks may follow the provisions laid down in the approach paper. The approach paper specified that the cases of temporary service in 12 consecutive months and who are entitled to benefit of Sec.25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 may be decided by entering into a settlement with the representative union. In respect of temporary employees who had put in less than 240 days of service in 12 consecutive months or less, a settlement could be avoided and however if the Management so desired they could enter into a conciliation settlement with the representative union. In para. 6(h) it is mentioned that only those temporary employees who had put in temporary service of 90 days or more days after 1.1.82 would be eligible for considering under the scheme. Although the Government guidelines envisaged for a settlement in respect of employees who had put in temporary service of 90 days or more days, the bank by way of a further concession entered into settlements. Even in respect of those who had put in less than 90 days and also the bank went a step further and said those persons who are working after 1975 were also considered. Hence, there was a genuine effort on the part of the Respondent bank to provide as many as possible jobs subject to the availability of the vacancies. However, para 6 (k) of the approach paper made it clear that it is a one time, exercise in full and final, settlement of all the claims and disputes for the past period, in respect of temporary workmen covered by the settlement. Another settlement was entered on 9.1.91 herein after referred as 4th settlement and the time limit was extended upto 1994 and separate panel was prepared for temporary employees, casual/daily wagers. It was agreed that while vacancies arising between 1988 to 1994 in respect of temporary employees and in respect of casual/daily wagers, they can be considered for the vacancies arising between 1995-96 only.

16. It is submitted that the administrative set up of the Hyderabad Local Head Office comprises of four Zonal Offices (Zones) at Hyderabad, Vijayawada, Visakhapatnam and Tirupathi covering all the Districts of Andhra Pradesh. In terms of the settlement the Management after following the procedure laid down therein prepared the panels of qualified candidates of temporary employees denoted as 1989 panel and also panel of casual/daily wagers denoted as 1992 panel for giving a chance for being considered for permanent absorption. These panels were prepared zone-wise separately for messengers and non-messengers in the descending order of temporary service put in by the candidates during the stipulated period i.e., 1.7.1975 to 31.7.1988. That the Federation approached the Regional Labour Commissioner(C) for implementation of bi-partite settlement in respect of absorption of temporary employees. The Regional Labour Commissioner(C) conducted conciliation proceedings and an agreement was arrived between the Federation and the bank. It was agreed that it would be kept alive upto March, 1997. A copy of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.2.1995 signed by the parties is filed as material paper. A settlement was arrived at and an agreement was signed between the Federation and the Management bank on 30.7.1996 under Sec.2 (p) read with Sec.18(1) of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957, which is hereinafter called as 5th settlement. That on 27.2.1997 a Memorandum of understanding was also signed by the federation's affiliate and the bank Management recording the fact that the exercise of identifying the messengerial vacancies as on 31.12.1994 has since been completed by Central Office and thereby 403 messengerial vacancies were sanctioned . It was agreed that these vacancies may be filled from 1989 panel of temporary employees after effecting conversion from full time non-messengerial staff in the usual manner and the agreement was reached accordingly. It was agreed between the Federation's affiliate and the Management bank that in terms of the settlement dated 30.7.1996 both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees would lapse on 31.3.1997. That as agreed upon vacancies were filled from the panels. The Workman who has put in an aggregate temporary service of less than 240 days in a continuous block of 12 months period during 1.7.1975 to 31.7.1988 has no right to seek a direction to consider his candidature for absorption in the Management bank under any rule/law except under the settlement entered into thereon.

17. Respondent contended that, in fact, the case of the Workman can be considered under all the five settlements having got his case considered under provisions of these settlements. All the other provisions and terms of the

settlements are also binding on him/her. The Management bank has not violated any of the provisions of the terms of the said settlement. That the very preparation and maintenance of panel is in compliance of the terms agreed under these settlements. These settlements were time bound and they ceased to exist on 31.3.1997. That the bank has never promised that all the candidates in the panel will be absorbed. In the advertisement itself it was made clear that candidates will be considered for absorption in the vacancies that may arise upto 1992. Keeping alive the panels after 31.3.1997 is contrary to the settlements arrived between the State Bank of India Staff Federation and the Management bank. That the settlements are binding on the parties. The Workman is also bound under the terms of the said settlement. The settlement does not suffer from any ambiguity as their language is very clear. The right under the settlements is to give them a chance to be considered for future appointment in the bank's services against the vacancies likely to arise. The settlements were effected to balance the expectations of the temporary employees to be absorbed in permanent service as against the constitutional rights for all eligible persons to be considered for employment every time a vacancy arises. That the alleged dispute including the demand for reinstatement has to be decided in this context. It is submitted that the period of panel list got expired on 31.3.97 and it is an integral term of the settlement and cannot be modified in any proceedings under the law. These temporary employees who unfortunately could not be accommodated for want of vacancies have no further rights to be considered for regularization. That the Hon'ble High Court in WP No.12964/94, held as follows, "It is needless to state that the settlement arrived at between the All India State Bank of India Staff Federation which, is the majority union and the bank Management is binding on the Workmen also. It is not at all the case of the Workman that any of the terms of the settlement has been violated by the bank's Management. If the Workman had worked in the bank on part-time basis before 31.5.94, that itself would not vest in him a right to claim that his services should be regularized on permanent basis against a full time cadre post. The claim put forth by the Workman in the present petition is therefore misconceived and not tenable. However, it is open to the Workman to claim any right which flows from the settlement between the union and the bank Management. As already pointed out that it is not the grievance of the Workman that some right which has flown from the settlement in favour of the Workman has been denied by the bank Management. Therefore, I do not find any ground, let alone substantial ground, to grant the kind of relief sought for by the Workman. Writ Petition fails and is accordingly dismissed. No costs."

18. Further, it is contended that if the panels were not lapsed at the end of designated period and allowed to be continued it would result in making the contracts of temporary employment indirectly permanent through back door entry, which would not only be contrary to the settlements but also to Articles 14 and 16 of Constitution of India and deprive the chances of original claimants who would Come through proper recruitment procedure. As their rights have been crystallized by operation of the settlements. Hence, there is no question of any Legitimate expectation being violated.

19. Similarly placed ex-employees filed WP No.9206/1995 and the batch before the Hon'ble High Court of A.P. and the learned Single Judge allowed the Writ Petitions. Aggrieved by the same WA No.86/98 and the batch was filed and the Division Bench set aside the order of the Single Judge. Thereafter the ex-temporary employees filed Special Leave Petition No.11886-11888 of 1998 before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India also dismissed the SLP. Therefore, reference to the Judgement of the Learned Single Judge in WP No.9206/97 is of no consequences as the same has already been set aside. The observations made in the Judgements cannot be relied upon for any purpose what so ever. The question of operation of Sec.25F would not come into play. Further the issue is covered by various Judgements of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India and various Hon'ble High Courts. Hence, the reference may be ordered that the Workman is not entitled for any relief.

20. In order to fortify his claim Workman has examined himself as WW1 and also filed documents in evidence which has been exhibited as Ex.W1 to W6. Further, the Workman has filed photocopies of documents in support of his claim which are discussed as under:-

Ex.W1 is the notification. Ex.W2 is the interview call letter. Ex.W3 is the panel list. Ex.W4 is the service certificate.

21. On the other hand, Respondent has examined witness MW1 Sri K. Bala Kotaiah and this witness has exhibited 12 documents, marked as Ex.M1 to M12. The details of these documents are as follows:-

Ex.M.1 is the Settlement dated 17.11.1987. Ex.M2 is the Settlement dated 16.7.1988. Ex.M3 is the Settlement dated 27.10.1988. Ex.M4 is the Settlement dated 9.1.1991. Ex.M5 is the Minutes of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.1995. Ex.M6 is the Settlement dated 30.7.1996. Ex.M7 is the Memorandum of Understanding dt. 27.2.1997. Ex.M8 is the Particulars of 1989 Messengerial Panel. Ex.M9 is the Particulars of 1989 Non-Messengerial Panel. Ex.M10 is the Particulars of 1992 General Attendant Panel. Ex.M11 is the Judgment of Hon’ble High Court of A.P. in Writ Appeal No.86/98 dt.1.5.1998. Ex.M12 is the Judgment of Hon’ble Supreme Court of India in SLP No. 11886-11888 of 1998 dt.10.8.1998.

22. Apart from afore mentioned documents, Learned Counsel for Workman has also filed a long list of various judgements of Hon’ble Supreme Court as well as Hon’ble High Court, which we will discuss at appropriate place in this Award.

23. Heard the argument of Learned Counsel for Workman as well as for Respondent.

24. On the basis of rival pleadings of both the parties and submissions made by the Learned Counsel for both the parties, following points arise for determination in the industrial dispute :-

I. Whether the 1st settlement dated 17.11.1987, 2nd settlement dated 16.7.1988, 3rd settlement dated 27.10.1988, 4th settlement dated 9.1.1991 and 5th settlement dated 30.7.1996 entered into between State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and also Memorandum of Understanding are binding upon both the parties?

II. Whether the action of State Bank of India, branch in terminating the services of Workman Sri B. Rama Krishna, a Messenger with effect from 31.3.1997 is justified?

III. Whether the Workman is entitled for absorption on permanent post in the Branch of Respondent management as per averments made by him in the claim statement?

IV. To what relief if any the Workman is entitled for?

Findings:-

25. Point No.I:- Undisputedly settlements dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988, 9.1.1991 and 30.7.1996, minutes of conciliation proceedings and memorandum of understanding dated 27.2.1997 were executed between the State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation under section 2(p) and 18 (1) of I.D. Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Disputes (Central Rules), 1957.

Section 2(p) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 as follows:-

(p) "settlement" means a settlement arrived at in the course of conciliation proceeding and includes a written agreement between the employer and workmen arrived at otherwise than in the course of conciliation proceeding where such agreement has been signed by the parties thereto in such manner as may be prescribed and a copy thereof has been sent to an officer authorised in this behalf by the appropriate Government and the conciliation officer;

Section 18(1) provides as follows:-

18. Persons on whom settlements and awards are binding.

- [(1) A settlement arrived at by agreement between the employer and Workman otherwise than in the course of conciliation proceeding shall be binding on the parties to the agreement.

Therefore, in view of the provision contained u/s.18 (1) I.D. Act, 1947, terms and conditions enumerated in the aforesaid settlements are binding on the parties to the agreement. The Learned Counsel for Workman has argued that the Workman after going through the selection procedure has successfully been listed in the panel for appointment on the permanent basis in the Respondent management and the empanelled list has to be valid till last person in the empanelled list is appointed on permanent basis. But the impugned order dated 25.3.97, 27.3.97 and 31.3.97, has been issued by Respondent management thereby the services of the Workman has been terminated and the said order is not in consonance of the terms of the agreement entered into between the parties. Further, Workman submits that the Respondent in the 5th settlement has mentioned the date i.e., 31.3.1997 for lapse of empanel list which is illegal and that is not binding upon the Workman. The condition of lapse of empanelment list on 31.3.97 incorporated in the aforesaid 5th settlement, is arbitrary and illegal.

26. The perusal of the impugned order dated 25.3.1997 goes to reveal that the Chief/Branch Manager, SBI Zonal Office has issued the letter to all the branches with regard to the subject not to make any temporary appointments in the Branch in messengerial category from 1.4.1997. The extract of the said letter is given below:-

"We have been advised by the Deputy General Manager, Zonal Office, Hyderabad that as both the panels of temporary employees of 1989 and daily wagers/casual labours of 1992 will lapse by 31.3.1997, it has been decided by Central Office not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial category from 1.4.1997."

Thus, from the contents of the aforesaid letter, it manifest that Head Office of State Bank of India vide letter dated 25.3.1997 has issued direction to all its branches not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial category from 1.4.1997 due to reason of lapse of both panels i.e., 1989 & 1992 on 31.3.1997 as per terms of settlements entered into by both parties. Further, the contents of the subsequent letter dated 27.3.1997 issued by Respondent Management is also direction to Branch Manager, State Bank of India not to make any temporary messengerial category appointment with effect from 1.4.1997 and it has also been communicated to all concerned that the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers maintained by Zonal offices stand lapsed from 31.1.1997. Further, office order dated 31.3.1997 has been issued by Respondent management that goes to reveal that the said office order has been issued to this effect that, "Consequent on absorption of temporary employees in permanent cadre, it has been decided by the competent authority that no one onwards, no further daily labour or temporary

employees/appointments should be resorted to/engaged/employed." Therefore, it reflects from the contents of the aforesaid orders that the temporary appointment in messengerial category and daily labour has been stopped by the Respondent management with effect from 1.4.1997 because of the lapsed of panel of temporary workers and daily wagers by 31.3.1997. The agreement for lapse of both the panels on 31.3.1997 is contained in the 5th settlement which has been arrived at between the parties on dated 30.7.1996 with the consensus of both the parties. Therefore, Workman can not challenge the terms and conditions contained in settlement dated 30.7.1996 regarding lapse of panel on 31.3.1997 as agreed between State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation. As per provision contained u/s.18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 the said Agreement dated 30.7.1996 is binding on both the parties.

In the case of **Allied Sales Corporation Secunderabad vs.The Authority Under Andhra Pradesh..... 1990 II LLJ 510 AP para 414, Hon'ble Court have held:-**

"*4. There was a settlement between the Management and the workmen under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act on 25th April 1983 under which the age of superannuation of the workmen was fixed at 55 years. The settlement was to be in force upto 30th June 1986 and the next settlement, incorporating practically the same terms, was again entered into on 4th February 1987 under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act. There is no dispute that these settlements are under Section 18(1).*

14. Now the Authority constituted under Section 41(1) of the Act is an authority with very limited jurisdiction. It can only decide in the first appeal whether a termination by the management is valid or not and is within the parameters of Section 40 of the Act. The said Authority, in our view, has absolutely no jurisdiction to decide whether a settlement entered into under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act between the representatives of the Workmen and of the Management, is vitiated by undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion on the part of the Management. The Authority, namely, the Assistant Commissioner of Labour, was never intended by the A.P. Legislature to have jurisdiction to go into the question of the validity of a settlement arrived at under Section 18 of the Industrial Disputes Act by an Industrial Court. That Parliament has, in fact, constituted Industrial Courts under the Industrial Disputes Act, with extensive powers cannot be disputed. What we mean to say is that the Authority under Section 41(1) of the A.P. Act has no jurisdiction what-so-ever either to question or to decide about the validity of any such settlements. If parties to a settlement have a grievance about the validity of a settlement, it is for them to agitate the matter before the appropriate forum and they cannot ask an Authority constituted under Section 41(1) of the A.P. Shops and Establishments Act, 1966 with limited jurisdiction, to go into any such question and, that too, incidentally while deciding whether retirement as per the contract of employment, is legal or not."

It is not the case of Workman that aforesaid settlements are vitiated by undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion on the part of the management. If the Workman feeling aggrieved by any terms of settlement/ agreement on the aforementioned grounds then he can challenge of settlement before a competent authority under the Act, 1947. But here in the instant matter it is not a case of Workman that aforementioned settlement has been entered into between the parties on the ground of undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion. Therefore, Workman is barred to raise any objection in respect of fixing the date of lapse of both panels on 31.3.1997 as agreed between both the parties and Workman can not challenge any terms of said Agreement.

Further in the case of **Herbertsons Limited Vs. Workmen of Herbertsons Limited and Ors, 1977 AIR 322,** Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

The Tribunal thought that the question of the quantum of membership of the 2nd Respondent did not call for a finding at all in view of 1his Court's order. As observed above that was not a correct assumption. On the other hand, we feel that this view of the Tribunal has led it to approach the matter in an entirely erroneous manner. The Tribunal is, rightly enough, conscious that under section 18 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act the settlement was binding on the company and the members of the 3rd Respondent union. Even so, the Tribunal devoted nearly half of its order in scanning the evidence given by the company and Respondent No. 3 to find out whether the terms of the settlement had been explained by the President of the union to the workmen or not and whether the workers voluntarily accepted the settlement knowing all the "consequences". This to our mind is again an entirely wrong approach.

"When a recognised union negotiates with an employer the workers as individuals do not come into the picture. It is not necessary that each individual worker should know the implications of the settlement since a recognised union, which is expected to protect the legitimate interests of labour, enters into a settlement in the best interests of labour. This would be the normal rule. We cannot altogether rule out exceptional cases where there may be allegations of mala fides, fraud or even corruption or other induce- ments. Nothing of that kind has been suggested against the President of the 3rd Respondent in this case. That being the position, prima facie, this is a settlement in the course of collective bargaining and, therefore, is entitled to due weight and consideration.

It is not possible to scan the settlement in bits and pieces and hold some parts good and acceptable and others bad. Unless it can be demonstrated that the objectionable portion is such that it completely outweighs all the other advantages gained the Court will be slow to hold a settle- ment as unfair and unjust. The settlement has to be accepted or rejected as a whole and we are unable to reject it as a whole as unfair or unjust. Even before this Court the 3rd Respondent representing admittedly the large majority of the workmen has stood by this settlement and that is

a strong factor which it is difficult to ignore. As stated elsewhere in the judgment, we cannot also be oblivious of the fact that all workmen of the company have accepted the settlement. Besides, the period of settlement has since expired and we are informed that the employer and the 3rd Respondent are negotiating another settlement with further improvements. These factors, apart from what has been stated above, and the need for industrial peace and harmony when a union backed by a large majority of workmen has accepted a settlement in the course of collective bargaining have impelled us not to interfere with this settlement. That being the position, we unhold the settlement as fair and just and order that the award of the Tribunal shall be substituted by the settlement dated October 18, 1973. The said settlement shall be the substituted award. The appeal is disposed of accordingly. There will be no order as to costs."

Therefore, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above, the contention of the Workman that the date fixed for lapse of empanelled list on 31.3.1997 for appointment to the permanent post vide 5th Settlement dated 30.7.1996 is arbitrary, illegal is not untenable. The recognized union of Workmen has negotiated with the Respondent Bank Management representing large number of Workmen and the Workman as individual do not come into picture. Workman in the instant case has work as temporary Workmen in the Respondent Branch and in response of Notification he had applied for inclusion of his name in the panel and he was selected for inclusion his name in the panel list to be utilized for absorption of such Workman to permanent post in order of their seniority in the list. The Settlement dated 30.7.1996 between State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation under Sec.2(p) and Sec.18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 has clearly provided as regard non-messengerial position and it is agreed that all such posts sanctioned fallen vacant upto 31.3.1997 shall be filled before empanel list is allowed to lapse. Thus, in view of law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, in the instant case, Agreement dated 30.7.1996 was entered into between both the parties in respect of lapsing of the both the panels on 31.3.1997 and absorption of the Workmen from panel list was subject to availability of vacancy of post likely to arise upto 31.3.1997, have a binding force on Workman as well as management of State Bank of India in view of provision contained under section 18 (1) of I.D. Act, 1947.

Thus, Point No.I is answered against the Workman and in favour of the Respondent.

27. **Point No.II**:- Firstly, it is submitted on behalf of the Workman that the Respondent has terminated his services by oral order on 31.3.1997 without issuing any notice or paying any salary or compensation in lieu thereof. Therefore, the termination order of the Workman from service is in violation of provision contained Under Section 25 F of I.D. Act, 1947. Therefore, the order is liable to be set aside.

28. On the other hand, Respondent counsel contended that Workman has not worked for 240 days in any preceding calendar year. Therefore, reference of the industrial dispute is not relevant. In this context, the Workman has examined himself as WW1 who has reiterated that Workman has been terminated from service by Respondent on 31.3.1997 without notice of salary or compensation in lieu thereof. Before examining the claim of the Workman on merit it would be apposite to reproduce the provision contained under section 25 F:-

Section 25F provides:-

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].

Compensation to workmen in case of transfer of undertakings.

Section 25B defines the term continuous service which provides

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 authorized 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;

In order to prove the fact of 240 days of service within 12 months of a calendar year just preceding from the date of termination, the initial burden of proof lies upon the Workman and the Workman has to prove this factum by adducing his oral as well as documentary evidence in support of his claim.

Further, how to calculate 240 days of service by the Workman in a calendar year. In this context the reference of decisions of Hon'ble Supreme Court is relevant and the same are discussed below:-

In Rajasthan State Ganganagar S. Mills Ltd. v. State of Rajasthan and Anr. (2004) Apex Court held:

"It was the case of the Workman that he had worked for more than 240 days in the year concerned. This claim was denied by the appellant. It was for the claimant to lead evidence to show that he had worked for 240 days in the year preceding the date of his termination. He has filed an affidavit. It is statement which is in his favor and that cannot be regarded as sufficient evidence for any Court or Tribunal to come to the conclusion that in fact the claimant had worked for 240 days in a year These aspects were highlighted in Range Forest Officer v. S.T. Hadimani (2002 (3) SCC 25. No proof of receipt of salary or wages for 240 days or order or record in that regard was produced. Mere non-production of the muster roll for a particular period was not sufficient for the Labour Court held that the Workman had worked for 240 days as claimed."

In Municipal Corporation, Faridabad v. Siri Niwas (2004 (8) SCC 195), held "*the burden was on the Workman to show that he was working for more than 240 days in the preceding one year prior to his alleged retrenchment." In M.P. Electricity Board v. Hariram (2004 (8) SCC 246) the position was again reiterated in paragraph 11 as follows: "The above burden having not been discharged and the Labour Court having held so, in our opinion, the Industrial Court and the High Court erred in basing an order of reinstatement solely on an adverse inference drawn erroneously ..*"

In the case of Manager, RBI, Bangalore vs. S Mani (2005) SCC Page 100, the 3 Judges Bench of the Apex Court held that "*the initial burden of proof was on the Workman to show that he had completed 240 days of service."*

Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of Mohan Lal vs Management BEL 1981 SCC page 225 has laid down the principle that how to count 240 days of service within one year it is held: *"Clause (2)(a) provides for a fiction to treat a Workman in continuous service for a period of one year despite the fact that he has not rendered uninterrupted service for a period of one year but he has rendered period of 240 days during the period of 12 calendar service for months counting backwards and just preceding the relevant date being the date of retrenchment. In other words, in order to invoke the fiction enacted in clause (2)(a) it is necessary to determine first the relevant date, ie the date of termination of service which is complained of as retrenchment. After that date is ascertained. move backward to a period of 12 months just preceding the date of retrenchment and then ascertain whether within the period of 12 months, the Workman has rendered service for a period of 240 days. If these three facts are affirmatively answered in favor of the Workman pursuant to the deeming fiction enacted in clause (2)(a) it will have to be assumed that the Workman is in continuous service for a period of one year and he will satisfy the eligibility qualification enacted in Section 25-F"*

"14. We have already extracted section 25B since its amendment and the change in language is the legislative exposition of which note must be taken. In fact, we need not further dilate upon this aspect because in Surendra Kumar Verma and Ors. v. Central Government Industrial-cum-Labour Court, New Delhi and Anr., Chinnappa Reddy. J., after noticing the amendment and referring to the decision in Sur Enamel and Stamping Works (P) Ltd case, held as under:

"These changes brought about by Act 36 of 1964 appear to be clearly designed to provide that a Workman who has actually worked under the employer for not less than 240 days during a period of twelve months shall be deemed to have been in continuous service for a period of one year whether or not he has in fact been in such continuous service for a period of one year. It is enough that he has worked for 240 days in a period of 12 months, it is not necessary that he should have been in the service of the employer for one whole year."

In a concurring judgment Pathak J. agreed with this interpretation of section 25B(2). Therefore, both on principle and on precedent it must be held that section 25B(2) comprehends a situation where a Workman is not in employment for a period of 12 calendar months, but has rendered service for a period of 240 days within the period of 12 calendar months commencing and counting backwards from the relevant date, i.e. the date of retrenchment. If he has, he would be deemed to be in continuous service for a period of one year for the purpose of section 25B and Chapter VA."

Thus, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above the initial burden of proof lies upon the Workman to show that he has completed 240 days of the service with the Respondent just preceding from the date of his termination. Further, in respect of the employment of calculating the 240 days service in view of the contents of Section 25-F read with Section 25-B of the I.D. Act, 1947.

29. Now, in view of the provision contained under Section 25 F and law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, we have to examine whether the Workman has discharged his initial burden of proof in respect of his claim of 240 days continuous service in a calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination i.e., 31.3.1997.

In this context, WW1 in his cross examination has stated that,

"I was not sponsored by any employment exchange for appointment in the bank. I did not undergo the regular process of selection required for appointment in the bank. I did not work for 240 days in a year in the bank."

Thus, it is clear from the testimony of WW1 that the Workman had not worked for 240 days continuously in any 12 months of a calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination in the Respondent bank. Therefore, Workman failed to establish his plea by his oral and documentary evidence that he had worked for 240 days continuously in calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination i.e., 31.3.1997. Thus, the claim of the Workman that he has been terminated by oral order without issuing notice or payment in lieu after termination, in contravention of Section 25 F of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is not tenable. However the documents filed by the Workman in support of his claim, number of days worked with the Respondent goes to reveal that the Workman had worked intermittently as daily wager depending upon availability of work in branch. Workman did not file any document of appointment letter or salary slips in support of his claim for appointment as a non-messenger in the Respondent branch on temporary basis.

30. Per contra, the Learned Counsel for Respondent has submitted the allegation of Workman that he was terminated from services is not correct. As the vacancies were filled up on regular basis in order of their respective seniority the non-engagement of the Workman does not amount to termination. Further, Respondent contended that no law provide that even though there is no work temporary employee should be continued in the bank work as the very engagement of Workman was subject to availability of work. Therefore, the allegation that the bank has indulged in unfair labour practice is incorrect.

31. Thus, in view of the fore gone discussion and contentions made by the Respondent, I find the force in the argument advanced by the Respondent that in the instant matter, Workman was not terminated from service by order dated 31.3.1997 rather he was disengaged in view of the non-availability of the work in the branch. Further, there was direction issued by the Head Office of the Respondent authority not to engage any daily wager Workman/ temporary Worker w.e.f. 1.4.1997. Thus, such disengagement of Workman does not amount to termination. Moreover, the Workman failed to prove his claim that he was terminated in contravention of provision of Sec.25F of the I.D. Act, 1947 as he failed to establish his plea by any oral or documentary evidence that he had worked for 240 days continuously in a twelve months of calendar year just preceding from date of termination i.e., 31.3.1997.

32. Further, perusal of the order dated 25.3.1997 goes to reveal that the Chief Branch Manager, State Bank of India has issued the letter to Zonal Office with direction to all its branches to this effect that they have been advised by the DGM, Zonal Office, Hyderabad that as both the panel of temporary employees of 1989 and daily wagers/casual labour of 1992 will lapse on 31.3.1997 it has been decided by central office not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial cadre from 1.4.1997, therefore it was directed to issue suitable instructions not to make temporary appointments from 1.4.1997. There is no mention in this order that the Workman herein has been terminated from service by this order.

33. Further, the circular dated 27.3.1997 was issued by DGM, SBI to all branches in commercial network in respect of the non-appointment of temporary employees in subordinate cadre and it has directed not to make any temporary employment in the subordinate cadre with effect from 1.4.97 and further, it has directed to ensure that no temporary/casual/daily basis appointment of the petty cash. Further, it is directed to all Branch Managers that any deviation in this regard will be viewed seriously. Thus, these circulars do not reflect that the Workman has been terminated from service by this order.

34. Similarly, office order dated 31.3.1997 is simply a direction to all branches of the Respondent bank by DGM that no further daily labour should be engaged or employed. Therefore, the plea of the Workman that he has been terminated by the aforesaid order dated 25.3.1997, 27.3.1997 and 31.3.1997 from the service by the Respondent is not acceptable. The evidence adduced by the Workman clearly goes to reveal that he had worked as a daily wager for which he has been paid wages according to number of working days. As there was an order for prohibition for engaging temporary workmen, in the bank, therefore, Workman could not be engaged by the Respondent for work from 1.4.1997 and there after. It is settled law that the daily wagers are engaged by the employer depending upon the availability of work and as the work was not available the Workman was not engaged further by the Respondent management. Therefore, the Workman on the ground of number of days he had worked in the Respondent bank cannot claim any right to reinstate him into the employment. As the Workman failed to prove the mandatory condition of 240 days of continuous service as required under Sec.25F of I.D. Act, 1947. Therefore, the disengagement of Workman from work can not be termed in contravention of provision contained under Sec.25F and 25 B of the I.D. Act, 1947.

Thus, this point is answered against the Workman and in favour of Respondent.

35. **Point No.III**:- In this context, the Workman has contended that the management failed to implement the selected panels during its valid tenure. The management adopted the back door methods contrary to the settlements and filled up the vacancies. The same is evident from the proceedings dated 18.11.1993 a copy of the same is filed in the material papers and the same may be read as part of the claim statement. Further, it is submitted that management has to adhere the procedure issued by the Central Government, the instructions dated 16.8.1990 in the year 1995, but same was not followed in the year 1997 despite there being vacancies. The management has followed the procedure of calling candidates through employment exchange instead of giving chance to the empanelled candidates like the Workman herein. The management sent call letters to the similarly situated candidates like the Workman in the month of June 1997 subsequent to issuance of impugned termination orders. After knowing the fact that they are litigating the issue by way of dispute, the management has refused to engage those candidates, the copies of call letters issued are filed herein along with claim petition. The Workman herein reiterates that the panels are meant for absorption but not for termination. In view of the same a duty is cast upon the Respondent management to engage the empanelled candidates like the Workman herein even in temporary vacancies till they are absorbed permanently in regular vacancies.

36. On the other hand, Respondent has contended that the Federation approached Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) for implementation of bipartite settlement in respect of the absorption of temporary employees. The Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) conducted conciliation proceedings and agreement was arrived at between the Federation and the Management bank. It is submitted that it was agreed between the Federation and the Management that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers /casual labour would be kept alive upto March, 1997 and the vacancies as agreed to under the afore set out settlements will be filled from both the lists concurrently. A copy of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.1995 signed by the parties to the dispute is filed as a material paper. Further, it is submitted that the settlement was arrived at and an agreement was signed between the Federation and the Management bank on 30.7.1996 under Section 2(p) read with Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules 1957 which is binding on the parties. A copy of this agreement which hereinafter may be referred to as 5th settlement for brevity, is also filed as a material paper. The 5th settlement dated 30.7.1996 whereunder the earlier four settlements dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988 and 9.1.1991 were also referred, it was agreed to, by the Federation and the Management bank that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees will be kept alive upto March, 1997 for filling the vacancies existing/arrived at as on 31.12.1994 as per the norms agreed to between the bank and Federation and that thereafter the said panels would lapse. It was also agreed that within the framework of the above settlements the modalities about drawing names from either the panel of temporary employees or the panel of daily wagers and casual labour would be decided administratively on circle to circle basis depending upon the local requirements in consultation with the Federation's affiliate by the Circle management. It was further agreed that all messenger real vacancies/positions in the subordinate cadre including part-time attendants specifically provided as leave reserve will be filled by the end of 31.3.1997. Further, Respondent contended that on 27.2.1997 a memorandum of understanding was also signed between the Federation's affiliate and the bank management regarding the fact that the exercise of identifying the messengerial vacancies as on 31.12.1994 has since been completed by central office and thereby 403 messengerial vacancies were sanctioned to the circle of the Management bank and it was agreed that these vacancies may be filled from 1989 panel of temporary employees after effecting conversion from full time non-messengerial staff in the usual manner and the agreement was reached upon. Further, it was agreed between the Federations affiliate and the management bank that in terms of the settlement dated 30.7.1996 both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers /casual employees would lapse on 31.3.1997.

37. The Workman has contended that the empanelled list prepared by the Respondent management for appointment of temporary and daily wage Workers to the permanent post cannot lapse unless until it is exhausted by appointing all the empanelled persons and it should continue even after 31.3.1997, i.e., the date fixed for the lapse of panel. It is undisputed that the date of lapse of empanelled list of Workmen has been fixed to 31.3.1997 as mentioned in the settlement dated 30.7.1996, and agreed between the parties. It is settled law that and once the life of panel list lapses on the date as agreed between the parties it cannot be extended beyond that date. In the instant case the panel list of the workmen was valid upto 31.3.1997 in view of the terms and conditions enumerated in the 5th Settlement entered into between the parties. As the lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997 has been agreed by State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation through 5th Settlement, the Workman is not competent to challenge the same.

In this context I would like to take reference of the decision of the apex court in the case of **Syndicate Bank and Ors vs. Shankar Paul and Ors , AIR 1997 SC 3091, therein the Hon'ble Apex Court** have held:-

"Till 1982, the branches of the appellant Bank in Calcutta region were recruiting persons locally to work as temporary attenders in leave vacancies. In view of the revised procedure prescribed by the Government of India in respect of such temporary appointments, the Calcutta regional office of the appellant Bank issued a circular to all of its branches on 14.8.1982, instructing all the branches under it to discontinue the old practice from 1.6.1982 and appoint only empanelled candidates. The regional office was to prepare a panel of eligible candidates, after calling names from the local/district employment exchange, and split it up branch-wise. Following that new procedure yearly

panels were prepared thereafter. Names of the Respondents were for the first time included in the panel prepared for the period 7.2.1987 to 6.2.1988. By its letter dated 7.2.1987 the Bank had informed the Respondents that the panel was valid for one year only and that inclusion of their names in the panel was not to confer on them any right to seek permanent appointment in the service of the bank. Considering the object with which the panel was prepared and the fact that it was an yearly panel expiring on 6.2.1988, we are of the opinion that the Respondents did not get any right, because of inclusion of their names in the said panel, for permanent absorption in the service of the Bank. Whatever conditional right they had came to an end with the expiry of the panel. The claim of the Respondents, as contained in the writ petition was thus misconceived and therefore the learned single Judge and the Division Bench, when it first decided the appeal, were right in dismissing the writ petition and the appeal respectively."

Thus, in view of the above law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court and in view of the terms and conditions of the 5th Settlement the contention of the Workman that empanelled list should continue even after 31.3.1997 till the last Workman in the panel is absorbed is not tenable. The contention of the Workman is baseless in view of recital in the settlement. Therefore, in view of the fore gone discussion and finding given at Point No. I regarding binding nature of Settlements and terms and conditions enumerated therein, in view of the provision contained u/s.18(1) of the I.D. Act, 1947, I am of the considered view that life of panels lapsed on 31.3.1997 in view of terms of settlement dated 30.7.1996 and plea of Workman that the panel shall continue even after 31.3.1997 till last man absorbed has no legal force and same is untenable.

38. Undisputedly, settlement agreement dated 30.7.1996 was executed between the State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation and in that settlement it was agreed that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/ casual employees will be used for filling vacancies existing as on 31.12.1994 as per the norms agreed between the bank and the Federation. These empanelled workmen were to be given a chance for permanent appointment in the bank against vacancies arising up to December 1994 whereas the daily wagers/ casual employees were to be considered against the vacancies arise from January 1995 to December 1996, whereby the said panel would lapse. It was agreed that the vacancies falls upto 31.3.1997 shall be filled before the empanelled list is allowed to lapse. Thus, the claim of the Workman to the post of permanent non-messenger in the Respondent management was subject to the availability of the sanctioned post and vacancies arising upto 31.3.1997. The workmen given chance to the permanent post were seniors in number of working days in panel list and Workman herein was junior to those workmen. Therefore, Workman could not be given absorption to permanent post being junior to other workmen in the panel list.

39. In this context the Workman witness WW1 was cross examined by the Respondent counsel and in the cross examination the witness WW1 states:-

"I applied in response to an advertisement issued by the bank and my name was included in the panel in the year 1992…. Further, witness states, *The panels were prepared as per the number of days of service of the temporary employees and they were given regular appointment in terms of the settlement as per the bank seniority of the employees in the panel….* Further witness states, *I am not having any papers to show that any of my juniors were continuing in service."*

Thus, from the above statement of the Workman witness WW1 it is clear that the panel was prepared in terms of various settlements entered into between Staff Federation of State Bank of India and State Bank of India and it was prepared on the basis of number of days of work put in by the temporary employees. Further, the Workman himself admitted that some of the temporary employees whose names were included in the panel were given regular appointment in the bank in order of their seniority in the panel and he is not having any document to show that any person who worked for less number of days than the Workman was given appointment in the bank. Therefore, the allegation of the Workman that the regular appointment has been made by the bank from the panel list in breach of the terms of the settlement and violation of seniority of panel list is not proved by this evidence of WW1. Thus, there is no evidence on record that bank has given the appointment to the temporary employees as well as daily wagers from the panel list 1989 and 1992 in breach of seniority of the temporary employees in the list. There is no evidence of jumbling in the panel list to make appointment of any permanent Workman in breach of the seniority. Therefore, I am constrained to hold that the Respondent Management has appointed the workmen from panel list in order of seniority and there is no jumbling of workmen in the panel list before it got lapsed on 31.3.1997.

40. However, Workman has taken the plea that the panels of Workmen for absorption in the employment of the Respondent banks (panels of temporary employees and daily wagers) has been lapsed on 31.3.1997 in contravention of terms of settlement as the object of preparing the entire empanelment of temporary and daily wagers was to provide them permanent employment and till the both the panel lists exhausted the panel list cannot be lapsed on 31.3.1997 and the date of lapsing of the panel on 31.3.1997 has been fixed by the Respondent arbitrarily without any authority.

41. In this context, the perusal of Settlement dated 30.7.1996 reveals that the 5th Settlement dated 30.7.1996 was entered under Section 2(p) and 18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Dispute (Central) Rules 1957. This settlement has been entered into by the competent parties and in this settlement parties thereto agreed

that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees will lapse on 31.3.1997. Thus the date of lapse of panel was fixed by both the parties with consensus under the settlement dated 30.7.1996 and same is binding upon the Workman under the provision of Section 18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947. Moreover, this issue of binding force of the settlement dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988 and 9.1.1991 has already been discussed, decided at finding in Point No.I of this award. However, the legality and validity of the aforementioned settlement has not been challenged by the Workman before any competent forum. Thus, claim of Workman that the date of lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997 has been fixed arbitrarily by the Respondent bank is untenable. As regard the claim of Workman for his absorption to the permanent post it is settled law that the Workman can not claim his regularization to permanent post merely on the basis of number of working days.

42. In this context the reference of the decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Oil and Natural Gas Corporation vs Krishan Gopal 2020(3) SCALE 272, date of decision 7.2.2020** is relevant therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have has laid down principle regarding regularization of the Workman on permanent posts. Hon'ble Supreme Court have laid down the prepositions of regularization of the workmen to permanent post is as under:-

"*(i) Wide as they are, the powers of the Labour Court and the Industrial Court cannot extend to a direction to order regularisation, where such a direction would in the context of public employment offend the provisions contained in Article 14 of the Constitution;*

(ii) The statutory power of the Labour Court or Industrial Court to grant relief to workmen including the status of permanency continues to exist in circumstances where the employer has indulged in an unfair labour practice by not filling up permanent posts even though such posts are available and by continuing to employ workmen as temporary or daily wage employees despite their performing the same work as regular workmen on lower wages;

(iii) The power to create permanent or sanctioned posts lies outside the judicial domain and where no posts are available, a direction to grant regularisation would be impermissible merely on the basis of the number of years of service;

(iv) Where an employer has regularised similarly situated workmen either in a scheme or otherwise, it would be open to workmen who have been deprived of the same benefit at par with the workmen who have been regularised to make a complaint before the Labour or Industrial Court, since the deprivation of the benefit would amount to a violation of Article 14; and

(v) In order to constitute an unfair labour practice under Section 2(ra) read with Item 10 of the Vth Schedule of the ID Act, the employer should be engaging workmen as badlis, temporaries or casuals, and continuing them for years, with the object of depriving them of the benefits payable to permanent workmen.

Thus, in view of the principles laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court as discussed above, in the instant matter the Workman utterly failed to prove his claim by adducing any documentary or oral evidence that the employer has indulged in unfair labour practice by not filling the permanent posts even though such posts are available and by continuing to employ workmen as temporary or daily wage employees despite their performance was the same work, as regular workmen on lower wages.

43. Respondent has contended that all the vacancies exist and arise upto 31.3.1997 has been filled up from the panel list in order of seniority and no vacancy exists or arises as on 31.3.1997 remained unfilled. Further, it is contended that as per terms of settlement the life of panel lists has been lapsed on 31.3.1997, hence, there is no occasion to extend the life of panel lists beyond 31.3.1997. However, the workman failed to prove contrary by any evidence to the aforesaid contention of the Respondent that the vacancies were existing as on 31.3.1997 and the workman was not given absorption to the permanent post in order of his seniority. It is settled law that the power to create permanent or sanctioned post lies outside the judicial domain and where no posts are available, a direction to grant regularization would be impermissible merely on the basis of the number of years of service. Therefore, the claim of the workman on this ground also not acceptable.

44. Further, as per the of settlement, panel was prepared for absorption of the workmen on the permanent posts has already been lapsed on 31.3.1997 and the vacancies existing and arising upto 31.12.1994 and upto 31.3.1997 as settlement dated 30.7.1996 has been filled up from the panel by appointing the workmen as per seniority in the panel list. Workman witness WW1 in his cross examination has himself admitted this fact that, some of the temporary employees whose names were included in the panel were given regular appointment in the bank in order of their seniority in the panel. The Workman failed to show that there was any breach of terms of settlement has been committed by the Respondent in appointment to permanent post from aforesaid panel list.

45. As discussed in preceding paragraph of this Award, the life of the panel has not been extended beyond 31.3.1997, by any further settlement hence, the panel list in which name of the Workman was included got expired on 31.3.1997. It is not the case of the Workman that Respondent has regularized similarly situated workmen either in the scheme or otherwise and the Workman has been deprived of same benefit on par with those workmen or the vacancies remained unfilled on the date of lapse of panels i.e., 31.3.1997, Industrial Tribunal has no jurisdiction to

extend the date of lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997. This Tribunal can not order for regularization of workmen to the permanent post in contravention of the provision of Article 14 of the Constitution of India.

In the case of **Mahboob Deepak vs. Nagar Panchayat Gajraula & Anr, Civil Appeal No.5875/2007 date of judgement 13.12.2007,** Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

"8. Respondent is a Local Authority. The terms and conditions of employment of the employees are governed by a statute and statutory rules. No appointment can be made by a Local Authority without following the provisions of the recruitment rules. Any appointment made in violation of the said rules as also the constitutional scheme of equality as contained in Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India would be a nullity.

9. Due to some exigency of work, although recruitment on daily wages or on an ad hoc basis was permissible, but by reason thereof an employee cannot claim any right to be permanently absorbed in service or made permanent in absence of any statute or statutory rules. Merely because an employee has completed 240 days of work in a year preceding the date of retrenchment, the same would not mean that his services were liable to be regularized."

Therefore, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, the claim of the Workman for absorption merely on the basis of number of day of work in the Respondent bank Branch is not acceptable. As regard plea of the Workman that the Workman should have been given employment even after 31.3.1997 as temporary Workman, it is the discretion of Respondent to engage the Workman depending upon availability of work and this Tribunal can not direct the Respondent to engage the Workman in the absent of such rule/scheme.

46. In view of principle laid down by Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above, in the instant matter Workman utterly failed to establish the fact of rendering continuous service for a period of 240 days of service within a period of 12 calendar months commencing and coming backward from relevant date i.e., the date of retrenchment, if has he would be denied to be in continuous service for a period of one year. Therefore, the provision contained under Sec.25F of retrenchment is not applicable to Workman.

Counsel for Workman has relied upon number of decisions of Hon'ble High Court and Hon'ble Supreme Court and few of them are discussed herein:-

In the case of **F.C.I., vs. Kamdhenu Cattle Feed Industries 1993 (1) SCC 71,** therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

"7. In contractual sphere as in all other State actions, the State and all its instrumentalities have to conform to Article 14 of the Constitution of which non-arbitrariness is a significant facet. There is no unfettered discretion in public law: A public authority possesses powers only to use them for public good. This impose the duty to act fairly and to adopt a procedure which is `fairplay in action'. Due observance of this obligation as a part of good administration raises a reasonable or legitimate expectation in every citizen to be treated fairly in his interaction with the State and its instrumentalities, with this element forming a necessary component of the decision making process in all State actions. To satisfy this requirement of non- arbitrariness in a State action, it is, therefore, necessary to consider and give due weight to the reasonable or legitimate expectations of the persons likely lo be affected by the decision or else that unfairness in the exercise of the power may amount to an abuse or excess of power apart from affecting the bona fides of the decision in a given case. The decision so made would be exposed to challenge on the ground of arbitrariness. Rule of law does not completely eliminate discretion in the exercise of power, as it is unrealistic, but providers for control of its exercise by judicial review."

In the case of **State Bank of India, R.O., Vijayawada vs. Industrial Tribunal, Hyderabad WP No.193/1997,** therein Hon'ble High Court have held,

"*Sri Krovvidi Narasimham, the learned counsel for the 2nd respondent contends, supporting the award that it was a permanent vacancy and even though the 2nd respondent was appointed on temporary basis, his services were not liable to be terminated and he was to be regularised into service on permanent basis. Shastry award warrants that no temporary appointment can be made to a permanent post. But the matter is now covered by two division bench judgements dated 28.11.1986 in W.A. No.791 of 1986 and 25.8.1987 in W.A. No.270 of 1982. The ratio decided in the two judgements is to the effect that there cannot be any mandate to appoint employees on permanent basis when the requirement was for appointment on temporary basis. But it is held in the said judgements that when a temporary appointee is ousted from service and not for misconduct and, if again temporary appointment is to be made, then, the case of such temporary appointee who was ousted, has got to be considered in accordance with Sec. 25-H of the Act."*

In the case of **State of Haryana and others vs. Piara Singh and others. 1992 (4) SCC 118,** therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

" 49. If for any reason an adhoc or temporary employee is continued for a fairly long spell, the authorities must consider his case for regularization provided he is eligible and qualified according to the rules and his service record is satisfactory and his appointment does not run counter to the reservation policy of the state."

In the above cited judgements by the Workman the facts of the case are different hence do not apply to instant case of Workman.

47. On the other hand, in support of his contention Respondent has examined witness MW1 and MW1 in chief examination states that, Settlements i.e., on 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988, 9.1.1991 were entered into between the SBI and SBI Staff Federation for filling up of the vacancies that arise up to 1994 for those temporary employees who has worked on scale wages. Further, MW1 states that two different panels for messengers and non-messengers as per the eligibility criteria prescribed by the bank. There are four modules in Andhra Pradesh and they are Hyderabad, Tirupathi, Vijayawada and Visakhapatnam. MW1 states that the temporary employees so empanelled were given permanent absorption depending upon the vacancies so arise strictly in terms of the settlement. MW1 states that on 9.6.1995 conciliation proceeding was held before the RLC(C), Hyderabad and in said proceedings it was decided that the panels will be kept live up to 31.3.1997 and vacancies will be filled from both the lists concurrently. A copy of the said minutes of proceedings is Ex.M5. Further, MW1 states that on 30.7.1996 another settlement was entered between the SBI and All India SBI Staff Federation providing for filling up of the vacancies arising up to December 1994 in respect of subordinate cadre and daily wage /casual wage employees out of panel so prepared were to be considered against vacancies arising from January 1995 to December 1996, thereafter the said panels lapse. MW1 states that it was also agreed that all the non- messenger positions in subordinate cadre including part time attendants specially provided as leave reserve will be filled before 31.3.1997 and as regards to non-messengerial positions it is agreed that all such posts sanctioned and fallen vacant up to 31.3.1997 shall be filled before the empanelled list is allowed to lapse. Thus in both the cases empanelled list were lapsed on 1.4.1997. Ex.M6 is the copy of the settlement dated 30.7.1996. Further, witness states that on 27.2.1997 a memorandum of understanding was reached between the SBI and SBI Staff Federation providing that both the panels above mentioned will lapse on 31.3.1997. Ex.M7 is the copy of the memorandum of understanding and Ex.M8 is the copy of the statements giving the particulars of 1989 non-messenger panel, Ex.M9 is the copy of the statement of 1989 non-messenger panel, Ex.M10 is the copy of statement of 1992 panel. Further, witness states that petitioner was included in the 1989 panel. As the existing vacancies at that time were exhausted and his turn did not come he could not be given permanent employment in the bank as per the agreements. All the appointments were made strictly in accordance with the settlements reached from time to time between SBI and SBI staff federation and as per seniority, number of days of temporary service put in by them in the bank in the given period. Further, MW1 states petitioner was not sponsored by any employment exchange he did not undergo the regular process of selection required for appointment as a regular non-messenger the petitioner has not worked for 240 days in any year in his entire temporary service in the bank. The petitioner and other temporary employees were terminated from service by the bank. Further, MW1 states that the vacancies were filled up on regular basis with the temporary employees from the panels and these panels were expired in terms of the settlements so reached and there were no vacancies to absorb such employees. Thus, witness MW1 has proved the documents Ex.M1 to Ex.M12 and also contentions made in the counter. However, MW1 was cross examined by the Petitioner Counsel. But nothing has been elicited in his cross examination so as to discredit the testimony of the witness MW1 as regards the date of lapse of both the panels on 31.3.1997 and reasons assigned for non-absorption of the Petitioner from the panel list to the permanent post. Moreover the witness MW1 was re-examined by the Respondent and the witness MW1 states that panels were expired in terms of the settlement send absorptions to the extent of the available vacancies were made. There was no termination of any temporary messenger as such but their services were not utilized after the cut off date as the available vacancies were already filled up and most of these Petitioners were not in the service of the bank as on the date of the expiry date of the panels. Therefore, in view of the aforesaid testimony of the MW1 in re-examination in the absence of cross examination remained uncontraverted, the claim of the Workman that he was entitled for absorption in permanent post in the branch of Respondent Management on the basis of panel list is found not established.

This point is answered against the Workman.

48. **Point No.IV**:- In view of the discussion and finding given at Point Nos. I, II and III, the Workman is not entitled for any relief and claim statement of Workman sans merit and liable to be dismissed.

This Point is answered accordingly.

AWARD

In view of the fore gone discussion, it is held that the action of the Respondent bank in terminating the services of Sri Routhu Vasudeva Rao, Ex. Messenger by way of oral orders w.e.f. 31.12.1996 is justified. Hence, the Petitioner is not entitled for any relief as prayed for. The claim statement filed by Workman sans merit, hence, dismissed.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, Personal Assistant, transcribed by her, corrected and signed by me on this the 19th day of May, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner	Witnesses examined for the Respondent
WW1: Sri B. Rama Krishna	MW1: Sri C.R.M. Sastry

Documents marked for the Petitioner

Ex.W1 to:	
Ex.W4:	Photocopy of Service certificates
Ex.W5:	Photocopy of of employment notification
Ex.W6:	Photocopy of letter to CGM (Per) dated 10.10.1990
Ex.W7:	Photocopy of the letter from Government of India reg. recruitment and absorption of temporary employees dt. 19.8.90
Ex.W8:	Photocopy of the letter from Government of India to Respondent dt. 30.11.87.

Documents marked for the Respondent

Ex.M1:	Photocopy of printed book containing settlement between the staff federation and management for regularization of services of the temporary employees and casual employees.

नई दिल्ली, 27 जुलाई, 2026

का.आ. 1684.— औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार भारतीय स्टेट बैंक के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजको और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण – सह – श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद के पंचाट (सन्दर्भ संख्या 39/2002) को प्रकाशित करती है,

[सं. एल. 39025/01/2026-आई.आर-(बी-II)-76]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 27th July, 2026

S.O. 1684.— In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (.No.LC.39/2002) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Hyderabad as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the Management of State Bank of India and their workmen,

[No. L-39025/01/2026- IR (B-II)-76]

SALONI, Dy. Director

In The Central Government Industrial Tribunal Cum Labour Court At Hyderabad

Present: **Sri IRFAN QAMAR**

Presiding Officer

Dated the 18th day of May, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE L.C.No. 39/2002

[Old ITID(C) No. 16/2001 of Labour Court cum Industrial Tribunal, Visakhapatnam]

Between:

Sri Vandrangi Venkataramana,

S/o Appanna,

G.K.R. Puram Village,

Uppinivalasa (P.O.),

Burja Mandal,

Srikakulam District … Petitioner

And

The Dy. General Manager,

State Bank of India,

Personnel section,

Zonal office, Region-II,

Visakhapatnam. .....Respondent

Appearances:

For the Petitioner: Sri Macherla Rangaiah, Advocate

For the Respondent: Sri Y. Ranjeeth Reddy, Advocate

AWARD

Sri Vandrangi Venkataramana who worked as Messenger (who will be referred to as the workman) has filed this petition under Sec. 2A(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 against the Respondents State Bank of India seeking for reinstatement into service as Messenger/Sweeper duly granting all the consequential benefits such as continuity of service, back wages and all other attendant benefits etc., and such other reliefs as this court may deem fit. Earlier Petitioner has filed this dispute before the Labour Court cum Industrial Tribunal, Visakhapatnam for adjudication and later the same has been transferred to this Tribunal bearing ITID (C) No. 16/2001, as per orders of Central Government vide lr. No. H-11026/1/2001-IR(C.II) dated 18.10.2001 and registered, numbered in this Tribunal as LC No. 39/2002.

2. Before unfolding the factual matrix of the instant industrial dispute it would be apposite to have a bird eye view of a chequered history of the instant industrial dispute. Earlier instant industrial dispute along with the batch cases was decided by this Tribunal vide common award dated 17.5.2005 and the reference was answered in favour of the Respondent and against the Workman. That said common award dated 17.5.2005 was challenged by the aggrieved Workmen in various Writ petition No.6470/2014 along with batch of writ petitions before the Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh and Hon'ble High Court vide its' judgement dated 23.6.2014 allowed all batch of writ petitions and set aside the common award dated 17.5.2005 passed in ID No.222 of 2001 and other batch of ID cases by Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad and the Respondent management of State Bank of India was directed to reengage the Writ Petitioners in position, which they have been occupying prior to their termination and further directed to consider their cases for regularization as and when the substantive vacancy arises. This judgement dated 23.6.2014 of Hon'ble High Court of AP, passed in WP No.6470/2014 and batch petitions was challenged by Respondent management before the Hon'ble High Court in Writ Appeal No. 1268 of 2014. The aforesaid Writ Appeals No.1268/2014 and other Writ Appeals were decided by Division Bench of High Court of Andhra Pradesh by a common judgement dated 20.3.2019. Hon'ble High Court in aforesaid Writ Appeal was pleased to pass the order which is extracted as below:-

" 7. Hearing the learned senior counsel for the SBI and the learned senior counsel for the contesting unofficial Respondents, we see that while the learned single Judge was justified in setting aside the award af the Tribunal, the proper course to be adopted was to remit all the cases to the Tribunal. This we say for reasons more than one. Firstly, in such matters, claims have to be decided on individual basis, as different persons have different claims as to the length of officiation or discharge of duties and functions; quality of engagement, drawings, accounting of the post for each one of them, who have worked etc. All these issues will not be the same in all the cases. Therefore, each case ought to have been directed to be decided by the Tribunal afresh on individual basis. The second and most important aspect is the learned single Judge has in one go ordered re-employment of all the workmen. This is not a relief that could have been granted without answering the individual issues; each issue relating to each case could not have been decided by the writ Court within the format of its adjudication procedures and scope. The adjudicating body, which has to do that activity, is the Industrial Tribunal. Therefore, we are of the view that while we would sustain the order of the learned singe Judge insofar as it interfered and sets aside the award of the Tribunal, the further findings and directions, issued through the impugned order have to go and the individual cases have to be sent back for consideration of the Tribunal. Such further procedure before the Tribunal will have to be carried forward with the materials already on record and also by affording an opportunity to the persons, who have claims as well as the management to place their rival contentions and further material before the Tribunal. The learned counsel appearing for the workmen are justified in pointing out that enormous delay has already happened and further action by the Tribunal in this line may be expedited.

9. In the result, these writ appeals are ordered;

(1) affirming the impugned common order of the learned single Judge to the extent it sets aside the common award dated 17.05.2005 of the Industrial Tribunal;

(2) the further findings and directions issued through the impugned common order are vacated:

(3) all the matters shall be remitted to the Industrial Tribunal with a direction to dispose of them within an outer limit of five (5) months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order; and,

(4) the parties to make appearance before the Tribunal on the given date."

Thus, in view of the above direction of Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh in W.A.No.1268 of 2014 and batch cases. This Tribunal has taken up the matter of industrial dispute for hearing and deciding it afresh in view of the aforesaid guidelines laid down by the Hon'ble High Court in Writ Appeal No.1268/2014 vide judgement dated 20.3.019.

3. The factual matrix of instant industrial dispute as narrated by the Workman in his claim statement are that, the Workman joined in the service of the management institution as Messenger from 1990 to 1996, and has rendered unblemished service spreading over a period of about 7 years. The Respondent has terminated services of Workman by oral orders with effect from 1.4.1997. Further, it is submitted that the management of Respondent bank decided to give a chance to temporarily employed personnel "found suitable for permanent appointment" by wait- listing them by offering permanent appointment or waitlisting till such opportunity arises.

4. That on 17.11.1987 a settlement was reached between All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and the Management of State Bank of India - settlement one, under this settlement three categories of employees were listed. That is, A) those who have completed 240 days in 12 months or less after 1.7.1975. B) those who have completed 270 days in any continuous block of 36 calendar months after 1.7.1975. C) (i) those who have completed minimum of 30 days aggregate temporary service in any calendar year after 1.7.1975 or (ii) 70 days aggregate temporary service in continuous block of 36 months after 1.7.1975.

5. The persons who satisfied in all the above 4 categories were to be interviewed by a selection committee and the said selection committee would determine the suitability of the said candidate for permanent appointment. Therefore, the bank prescribed certain qualifications and from among the candidates satisfying the qualifications the suitable candidates were enlisted by a selection committee. The Clause 7 of the said agreement provided with the selected candidate would be wait listed in order of their respective categorization and the selected panel would be valid upto December, 1991. Clause 10 of the settlement specifically provided that henceforth. "there will be no temporary appointments in the subordinate cadre", except on a restrictive basis in the specified category, "from amongst empanelled candidates as per existing guidelines of the bank". The Workman further submits that consequent upon the said agreement and the draft, a notification was issued in the newspapers. The last date for responding to the advertisement was 30.8.1988. A written examination followed by viva-voce in May, 1989 was held. A selected panel was prepared, as per Clause 7 of the agreement, ie. Settlement No.1, the selected panel was to be valid upto December, 1991, the Workman submits that circular was issued on 26.4.91 by the said letter it is mentioned that the terms of the agreement dated 17.11.87 was modified vide second agreement dated 16.7.88 was entered into between the parties. In terms of the said agreement a chance was to be given, "to all eligible temporary employees for permanent appointments. The appointments were against the vacancies likely to arise during the years 1995-96, circular made it clear that in view of the enormity of the problem an extension of the currency of the panel, eligible temporary employees who have been empanelled could not appear in the earlier interviews and have been pursuing their cases thereafter, "will be given another chance to appear for interview".

6. Workman submits that there were total five settlements. The settlement dated 17.11.87 is the 1st settlement (Ex M1), settlement dated 16.7.88 is 2nd settlement (Ex M2), settlement dated 27.10.88 is the 3rd settlement (Ex M3), then settlement dated 9.1.91 is 4th settlement and settlement dated 30.7.96 is 5th settlement (Ex M6). In between there is minutes of conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.95 marked as Ex M5. That due to all these settlements which were extended by subsequent settlements thereby created reasonable expectations in the list of the selected candidates arose with that it's a question of time their appointments or services would be regularized in the services of the bank. The Workman was working with the bank on temporary basis was under the bonafide hope that sooner his services will be regularized with the bank. He is thereby closed all his options elsewhere. It is needless to point out that employing person to whom hope of employment in substantial terms was made is a facet of Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

7. Further Workman submits that the Government of India issued Circular No. F-3/3/104/87-IR, dated 16.8.1990. Under said circular the chief Executives of all public sector banks including the Management herein were specifically instructed that until the problem of existing temporary employees is fully resolved, no bank is permitted to make any permanent appointments. That some of the persons similarly situated like this Workman aggrieved by the inaction on the part of the management of the bank is not regularizing their services from out of the selected panel and not clearly focusing the vacancy position, filed W.P. No. 4194/97 before Hon'ble High court of A.P.. It is specifically averred in the said writ petition that the Management of the bank had failed to implement the settlement

and that it violates the various fundamental rights guaranteed under the constitution of India. The Hon'ble High court of A.P .. by order dated 5.3.97 directed the bank to implement the settlement as amended from time to time. It also directed the bank to carry out the terms of settlement before the expiry of March, 1997. The Hon'ble High Court also recorded finding that the Bank cannot escape its liability of enforcement of the Settlement. In view of the directions given by the High Court all candidates whose names appeared in the select panels prepared on the basis of the agreement entered into on 17.11.87 under which the panel was valid upto December, 1991, and on the basis of a settlement dated 27.10.1988 whereby the panels were made alive upto 31.3.1997 under which the panel was valid upto December, 1999. The other agreement dated 16.7.1988 under which the panel was valid upto 1992 and on the basis of the settlement dated 27.10.1998 whereby the panels were made alive upto 31.3.1997 were under the bonafide impression that their cases will be considered for regularization and were living on the basis of the said reasonable expectation. Unfortunately, contrary to the aforesaid directions given by the High Court and contrary to the settlements entered into between the parties, the bank issued proceedings dated 25.3.1997, dated 27.3.1997 and 31.3.1997 instructing the various authorities of the Management not to continue the temporary employees those who are in services of the bank from 1.4.97. The said order was followed by the Management. Aggrieved by the said action the Workman herein and similarly situated candidates have filed a writ petition before the Hon'ble High Court and by way of Writ Petition No.9206/97 seeking a declaration that the proceedings issued by the Deputy General Manager and the Assistant General Manager (Respondents 3,4 and 5 therein) on 25.3.97, 27.3.97 and 31.3.97 as illegal and also non-continuance of the Workmen therein in service by absorbing them in the services of the bank as violative of Section 2(p) and 18(1) read with Rule 58 of Central Rules and sought for specific direction to the bank to absorb them in service.

8. Further, Workman submits that in the counter affidavit filed in Writ Petition No.9206/97, the bank has submitted that it has about 805 branches in Andhra Pradesh alone. It has stated that due to exigencies of circumstances and on account of the urgent need in its banks, it employed temporary employees in subordinate cadre. It is pertinent to mention that it does not state the urgent or need or the nature of temporary employees that it had engaged. Enquiry into the same would reveal that the stand taken by the bank either on the ground of urgent need or of temporary employees is a façade to perpetuate unfair labour practice. It is designed to on the one hand, keep the employed in the erroneous zone of hope and on the other to ensure that benefits that a model employer will extend under various statutes to its employees is not required to be borne out by the bank. A reading of the counter affidavit would show that the bank would opines that being just fair and reasonable are which obviously is reprehensible and is a facet of unfair labour practice.

9. The Workman submits that the bank had referred in its counter affidavit to three settlements dated 17.11.87, 16.7.88 and 27.10.88. The bank in the guise of extending the benefits of the circular of Government dated 16.8.90 stated in its counter affidavit that as follows:

"Government of India, vide its letter dated 16.8.1990, issued guidelines to all the public sector banks with regard to recruitment and absorption of temporary employees in public sector banks. The said guidelines were issued to implement on the lines of the approach paper on the issue provided by a committee constituted in this regard. The Government of India guidelines made it clear that all the public sector banks may follow the provisions laid down in the approach paper.

The approach paper specified that the cases of temporary employees who had put in not less than 240 days of temporary service in 12 consecutive Months and who are entitled to benefit of Section 25-F may be decided by entering into a settlement with the representative union. In respect of temporary employees who had put in less than 240 days of service in 12 consecutive months or less, a settlement could be avoided and however if the Management so desired, they could enter into a conciliation settlement with the representative union. Para 6(h), it is mentioned that only those temporary employees who had put in temporary service of 90 or more days after 1.1 1982 would be eligible for considering under the scheme. Although the Government guidelines envisaged for a settlement in respect of employees who had put in temporary service of 90 or more days, the bank by way of further concession entered into settlements Even in respect of those who had put in less than 90 days. As such, it could be Seen that the settlements are more beneficial to the temporary employees concerned. The approach paper also specify at para 6(c) that the banks would provide one time opportunity to all the temporary employees and for that purpose temporary employees worked in the bank on or after 1.1.1982 could be considered for re-employment in terms of the scheme. The Respondents have gone further wherein even persons working after 1975 were also considered.

As could be seen from the above, there was a genuine effort on the part of the Respondent bank to provide permanent employment for as many as possible subject to availability of the vacancies.

It is further submitted that at para 6(k) of the approach paper, it was made clear that this would be one time exercise in full and final settlement of all the aims and disputes for the past period in respect of temporary workmen covered by the settlement. This would mean that the Government of India guidelines would cover only those persons who were temporarily employed for the period specified therein and not otherwise. As such, it is submitted that the Respondents have not only followed the Government of India guidelines but in fact covered cases of the employees

who had worked for less than 90 days. As such, question of violation does not arise and in any case those were only broad guidelines and not directives".

10. The Workman submits that the bank also referred a subsequent settlement dated 9.1.1991 wherein there is a clause to the effect- that the panel of temporary employees and the panel of daily wage employees will be operated to a particular period. Therefore, their cases will not be considered. The Management herein relying upon this settlement in their impugned action. It is submitted that even the settlement dated 9.1.1991 will not empower the management to terminate the services of the temporary employees who are working in the bank services like the Workman herein as it does not specify the termination of the employees. In fact there are so many vacancies wherein the Management has engaged several new persons as temporary messengers/ attendars/ sweepers etc., even after the judgment of Hon'ble High Court without considering the cases of the similarly situated candidates like the Workman herein. It is submitted inspite of engaging fresh candidates as is now being done by the Management they would have continued the similarly situated candidates like the Workman herein in the services of the bank and consider their cases for absorption in view of the circulars issued by Central Government as well as the directions of this Hon'ble Court in Writ Petition No.4194/97, dated 5.3.97. In view of the circulars issued by the Central Government, the Management should not have relied upon the settlement dated 9.1.1991. Hence, the impugned action of the Management is illegal, unjust, violative of fundamental rights such as Articles 14,16 and 21 of the Constitution of India.

11. The Workman submits that in W.P. No.4194/97 filed by the union of temporary employees where in they have complained about the non- implementation of the settlements arrived between the parties and sought for absorption. Such employees in the bank services on permanent basis before the date fixed for carrying out the terms of settlement, the Court held that the members of the union had been empanelled in the list, they were not regularized and the time was going to run out to the near future and the Respondent bank and its officers cannot escape from the liability of enforcing the settlement which has been reached and therefore directed that the bank and the officers shall implement the settlement dated 17.11.87 as amended from time to time before the expiry of 31.3.97.

12. Further, it is submitted that in the clause of Settlement it is specifically mentioned that the workmen to be absorbed/appointed in the bank prohibiting any temporary appointments subsequent to the date of settlement even the authorities want to make temporary appointments that should be made only from among the empanelled can be appointed either for temporary vacancy or permanent vacancy except from among the empanelled candidates like the Workman and that should be continued till they are absorbed. The management committed unfair labour practices and terminated the services of the candidates with effect from 1.4.1997 which is arbitrary, discriminatory, contrary to their own guidelines and violative of the constitutional provisions which are guaranteed in Chapter-III of the Constitution of India.

13. The Workman submits that it is strange as to how the panels were allowed to lapse by a so-called Memorandum of Understanding dated 25.2.1997, that the action of terminating such employees like the Workman by virtue of an impugned oral proceedings without implementing the settlement would be illegal and unfair labour practice which cannot be allowed to be perpetuated. That the discontinuance of the Workman after 31.3.97 who had served in the bank in any capacity amounts to retrenchment. It could not have been done without any notice and it violates Sec.25FF of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and the said action is violative of principles of natural justice guaranteed under Chapter III of the Constitution of India. This amounts to retrenchment without one month's notice and taken in view of such notice. Thus, the main proceedings issued by the Respondent is without jurisdiction and is arbitrary, illegal and therefore liable to be quashed. That the alleged Memorandum of Understanding dated 27.2.97, Ex.M5 does not own any legal entity, as the said Memorandum of Understanding is not published anywhere to brought to the notice of the Workman whose rights are being affected. It is submitted that Management did not adhere to the procedure envisaged by the Central Government in its' instructions dated 16.8.90 in the year 1995. The same was not followed in the year 1997 despite there being vacancies. The management has followed the procedure of calling candidates through Employment exchange instead of giving chance to the empanelled candidates like the Workman here. It is pertinent to mention here that the Respondent Management sent letters to the all similarly situated candidates like the Workman in the month of June, 1997, subsequent to the passing of impugned termination orders. After knowing the facts that the candidates are litigating, the Management refused to engage these candidates. It is once again reiterated that the panels are meant for absorption but not for termination. It was the duty of the Management to engage the empanelled candidates like the Workman even in temporary vacancies till they are absorbed permanently in regular vacancies. Hence, the action of the Respondent Management terminating the services of the Workman by oral order dated 31.3.97 is unjust, illegal, violative of principles of natural justice and hence, the Management be directed to reinstate and absorb the Workman and to grant all incidental and consequential benefits.

14. Per contra, Respondent had filed counter and made a contentions that the reference is not tenable and contrary to the provisions of I.D. Act, 1947. Respondent submitted that to tide over severe sub-ordinate staff constraints which arose out of leave vacancies, exigencies, etc., and also owning to the restrictions imposed by the Government of India/Reserve Bank of India on intake of staff, the Respondent bank used to engage sub-ordinate staff like messengers, sweepers, sweeper cum water boys, etc., depending on the availability of work on purely temporary

basis for the smooth and uninterrupted functioning of the branches. It is submitted that the All India State Bank of India Staff Federation which represents majority of the employees in the State Bank of India comprising about 98% of the work force as its' members espoused the cause of temporary employees who have put in less than 240 days of temporary service in 12 calendar months in the bank and who were ineligible for any protection under Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 to give a chance for being considered for absorption and permanent appointments.

15. Discussions were held and on 17.11.1987 an agreement was signed between the federation and the Management bank under Sec. 2(p) read with Sec 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules 1957. A copy of the said settlement dated 17.11.87 which may be herein after referred as first settlement is filed and 4 categories were made as it has already been mentioned in the claim statement above, it need not be repeated here. In the first settlement, it was agreed that the temporary employees as categorized would be given a chance for being considered for permanent appointment in the bank's service against the vacancies which are likely to arise during the period 1987 to 1991. On 16.7.88 second settlement was arrived between the Federation and the Bank whereby it was agreed to substitute the period of consideration of vacancies as 1987 to 1992 in place of 1987 to 1991 as contemplated under the first settlement dated 17.11.1987. This is the second settlement. A 3rd settlement was entered into on 27.10.88 and it was agreed that the bank's service against the vacancies likely to arise from 1988 to 1992 was to be considered. Government of India vide its letter dated 16.8.90 issued guidelines to all the public sector banks with regard to recruitment and absorption of temporary employees in public sector banks. The said guidelines were issued to implement on the lines of approach paper on the issue provided by a committee constituted in this regard. Government of India guidelines made it clear that all the public sector banks may follow the provisions laid down in the approach paper. The approach paper specified that the cases of temporary service in 12 consecutive months and who are entitled to benefit of Sec.25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 may be decided by entering into a settlement with the representative union. In respect of temporary employees who had put in less than 240 days of service in 12 consecutive months or less, a settlement could be avoided and however if the Management so desired they could enter into a conciliation settlement with the representative union. In para. 6(h) it is mentioned that only those temporary employees who had put in temporary service of 90 days or more days after 1.1.82 would be eligible for considering under the scheme. Although the Government guidelines envisaged for a settlement in respect of employees who had put in temporary service of 90 days or more days, the bank by way of a further concession entered into settlements. Even in respect of those who had put in less than 90 days and also the bank went a step further and said those persons who are working after 1975 were also considered. Hence, there was a genuine effort on the part of the Respondent bank to provide as many as possible jobs subject to the availability of the vacancies. However, para 6 (k) of the approach paper made it clear that it is a one time, exercise in full and final, settlement of all the claims and disputes for the past period, in respect of temporary workmen covered by the settlement. Another settlement was entered on 9.1.91 herein after referred as 4th settlement and the time limit was extended upto 1994 and separate panel was prepared for temporary employees, casual/daily wagers. It was agreed that while vacancies arising between 1988 to 1994 in respect of temporary employees and in respect of casual/daily wagers, they can be considered for the vacancies arising between 1995-96 only.

16. It is submitted that the administrative set up of the Hyderabad Local Head Office comprises of four Zonal Offices (Zones) at Hyderabad, Vijayawada, Visakhapatnam and Tirupathi covering all the Districts of Andhra Pradesh. In terms of the settlement the Management after following the procedure laid down therein prepared the panels of qualified candidates of temporary employees denoted as 1989 panel and also panel of casual/daily wagers denoted as 1992 panel for giving a chance for being considered for permanent absorption. These panels were prepared zone-wise separately for messengers and non-messengers in the descending order of temporary service put in by the candidates during the stipulated period i.e., 1.7.1975 to 31.7.1988. That the Federation approached the Regional Labour Commissioner(C) for implementation of bi-partite settlement in respect of absorption of temporary employees. The Regional Labour Commissioner(C) conducted conciliation proceedings and an agreement was arrived between the Federation and the bank. It was agreed that it would be kept alive upto March, 1997. A copy of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.2.1995 signed by the parties is filed as material paper. A settlement was arrived at and an agreement was signed between the Federation and the Management bank on 30.7.1996 under Sec.2 (p) read with Sec.18(1) of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957, which is hereinafter called as 5th settlement. That on 27.2.1997 a Memorandum of understanding was also signed by the federation's affiliate and the bank Management recording the fact that the exercise of identifying the messengerial vacancies as on 31.12.1994 has since been completed by Central Office and thereby 403 messengerial vacancies were sanctioned . It was agreed that these vacancies may be filled from 1989 panel of temporary employees after effecting conversion from full time non-messengerial staff in the usual manner and the agreement was reached accordingly. It was agreed between the Federation's affiliate and the Management bank that in terms of the settlement dated 30.7.1996 both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees would lapse on 31.3.1997. That as agreed upon vacancies were filled from the panels. The Workman who has put in an aggregate temporary service of less than 240 days in a continuous block of 12 months period during 1.7.1975 to 31.7.1988 has no right to seek a direction to consider his candidature for absorption in the Management bank under any rule/law except under the settlement entered into thereon.

17. Respondent contended that, in fact, the case of the Workman can be considered under all the five settlements having got his case considered under provisions of these settlements. All the other provisions and terms of the settlements are also binding on him/her. The Management bank has not violated any of the provisions of the terms of the said settlement. That the very preparation and maintenance of panel is in compliance of the terms agreed under these settlements. These settlements were time bound and they ceased to exist on 31.3.1997. That the bank has never promised that all the candidates in the panel will be absorbed. In the advertisement itself it was made clear that candidates will be considered for absorption in the vacancies that may arise upto 1992. Keeping alive the panels after 31.3.1997 is contrary to the settlements arrived between the State Bank of India Staff Federation and the Management bank. That the settlements are binding on the parties. The Workman is also bound under the terms of the said settlement. The settlement does not suffer from any ambiguity as their language is very clear. The right under the settlements is to give them a chance to be considered for future appointment in the bank's services against the vacancies likely to arise. The settlements were effected to balance the expectations of the temporary employees to be absorbed in permanent service as against the constitutional rights for all eligible persons to be considered for employment every time a vacancy arises. That the alleged dispute including the demand for reinstatement has to be decided in this context. It is submitted that the period of panel list got expired on 31.3.97 and it is an integral term of the settlement and cannot be modified in any proceedings under the law. These temporary employees who unfortunately could not be accommodated for want of vacancies have no further rights to be considered for regularization. That the Hon'ble High Court in WP No.12964/94, held as follows, "It is needless to state that the settlement arrived at between the All India State Bank of India Staff Federation which, is the majority union and the bank Management is binding on the Workmen also. It is not at all the case of the Workman that any of the terms of the settlement has been violated by the bank's Management. If the Workman had worked in the bank on part-time basis before 31.5.94, that itself would not vest in him a right to claim that his services should be regularized on permanent basis against a full time cadre post. The claim put forth by the Workman in the present petition is therefore misconceived and not tenable. However, it is open to the Workman to claim any right which flows from the settlement between the union and the bank Management. As already pointed out that it is not the grievance of the Workman that some right which has flown from the settlement in favour of the Workman has been denied by the bank Management. Therefore, I do not find any ground, let alone substantial ground, to grant the kind of relief sought for by the Workman. Writ Petition fails and is accordingly dismissed. No costs."

18. Further, it is contended that if the panels were not lapsed at the end of designated period and allowed to be continued it would result in making the contracts of temporary employment indirectly permanent through back door entry, which would not only be contrary to the settlements but also to Articles 14 and 16 of Constitution of India and deprive the chances of original claimants who would Come through proper recruitment procedure. As their rights have been crystallized by operation of the settlements. Hence, there is no question of any Legitimate expectation being violated.

19. Similarly placed ex-employees filed WP No.9206/1995 and the batch before the Hon'ble High Court of A.P. and the learned Single Judge allowed the Writ Petitions. Aggrieved by the same WA No.86/98 and the batch was filed and the Division Bench set aside the order of the Single Judge. Thereafter the ex-temporary employees filed Special Leave Petition No.11886-11888 of 1998 before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India also dismissed the SLP. Therefore, reference to the Judgement of the Learned Single Judge in WP No.9206/97 is of no consequences as the same has already been set aside. The observations made in the Judgements cannot be relied upon for any purpose what so ever. The question of operation of Sec.25F would not come into play. Further the issue is covered by various Judgements of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India and various Hon'ble High Courts. Hence, the reference may be ordered that the Workman is not entitled for any relief.

20. In order to fortify his claim Workman has examined himself as WW1 and also filed documents in evidence which has been exhibited as Ex.W1 to W2. Further, the Workman has filed photocopies of documents in support of his claim which are discussed as under:-

Ex.W1 is the service certificate. Ex.W2 is the panel list.

21. On the other hand, Respondent has examined witness MW1 Sri K. Bala Kotaiah and this witness has exhibited 12 documents, marked as Ex.M1 to M12. The details of these documents are as follows:-

Ex.M.1 is the Settlement dated 17.11.1987. Ex.M2 is the Settlement dated 16.7.1988. Ex.M3 is the Settlement dated 27.10.1988. Ex.M4 is the Settlement dated 9.1.1991. Ex.M5 is the Minutes of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.1995. Ex.M6 is the Settlement dated 30.7.1996. Ex.M7 is the Memorandum of Understanding dt. 27.2.1997. Ex.M8 is the Particulars of 1989 Messengerial Panel. Ex.M9 is the Particulars of 1989 Non-Messengerial Panel. Ex.M10 is the Particulars of 1992 General Attendant Panel. Ex.M11 is the Judgment of Hon’ble High Court of A.P. in Writ Appeal No.86/98 dt.1.5.1998. Ex.M12 is the Judgment of Hon’ble Supreme Court of India in SLP No. 11886-11888 of 1998 dt.10.8.1998.

22. Apart from afore mentioned documents, Learned Counsel for Workman has also filed a long list of various judgements of Hon'ble Supreme Court as well as Hon'ble High Court, which we will discuss at appropriate place in this Award.

23. Heard the argument of Learned Counsel for Workman as well as for Respondent.

24. On the basis of rival pleadings of both the parties and submissions made by the Learned Counsel for both the parties, following points arise for determination in the industrial dispute :-

I. Whether the 1st settlement dated 17.11.1987, 2nd settlement dated 16.7.1988, 3rd settlement dated 27.10.1988, 4th settlement dated 9.1.1991 and 5th settlement dated 30.7.1996 entered into between State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and also Memorandum of Understanding are binding upon both the parties?

II. Whether the action of State Bank of India, branch in terminating the services of Workman Sri C. Raju, a Messenger with effect from 31.3.1997 is justified?

III. Whether the Workman is entitled for absorption on permanent post in the Branch of Respondent management as per averments made by him in the claim statement?

IV. To what relief if any the Workman is entitled for?

Findings:-

25. Point No.I:- Undisputedly settlements dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988, 9.1.1991 and 30.7.1996, minutes of conciliation proceedings and memorandum of understanding dated 27.2.1997 were executed between the State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation under section 2(p) and 18 (1) of I.D. Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Disputes (Central Rules), 1957.

Section 2(p) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 as follows:-

(p) "settlement" means a settlement arrived at in the course of conciliation proceeding and includes a written agreement between the employer and workmen arrived at otherwise than in the course of conciliation proceeding where such agreement has been signed by the parties thereto in such manner as may be prescribed and a copy thereof has been sent to an officer authorised in this behalf by the appropriate Government and the conciliation officer;

Section 18(1) provides as follows:-

18. Persons on whom settlements and awards are binding.

- [(1) A settlement arrived at by agreement between the employer and Workman otherwise than in the course of conciliation proceeding shall be binding on the parties to the agreement.

Therefore, in view of the provision contained u/s.18 (1) I.D. Act, 1947, terms and conditions enumerated in the aforesaid settlements are binding on the parties to the agreement. The Learned Counsel for Workman has argued that the Workman after going through the selection procedure has successfully been listed in the panel for appointment on the permanent basis in the Respondent management and the empanelled list has to be valid till last person in the empanelled list is appointed on permanent basis. But the impugned order dated 25.3.97, 27.3.97 and 31.3.97, has been issued by Respondent management thereby the services of the Workman has been terminated and the said order is not in consonance of the terms of the agreement entered into between the parties. Further, Workman submits that the Respondent in the 5th settlement has mentioned the date i.e., 31.3.1997 for lapse of empanel list which is illegal and that is not binding upon the Workman. The condition of lapse of empanelment list on 31.3.97 incorporated in the aforesaid 5th settlement, is arbitrary and illegal.

26. The perusal of the impugned order dated 25.3.1997 goes to reveal that the Chief/Branch Manager, SBI Zonal Office has issued the letter to all the branches with regard to the subject not to make any temporary appointments in the Branch in messengerial category from 1.4.1997. The extract of the said letter is given below:-

"We have been advised by the Deputy General Manager, Zonal Office, Hyderabad that as both the panels of temporary employees of 1989 and daily wagers/casual labours of 1992 will lapse by 31.3.1997, it has been decided by Central Office not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial category from 1.4.1997."

Thus, from the contents of the aforesaid letter, it manifest that Head Office of State Bank of India vide letter dated 25.3.1997 has issued direction to all its branches not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial category from 1.4.1997 due to reason of lapse of both panels i.e., 1989 & 1992 on 31.3.1997 as per terms of settlements entered into by both parties. Further, the contents of the subsequent letter dated 27.3.1997 issued by Respondent Management is also direction to Branch Manager, State Bank of India not to make any temporary messengerial category appointment with effect from 1.4.1997 and it has also been communicated to all concerned that the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers maintained by Zonal offices stand lapsed from 31.1.1997. Further, office order dated 31.3.1997 has been issued by Respondent management that goes to reveal that the said office order has

been issued to this effect that, "Consequent on absorption of temporary employees in permanent cadre, it has been decided by the competent authority that no one onwards, no further daily labour or temporary employees/appointments should be resorted to/engaged/employed." Therefore, it reflects from the contents of the aforesaid orders that the temporary appointment in messengerial category and daily labour has been stopped by the Respondent management with effect from 1.4.1997 because of the lapsed of panel of temporary workers and daily wagers by 31.3.1997. The agreement for lapse of both the panels on 31.3.1997 is contained in the 5th settlement which has been arrived at between the parties on dated 30.7.1996 with the consensus of both the parties. Therefore, Workman can not challenge the terms and conditions contained in settlement dated 30.7.1996 regarding lapse of panel on 31.3.1997 as agreed between State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation. As per provision contained u/s.18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 the said Agreement dated 30.7.1996 is binding on both the parties.

In the case of **Allied Sales Corporation Secunderabad vs.The Authority Under Andhra Pradesh..... 1990 II LLJ 510 AP para 414, Hon'ble Court have held:-**

"*4. There was a settlement between the Management and the workmen under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act on 25th April 1983 under which the age of superannuation of the workmen was fixed at 55 years. The settlement was to be in force upto 30th June 1986 and the next settlement, incorporating practically the same terms, was again entered into on 4th February 1987 under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act. There is no dispute that these settlements are under Section 18(1).*

14. Now the Authority constituted under Section 41(1) of the Act is an authority with very limited jurisdiction. It can only decide in the first appeal whether a termination by the management is valid or not and is within the parameters of Section 40 of the Act. The said Authority, in our view, has absolutely no jurisdiction to decide whether a settlement entered into under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act between the representatives of the Workmen and of the Management, is vitiated by undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion on the part of the Management. The Authority, namely, the Assistant Commissioner of Labour, was never intended by the A.P. Legislature to have jurisdiction to go into the question of the validity of a settlement arrived at under Section 18 of the Industrial Disputes Act by an Industrial Court. That Parliament has, in fact, constituted Industrial Courts under the Industrial Disputes Act, with extensive powers cannot be disputed. What we mean to say is that the Authority under Section 41(1) of the A.P. Act has no jurisdiction what-so-ever either to question or to decide about the validity of any such settlements. If parties to a settlement have a grievance about the validity of a settlement, it is for them to agitate the matter before the appropriate forum and they cannot ask an Authority constituted under Section 41(1) of the A.P. Shops and Establishments Act, 1966 with limited jurisdiction, to go into any such question and, that too, incidentally while deciding whether retirement as per the contract of employment, is legal or not."

It is not the case of Workman that aforesaid settlements are vitiated by undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion on the part of the management. If the Workman feeling aggrieved by any terms of settlement/ agreement on the aforementioned grounds then he can challenge of settlement before a competent authority under the Act, 1947. But here in the instant matter it is not a case of Workman that aforementioned settlement has been entered into between the parties on the ground of undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion. Therefore, Workman is barred to raise any objection in respect of fixing the date of lapse of both panels on 31.3.1997 as agreed between both the parties and Workman can not challenge any terms of said Agreement.

Further in the case of **Herbertsons Limited Vs. Workmen of Herbertsons Limited and Ors, 1977 AIR 322,** Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

The Tribunal thought that the question of the quantum of membership of the 2nd Respondent did not call for a finding at all in view of 1his Court's order. As observed above that was not a correct assumption. On the other hand, we feel that this view of the Tribunal has led it to approach the matter in an entirely erroneous manner. The Tribunal is, rightly enough, conscious that under section 18 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act the settlement was binding on the company and the members of the 3rd Respondent union. Even so, the Tribunal devoted nearly half of its order in scanning the evidence given by the company and Respondent No. 3 to find out whether the terms of the settlement had been explained by the President of the union to the workmen or not and whether the workers voluntarily accepted the settlement knowing all the "consequences". This to our mind is again an entirely wrong approach.

"When a recognised union negotiates with an employer the workers as individuals do not come into the picture. It is not necessary that each individual worker should know the implications of the settlement since a recognised union, which is expected to protect the legitimate interests of labour, enters into a settlement in the best interests of labour. This would be the normal rule. We cannot altogether rule out exceptional cases where there may be allegations of mala fides, fraud or even corruption or other induce- ments. Nothing of that kind has been suggested against the President of the 3rd Respondent in this case. That being the position, prima facie, this is a settlement in the course of collective bargaining and, therefore, is entitled to due weight and consideration.

It is not possible to scan the settlement in bits and pieces and hold some parts good and acceptable and others bad. Unless it can be demonstrated that the objectionable portion is such that it completely outweighs all the other advantages gained the Court will be slow to hold a settle- ment as unfair and unjust. The settlement has to be

accepted or rejected as a whole and we are unable to reject it as a whole as unfair or unjust. Even before this Court the 3rd Respondent representing admittedly the large majority of the workmen has stood by this settlement and that is a strong factor which it is difficult to ignore. As stated elsewhere in the judgment, we cannot also be oblivious of the fact that all workmen of the company have accepted the settlement. Besides, the period of settlement has since expired and we are informed that the employer and the 3rd Respondent are negotiating another settlement with further improvements. These factors, apart from what has been stated above, and the need for industrial peace and harmony when a union backed by a large majority of workmen has accepted a settlement in the course of collective bargaining have impelled us not to interfere with this settlement. That being the position, we unhold the settlement as fair and just and order that the award of the Tribunal shall be substituted by the settlement dated October 18, 1973. The said settlement shall be the substituted award. The appeal is disposed of accordingly. There will be no order as to costs."

Therefore, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above, the contention of the Workman that the date fixed for lapse of empanelled list on 31.3.1997 for appointment to the permanent post vide 5th Settlement dated 30.7.1996 is arbitrary, illegal is not untenable. The recognized union of Workmen has negotiated with the Respondent Bank Management representing large number of Workmen and the Workman as individual do not come into picture. Workman in the instant case has work as temporary Workmen in the Respondent Branch and in response of Notification he had applied for inclusion of his name in the panel and he was selected for inclusion his name in the panel list to be utilized for absorption of such Workman to permanent post in order of their seniority in the list. The Settlement dated 30.7.1996 between State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation under Sec.2(p) and Sec.18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 has clearly provided as regard non-messengerial position and it is agreed that all such posts sanctioned fallen vacant upto 31.3.1997 shall be filled before empanel list is allowed to lapse. Thus, in view of law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, in the instant case, Agreement dated 30.7.1996 was entered into between both the parties in respect of lapsing of the both the panels on 31.3.1997 and absorption of the Workmen from panel list was subject to availability of vacancy of post likely to arise upto 31.3.1997, have a binding force on Workman as well as management of State Bank of India in view of provision contained under section 18 (1) of I.D. Act, 1947.

Thus, Point No.I is answered against the Workman and in favour of the Respondent.

27. **Point No.II**:- Firstly, it is submitted on behalf of the Workman that the Respondent has terminated his services by oral order on 31.3.1997 without issuing any notice or paying any salary or compensation in lieu thereof. Therefore, the termination order of the Workman from service is in violation of provision contained Under Section 25 F of I.D. Act, 1947. Therefore, the order is liable to be set aside.

28. On the other hand, Respondent counsel contended that Workman has not worked for 240 days in any preceding calendar year. Therefore, reference of the industrial dispute is not relevant. In this context, the Workman has examined himself as WW1 who has reiterated that Workman has been terminated from service by Respondent on 31.3.1997 without notice of salary or compensation in lieu thereof. Before examining the claim of the Workman on merit it would be apposite to reproduce the provision contained under section 25 F:-

Section 25F provides:-

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].

Compensation to workmen in case of transfer of undertakings.

Section 25B defines the term continuous service which provides

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 authorized 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;

In order to prove the fact of 240 days of service within 12 months of a calendar year just preceding from the date of termination, the initial burden of proof lies upon the Workman and the Workman has to prove this factum by adducing his oral as well as documentary evidence in support of his claim.

Further, how to calculate 240 days of service by the Workman in a calendar year. In this context the reference of decisions of Hon'ble Supreme Court is relevant and the same are discussed below:-

In Rajasthan State Ganganagar S. Mills Ltd. v. State of Rajasthan and Anr. (2004) Apex Court held:

"It was the case of the Workman that he had worked for more than 240 days in the year concerned. This claim was denied by the appellant. It was for the claimant to lead evidence to show that he had worked for 240 days in the year preceding the date of his termination. He has filed an affidavit. It is statement which is in his favor and that cannot be regarded as sufficient evidence for any Court or Tribunal to come to the conclusion that in fact the claimant had worked for 240 days in a year These aspects were highlighted in Range Forest Officer v. S.T. Hadimani (2002 (3) SCC 25. No proof of receipt of salary or wages for 240 days or order or record in that regard was produced. Mere non-production of the muster roll for a particular period was not sufficient for the Labour Court held that the Workman had worked for 240 days as claimed."

In Municipal Corporation, Faridabad v. Siri Niwas (2004 (8) SCC 195), held "*the burden was on the Workman to show that he was working for more than 240 days in the preceding one year prior to his alleged retrenchment." In M.P. Electricity Board v. Hariram (2004 (8) SCC 246) the position was again reiterated in paragraph 11 as follows: "The above burden having not been discharged and the Labour Court having held so, in our opinion, the Industrial Court and the High Court erred in basing an order of reinstatement solely on an adverse inference drawn erroneously ..*"

In the case of Manager, RBI, Bangalore vs. S Mani (2005) SCC Page 100, the 3 Judges Bench of the Apex Court held that "*the initial burden of proof was on the Workman to show that he had completed 240 days of service."*

Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of Mohan Lal vs Management BEL 1981 SCC page 225 has laid down the principle that how to count 240 days of service within one year it is held: *"Clause (2)(a) provides for a fiction to treat a Workman in continuous service for a period of one year despite the fact that he has not rendered uninterrupted service for a period of one year but he has rendered period of 240 days during the period of 12 calendar service for months counting backwards and just preceding the relevant date being the date of retrenchment. In other words, in order to invoke the fiction enacted in clause (2)(a) it is necessary to determine first the relevant date, ie the date of termination of service which is complained of as retrenchment. After that date is ascertained. move backward to a period of 12 months just preceding the date of retrenchment and then ascertain whether within the period of 12 months, the Workman has rendered service for a period of 240 days. If these three facts are affirmatively answered in favor of the Workman pursuant to the deeming fiction enacted in clause (2)(a) it will have to be assumed that the Workman is in continuous service for a period of one year and he will satisfy the eligibility qualification enacted in Section 25-F"*

"14. We have already extracted section 25B since its amendment and the change in language is the legislative exposition of which note must be taken. In fact, we need not further dilate upon this aspect because in Surendra Kumar Verma and Ors. v. Central Government Industrial-cum-Labour Court, New Delhi and Anr., Chinnappa Reddy. J., after noticing the amendment and referring to the decision in Sur Enamel and Stamping Works (P) Ltd case, held as under:

"These changes brought about by Act 36 of 1964 appear to be clearly designed to provide that a Workman who has actually worked under the employer for not less than 240 days during a period of twelve months shall be deemed to have been in continuous service for a period of one year whether or not he has in fact been in such continuous service for a period of one year. It is enough that he has worked for 240 days in a period of 12 months, it is not necessary that he should have been in the service of the employer for one whole year."

In a concurring judgment Pathak J. agreed with this interpretation of section 25B(2). Therefore, both on principle and on precedent it must be held that section 25B(2) comprehends a situation where a Workman is not in employment for a period of 12 calendar months, but has rendered service for a period of 240 days within the period of 12 calendar months commencing and counting backwards from the relevant date, i.e. the date of retrenchment. If he has, he would be deemed to be in continuous service for a period of one year for the purpose of section 25B and Chapter VA."

Thus, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above the initial burden of proof lies upon the Workman to show that he has completed 240 days of the service with the Respondent just preceding from the date of his termination. Further, in respect of the employment of calculating the 240 days service in view of the contents of Section 25-F read with Section 25-B of the I.D. Act, 1947.

29. Now, in view of the provision contained under Section 25 F and law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, we have to examine whether the Workman has discharged his initial burden of proof in respect of his claim of 240 days continuous service in a calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination i.e., 31.3.1997.

In this context, WW1 in his cross examination has stated that,

"I was not sponsored by any employment exchange. I did not undergo the regular selection process required for appointment in the bank."

"I did not work for 240 days in any year in my entire service."

Thus, it is clear from the testimony of WW1 that the Workman had not worked for 240 days continuously in any 12 months of a calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination in the Respondent bank. Therefore, Workman failed to establish his plea by his oral and documentary evidence that he had worked for 240 days continuously in calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination i.e., 31.3.1997. Thus, the claim of the Workman that he has been terminated by oral order without issuing notice or payment in lieu after termination, in contravention of Section 25 F of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is not tenable. However the documents filed by the Workman in support of his claim, number of days worked with the Respondent goes to reveal that the Workman had worked intermittently as daily wager depending upon availability of work in branch. Workman did not file any document of appointment letter or salary slips in support of his claim for appointment as a non-messenger in the Respondent branch on temporary basis.

30. Per contra, the Learned Counsel for Respondent has submitted the allegation of Workman that he was terminated from services is not correct. As the vacancies were filled up on regular basis in order of their respective seniority the non-engagement of the Workman does not amount to termination. Further, Respondent contended that no law provide that even though there is no work temporary employee should be continued in the bank work as the very engagement of Workman was subject to availability of work. Therefore, the allegation that the bank has indulged in unfair labour practice is incorrect.

31. Thus, in view of the fore gone discussion and contentions made by the Respondent, I find the force in the argument advanced by the Respondent that in the instant matter, Workman was not terminated from service by order dated 31.3.1997 rather he was disengaged in view of the non-availability of the work in the branch. Further, there was direction issued by the Head Office of the Respondent authority not to engage any daily wager Workman/ temporary Worker w.e.f. 1.4.1997. Thus, such disengagement of Workman does not amount to termination. Moreover, the Workman failed to prove his claim that he was terminated in contravention of provision of Sec.25F of the I.D. Act, 1947 as he failed to establish his plea by any oral or documentary evidence that he had worked for 240 days continuously in a twelve months of calendar year just preceding from date of termination i.e., 31.3.1997.

32. Further, perusal of the order dated 25.3.1997 goes to reveal that the Chief Branch Manager, State Bank of India has issued the letter to Zonal Office with direction to all its branches to this effect that they have been advised by the DGM, Zonal Office, Hyderabad that as both the panel of temporary employees of 1989 and daily wagers/casual labour of 1992 will lapse on 31.3.1997 it has been decided by central office not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial cadre from 1.4.1997, therefore it was directed to issue suitable instructions not to make temporary appointments from 1.4.1997. There is no mention in this order that the Workman herein has been terminated from service by this order.

33. Further, the circular dated 27.3.1997 was issued by DGM, SBI to all branches in commercial network in respect of the non-appointment of temporary employees in subordinate cadre and it has directed not to make any temporary employment in the subordinate cadre with effect from 1.4.97 and further, it has directed to ensure that no temporary/casual/daily basis appointment of the petty cash. Further, it is directed to all Branch Managers that any deviation in this regard will be viewed seriously. Thus, these circulars do not reflect that the Workman has been terminated from service by this order.

34. Similarly, office order dated 31.3.1997 is simply a direction to all branches of the Respondent bank by DGM that no further daily labour should be engaged or employed. Therefore, the plea of the Workman that he has been terminated by the aforesaid order dated 25.3.1997, 27.3.1997 and 31.3.1997 from the service by the Respondent is not acceptable. The evidence adduced by the Workman clearly goes to reveal that he had worked as a daily wager for which he has been paid wages according to number of working days. As there was an order for prohibition for engaging temporary workmen, in the bank, therefore, Workman could not be engaged by the Respondent for work from 1.4.1997 and there after. It is settled law that the daily wagers are engaged by the employer depending upon the availability of work and as the work was not available the Workman was not engaged further by the Respondent management. Therefore, the Workman on the ground of number of days he had worked in the Respondent bank cannot claim any right to reinstate him into the employment. As the Workman failed to prove the mandatory condition of 240 days of continuous service as required under Sec.25F of I.D. Act, 1947. Therefore, the disengagement of Workman from work can not be termed in contravention of provision contained under Sec.25F and 25 B of the I.D. Act, 1947.

Thus, this point is answered against the Workman and in favour of Respondent.

35. **Point No.III**:- In this context, the Workman has contended that the management failed to implement the selected panels during its valid tenure. The management adopted the back door methods contrary to the settlements and filled up the vacancies. The same is evident from the proceedings dated 18.11.1993 a copy of the same is filed in the material papers and the same may be read as part of the claim statement. Further, it is submitted that management has to adhere the procedure issued by the Central Government, the instructions dated 16.8.1990 in the year 1995, but same was not followed in the year 1997 despite there being vacancies. The management has followed the procedure of calling candidates through employment exchange instead of giving chance to the empanelled candidates like the Workman herein. The management sent call letters to the similarly situated candidates like the Workman in the month of June 1997 subsequent to issuance of impugned termination orders. After knowing the fact that they are litigating the issue by way of dispute, the management has refused to engage those candidates, the copies of call letters issued are filed herein along with claim petition. The Workman herein reiterates that the panels are meant for absorption but not for termination. In view of the same a duty is cast upon the Respondent management to engage the empanelled candidates like the Workman herein even in temporary vacancies till they are absorbed permanently in regular vacancies.

36. On the other hand, Respondent has contended that the Federation approached Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) for implementation of bipartite settlement in respect of the absorption of temporary employees. The Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) conducted conciliation proceedings and agreement was arrived at between the Federation and the Management bank. It is submitted that it was agreed between the Federation and the Management that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers /casual labour would be kept alive upto March, 1997 and the vacancies as agreed to under the afore set out settlements will be filled from both the lists concurrently. A copy of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.1995 signed by the parties to the dispute is filed as a material paper. Further, it is submitted that the settlement was arrived at and an agreement was signed between the Federation and the Management bank on 30.7.1996 under Section 2(p) read with Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules 1957 which is binding on the parties. A copy of this agreement which hereinafter may be referred to as 5th settlement for brevity, is also filed as a material paper. The 5th settlement dated 30.7.1996 whereunder the earlier four settlements dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988 and 9.1.1991 were also referred, it was agreed to, by the Federation and the Management bank that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees will be kept alive upto March, 1997 for filling the vacancies existing/arrived at as on 31.12.1994 as per the norms agreed to between the bank and Federation and that thereafter the said panels would lapse. It was also agreed that within the framework of the above settlements the modalities about drawing names from either the panel of temporary employees or the panel of daily wagers and casual labour would be decided administratively on circle to circle basis depending upon the local requirements in consultation with the Federation's affiliate by the Circle management. It was further agreed that all messenger real vacancies/positions in the subordinate cadre including part-time attendants specifically provided as leave reserve will be filled by the end of 31.3.1997. Further, Respondent contended that on 27.2.1997 a memorandum of understanding was also signed between the Federation's affiliate and the bank management regarding the fact that the exercise of identifying the messengerial vacancies as on 31.12.1994 has since been completed by central office and thereby 403 messengerial vacancies were sanctioned to the circle of the Management bank and it was agreed that these vacancies may be filled from 1989 panel of temporary employees after effecting conversion from full time non-messengerial staff in the usual manner and the agreement was reached upon. Further, it was agreed between the Federations affiliate and the management bank that in terms of the settlement dated 30.7.1996 both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers /casual employees would lapse on 31.3.1997.

37. The Workman has contended that the empanelled list prepared by the Respondent management for appointment of temporary and daily wage Workers to the permanent post cannot lapse unless until it is exhausted by appointing all the empanelled persons and it should continue even after 31.3.1997, i.e., the date fixed for the lapse of panel. It is undisputed that the date of lapse of empanelled list of Workmen has been fixed to 31.3.1997 as mentioned in the settlement dated 30.7.1996, and agreed between the parties. It is settled law that and once the life of panel list lapses on the date as agreed between the parties it cannot be extended beyond that date. In the instant case the panel list of the workmen was valid upto 31.3.1997 in view of the terms and conditions enumerated in the 5th Settlement entered into between the parties. As the lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997 has been agreed by State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation through 5th Settlement, the Workman is not competent to challenge the same.

In this context I would like to take reference of the decision of the apex court in the case of **Syndicate Bank and Ors vs. Shankar Paul and Ors , AIR 1997 SC 3091, therein the Hon'ble Apex Court** have held:-

"Till 1982, the branches of the appellant Bank in Calcutta region were recruiting persons locally to work as temporary attenders in leave vacancies. In view of the revised procedure prescribed by the Government of India in respect of such temporary appointments, the Calcutta regional office of the appellant Bank issued a circular to all of its branches on 14.8.1982, instructing all the branches under it to discontinue the old practice from 1.6.1982 and

appoint only empanelled candidates. The regional office was to prepare a panel of eligible candidates, after calling names from the local/district employment exchange, and split it up branch-wise. Following that new procedure yearly panels were prepared thereafter. Names of the Respondents were for the first time included in the panel prepared for the period 7.2.1987 to 6.2.1988. By its letter dated 7.2.1987 the Bank had informed the Respondents that the panel was valid for one year only and that inclusion of their names in the panel was not to confer on them any right to seek permanent appointment in the service of the bank. Considering the object with which the panel was prepared and the fact that it was an yearly panel expiring on 6.2.1988, we are of the opinion that the Respondents did not get any right, because of inclusion of their names in the said panel, for permanent absorption in the service of the Bank. Whatever conditional right they had came to an end with the expiry of the panel. The claim of the Respondents, as contained in the writ petition was thus misconceived and therefore the learned single Judge and the Division Bench, when it first decided the appeal, were right in dismissing the writ petition and the appeal respectively."

Thus, in view of the above law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court and in view of the terms and conditions of the 5th Settlement the contention of the Workman that empanelled list should continue even after 31.3.1997 till the last Workman in the panel is absorbed is not tenable. The contention of the Workman is baseless in view of recital in the settlement. Therefore, in view of the fore gone discussion and finding given at Point No. I regarding binding nature of Settlements and terms and conditions enumerated therein, in view of the provision contained u/s.18(1) of the I.D. Act, 1947, I am of the considered view that life of panels lapsed on 31.3.1997 in view of terms of settlement dated 30.7.1996 and plea of Workman that the panel shall continue even after 31.3.1997 till last man absorbed has no legal force and same is untenable.

38. Undisputedly, settlement agreement dated 30.7.1996 was executed between the State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation and in that settlement it was agreed that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/ casual employees will be used for filling vacancies existing as on 31.12.1994 as per the norms agreed between the bank and the Federation. These empanelled workmen were to be given a chance for permanent appointment in the bank against vacancies arising up to December 1994 whereas the daily wagers/ casual employees were to be considered against the vacancies arise from January 1995 to December 1996, whereby the said panel would lapse. It was agreed that the vacancies falls upto 31.3.1997 shall be filled before the empanelled list is allowed to lapse. Thus, the claim of the Workman to the post of permanent non-messenger in the Respondent management was subject to the availability of the sanctioned post and vacancies arising upto 31.3.1997. The workmen given chance to the permanent post were seniors in number of working days in panel list and Workman herein was junior to those workmen. Therefore, Workman could not be given absorption to permanent post being junior to other workmen in the panel list.

39. In this context the Workman witness WW1 was cross examined by the Respondent counsel and in the cross examination the witness WW1 states:-

"I applied in response to the notification issued by the bank as per the settlements..... Further, witness states, *"It is true that some of persons whose names were included in the panel were given regular appointment as per the settlements in the order of their seniority in number of days....* Further witness states, *I am not having any documents to show that any person who had worked for less number of days than me was given regular appointment in the bank."*

Thus, from the above statement of the Workman witness WW1 it is clear that the panel was prepared in terms of various settlements entered into between Staff Federation of State Bank of India and State Bank of India and it was prepared on the basis of number of days of work put in by the temporary employees. Further, the Workman himself admitted that some of the temporary employees whose names were included in the panel were given regular appointment in the bank in order of their seniority in the panel and he is not having any document to show that any person who worked for less number of days than the Workman was given appointment in the bank. Therefore, the allegation of the Workman that the regular appointment has been made by the bank from the panel list in breach of the terms of the settlement and violation of seniority of panel list is not proved by this evidence of WW1. Thus, there is no evidence on record that bank has given the appointment to the temporary employees as well as daily wagers from the panel list 1989 and 1992 in breach of seniority of the temporary employees in the list. There is no evidence of jumbling in the panel list to make appointment of any permanent Workman in breach of the seniority. Therefore, I am constrained to hold that the Respondent Management has appointed the workmen from panel list in order of seniority and there is no jumbling of workmen in the panel list before it got lapsed on 31.3.1997.

40. However, Workman has taken the plea that the panels of Workmen for absorption in the employment of the Respondent banks (panels of temporary employees and daily wagers) has been lapsed on 31.3.1997 in contravention of terms of settlement as the object of preparing the entire empanelment of temporary and daily wagers was to provide them permanent employment and till the both the panel lists exhausted the panel list cannot be lapsed on 31.3.1997 and the date of lapsing of the panel on 31.3.1997 has been fixed by the Respondent arbitrarily without any authority.

41. In this context, the perusal of Settlement dated 30.7.1996 reveals that the 5th Settlement dated 30.7.1996 was entered under Section 2(p) and 18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Dispute (Central) Rules

1957. This settlement has been entered into by the competent parties and in this settlement parties thereto agreed that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees will lapse on 31.3.1997. Thus the date of lapse of panel was fixed by both the parties with consensus under the settlement dated 30.7.1996 and same is binding upon the Workman under the provision of Section 18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947. Moreover, this issue of binding force of the settlement dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988 and 9.1.1991 has already been discussed, decided at finding in Point No.I of this award. However, the legality and validity of the aforementioned settlement has not been challenged by the Workman before any competent forum. Thus, claim of Workman that the date of lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997 has been fixed arbitrarily by the Respondent bank is untenable. As regard the claim of Workman for his absorption to the permanent post it is settled law that the Workman can not claim his regularization to permanent post merely on the basis of number of working days.

42. In this context the reference of the decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Oil and Natural Gas Corporation vs Krishan Gopal 2020(3) SCALE 272, date of decision 7.2.2020** is relevant therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have has laid down principle regarding regularization of the Workman on permanent posts. Hon'ble Supreme Court have laid down the prepositions of regularization of the workmen to permanent post is as under:-

"*(i) Wide as they are, the powers of the Labour Court and the Industrial Court cannot extend to a direction to order regularisation, where such a direction would in the context of public employment offend the provisions contained in Article 14 of the Constitution;*

(ii) The statutory power of the Labour Court or Industrial Court to grant relief to workmen including the status of permanency continues to exist in circumstances where the employer has indulged in an unfair labour practice by not filling up permanent posts even though such posts are available and by continuing to employ workmen as temporary or daily wage employees despite their performing the same work as regular workmen on lower wages;

(iii) The power to create permanent or sanctioned posts lies outside the judicial domain and where no posts are available, a direction to grant regularisation would be impermissible merely on the basis of the number of years of service;

(iv) Where an employer has regularised similarly situated workmen either in a scheme or otherwise, it would be open to workmen who have been deprived of the same benefit at par with the workmen who have been regularised to make a complaint before the Labour or Industrial Court, since the deprivation of the benefit would amount to a violation of Article 14; and

(v) In order to constitute an unfair labour practice under Section 2(ra) read with Item 10 of the Vth Schedule of the ID Act, the employer should be engaging workmen as badlis, temporaries or casuals, and continuing them for years, with the object of depriving them of the benefits payable to permanent workmen.

Thus, in view of the principles laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court as discussed above, in the instant matter the Workman utterly failed to prove his claim by adducing any documentary or oral evidence that the employer has indulged in unfair labour practice by not filling the permanent posts even though such posts are available and by continuing to employ workmen as temporary or daily wage employees despite their performance was the same work, as regular workmen on lower wages.

43. Respondent has contended that all the vacancies exist and arise upto 31.3.1997 has been filled up from the panel list in order of seniority and no vacancy exists or arises as on 31.3.1997 remained unfilled. Further, it is contended that as per terms of settlement the life of panel lists has been lapsed on 31.3.1997, hence, there is no occasion to extend the life of panel lists beyond 31.3.1997. However, the workman failed to prove contrary by any evidence to the aforesaid contention of the Respondent that the vacancies were existing as on 31.3.1997 and the workman was not given absorption to the permanent post in order of his seniority. It is settled law that the power to create permanent or sanctioned post lies outside the judicial domain and where no posts are available, a direction to grant regularization would be impermissible merely on the basis of the number of years of service. Therefore, the claim of the workman on this ground also not acceptable.

44. Further, as per the of settlement, panel was prepared for absorption of the workmen on the permanent posts has already been lapsed on 31.3.1997 and the vacancies existing and arising upto 31.12.1994 and upto 31.3.1997 as settlement dated 30.7.1996 has been filled up from the panel by appointing the workmen as per seniority in the panel list. Workman witness WW1 in his cross examination has himself admitted this fact that, some of the temporary employees whose names were included in the panel were given regular appointment in the bank in order of their seniority in the panel. The Workman failed to show that there was any breach of terms of settlement has been committed by the Respondent in appointment to permanent post from aforesaid panel list.

45. As discussed in preceding paragraph of this Award, the life of the panel has not been extended beyond 31.3.1997, by any further settlement hence, the panel list in which name of the Workman was included got expired on 31.3.1997. It is not the case of the Workman that Respondent has regularized similarly situated workmen either in the scheme or otherwise and the Workman has been deprived of same benefit on par with those workmen or the vacancies remained unfilled on the date of lapse of panels i.e., 31.3.1997, Industrial Tribunal has no jurisdiction to

extend the date of lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997. This Tribunal can not order for regularization of workmen to the permanent post in contravention of the provision of Article 14 of the Constitution of India.

In the case of **Mahboob Deepak vs. Nagar Panchayat Gajraula & Anr, Civil Appeal No.5875/2007 date of judgement 13.12.2007,** Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

"8. Respondent is a Local Authority. The terms and conditions of employment of the employees are governed by a statute and statutory rules. No appointment can be made by a Local Authority without following the provisions of the recruitment rules. Any appointment made in violation of the said rules as also the constitutional scheme of equality as contained in Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India would be a nullity.

9. Due to some exigency of work, although recruitment on daily wages or on an ad hoc basis was permissible, but by reason thereof an employee cannot claim any right to be permanently absorbed in service or made permanent in absence of any statute or statutory rules. Merely because an employee has completed 240 days of work in a year preceding the date of retrenchment, the same would not mean that his services were liable to be regularized."

Therefore, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, the claim of the Workman for absorption merely on the basis of number of day of work in the Respondent bank Branch is not acceptable. As regard plea of the Workman that the Workman should have been given employment even after 31.3.1997 as temporary Workman, it is the discretion of Respondent to engage the Workman depending upon availability of work and this Tribunal can not direct the Respondent to engage the Workman in the absent of such rule/scheme.

46. In view of principle laid down by Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above, in the instant matter Workman utterly failed to establish the fact of rendering continuous service for a period of 240 days of service within a period of 12 calendar months commencing and coming backward from relevant date i.e., the date of retrenchment, if has he would be denied to be in continuous service for a period of one year. Therefore, the provision contained under Sec.25F of retrenchment is not applicable to Workman.

Counsel for Workman has relied upon number of decisions of Hon'ble High Court and Hon'ble Supreme Court and few of them are discussed herein:-

In the case of **F.C.I., vs. Kamdhenu Cattle Feed Industries 1993 (1) SCC 71,** therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

"7. In contractual sphere as in all other State actions, the State and all its instrumentalities have to conform to Article 14 of the Constitution of which non-arbitrariness is a significant facet. There is no unfettered discretion in public law: A public authority possesses powers only to use them for public good. This impose the duty to act fairly and to adopt a procedure which is `fairplay in action'. Due observance of this obligation as a part of good administration raises a reasonable or legitimate expectation in every citizen to be treated fairly in his interaction with the State and its instrumentalities, with this element forming a necessary component of the decision making process in all State actions. To satisfy this requirement of non- arbitrariness in a State action, it is, therefore, necessary to consider and give due weight to the reasonable or legitimate expectations of the persons likely lo be affected by the decision or else that unfairness in the exercise of the power may amount to an abuse or excess of power apart from affecting the bona fides of the decision in a given case. The decision so made would be exposed to challenge on the ground of arbitrariness. Rule of law does not completely eliminate discretion in the exercise of power, as it is unrealistic, but providers for control of its exercise by judicial review."

In the case of **State Bank of India, R.O., Vijayawada vs. Industrial Tribunal, Hyderabad WP No.193/1997,** therein Hon'ble High Court have held,

"*Sri Krovvidi Narasimham, the learned counsel for the 2nd respondent contends, supporting the award that it was a permanent vacancy and even though the 2nd respondent was appointed on temporary basis, his services were not liable to be terminated and he was to be regularised into service on permanent basis. Shastry award warrants that no temporary appointment can be made to a permanent post. But the matter is now covered by two division bench judgements dated 28.11.1986 in W.A. No.791 of 1986 and 25.8.1987 in W.A. No.270 of 1982. The ratio decided in the two judgements is to the effect that there cannot be any mandate to appoint employees on permanent basis when the requirement was for appointment on temporary basis. But it is held in the said judgements that when a temporary appointee is ousted from service and not for misconduct and, if again temporary appointment is to be made, then, the case of such temporary appointee who was ousted, has got to be considered in accordance with Sec. 25-H of the Act."*

In the case of **State of Haryana and others vs. Piara Singh and others. 1992 (4) SCC 118,** therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

" 49. If for any reason an adhoc or temporary employee is continued for a fairly long spell, the authorities must consider his case for regularization provided he is eligible and qualified according to the rules and his service record is satisfactory and his appointment does not run counter to the reservation policy of the state."

In the above cited judgements by the Workman the facts of the case are different hence do not apply to instant case of Workman.

47. On the other hand, in support of his contention Respondent has examined witness MW1 and MW1 in chief examination states that, Settlements i.e., on 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988, 9.1.1991 were entered into between the SBI and SBI Staff Federation for filling up of the vacancies that arise up to 1994 for those temporary employees who has worked on scale wages. Further, MW1 states that two different panels for messengers and non-messengers as per the eligibility criteria prescribed by the bank. There are four modules in Andhra Pradesh and they are Hyderabad, Tirupathi, Vijayawada and Visakhapatnam. MW1 states that the temporary employees so empanelled were given permanent absorption depending upon the vacancies so arise strictly in terms of the settlement. MW1 states that on 9.6.1995 conciliation proceeding was held before the RLC(C), Hyderabad and in said proceedings it was decided that the panels will be kept live up to 31.3.1997 and vacancies will be filled from both the lists concurrently. A copy of the said minutes of proceedings is Ex.M5. Further, MW1 states that on 30.7.1996 another settlement was entered between the SBI and All India SBI Staff Federation providing for filling up of the vacancies arising up to December 1994 in respect of subordinate cadre and daily wage /casual wage employees out of panel so prepared were to be considered against vacancies arising from January 1995 to December 1996, thereafter the said panels lapse. MW1 states that it was also agreed that all the non- messenger positions in subordinate cadre including part time attendants specially provided as leave reserve will be filled before 31.3.1997 and as regards to non-messengerial positions it is agreed that all such posts sanctioned and fallen vacant up to 31.3.1997 shall be filled before the empanelled list is allowed to lapse. Thus in both the cases empanelled list were lapsed on 1.4.1997. Ex.M6 is the copy of the settlement dated 30.7.1996. Further, witness states that on 27.2.1997 a memorandum of understanding was reached between the SBI and SBI Staff Federation providing that both the panels above mentioned will lapse on 31.3.1997. Ex.M7 is the copy of the memorandum of understanding and Ex.M8 is the copy of the statements giving the particulars of 1989 non-messenger panel, Ex.M9 is the copy of the statement of 1989 non-messenger panel, Ex.M10 is the copy of statement of 1992 panel. Further, witness states that petitioner was included in the 1989 panel. As the existing vacancies at that time were exhausted and his turn did not come he could not be given permanent employment in the bank as per the agreements. All the appointments were made strictly in accordance with the settlements reached from time to time between SBI and SBI staff federation and as per seniority, number of days of temporary service put in by them in the bank in the given period. Further, MW1 states petitioner was not sponsored by any employment exchange he did not undergo the regular process of selection required for appointment as a regular non-messenger the petitioner has not worked for 240 days in any year in his entire temporary service in the bank. The petitioner and other temporary employees were terminated from service by the bank. Further, MW1 states that the vacancies were filled up on regular basis with the temporary employees from the panels and these panels were expired in terms of the settlements so reached and there were no vacancies to absorb such employees. Thus, witness MW1 has proved the documents Ex.M1 to Ex.M12 and also contentions made in the counter. However, MW1 was cross examined by the Petitioner Counsel. But nothing has been elicited in his cross examination so as to discredit the testimony of the witness MW1 as regards the date of lapse of both the panels on 31.3.1997 and reasons assigned for non-absorption of the Petitioner from the panel list to the permanent post. Moreover the witness MW1 was re-examined by the Respondent and the witness MW1 states that panels were expired in terms of the settlement send absorptions to the extent of the available vacancies were made. There was no termination of any temporary messenger as such but their services were not utilized after the cut off date as the available vacancies were already filled up and most of these Petitioners were not in the service of the bank as on the date of the expiry date of the panels. Therefore, in view of the aforesaid testimony of the MW1 in re-examination in the absence of cross examination remained uncontraverted, the claim of the Workman that he was entitled for absorption in permanent post in the branch of Respondent Management on the basis of panel list is found not established.

This point is answered against the Workman.

48. **Point No.IV**:- In view of the discussion and finding given at Point Nos. I, II and III, the Workman is not entitled for any relief and claim statement of Workman sans merit and liable to be dismissed.

This Point is answered accordingly.

AWARD

In view of the fore gone discussion, it is held that the action of the Respondent bank in terminating the services of Sri Vandrangi Venkataramana, Ex. Messenger by way of oral orders w.e.f. 23.3.1997 is justified. Hence, the Petitioner is not entitled for any relief as prayed for. The claim statement filed by Workman sans merit, hence, dismissed.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, Personal Assistant, transcribed by her, corrected and signed by me on this the 18th day of May, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner	Witnesses examined for the Respondent
WWI: Sri Vandrangi Venkataramana	MWI: Sri C.R.M. Sastry

Documents marked for the Petitioner

Ex.W1:	Photocopy of Service certificates
Ex. W2:	Photocopy of employment notification
Ex.W3:	Photocopy of letter to CGM (Per) dated 10.10.1990
Ex.W4:	Photocopy of the letter from Government of India reg. recruitment and absorption of temporary employees dt. 19.8.90
Ex.W5:	Photocopy of the letter from Government of India to Respondent dt.30.11.87.

Documents marked for the Respondent

Ex.M1:	Photocopy of printed book containing settlement between the staff federation and Management for regularization of services of the temporary employees and casual employees.

नई दिल्ली, 27 जुलाई, 2026

का.आ. 1685.— औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार भारतीय स्टेट बैंक के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजको और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण – सह – श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद के पंचाट (सन्दर्भ संख्या 149/2002) को प्रकाशित करती है,

[सं. एल. 39025/01/2026–आई.आर.(बी–II)-75]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 27th July, 2026

S.O. 1685.— In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (.No.LC.149/2002) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Hyderabad as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the Management of State Bank of India and their workmen,

[No. L-39025/01/2026- IR (B-II)- 75]

SALONI, Dy. Director

In The Central Government Industrial Tribunal Cum Labour Court At Hyderabad

Present: **Sri IRFAN QAMAR**

Presiding Officer

Dated the 9th day of June, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. 149/2002

[Old ID No. 269/2000 of Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Guntur]

Between:

Sri M.J. Prasantha Rao

S/o China Hanumaiah,

Lingamguntla,

Narasaraopet,

Guntur District. …..Petitioner

1. The Chairman,
   State Bank of India,
   Central office,
   Mumbai.
2. The Chief General Manager,
   (Personnel)
   State Bank of India,
   Bank Street
   Hyderabad-500 095.
3. The Regional Asst. General Manager,
   State Bank of India,
   Zonal Office, Vijayawada Zone,
   Vijayawada.
4. The Branch Manager,
   State Bank of India,
   Narasaraopet branch(ADB),
   Guntur district. ……..Respondents

Appearances:

For the Petitioner: Sri Macherla Rangaiah, Advocate

For the Respondent: Sri Y. Ranjeeth Reddy, Advocate

AWARD

Sri M.J. Prasantha Rao who worked as Messenger (who will be referred to as the workman) has filed this petition under Sec. 2A(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 against the Respondents State Bank of India seeking for reinstatement into service as Messenger/Sweeper duly granting all the consequential benefits such as continuity of service, back wages and all other attendant benefits etc., and such other reliefs as this court may deem fit. Earlier, Petitioner has filed this dispute before the Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Guntur for adjudication and later the same has been transferred to this Tribunal bearing ID No. 269/2000, as per orders of Central Government vide Lr.No.H-11026/1/2001IR(C.II) dated 18.10.2001 and registered, numbered in this Tribunal as LC No. 149/2002.

2. Before unfolding the factual matrix of the instant industrial dispute it would be apposite to have a bird eye view of a chequered history of the instant industrial dispute. Earlier instant industrial dispute along with the batch cases was decided by this Tribunal vide common award dated 17.5.2005 and the reference was answered in favour of the Respondent and against the Workman. That said common award dated 17.5.2005 was challenged by the aggrieved Workmen in various Writ petition No.6470/2014 along with batch of writ petitions before the Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh and Hon'ble High Court vide its' judgement dated 23.6.2014 allowed all batch of writ petitions and set aside the common award dated 17.5.2005 passed in ID No.222 of 2001 and other batch of ID cases by Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad and the Respondent management of State Bank of India was directed to reengage the Writ Petitioners in position, which they have been occupying prior to their termination and further directed to consider their cases for regularization as and when the substantive vacancy arises. This judgement dated 23.6.2014 of Hon'ble High Court of AP, passed in WP No.6470/2014 and batch petitions was challenged by Respondent management before the Hon'ble High Court in Writ Appeal No. 1268 of 2014. The aforesaid Writ Appeals No.1268/2014 and other Writ Appeals were decided by Division Bench of High Court of Andhra Pradesh by a common judgement dated 20.3.2019. Hon'ble High Court in aforesaid Writ Appeal was pleased to pass the order which is extracted as below:-

" 7. Hearing the learned senior counsel for the SBI and the learned senior counsel for the contesting unofficial Respondents, we see that while the learned single Judge was justified in setting aside the award af the Tribunal, the

proper course to be adopted was to remit all the cases to the Tribunal. This we say for reasons more than one. Firstly, in such matters, claims have to be decided on individual basis, as different persons have different claims as to the length of officiation or discharge of duties and functions; quality of engagement, drawings, accounting of the post for each one of them, who have worked etc. AIl these issues will not be the same in all the cases. Therefore, each case ought to have been directed to be decided by the Tribunal afresh on individual basis. The second and most important aspect is the learned single Judge has in one go ordered re-employment of all the workmen. This is not a relief that could have been granted without answering the individual issues; each issue relating to each case could not have been decided by the writ Court within the format of its adjudication procedures and scope. The adjudicating body, which has to do that activity, is the Industrial Tribunal. Therefore, we are of the view that while we would sustain the order of the learned singe Judge insofar as it interfered and sets aside the award of the Tribunal, the further findings and directions, issued through the impugned order have to go and the individual cases have to be sent back for consideration of the Tribunal. Such further procedure before the Tribunal will have to be carried forward with the materials already on record and also by affording an opportunity to the persons, who have claims as well as the management to place their rival contentions and further material before the Tribunal. The learned counsel appearing for the workmen are justified in pointing out that enormous delay has already happened and further action by the Tribunal in this line may be expedited.

9. In the result, these writ appeals are ordered;

(1) affirming the impugned common order of the learned single Judge to the extent it sets aside the common award dated 17.05.2005 of the Industrial Tribunal;

(2) the further findings and directions issued through the impugned common order are vacated:

(3) all the matters shall be remitted to the Industrial Tribunal with a direction to dispose of them within an outer limit of five (5) months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order; and,

(4) the parties to make appearance before the Tribunal on the given date."

Thus, in view of the above direction of Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh in W.A.No.1268 of 2014 and batch cases. This Tribunal has taken up the matter of industrial dispute for hearing and deciding it afresh in view of the aforesaid guidelines laid down by the Hon'ble High Court in Writ Appeal No.1268/2014 vide judgement dated 20.3.019.

3. The factual matrix of instant industrial dispute as narrated by the Workman in his claim statement are that, the Workman joined in the service of the management institution as Sweeper from 1981 to 1996, and has rendered unblemished service spreading over a period of about 7 years. The Respondent has terminated services of Workman by oral orders with effect from 1.4.1997. Further, it is submitted that the management of Respondent bank decided to give a chance to temporarily employed personnel "found suitable for permanent appointment" by wait- listing them by offering permanent appointment or waitlisting till such opportunity arises.

4. That on 17.11.1987 a settlement was reached between All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and the Management of State Bank of India - settlement one, under this settlement three categories of employees were listed. That is, A) those who have completed 240 days in 12 months or less after 1.7.1975. B) those who have completed 270 days in any continuous block of 36 calendar months after 1.7.1975. C) (i) those who have completed minimum of 30 days aggregate temporary service in any calendar year after 1.7.1975 or (ii) 70 days aggregate temporary service in continuous block of 36 months after 1.7.1975.

5. The persons who satisfied in all the above 4 categories were to be interviewed by a selection committee and the said selection committee would determine the suitability of the said candidate for permanent appointment. Therefore, the bank prescribed certain qualifications and from among the candidates satisfying the qualifications the suitable candidates were enlisted by a selection committee. The Clause 7 of the said agreement provided with the selected candidate would be wait listed in order of their respective categorization and the selected panel would be valid upto December, 1991. Clause 10 of the settlement specifically provided that henceforth. "there will be no temporary appointments in the subordinate cadre", except on a restrictive basis in the specified category, "from amongst empanelled candidates as per existing guidelines of the bank". The Workman further submits that consequent upon the said agreement and the draft, a notification was issued in the newspapers. The last date for responding to the advertisement was 30.8.1988. A written examination followed by viva-voce in May, 1989 was held. A selected panel was prepared, as per Clause 7 of the agreement, ie. Settlement No.1, the selected panel was to be valid upto December, 1991, the Workman submits that circular was issued on 26.4.91 by the said letter it is mentioned that the terms of the agreement dated 17.11.87 was modified vide second agreement dated 16.7.88 was entered into between the parties. In terms of the said agreement a chance was to be given, "to all eligible temporary employees for permanent appointments. The appointments were against the vacancies likely to arise during the years 1995-96, circular made it clear that in view of the enormity of the problem an extension of the currency of the panel, eligible temporary employees who have been empanelled could not appear in the earlier interviews and have been pursuing their cases thereafter, "will be given another chance to appear for interview".

6. Workman submits that there were total five settlements. The settlement dated 17.11.87 is the 1st settlement (Ex M1), settlement dated 16.7.88 is 2nd settlement (Ex M2), settlement dated 27.10.88 is the 3rd settlement (Ex M3), then settlement dated 9.1.91 is 4th settlement and settlement dated 30.7.96 is 5th settlement (Ex M6). In between there is minutes of conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.95 marked as Ex M5. That due to all these settlements which were extended by subsequent settlements thereby created reasonable expectations in the list of the selected candidates arose with that it's a question of time their appointments or services would be regularized in the services of the bank. The Workman was working with the bank on temporary basis was under the bonafide hope that sooner his services will be regularized with the bank. He is thereby closed all his options elsewhere. It is needless to point out that employing person to whom hope of employment in substantial terms was made is a facet of Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

7. Further Workman submits that the Government of India issued Circular No. F-3/3/104/87-IR, dated 16.8.1990. Under said circular the chief Executives of all public sector banks including the Management herein were specifically instructed that until the problem of existing temporary employees is fully resolved, no bank is permitted to make any permanent appointments. That some of the persons similarly situated like this Workman aggrieved by the inaction on the part of the management of the bank is not regularizing their services from out of the selected panel and not clearly focusing the vacancy position, filed W.P. No. 4194/97 before Hon'ble High court of A.P.. It is specifically averred in the said writ petition that the Management of the bank had failed to implement the settlement and that it violates the various fundamental rights guaranteed under the constitution of India. The Hon'ble High court of A.P .. by order dated 5.3.97 directed the bank to implement the settlement as amended from time to time. It also directed the bank to carry out the terms of settlement before the expiry of March, 1997. The Hon'ble High Court also recorded finding that the Bank cannot escape its liability of enforcement of the Settlement. In view of the directions given by the High Court all candidates whose names appeared in the select panels prepared on the basis of the agreement entered into on 17.11.87 under which the panel was valid upto December, 1991, and on the basis of a settlement dated 27.10.1988 whereby the panels were made alive upto 31.3.1997 under which the panel was valid upto December, 1999. The other agreement dated 16.7.1988 under which the panel was valid upto 1992 and on the basis of the settlement dated 27.10.1998 whereby the panels were made alive upto 31.3.1997 were under the bonafide impression that their cases will be considered for regularization and were living on the basis of the said reasonable expectation. Unfortunately, contrary to the aforesaid directions given by the High Court and contrary to the settlements entered into between the parties, the bank issued proceedings dated 25.3.1997, dated 27.3.1997 and 31.3.1997 instructing the various authorities of the Management not to continue the temporary employees those who are in services of the bank from 1.4.97. The said order was followed by the Management. Aggrieved by the said action the Workman herein and similarly situated candidates have filed a writ petition before the Hon'ble High Court and by way of Writ Petition No.9206/97 seeking a declaration that the proceedings issued by the Deputy General Manager and the Assistant General Manager (Respondents 3,4 and 5 therein) on 25.3.97, 27.3.97 and 31.3.97 as illegal and also non-continuance of the Workmen therein in service by absorbing them in the services of the bank as violative of Section 2(p) and 18(1) read with Rule 58 of Central Rules and sought for specific direction to the bank to absorb them in service.

8. Further, Workman submits that in the counter affidavit filed in Writ Petition No.9206/97, the bank has submitted that it has about 805 branches in Andhra Pradesh alone. It has stated that due to exigencies of circumstances and on account of the urgent need in its banks, it employed temporary employees in subordinate cadre. It is pertinent to mention that it does not state the urgent or need or the nature of temporary employees that it had engaged. Enquiry into the same would reveal that the stand taken by the bank either on the ground of urgent need or of temporary employees is a façade to perpetuate unfair labour practice. It is designed to on the one hand, keep the employed in the erroneous zone of hope and on the other to ensure that benefits that a model employer will extend under various statutes to its employees is not required to be borne out by the bank. A reading of the counter affidavit would show that the bank would opines that being just fair and reasonable are which obviously is reprehensible and is a facet of unfair labour practice.

9. The Workman submits that the bank had referred in its counter affidavit to three settlements dated 17.11.87, 16.7.88 and 27.10.88. The bank in the guise of extending the benefits of the circular of Government dated 16.8.90 stated in its counter affidavit that as follows:

"Government of India, vide its letter dated 16.8.1990, issued guidelines to all the public sector banks with regard to recruitment and absorption of temporary employees in public sector banks. The said guidelines were issued to implement on the lines of the approach paper on the issue provided by a committee constituted in this regard. The Government of India guidelines made it clear that all the public sector banks may follow the provisions laid down in the approach paper.

The approach paper specified that the cases of temporary employees who had put in not less than 240 days of temporary service in 12 consecutive Months and who are entitled to benefit of Section 25-F may be decided by entering into a settlement with the representative union. In respect of temporary employees who had put in less than 240 days of service in 12 consecutive months or less, a settlement could be avoided and however if the Management

so desired, they could enter into a conciliation settlement with the representative union. Para 6(h), it is mentioned that only those temporary employees who had put in temporary service of 90 or more days after 1.1 1982 would be eligible for considering under the scheme. Although the Government guidelines envisaged for a settlement in respect of employees who had put in temporary service of 90 or more days, the bank by way of further concession entered into settlements Even in respect of those who had put in less than 90 days. As such, it could be Seen that the settlements are more beneficial to the temporary employees concerned. The approach paper also specify at para 6(c) that the banks would provide one time opportunity to all the temporary employees and for that purpose temporary employees worked in the bank on or after 1.1.1982 could be considered for re-employment in terms of the scheme. The Respondents have gone further wherein even persons working after 1975 were also considered.

As could be seen from the above, there was a genuine effort on the part of the Respondent bank to provide permanent employment for as many as possible subject to availability of the vacancies.

It is further submitted that at para 6(k) of the approach paper, it was made clear that this would be one time exercise in full and final settlement of all the aims and disputes for the past period in respect of temporary workmen covered by the settlement. This would mean that the Government of India guidelines would cover only those persons who were temporarily employed for the period specified therein and not otherwise. As such, it is submitted that the Respondents have not only followed the Government of India guidelines but in fact covered cases of the employees who had worked for less than 90 days. As such, question of violation does not arise and in any case those were only broad guidelines and not directives".

10. The Workman submits that the bank also referred a subsequent settlement dated 9.1.1991 wherein there is a clause to the effect- that the panel of temporary employees and the panel of daily wage employees will be operated to a particular period. Therefore, their cases will not be considered. The Management herein relying upon this settlement in their impugned action. It is submitted that even the settlement dated 9.1.1991 will not empower the management to terminate the services of the temporary employees who are working in the bank services like the Workman herein as it does not specify the termination of the employees. In fact there are so many vacancies wherein the Management has engaged several new persons as temporary messengers/ attendars/ sweepers etc., even after the judgment of Hon'ble High Court without considering the cases of the similarly situated candidates like the Workman herein. It is submitted inspite of engaging fresh candidates as is now being done by the Management they would have continued the similarly situated candidates like the Workman herein in the services of the bank and consider their cases for absorption in view of the circulars issued by Central Government as well as the directions of this Hon'ble Court in Writ Petition No.4194/97, dated 5.3.97. In view of the circulars issued by the Central Government, the Management should not have relied upon the settlement dated 9.1.1991. Hence, the impugned action of the Management is illegal, unjust, violative of fundamental rights such as Articles 14,16 and 21 of the Constitution of India.

11. The Workman submits that in W.P. No.4194/97 filed by the union of temporary employees where in they have complained about the non- implementation of the settlements arrived between the parties and sought for absorption. Such employees in the bank services on permanent basis before the date fixed for carrying out the terms of settlement, the Court held that the members of the union had been empanelled in the list, they were not regularized and the time was going to run out to the near future and the Respondent bank and its officers cannot escape from the liability of enforcing the settlement which has been reached and therefore directed that the bank and the officers shall implement the settlement dated 17.11.87 as amended from time to time before the expiry of 31.3.97.

12. Further, it is submitted that in the clause of Settlement it is specifically mentioned that the workmen to be absorbed/appointed in the bank prohibiting any temporary appointments subsequent to the date of settlement even the authorities want to make temporary appointments that should be made only from among the empanelled can be appointed either for temporary vacancy or permanent vacancy except from among the empanelled candidates like the Workman and that should be continued till they are absorbed. The management committed unfair labour practices and terminated the services of the candidates with effect from 1.4.1997 which is arbitrary, discriminatory, contrary to their own guidelines and violative of the constitutional provisions which are guaranteed in Chapter-III of the Constitution of India.

13. The Workman submits that it is strange as to how the panels were allowed to lapse by a so-called Memorandum of Understanding dated 25.2.1997, that the action of terminating such employees like the Workman by virtue of an impugned oral proceedings without implementing the settlement would be illegal and unfair labour practice which cannot be allowed to be perpetuated. That the discontinuance of the Workman after 31.3.97 who had served in the bank in any capacity amounts to retrenchment. It could not have been done without any notice and it violates Sec.25FF of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and the said action is violative of principles of natural justice guaranteed under Chapter III of the Constitution of India. This amounts to retrenchment without one month's notice and taken in view of such notice. Thus, the main proceedings issued by the Respondent is without jurisdiction and is arbitrary, illegal and therefore liable to be quashed. That the alleged Memorandum of Understanding dated 27.2.97, Ex.M5 does not own any legal entity, as the said Memorandum of Understanding is not published anywhere to brought to the notice of the Workman whose rights are being affected. It is submitted that Management did not adhere to the procedure envisaged by the Central Government in its' instructions dated 16.8.90

in the year 1995. The same was not followed in the year 1997 despite there being vacancies. The management has followed the procedure of calling candidates through Employment exchange instead of giving chance to the empanelled candidates like the Workman here. It is pertinent to mention here that the Respondent Management sent letters to the all similarly situated candidates like the Workman in the month of June, 1997, subsequent to the passing of impugned termination orders. After knowing the facts that the candidates are litigating, the Management refused to engage these candidates. It is once again reiterated that the panels are meant for absorption but not for termination. It was the duty of the Management to engage the empanelled candidates like the Workman even in temporary vacancies till they are absorbed permanently in regular vacancies. Hence, the action of the Respondent Management terminating the services of the Workman by oral order dated 31.3.97 is unjust, illegal, violative of principles of natural justice and hence, the Management be directed to reinstate and absorb the Workman and to grant all incidental and consequential benefits.

14. Per contra, Respondent had filed counter and made a contentions that the reference is not tenable and contrary to the provisions of I.D. Act, 1947. Respondent submitted that to tide over severe sub-ordinate staff constraints which arose out of leave vacancies, exigencies, etc., and also owning to the restrictions imposed by the Government of India/Reserve Bank of India on intake of staff, the Respondent bank used to engage sub-ordinate staff like messengers, sweepers, sweeper cum water boys, etc., depending on the availability of work on purely temporary basis for the smooth and uninterrupted functioning of the branches. It is submitted that the All India State Bank of India Staff Federation which represents majority of the employees in the State Bank of India comprising about 98% of the work force as its' members espoused the cause of temporary employees who have put in less than 240 days of temporary service in 12 calendar months in the bank and who were ineligible for any protection under Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 to give a chance for being considered for absorption and permanent appointments.

15. Discussions were held and on 17.11.1987 an agreement was signed between the federation and the Management bank under Sec. 2(p) read with Sec 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules 1957. A copy of the said settlement dated 17.11.87 which may be herein after referred as first settlement is filed and 4 categories were made as it has already been mentioned in the claim statement above, it need not be repeated here. In the first settlement, it was agreed that the temporary employees as categorized would be given a chance for being considered for permanent appointment in the bank's service against the vacancies which are likely to arise during the period 1987 to 1991. On 16.7.88 second settlement was arrived between the Federation and the Bank whereby it was agreed to substitute the period of consideration of vacancies as 1987 to 1992 in place of 1987 to 1991 as contemplated under the first settlement dated 17.11.1987. This is the second settlement. A 3rd settlement was entered into on 27.10.88 and it was agreed that the bank's service against the vacancies likely to arise from 1988 to 1992 was to be considered. Government of India vide its letter dated 16.8.90 issued guidelines to all the public sector banks with regard to recruitment and absorption of temporary employees in public sector banks. The said guidelines were issued to implement on the lines of approach paper on the issue provided by a committee constituted in this regard. Government of India guidelines made it clear that all the public sector banks may follow the provisions laid down in the approach paper. The approach paper specified that the cases of temporary service in 12 consecutive months and who are entitled to benefit of Sec.25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 may be decided by entering into a settlement with the representative union. In respect of temporary employees who had put in less than 240 days of service in 12 consecutive months or less, a settlement could be avoided and however if the Management so desired they could enter into a conciliation settlement with the representative union. In para. 6(h) it is mentioned that only those temporary employees who had put in temporary service of 90 days or more days after 1.1.82 would be eligible for considering under the scheme. Although the Government guidelines envisaged for a settlement in respect of employees who had put in temporary service of 90 days or more days, the bank by way of a further concession entered into settlements. Even in respect of those who had put in less than 90 days and also the bank went a step further and said those persons who are working after 1975 were also considered. Hence, there was a genuine effort on the part of the Respondent bank to provide as many as possible jobs subject to the availability of the vacancies. However, para 6 (k) of the approach paper made it clear that it is a one time, exercise in full and final, settlement of all the claims and disputes for the past period, in respect of temporary workmen covered by the settlement. Another settlement was entered on 9.1.91 herein after referred as 4th settlement and the time limit was extended upto 1994 and separate panel was prepared for temporary employees, casual/daily wagers. It was agreed that while vacancies arising between 1988 to 1994 in respect of temporary employees and in respect of casual/daily wagers, they can be considered for the vacancies arising between 1995-96 only.

16. It is submitted that the administrative set up of the Hyderabad Local Head Office comprises of four Zonal Offices (Zones) at Hyderabad, Vijayawada, Visakhapatnam and Tirupathi covering all the Districts of Andhra Pradesh. In terms of the settlement the Management after following the procedure laid down therein prepared the panels of qualified candidates of temporary employees denoted as 1989 panel and also panel of casual/daily wagers denoted as 1992 panel for giving a chance for being considered for permanent absorption. These panels were prepared zone-wise separately for messengers and non-messengers in the descending order of temporary service put in by the candidates during the stipulated period i.e., 1.7.1975 to 31.7.1988. That the Federation approached the Regional Labour Commissioner(C) for implementation of bi-partite settlement in respect of absorption of temporary

employees. The Regional Labour Commissioner(C) conducted conciliation proceedings and an agreement was arrived between the Federation and the bank. It was agreed that it would be kept alive upto March, 1997. A copy of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.2.1995 signed by the parties is filed as material paper. A settlement was arrived at and an agreement was signed between the Federation and the Management bank on 30.7.1996 under Sec.2 (p) read with Sec.18(1) of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957, which is hereinafter called as 5th settlement. That on 27.2.1997 a Memorandum of understanding was also signed by the federation's affiliate and the bank Management recording the fact that the exercise of identifying the messengerial vacancies as on 31.12.1994 has since been completed by Central Office and thereby 403 messengerial vacancies were sanctioned . It was agreed that these vacancies may be filled from 1989 panel of temporary employees after effecting conversion from full time non-messengerial staff in the usual manner and the agreement was reached accordingly. It was agreed between the Federation's affiliate and the Management bank that in terms of the settlement dated 30.7.1996 both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees would lapse on 31.3.1997. That as agreed upon vacancies were filled from the panels. The Workman who has put in an aggregate temporary service of less than 240 days in a continuous block of 12 months period during 1.7.1975 to 31.7.1988 has no right to seek a direction to consider his candidature for absorption in the Management bank under any rule/law except under the settlement entered into thereon.

17. Respondent contended that, in fact, the case of the Workman can be considered under all the five settlements having got his case considered under provisions of these settlements. All the other provisions and terms of the settlements are also binding on him/her. The Management bank has not violated any of the provisions of the terms of the said settlement. That the very preparation and maintenance of panel is in compliance of the terms agreed under these settlements. These settlements were time bound and they ceased to exist on 31.3.1997. That the bank has never promised that all the candidates in the panel will be absorbed. In the advertisement itself it was made clear that candidates will be considered for absorption in the vacancies that may arise upto 1992. Keeping alive the panels after 31.3.1997 is contrary to the settlements arrived between the State Bank of India Staff Federation and the Management bank. That the settlements are binding on the parties. The Workman is also bound under the terms of the said settlement. The settlement does not suffer from any ambiguity as their language is very clear. The right under the settlements is to give them a chance to be considered for future appointment in the bank's services against the vacancies likely to arise. The settlements were effected to balance the expectations of the temporary employees to be absorbed in permanent service as against the constitutional rights for all eligible persons to be considered for employment every time a vacancy arises. That the alleged dispute including the demand for reinstatement has to be decided in this context. It is submitted that the period of panel list got expired on 31.3.97 and it is an integral term of the settlement and cannot be modified in any proceedings under the law. These temporary employees who unfortunately could not be accommodated for want of vacancies have no further rights to be considered for regularization. That the Hon'ble High Court in WP No.12964/94, held as follows, "It is needless to state that the settlement arrived at between the All India State Bank of India Staff Federation which, is the majority union and the bank Management is binding on the Workmen also. It is not at all the case of the Workman that any of the terms of the settlement has been violated by the bank's Management. If the Workman had worked in the bank on part-time basis before 31.5.94, that itself would not vest in him a right to claim that his services should be regularized on permanent basis against a full time cadre post. The claim put forth by the Workman in the present petition is therefore misconceived and not tenable. However, it is open to the Workman to claim any right which flows from the settlement between the union and the bank Management. As already pointed out that it is not the grievance of the Workman that some right which has flown from the settlement in favour of the Workman has been denied by the bank Management. Therefore, I do not find any ground, let alone substantial ground, to grant the kind of relief sought for by the Workman. Writ Petition fails and is accordingly dismissed. No costs."

18. Further, it is contended that if the panels were not lapsed at the end of designated period and allowed to be continued it would result in making the contracts of temporary employment indirectly permanent through back door entry, which would not only be contrary to the settlements but also to Articles 14 and 16 of Constitution of India and deprive the chances of original claimants who would Come through proper recruitment procedure. As their rights have been crystallized by operation of the settlements. Hence, there is no question of any Legitimate expectation being violated.

19. Similarly placed ex-employees filed WP No.9206/1995 and the batch before the Hon'ble High Court of A.P. and the learned Single Judge allowed the Writ Petitions. Aggrieved by the same WA No.86/98 and the batch was filed and the Division Bench set aside the order of the Single Judge. Thereafter the ex-temporary employees filed Special Leave Petition No.11886-11888 of 1998 before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India also dismissed the SLP. Therefore, reference to the Judgement of the Learned Single Judge in WP No.9206/97 is of no consequences as the same has already been set aside. The observations made in the Judgements cannot be relied upon for any purpose what so ever. The question of operation of Sec.25F would not come into play. Further the issue is covered by various Judgements of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India and various Hon'ble High Courts. Hence, the reference may be ordered that the Workman is not entitled for any relief.

20. In order to fortify his claim Workman has examined himself as WW1 and also filed documents in evidence which has been exhibited as Ex.W1 to W7. Further, the Workman has filed photocopies of documents in support of his claim which are discussed as under:-

Ex.W1 is the Notification. Further Ex.W2 is the Service certificate. Ex.W3 is the service certificate. Ex.W4 is the Panel list. Ex.W5 is the service certificate. Ex.W6 is the letter to employment exchange by Respondent. Ex. W7 is the circular letter 14.07.1999.

21. On the other hand, Respondent has examined witness MW1 Sri Aluru Rama Rao and this witness has exhibited 12 documents, marked as Ex.M1 to M12. The details of these documents are as follows:-

Ex.M.1 is the Settlement dated 17.11.1987. Ex.M2 is the Settlement dated 16.7.1988. Ex.M3 is the Settlement dated 27.10.1988. Ex.M4 is the Settlement dated 9.1.1991. Ex.M5 is the Minutes of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.1995. Ex.M6 is the Settlement dated 30.7.1996. Ex.M7 is the Memorandum of Understanding dt. 27.2.1997. Ex.M8 is the Particulars of 1989 Messengerial Panel. Ex.M9 is the Particulars of 1989 Non-Messengerial Panel. Ex.M10 is the Particulars of 1992 General Attendant Panel. Ex.M11 is the Judgment of Hon'ble High Court of A.P. in Writ Appeal No.86/98 dt.1.5.1998. Ex.M12 is the Judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in SLP No. 11886-11888 of 1998 dt.10.8.1998.

22. Apart from afore mentioned documents, Learned Counsel for Workman has also filed a long list of various judgements of Hon'ble Supreme Court as well as Hon'ble High Court, which we will discuss at appropriate place in this Award.

23. Heard the argument of Learned Counsel for Workman as well as for Respondent.

24. On the basis of rival pleadings of both the parties and submissions made by the Learned Counsel for both the parties, following points arise for determination in the industrial dispute :-

I. Whether the 1st settlement dated 17.11.1987, 2nd settlement dated 16.7.1988, 3rd settlement dated 27.10.1988, 4th settlement dated 9.1.1991 and 5th settlement dated 30.7.1996 entered into between State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and also Memorandum of Understanding are binding upon both the parties?

II. Whether the action of State Bank of India, Munnanur branch, Mahaboob Nagar District in terminating the services of Workman Sri M. Narayana, a Messenger with effect from 31.3.1997 is justified?

III. Whether the Workman is entitled for absorption on permanent post in the Branch of Respondent management as per averments made by him in the claim statement?

IV. To what relief if any the Workman is entitled for?

Findings:-

25. Point No.I:- Undisputedly settlements dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988, 9.1.1991 and 30.7.1996, minutes of conciliation proceedings and memorandum of understanding dated 27.2.1997 were executed between the State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation under section 2(p) and 18 (1) of I.D. Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Disputes (Central Rules), 1957.

Section 2(p) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 as follows:-

(p) "settlement" means a settlement arrived at in the course of conciliation proceeding and includes a written agreement between the employer and workmen arrived at otherwise than in the course of conciliation proceeding where such agreement has been signed by the parties thereto in such manner as may be prescribed and a copy thereof has been sent to an officer authorised in this behalf by the appropriate Government and the conciliation officer;

Section 18(1) provides as follows:-

18. Persons on whom settlements and awards are binding.

- [(1) A settlement arrived at by agreement between the employer and Workman otherwise than in the course of conciliation proceeding shall be binding on the parties to the agreement.

Therefore, in view of the provision contained u/s.18 (1) I.D. Act, 1947, terms and conditions enumerated in the aforesaid settlements are binding on the parties to the agreement. The Learned Counsel for Workman has argued that the Workman after going through the selection procedure has successfully been listed in the panel for appointment on the permanent basis in the Respondent management and the empanelled list has to be valid till last person in the empanelled list is appointed on permanent basis. But the impugned order dated 25.3.97, 27.3.97 and 31.3.97, has been issued by Respondent management thereby the services of the Workman has been terminated and the said order is not in consonance of the terms of the agreement entered into between the parties. Further, Workman submits that the Respondent in the 5th settlement has mentioned the date i.e., 31.3.1997 for lapse of empanel list which is illegal and

that is not binding upon the Workman. The condition of lapse of empanelment list on 31.3.97 incorporated in the aforesaid 5th settlement, is arbitrary and illegal.

26. The perusal of the impugned order dated 25.3.1997 goes to reveal that the Chief/Branch Manager, SBI Zonal Office has issued the letter to all the branches with regard to the subject not to make any temporary appointments in the Branch in messengerial category from 1.4.1997. The extract of the said letter is given below:-

"We have been advised by the Deputy General Manager, Zonal Office, Hyderabad that as both the panels of temporary employees of 1989 and daily wagers/casual labours of 1992 will lapse by 31.3.1997, it has been decided by Central Office not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial category from 1.4.1997."

Thus, from the contents of the aforesaid letter, it manifest that Head Office of State Bank of India vide letter dated 25.3.1997 has issued direction to all its branches not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial category from 1.4.1997 due to reason of lapse of both panels i.e., 1989 & 1992 on 31.3.1997 as per terms of settlements entered into by both parties. Further, the contents of the subsequent letter dated 27.3.1997 issued by Respondent Management is also direction to Branch Manager, State Bank of India not to make any temporary messengerial category appointment with effect from 1.4.1997 and it has also been communicated to all concerned that the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers maintained by Zonal offices stand lapsed from 31.1.1997. Further, office order dated 31.3.1997 has been issued by Respondent management that goes to reveal that the said office order has been issued to this effect that, "Consequent on absorption of temporary employees in permanent cadre, it has been decided by the competent authority that no one onwards, no further daily labour or temporary employees/appointments should be resorted to/engaged/employed." Therefore, it reflects from the contents of the aforesaid orders that the temporary appointment in messengerial category and daily labour has been stopped by the Respondent management with effect from 1.4.1997 because of the lapsed of panel of temporary workers and daily wagers by 31.3.1997. The agreement for lapse of both the panels on 31.3.1997 is contained in the 5th settlement which has been arrived at between the parties on dated 30.7.1996 with the consensus of both the parties. Therefore, Workman can not challenge the terms and conditions contained in settlement dated 30.7.1996 regarding lapse of panel on 31.3.1997 as agreed between State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation. As per provision contained u/s.18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 the said Agreement dated 30.7.1996 is binding on both the parties.

In the case of **Allied Sales Corporation Secunderabad vs.The Authority Under Andhra Pradesh..... 1990 II LLJ 510 AP para 414, Hon'ble Court have held:-**

"*4. There was a settlement between the Management and the workmen under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act on 25th April 1983 under which the age of superannuation of the workmen was fixed at 55 years. The settlement was to be in force upto 30th June 1986 and the next settlement, incorporating practically the same terms, was again entered into on 4th February 1987 under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act. There is no dispute that these settlements are under Section 18(1).*

14. Now the Authority constituted under Section 41(1) of the Act is an authority with very limited jurisdiction. It can only decide in the first appeal whether a termination by the management is valid or not and is within the parameters of Section 40 of the Act. The said Authority, in our view, has absolutely no jurisdiction to decide whether a settlement entered into under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act between the representatives of the Workmen and of the Management, is vitiated by undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion on the part of the Management. The Authority, namely, the Assistant Commissioner of Labour, was never intended by the A.P. Legislature to have jurisdiction to go into the question of the validity of a settlement arrived at under Section 18 of the Industrial Disputes Act by an Industrial Court. That Parliament has, in fact, constituted Industrial Courts under the Industrial Disputes Act, with extensive powers cannot be disputed. What we mean to say is that the Authority under Section 41(1) of the A.P. Act has no jurisdiction what-so-ever either to question or to decide about the validity of any such settlements. If parties to a settlement have a grievance about the validity of a settlement, it is for them to agitate the matter before the appropriate forum and they cannot ask an Authority constituted under Section 41(1) of the A.P. Shops and Establishments Act, 1966 with limited jurisdiction, to go into any such question and, that too, incidentally while deciding whether retirement as per the contract of employment, is legal or not."

It is not the case of Workman that aforesaid settlements are vitiated by undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion on the part of the management. If the Workman feeling aggrieved by any terms of settlement/ agreement on the aforementioned grounds then he can challenge of settlement before a competent authority under the Act, 1947. But here in the instant matter it is not a case of Workman that aforementioned settlement has been entered into between the parties on the ground of undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion. Therefore, Workman is barred to raise any objection in respect of fixing the date of lapse of both panels on 31.3.1997 as agreed between both the parties and Workman can not challenge any terms of said Agreement.

Further in the case of **Herbertsons Limited Vs. Workmen of Herbertsons Limited and Ors, 1977 AIR 322,** Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

The Tribunal thought that the question of the quantum of membership of the 2nd Respondent did not call for a finding at all in view of 1his Court's order. As observed above that was not a correct assumption. On the other hand, we feel

that this view of the Tribunal has led it to approach the matter in an entirely erroneous manner. The Tribunal is, rightly enough, conscious that under section 18 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act the settlement was binding on the company and the members of the 3rd Respondent union. Even so, the Tribunal devoted nearly half of its order in scanning the evidence given by the company and Respondent No. 3 to find out whether the terms of the settlement had been explained by the President of the union to the workmen or not and whether the workers voluntarily accepted the settlement knowing all the "consequences". This to our mind is again an entirely wrong approach.

"When a recognised union negotiates with an employer the workers as individuals do not come into the picture. It is not necessary that each individual worker should know the implications of the settlement since a recognised union, which is expected to protect the legitimate interests of labour, enters into a settlement in the best interests of labour. This would be the normal rule. We cannot altogether rule out exceptional cases where there may be allegations of mala fides, fraud or even corruption or other induce- ments. Nothing of that kind has been suggested against the President of the 3rd Respondent in this case. That being the position, prima facie, this is a settlement in the course of collective bargaining and, therefore, is entitled to due weight and consideration.

It is not possible to scan the settlement in bits and pieces and hold some parts good and acceptable and others bad. Unless it can be demonstrated that the objectionable portion is such that it completely outweighs all the other advantages gained the Court will be slow to hold a settle- ment as unfair and unjust. The settlement has to be accepted or rejected as a whole and we are unable to reject it as a whole as unfair or unjust. Even before this Court the 3rd Respondent representing admittedly the large majority of the workmen has stood by this settlement and that is a strong factor which it is difficult to ignore. As stated elsewhere in the judgment, we cannot also be oblivious of the fact that all workmen of the company have accepted the settlement. Besides, the period of settlement has since expired and we are informed that the employer and the 3rd Respondent are negotiating another settlement with further improvements. These factors, apart from what has been stated above, and the need for industrial peace and harmony when a union backed by a large majority of workmen has accepted a settlement in the course of collective bargaining have impelled us not to interfere with this settlement. That being the position, we unhold the settlement as fair and just and order that the award of the Tribunal shall be substituted by the settlement dated October 18, 1973. The said settlement shall be the substituted award. The appeal is disposed of accordingly. There will be no order as to costs."

Therefore, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above, the contention of the Workman that the date fixed for lapse of empanelled list on 31.3.1997 for appointment to the permanent post vide 5th Settlement dated 30.7.1996 is arbitrary, illegal is not untenable. The recognized union of Workmen has negotiated with the Respondent Bank Management representing large number of Workmen and the Workman as individual do not come into picture. Workman in the instant case has work as temporary Workmen in the Respondent Branch and in response of Notification he had applied for inclusion of his name in the panel and he was selected for inclusion his name in the panel list to be utilized for absorption of such Workman to permanent post in order of their seniority in the list. The Settlement dated 30.7.1996 between State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation under Sec.2(p) and Sec.18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 has clearly provided as regard non-messengerial position and it is agreed that all such posts sanctioned fallen vacant upto 31.3.1997 shall be filled before empanel list is allowed to lapse. Thus, in view of law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, in the instant case, Agreement dated 30.7.1996 was entered into between both the parties in respect of lapsing of the both the panels on 31.3.1997 and absorption of the Workmen from panel list was subject to availability of vacancy of post likely to arise upto 31.3.1997, have a binding force on Workman as well as management of State Bank of India in view of provision contained under section 18 (1) of I.D. Act, 1947.

Thus, Point No.I is answered against the Workman and in favour of the Respondent.

27. **Point No.II**:- Firstly, it is submitted on behalf of the Workman that the Respondent has terminated his services by oral order on 31.3.1997 without issuing any notice or paying any salary or compensation in lieu thereof. Therefore, the termination order of the Workman from service is in violation of provision contained Under Section 25 F of I.D. Act, 1947. Therefore, the order is liable to be set aside.

28. On the other hand, Respondent counsel contended that Workman has not worked for 240 days in any preceding calendar year. Therefore, reference of the industrial dispute is not relevant. In this context, the Workman has examined himself as WW1 who has reiterated that Workman has been terminated from service by Respondent on 31.3.1997 without notice of salary or compensation in lieu thereof. Before examining the claim of the Workman on merit it would be apposite to reproduce the provision contained under section 25 F:-

Section 25F provides:-

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].

Compensation to workmen in case of transfer of undertakings.

Section 25B defines the term continuous service which provides

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 authorized 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;

In order to prove the fact of 240 days of service within 12 months of a calendar year just preceding from the date of termination, the initial burden of proof lies upon the Workman and the Workman has to prove this factum by adducing his oral as well as documentary evidence in support of his claim.

Further, how to calculate 240 days of service by the Workman in a calendar year. In this context the reference of decisions of Hon'ble Supreme Court is relevant and the same are discussed below:-

In Rajasthan State Ganganagar S. Mills Ltd. v. State of Rajasthan and Anr. (2004) Apex Court held:

"It was the case of the Workman that he had worked for more than 240 days in the year concerned. This claim was denied by the appellant. It was for the claimant to lead evidence to show that he had worked for 240 days in the year preceding the date of his termination. He has filed an affidavit. It is statement which is in his favor and that cannot be regarded as sufficient evidence for any Court or Tribunal to come to the conclusion that in fact the claimant had worked for 240 days in a year These aspects were highlighted in Range Forest Officer v. S.T. Hadimani (2002 (3) SCC 25. No proof of receipt of salary or wages for 240 days or order or record in that regard was produced. Mere non-production of the muster roll for a particular period was not sufficient for the Labour Court held that the Workman had worked for 240 days as claimed."

In Municipal Corporation, Faridabad v. Siri Niwas (2004 (8) SCC 195), held "*the burden was on the Workman to show that he was working for more than 240 days in the preceding one year prior to his alleged retrenchment." In M.P. Electricity Board v. Hariram (2004 (8) SCC 246) the position was again reiterated in paragraph 11 as follows: "The above burden having not been discharged and the Labour Court having held so, in our opinion, the Industrial Court and the High Court erred in basing an order of reinstatement solely on an adverse inference drawn erroneously ..*"

In the case of Manager, RBI, Bangalore vs. S Mani (2005) SCC Page 100, the 3 Judges Bench of the Apex Court held that "*the initial burden of proof was on the Workman to show that he had completed 240 days of service."*

Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of Mohan Lal vs Management BEL 1981 SCC page 225 has laid down the principle that how to count 240 days of service within one year it is held: *"Clause (2)(a) provides for a fiction to treat a Workman in continuous service for a period of one year despite the fact that he has not rendered uninterrupted service for a period of one year but he has rendered period of 240 days during the period of 12 calendar service for months counting backwards and just preceding the relevant date being the date of retrenchment. In other words, in order to invoke the fiction enacted in clause (2)(a) it is necessary to determine first the relevant date, ie the date of termination of service which is complained of as retrenchment. After that date is ascertained. move backward to a period of 12 months just preceding the date of retrenchment and then ascertain whether within the period of 12 months, the Workman has rendered service for a period of 240 days. If these three facts are affirmatively answered in favor of the Workman pursuant to the deeming fiction enacted in clause (2)(a) it will have to be assumed that the Workman is in continuous service for a period of one year and he will satisfy the eligibility qualification enacted in Section 25-F"*

"14. We have already extracted section 25B since its amendment and the change in language is the legislative exposition of which note must be taken. In fact, we need not further dilate upon this aspect because in Surendra Kumar Verma and Ors. v. Central Government Industrial-cum-Labour Court, New Delhi and Anr., Chinnappa

Reddy. J., after noticing the amendment and referring to the decision in Sur Enamel and Stamping Works (P) Ltd case, held as under:

"These changes brought about by Act 36 of 1964 appear to be clearly designed to provide that a Workman who has actually worked under the employer for not less than 240 days during a period of twelve months shall be deemed to have been in continuous service for a period of one year whether or not he has in fact been in such continuous service for a period of one year. It is enough that he has worked for 240 days in a period of 12 months, it is not necessary that he should have been in the service of the employer for one whole year."

In a concurring judgment Pathak J. agreed with this interpretation of section 25B(2). Therefore, both on principle and on precedent it must be held that section 25B(2) comprehends a situation where a Workman is not in employment for a period of 12 calendar months, but has rendered service for a period of 240 days within the period of 12 calendar months commencing and counting backwards from the relevant date, i.e. the date of retrenchment. If he has, he would be deemed to be in continuous service for a period of one year for the purpose of section 25B and

Chapter VA."

Thus, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above the initial burden of proof lies upon the Workman to show that he has completed 240 days of the service with the Respondent just preceding from the date of his termination. Further, in respect of the employment of calculating the 240 days service provision contained Under Section 25-F read with Section 25-B of the I.D. Act, 1947.

29. Now, in view of the provision contained under Section 25 F and law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, we have to examine whether the Workman has discharged his initial burden of proof in respect of his claim of 240 days continuous service in a calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination i.e., 31.3.1997.

In this context, WW1 in his cross examination has stated that,

" I was not sponsored by any employment exchange. I did not undergo the regular process of selection before my engagement as temporary Messenger in the branch."

"It is true that I did not work for 240 days in any year in my entire service in the bank in any branch."

Thus, it is clear from the testimony of WW1 that the Workman had not worked for 240 days continuously in any 12 months of a calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination in the Respondent bank. Therefore, Workman failed to establish his plea by his oral and documentary evidence that he had worked for 240 days continuously in calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination i.e., 31.3.1997. Thus, the claim of the Workman that he has been terminated by oral order without issuing notice or payment in lieu after termination, in contravention of Section 25 F of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is not tenable. However the documents filed by the Workman in support of his claim, number of days worked with the Respondent goes to reveal that the Workman had worked intermittently as daily wager depending upon availability of work in branch. Workman did not file any document of appointment letter or salary slips in support of his claim for appointment as a non-messenger in the Respondent branch on temporary basis.

30. Per contra, the Learned Counsel for Respondent has submitted the allegation of Workman that he was terminated from services is not correct. As the vacancies were filled up on regular basis in order of their respective seniority the non-engagement of the Workman does not amount to termination. Further, Respondent contended that no law provide that even though there is no work temporary employee should be continued in the bank work as the very engagement of Workman was subject to availability of work. Therefore, the allegation that the bank has indulged in unfair labour practice is incorrect.

31. Thus, in view of the fore gone discussion and contentions made by the Respondent, I find the force in the argument advanced by the Respondent that in the instant matter, Workman was not terminated from service by order dated 31.3.1997 rather he was disengaged in view of the non-availability of the work in the branch. Further, there was direction issued by the Head Office of the Respondent authority not to engage any daily wager Workman/ temporary Worker w.e.f. 1.4.1997. Thus, such disengagement of Workman does not amount to termination. Moreover, the Workman failed to prove his claim that he was terminated in contravention of provision of Sec.25F of the I.D. Act, 1947 as he failed to establish his plea by any oral or documentary evidence that he had worked for 240 days continuously in a twelve months of calendar year just preceding from date of termination i.e., 31.3.1997.

32. Further, perusal of the order dated 25.3.1997 goes to reveal that the Chief Branch Manager, State Bank of India has issued the letter to Zonal Office with direction to all its branches to this effect that they have been advised by the DGM, Zonal Office, Hyderabad that as both the panel of temporary employees of 1989 and daily wagers/casual labour of 1992 will lapse on 31.3.1997 it has been decided by central office not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial cadre from 1.4.1997, therefore it was directed to issue suitable instructions not to make temporary appointments from 1.4.1997. There is no mention in this order that the Workman herein has been terminated from service by this order.

33. Further, the circular dated 27.3.1997 was issued by DGM, SBI to all branches in commercial network in respect of the non-appointment of temporary employees in subordinate cadre and it has directed not to make any temporary employment in the subordinate cadre with effect from 1.4.97 and further, it has directed to ensure that no temporary/casual/daily basis appointment of the petty cash. Further, it is directed to all Branch Managers that any deviation in this regard will be viewed seriously. Thus, these circulars do not reflect that the Workman has been terminated from service by this order.

34. Similarly, office order dated 31.3.1997 is simply a direction to all branches of the Respondent bank by DGM that no further daily labour should be engaged or employed. Therefore, the plea of the Workman that he has been terminated by the aforesaid order dated 25.3.1997, 27.3.1997 and 31.3.1997 from the service by the Respondent is not acceptable. The evidence adduced by the Workman clearly goes to reveal that he had worked as a daily wager for which he has been paid wages according to number of working days. As there was an order for prohibition for engaging temporary workmen, in the bank, therefore, Workman could not be engaged by the Respondent for work from 1.4.1997 and there after. It is settled law that the daily wagers are engaged by the employer depending upon the availability of work and as the work was not available the Workman was not engaged further by the Respondent management. Therefore, the Workman on the ground of number of days he had worked in the Respondent bank cannot claim any right to reinstate him into the employment. As the Workman failed to prove the mandatory condition of 240 days of continuous service as required under Sec.25F of I.D. Act, 1947. Therefore, the disengagement of Workman from work can not be termed in contravention of provision contained under Sec.25F and 25 B of the I.D. Act, 1947.

Thus, this point is answered against the Workman and in favour of Respondent.

35. **Point No.III**:- In this context, the Workman has contended that the management failed to implement the selected panels during its valid tenure. The management adopted the back door methods contrary to the settlements and filled up the vacancies. The same is evident from the proceedings dated 18.11.1993 a copy of the same is filed in the material papers and the same may be read as part of the claim statement. Further, it is submitted that management has to adhere the procedure issued by the Central Government, the instructions dated 16.8.1990 in the year 1995, but same was not followed in the year 1997 despite there being vacancies. The management has followed the procedure of calling candidates through employment exchange instead of giving chance to the empanelled candidates like the Workman herein. The management sent call letters to the similarly situated candidates like the Workman in the month of June 1997 subsequent to issuance of impugned termination orders. After knowing the fact that they are litigating the issue by way of dispute, the management has refused to engage those candidates, the copies of call letters issued are filed herein along with claim petition. The Workman herein reiterates that the panels are meant for absorption but not for termination. In view of the same a duty is cast upon the Respondent management to engage the empanelled candidates like the Workman herein even in temporary vacancies till they are absorbed permanently in regular vacancies.

36. On the other hand, Respondent has contended that the Federation approached Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) for implementation of bipartite settlement in respect of the absorption of temporary employees. The Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) conducted conciliation proceedings and agreement was arrived at between the Federation and the Management bank. It is submitted that it was agreed between the Federation and the Management that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers /casual labour would be kept alive upto March, 1997 and the vacancies as agreed to under the afore set out settlements will be filled from both the lists concurrently. A copy of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.1995 signed by the parties to the dispute is filed as a material paper. Further, it is submitted that the settlement was arrived at and an agreement was signed between the Federation and the Management bank on 30.7.1996 under Section 2(p) read with Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules 1957 which is binding on the parties. A copy of this agreement which hereinafter may be referred to as 5th settlement for brevity, is also filed as a material paper. The 5th settlement dated 30.7.1996 whereunder the earlier four settlements dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988 and 9.1.1991 were also referred, it was agreed to, by the Federation and the Management bank that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees will be kept alive upto March, 1997 for filling the vacancies existing/arrived at as on 31.12.1994 as per the norms agreed to between the bank and Federation and that thereafter the said panels would lapse. It was also agreed that within the framework of the above settlements the modalities about drawing names from either the panel of temporary employees or the panel of daily wagers and casual labour would be decided administratively on circle to circle basis depending upon the local requirements in consultation with the Federation's affiliate by the Circle management. It was further agreed that all messenger real vacancies/positions in the subordinate cadre including part-time attendants specifically provided as leave reserve will be filled by the end of 31.3.1997. Further, Respondent contended that on 27.2.1997 a memorandum of understanding was also signed between the Federation's affiliate and the bank management regarding the fact that the exercise of identifying the messengerial vacancies as on 31.12.1994 has since been completed by central office and thereby 403 messengerial vacancies were sanctioned to the circle of the Management bank and it was agreed that these vacancies may be filled from 1989 panel of temporary employees after effecting conversion from full time non-messengerial staff in the usual manner and the agreement was reached upon. Further, it was agreed between the Federations affiliate and the management bank

that in terms of the settlement dated 30.7.1996 both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers /casual employees would lapse on 31.3.1997.

37. The Workman has contended that the empanelled list prepared by the Respondent management for appointment of temporary and daily wage Workers to the permanent post cannot lapse unless until it is exhausted by appointing all the empanelled persons and it should continue even after 31.3.1997, i.e., the date fixed for the lapse of panel. It is undisputed that the date of lapse of empanelled list of Workmen has been fixed to 31.3.1997 as mentioned in the settlement dated 30.7.1996, and agreed between the parties. It is settled law that and once the life of panel list lapses on the date as agreed between the parties it cannot be extended beyond that date. In the instant case the panel list of the workmen was valid upto 31.3.1997 in view of the terms and conditions enumerated in the 5th Settlement entered into between the parties. As the lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997 has been agreed by State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation through 5th Settlement, the Workman is not competent to challenge the same.

In this context I would like to take reference of the decision of the apex court in the case of **Syndicate Bank and Ors vs. Shankar Paul and Ors , AIR 1997 SC 3091, therein the Hon'ble Apex Court** have held:-

"Till 1982, the branches of the appellant Bank in Calcutta region were recruiting persons locally to work as temporary attenders in leave vacancies. In view of the revised procedure prescribed by the Government of India in respect of such temporary appointments, the Calcutta regional office of the appellant Bank issued a circular to all of its branches on 14.8.1982, instructing all the branches under it to discontinue the old practice from 1.6.1982 and appoint only empanelled candidates. The regional office was to prepare a panel of eligible candidates, after calling names from the local/district employment exchange, and split it up branch-wise. Following that new procedure yearly panels were prepared thereafter. Names of the Respondents were for the first time included in the panel prepared for the period 7.2.1987 to 6.2.1988. By its letter dated 7.2.1987 the Bank had informed the Respondents that the panel was valid for one year only and that inclusion of their names in the panel was not to confer on them any right to seek permanent appointment in the service of the bank. Considering the object with which the panel was prepared and the fact that it was an yearly panel expiring on 6.2.1988, we are of the opinion that the Respondents did not get any right, because of inclusion of their names in the said panel, for permanent absorption in the service of the Bank. Whatever conditional right they had came to an end with the expiry of the panel. The claim of the Respondents, as contained in the writ petition was thus misconceived and therefore the learned single Judge and the Division Bench, when it first decided the appeal, were right in dismissing the writ petition and the appeal respectively."

Thus, in view of the above law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court and in view of the terms and conditions of the 5th Settlement the contention of the Workman that empanelled list should continue even after 31.3.1997 till the last Workman in the panel is absorbed is not tenable. The contention of the Workman is baseless in view of recital in the settlement. Therefore, in view of the fore gone discussion and finding given at Point No. I regarding binding nature of Settlements and terms and conditions enumerated therein, in view of the provision contained u/s.18(1) of the I.D. Act, 1947, I am of the considered view that life of panels lapsed on 31.3.1997 in view of terms of settlement dated 30.7.1996 and plea of Workman that the panel shall continue even after 31.3.1997 till last man absorbed has no legal force and same is untenable.

38. Undisputedly, settlement agreement dated 30.7.1996 was executed between the State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation and in that settlement it was agreed that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/ casual employees will be used for filling vacancies existing as on 31.12.1994 as per the norms agreed between the bank and the Federation. These empanelled workmen were to be given a chance for permanent appointment in the bank against vacancies arising up to December 1994 whereas the daily wagers/ casual employees were to be considered against the vacancies arise from January 1995 to December 1996, whereby the said panel would lapse. It was agreed that the vacancies falls upto 31.3.1997 shall be filled before the empanelled list is allowed to lapse. Thus, the claim of the Workman to the post of permanent non-messenger in the Respondent management was subject to the availability of the sanctioned post and vacancies arising upto 31.3.1997. The workmen given chance to the permanent post were seniors in number of working days in panel list and Workman herein was junior to those workmen. Therefore, Workman could not be given absorption to permanent post being junior to other workmen in the panel list.

39. In this context the Workman witness WW1 was cross examined by the Respondent counsel and in the cross examination the witness WW1 states:-

"I applied for appointment as Messenger, in response to the advertisement issued by the bank and the union in the year 1989,.... Further, witness states, *"The panel was prepared basing upon the number of days of service, put in by the temporary employees. Some of the temporary employees whose names were included in the panel were given regular appointment in the bank in order of their seniority in the panel...*. Further witness states, *"It is true that I am not having any documents to show that any of my juniors are continuing in service in the bank."*

Thus, from the above statement of the Workman witness WW1 it is clear that the panel was prepared in terms of various settlements entered into between Staff Federation of State Bank of India and State Bank of India and it was prepared on the basis of number of days of work put in by the temporary employees. Further, the Workman himself admitted that some of the temporary employees whose names were included in the panel were given regular appointment in the bank in order of their seniority in the panel and he is not having any document to show that any person who worked for less number of days than the Workman was given appointment in the bank. Therefore, the allegation of the Workman that the regular appointment has been made by the bank from the panel list in breach of the terms of the settlement and violation of seniority of panel list is not proved by this evidence of WW1. Thus, there is no evidence on record that bank has given the appointment to the temporary employees as well as daily wagers from the panel list 1989 and 1992 in breach of seniority of the temporary employees in the list. There is no evidence of jumbling in the panel list to make appointment of any permanent Workman in breach of the seniority. Therefore, I am constrained to hold that the Respondent Management has appointed the workmen from panel list in order of seniority and there is no jumbling of workmen in the panel list before it got lapsed on 31.3.1997.

40. However, Workman has taken the plea that the panels of Workmen for absorption in the employment of the Respondent banks (panels of temporary employees and daily wagers) has been lapsed on 31.3.1997 in contravention of terms of settlement as the object of preparing the entire empanelment of temporary and daily wagers was to provide them permanent employment and till the both the panel lists exhausted the panel list cannot be lapsed on 31.3.1997 and the date of lapsing of the panel on 31.3.1997 has been fixed by the Respondent arbitrarily without any authority.

41. In this context, the perusal of Settlement dated 30.7.1996 reveals that the 5th Settlement dated 30.7.1996 was entered under Section 2(p) and 18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Dispute (Central) Rules 1957. This settlement has been entered into by the competent parties and in this settlement parties thereto agreed that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees will lapse on 31.3.1997. Thus the date of lapse of panel was fixed by both the parties with consensus under the settlement dated 30.7.1996 and same is binding upon the Workman under the provision of Section 18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947. Moreover, this issue of binding force of the settlement dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988 and 9.1.1991 has already been discussed, decided at finding in Point No.I of this award. However, the legality and validity of the aforementioned settlement has not been challenged by the Workman before any competent forum. Thus, claim of Workman that the date of lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997 has been fixed arbitrarily by the Respondent bank is untenable. As regard the claim of Workman for his absorption to the permanent post it is settled law that the Workman can not claim his regularization to permanent post merely on the basis of number of working days.

42. In this context the reference of the decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Oil and Natural Gas Corporation vs Krishan Gopal 2020(3) SCALE 272, date of decision 7.2.2020** is relevant therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have has laid down principle regarding regularization of the Workman on permanent posts. Hon'ble Supreme Court have laid down the prepositions of regularization of the workmen to permanent post is as under:-

"*(i) Wide as they are, the powers of the Labour Court and the Industrial Court cannot extend to a direction to order regularisation, where such a direction would in the context of public employment offend the provisions contained in Article 14 of the Constitution;*

(ii) The statutory power of the Labour Court or Industrial Court to grant relief to workmen including the status of permanency continues to exist in circumstances where the employer has indulged in an unfair labour practice by not filling up permanent posts even though such posts are available and by continuing to employ workmen as temporary or daily wage employees despite their performing the same work as regular workmen on lower wages;

(iii) The power to create permanent or sanctioned posts lies outside the judicial domain and where no posts are available, a direction to grant regularisation would be impermissible merely on the basis of the number of years of service;

(iv) Where an employer has regularised similarly situated workmen either in a scheme or otherwise, it would be open to workmen who have been deprived of the same benefit at par with the workmen who have been regularised to make a complaint before the Labour or Industrial Court, since the deprivation of the benefit would amount to a violation of Article 14; and

(v) In order to constitute an unfair labour practice under Section 2(ra) read with Item 10 of the Vth Schedule of the ID Act, the employer should be engaging workmen as badlis, temporaries or casuals, and continuing them for years, with the object of depriving them of the benefits payable to permanent workmen.

Thus, in view of the principles laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court as discussed above, in the instant matter the Workman utterly failed to prove his claim by adducing any documentary or oral evidence that the employer has indulged in unfair labour practice by not filling the permanent posts even though such posts are available and by

continuing to employ workmen as temporary or daily wage employees despite their performance was the same work, as regular workmen on lower wages.

43. Respondent has contended that all the vacancies exist and arise upto 31.3.1997 has been filled up from the panel list in order of seniority and no vacancy exists or arises as on 31.3.1997 remained unfilled. Further, it is contended that as per terms of settlement the life of panel lists has been lapsed on 31.3.1997, hence, there is no occasion to extend the life of panel lists beyond 31.3.1997. However, the workman failed to prove contrary by any evidence to the aforesaid contention of the Respondent that the vacancies were existing as on 31.3.1997 and the workman was not given absorption to the permanent post in order of his seniority. It is settled law that the power to create permanent or sanctioned post lies outside the judicial domain and where no posts are available, a direction to grant regularization would be impermissible merely on the basis of the number of years of service. Therefore, the claim of the workman on this ground also not acceptable.

44. Further, as per the of settlement, panel was prepared for absorption of the workmen on the permanent posts has already been lapsed on 31.3.1997 and the vacancies existing and arising upto 31.12.1994 and upto 31.3.1997 as settlement dated 30.7.1996 has been filled up from the panel by appointing the workmen as per seniority in the panel list. Workman witness WW1 in his cross examination has himself admitted this fact that, some of the temporary employees whose names were included in the panel were given regular appointment in the bank in order of their seniority in the panel. The Workman failed to show that there was any breach of terms of settlement has been committed by the Respondent in appointment to permanent post from aforesaid panel list.

45. As discussed in preceding paragraph of this Award, the life of the panel has not been extended beyond 31.3.1997, by any further settlement hence, the panel list in which name of the Workman was included got expired on 31.3.1997. It is not the case of the Workman that Respondent has regularized similarly situated workmen either in the scheme or otherwise and the Workman has been deprived of same benefit on par with those workmen or the vacancies remained unfilled on the date of lapse of panels i.e., 31.3.1997, Industrial Tribunal has no jurisdiction to extend the date of lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997. This Tribunal can not order for regularization of workmen to the permanent post in contravention of the provision of Article 14 of the Constitution of India.

In the case of **Mahboob Deepak vs. Nagar Panchayat Gajraula & Anr, Civil Appeal No.5875/2007 date of judgement 13.12.2007,** Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

"8. Respondent is a Local Authority. The terms and conditions of employment of the employees are governed by a statute and statutory rules. No appointment can be made by a Local Authority without following the provisions of the recruitment rules. Any appointment made in violation of the said rules as also the constitutional scheme of equality as contained in Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India would be a nullity.

9. Due to some exigency of work, although recruitment on daily wages or on an ad hoc basis was permissible, but by reason thereof an employee cannot claim any right to be permanently absorbed in service or made permanent in absence of any statute or statutory rules. Merely because an employee has completed 240 days of work in a year preceding the date of retrenchment, the same would not mean that his services were liable to be regularized."

Therefore, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, the claim of the Workman for absorption merely on the basis of number of day of work in the Respondent bank Branch is not acceptable. As regard plea of the Workman that the Workman should have been given employment even after 31.3.1997 as temporary Workman, it is the discretion of Respondent to engage the Workman depending upon availability of work and this Tribunal can not direct the Respondent to engage the Workman in the absent of such rule/scheme.

46. In view of principle laid down by Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above, in the instant matter Workman utterly failed to establish the fact of rendering continuous service for a period of 240 days of service within a period of 12 calendar months commencing and coming backward from relevant date i.e., the date of retrenchment, if has he would be denied to be in continuous service for a period of one year. Therefore, the provision contained under Sec.25F of retrenchment is not applicable to Workman.

Counsel for Workman has relied upon number of decisions of Hon'ble High Court and Hon'ble Supreme Court and few of them are discussed herein:-

In the case of **F.C.I., vs. Kamdhenu Cattle Feed Industries 1993 (1) SCC 71,** therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

"7. In contractual sphere as in all other State actions, the State and all its instrumentalities have to conform to Article 14 of the Constitution of which non-arbitrariness is a significant facet. There is no unfettered discretion in public law: A public authority possesses powers only to use them for public good. This impose the duty to act fairly and to adopt a procedure which is `fairplay in action'. Due observance of this obligation as a part of good administration raises a reasonable or legitimate expectation in every citizen to be treated fairly in his interaction with the State and its instrumentalities, with this element forming a necessary component of the decision making process in all State actions. To satisfy this requirement of non- arbitrariness in a State action, it is, therefore, necessary to consider and give due weight to the reasonable or legitimate expectations of the persons likely lo be affected by the decision or else

that unfairness in the exercise of the power may amount to an abuse or excess of power apart from affecting the bona fides of the decision in a given case. The decision so made would be exposed to challenge on the ground of arbitrariness. Rule of law does not completely eliminate discretion in the exercise of power, as it is unrealistic, but providers for control of its exercise by judicial review."

In the case of **State Bank of India, R.O., Vijayawada vs. Industrial Tribunal, Hyderabad WP No.193/1997,** therein Hon'ble High Court have held,

"*Sri Krovvidi Narasimham, the learned counsel for the 2nd respondent contends, supporting the award that it was a permanent vacancy and even though the 2nd respondent was appointed on temporary basis, his services were not liable to be terminated and he was to be regularised into service on permanent basis. Shastry award warrants that no temporary appointment can be made to a permanent post. But the matter is now covered by two division bench judgements dated 28.11.1986 in W.A. No.791 of 1986 and 25.8.1987 in W.A. No.270 of 1982. The ratio decided in the two judgements is to the effect that there cannot be any mandate to appoint employees on permanent basis when the requirement was for appointment on temporary basis. But it is held in the said judgements that when a temporary appointee is ousted from service and not for misconduct and, if again temporary appointment is to be made, then, the case of such temporary appointee who was ousted, has got to be considered in accordance with Sec. 25-H of the Act."*

In the case of **State of Haryana and others vs. Piara Singh and others. 1992 (4) SCC 118,** therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

" 49. If for any reason an adhoc or temporary employee is continued for a fairly long spell, the authorities must consider his case for regularization provided he is eligible and qualified according to the rules and his service record is satisfactory and his appointment does not run counter to the reservation policy of the state."

In the above cited judgements by the Workman the facts of the case are different hence do not apply to instant case of Workman.

47. On the other hand, in support of his contention Respondent has examined witness MW1 and MW1 in chief examination states that, Settlements i.e., on 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988, 9.1.1991 were entered into between the SBI and SBI Staff Federation for filling up of the vacancies that arise up to 1994 for those temporary employees who has worked on scale wages. Further, MW1 states that two different panels for messengers and non-messengers as per the eligibility criteria prescribed by the bank. There are four modules in Andhra Pradesh and they are Hyderabad, Tirupathi, Vijayawada and Visakhapatnam. MW1 states that the temporary employees so empanelled were given permanent absorption depending upon the vacancies so arise strictly in terms of the settlement. MW1 states that on 9.6.1995 conciliation proceeding was held before the RLC(C), Hyderabad and in said proceedings it was decided that the panels will be kept live up to 31.3.1997 and vacancies will be filled from both the lists concurrently. A copy of the said minutes of proceedings is Ex.M5. Further, MW1 states that on 30.7.1996 another settlement was entered between the SBI and All India SBI Staff Federation providing for filling up of the vacancies arising up to December 1994 in respect of subordinate cadre and daily wage /casual wage employees out of panel so prepared were to be considered against vacancies arising from January 1995 to December 1996, thereafter the said panels lapse. MW1 states that it was also agreed that all the non- messenger positions in subordinate cadre including part time attendants specially provided as leave reserve will be filled before 31.3.1997 and as regards to non-messengerial positions it is agreed that all such posts sanctioned and fallen vacant up to 31.3.1997 shall be filled before the empanelled list is allowed to lapse. Thus in both the cases empanelled list were lapsed on 1.4.1997. Ex.M6 is the copy of the settlement dated 30.7.1996. Further, witness states that on 27.2.1997 a memorandum of understanding was reached between the SBI and SBI Staff Federation providing that both the panels above mentioned will lapse on 31.3.1997. Ex.M7 is the copy of the memorandum of understanding and Ex.M8 is the copy of the statements giving the particulars of 1989 non-messenger panel, Ex.M9 is the copy of the statement of 1989 non-messenger panel, Ex.M10 is the copy of statement of 1992 panel. Further, witness states that petitioner was included in the 1989 panel. As the existing vacancies at that time were exhausted and his turn did not come he could not be given permanent employment in the bank as per the agreements. All the appointments were made strictly in accordance with the settlements reached from time to time between SBI and SBI staff federation and as per seniority, number of days of temporary service put in by them in the bank in the given period. Further, MW1 states petitioner was not sponsored by any employment exchange he did not undergo the regular process of selection required for appointment as a regular non-messenger the petitioner has not worked for 240 days in any year in his entire temporary service in the bank. The petitioner and other temporary employees were terminated from service by the bank. Further, MW1 states that the vacancies were filled up on regular basis with the temporary employees from the panels and these panels were expired in terms of the settlements so reached and there were no vacancies to absorb such employees. Thus, witness MW1 has proved the documents Ex.M1 to Ex.M12 and also contentions made in the counter. However, MW1 was cross examined by the Petitioner Counsel. But nothing has been elicited in his cross examination so as to discredit the testimony of the witness MW1 as regards the date of lapse of both the panels on 31.3.1997 and reasons assigned for non-absorption of the Petitioner from the panel list to the permanent post. Moreover the witness MW1 was re-examined by the Respondent and the witness MW1 states that panels were expired in terms of the settlement send absorptions to the extent of the available vacancies were made. There was no

termination of any temporary messenger as such but their services were not utilized after the cut off date as the available vacancies were already filled up and most of these Petitioners were not in the service of the bank as on the date of the expiry date of the panels. Therefore, in view of the aforesaid testimony of the MW1 in re-examination in the absence of cross examination remained uncontraverted, the claim of the Workman that he was entitled for absorption in permanent post in the branch of Respondent Management on the basis of panel list is found not established.

This point is answered against the Workman.

48. **Point No.IV**:- In view of the discussion and finding given at Point Nos. I, II and III, the Workman is not entitled for any relief and claim statement of Workman sans merit and liable to be dismissed.

This Point is answered accordingly.

AWARD

In view of the fore gone discussion, it is held that the action of the Respondent bank in terminating the services of Sri M.J.Prasantha Rao, Ex. Messenger by way of oral orders w.e.f. 31.3.1997 is justified. Hence, the Petitioner is not entitled for any relief as prayed for. The claim statement filed by Workman sans merit, hence, dismissed.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation Smt. K. Phani Gowri, Personal Assistant, transcribed by her, corrected and signed by me on this the 9th day of June, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner	Witnesses examined for the Respondent
WW1: Sri M. Narayana	MW1: Sri K. Chandra Sekhar Goud

Documents marked for the Petitioner

Ex.W1:	Photocopy of Service certificate
Ex.W2:	Photocopy of Service certificate
Ex.W3:	Photocopy of caste certificate
Ex.W4:	Photocopy of transfer certificate
Ex.W5:	Photocopy of physically handicapped certificate
Ex.W6:	Photocopy of Panel list
Ex.W7:	Photocopy of interview call letter
Ex.W8:	Photocopy of stay order
Ex.W9:	Photocopy of 1992 Panel list
Ex.W10:	Photocopy of legal notice

Documents marked for the Respondent

Ex.M1:	Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.17.11.87
Ex.M2:	Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.16.7.88
Ex.M3:	Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.27.10.1988
Ex.M4:	Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.9.1.1991
Ex.M5:	Photocopy of conciliation proceedings before the Regional Labour Commissioner(C) dt.9.6.1995

Ex.M6:	Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.30.7.1996
Ex.M7:	Photocopy of Memorandum of understanding dt. 27.1.1997
Ex.M8:	Photocopy of statements giving the particulars of 1989 messenger panel.
Ex.M9:	Photocopy of statement of 1989 Non-messenger panel
Ex.M10:	Photocopy of statement of 1992 panel
Ex.M11:	Photocopy of order of Hon'ble High Court in WA No.86/98 dt. 1.5.98
Ex.M12:	Photocopy of order in SLP No.11886-11888 of 1998 dated 10.8.98
Ex. M13:	Photocopy of notification dated 4.5.1991

नई दिल्ली, 27 जुलाई, 2026

का.आ. 1686.— औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार भारतीय स्टेट बैंक के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजको और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण – सह – श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद के पंचाट (सन्दर्भ संख्या 100/2003) को प्रकाशित करती है,

[सं. एल. 39025/01/2026–आई.आर.(बी–II)-91]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 27th July, 2026

S.O. 1686.— In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (LC.No.100/2003) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Hyderabad as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the Management of State Bank of India and their workmen,

[No. L-39025/01/2026- IR (B-II)-91]

SALONI, Dy. Director

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD

Present: - **Sri Irfan Qamar**

Presiding Officer

Dated the 1st day of July, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE L.C.No. 100/2003

Between:

Sri Sadu China Mala Kondaiah,

S/o Peda Kondaiah,

R/o Voletivari palem(V),

Voletivari palem(M),

Prakasam District.

… Petitioner

And

The Chief General Manager,

(Personnel)

State Bank of India,

Bank Street

Hyderabad. …..Respondents

Appearances:

For the Petitioner : M/s. S. Prasada Rao, Advocates

For the Respondent: Sri Y. Ranjeeth Reddy, Advocate

AWARD

Sri Sadu China Mala Kondaiah who worked as Messenger (who will be referred to as the workman) has filed this petition under Sec. 2A(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 against the Respondents State Bank of India seeking for reinstatement into service as Messenger duly granting all the consequential benefits such as continuity of service, back wages and all other attendant benefits etc., and such other reliefs as this court may deem fit.

2. Before unfolding the factual matrix of the instant industrial dispute it would be apposite to have a bird eye view of a chequered history of the instant industrial dispute. Earlier instant industrial dispute along with the batch cases was decided by this Tribunal vide common award dated 17.5.2005 and the reference was answered in favour of the Respondent and against the Workman. That said common award dated 17.5.2005 was challenged by the aggrieved Workmen in various Writ petition No.6470/2014 along with batch of writ petitions before the Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh and Hon'ble High Court vide its' judgement dated 23.6.2014 allowed all batch of writ petitions and set aside the common award dated 17.5.2005 passed in ID No.222 of 2001 and other batch of ID cases by Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad and the Respondent management of State Bank of India was directed to reengage the Writ Petitioners in position, which they have been occupying prior to their termination and further directed to consider their cases for regularization as and when the substantive vacancy arises. This judgement dated 23.6.2014 of Hon'ble High Court of AP, passed in WP No.6470/2014 and batch petitions was challenged by Respondent management before the Hon'ble High Court in Writ Appeal No. 1268 of 2014. The aforesaid Writ Appeals No.1268/2014 and other Writ Appeals were decided by Division Bench of High Court of Andhra Pradesh by a common judgement dated 20.3.2019. Hon'ble High Court in aforesaid Writ Appeal was pleased to pass the order which is extracted as below:-

" 7. Hearing the learned senior counsel for the SBI and the learned senior counsel for the contesting unofficial Respondents, we see that while the learned single Judge was justified in setting aside the award af the Tribunal, the proper course to be adopted was to remit all the cases to the Tribunal. This we say for reasons more than one. Firstly, in such matters, claims have to be decided on individual basis, as different persons have different claims as to the length of officiation or discharge of duties and functions; quality of engagement, drawings, accounting of the post for each one of them, who have worked etc. All these issues will not be the same in all the cases. Therefore, each case ought to have been directed to be decided by the Tribunal afresh on individual basis. The second and most important aspect is the learned single Judge has in one go ordered re-employment of all the workmen. This is not a relief that could have been granted without answering the individual issues; each issue relating to each case could not have been decided by the writ Court within the format of its adjudication procedures and scope. The adjudicating body, which has to do that activity, is the Industrial Tribunal. Therefore, we are of the view that while we would sustain the order of the learned singe Judge insofar as it interfered and sets aside the award of the Tribunal, the further findings and directions, issued through the impugned order have to go and the individual cases have to be sent back for consideration of the Tribunal. Such further procedure before the Tribunal will have to be carried forward with the materials already on record and also by affording an opportunity to the persons, who have claims as well as the management to place their rival contentions and further material before the Tribunal. The learned counsel appearing for the workmen are justified in pointing out that enormous delay has already happened and further action by the Tribunal in this line may be expedited.

9. In the result, these writ appeals are ordered;

(1) affirming the impugned common order of the learned single Judge to the extent it sets aside the common award dated 17.05.2005 of the Industrial Tribunal;

(2) the further findings and directions issued through the impugned common order are vacated:

(3) all the matters shall be remitted to the Industrial Tribunal with a direction to dispose of them within an outer limit of five (5) months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order; and,

(4) the parties to make appearance before the Tribunal on the given date."

Thus, in view of the above direction of Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh in W.A.No.1268 of 2014 and batch cases. This Tribunal has taken up the matter of industrial dispute for hearing and deciding it afresh in view of the

aforesaid guidelines laid down by the Hon'ble High Court in Writ Appeal No.1268/2014 vide judgement dated 20.3.019.

3. The factual matrix of instant industrial dispute as narrated by the Workman in his claim statement are that, the Workman joined in the service of the management institution as Sweeper cum Water Boy from 1983 to 1996, and has rendered unblemished service spreading over a period of about 13 years. The Respondent has terminated services of Workman by oral orders with effect from March, 1996. Further, it is submitted that the management of Respondent bank decided to give a chance to temporarily employed personnel "found suitable for permanent appointment" by wait- listing them by offering permanent appointment or waitlisting till such opportunity arises.

4. That on 17.11.1987 a settlement was reached between All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and the Management of State Bank of India - settlement one, under this settlement three categories of employees were listed. That is, A) those who have completed 240 days in 12 months or less after 1.7.1975. B) those who have completed 270 days in any continuous block of 36 calendar months after 1.7.1975. C) (i) those who have completed minimum of 30 days aggregate temporary service in any calendar year after 1.7.1975 or (ii) 70 days aggregate temporary service in continuous block of 36 months after 1.7.1975.

5. The persons who satisfied in all the above 4 categories were to be interviewed by a selection committee and the said selection committee would determine the suitability of the said candidate for permanent appointment. Therefore, the bank prescribed certain qualifications and from among the candidates satisfying the qualifications the suitable candidates were enlisted by a selection committee. The Clause 7 of the said agreement provided with the selected candidate would be wait listed in order of their respective categorization and the selected panel would be valid upto December, 1991. Clause 10 of the settlement specifically provided that henceforth. "there will be no temporary appointments in the subordinate cadre", except on a restrictive basis in the specified category, "from amongst empanelled candidates as per existing guidelines of the bank". The Workman further submits that consequent upon the said agreement and the draft, a notification was issued in the newspapers. The last date for responding to the advertisement was 30.8.1988. A written examination followed by viva-voce in May, 1989 was held. A selected panel was prepared, as per Clause 7 of the agreement, ie. Settlement No.1, the selected panel was to be valid upto December, 1991, the Workman submits that circular was issued on 26.4.91 by the said letter it is mentioned that the terms of the agreement dated 17.11.87 was modified vide second agreement dated 16.7.88 was entered into between the parties. In terms of the said agreement a chance was to be given, "to all eligible temporary employees for permanent appointments. The appointments were against the vacancies likely to arise during the years 1995-96, circular made it clear that in view of the enormity of the problem an extension of the currency of the panel, eligible temporary employees who have been empanelled could not appear in the earlier interviews and have been pursuing their cases thereafter, "will be given another chance to appear for interview".

6. Workman submits that there were total five settlements. The settlement dated 17.11.87 is the 1st settlement (Ex M1), settlement dated 16.7.88 is 2nd settlement (Ex M2), settlement dated 27.10.88 is the 3rd settlement (Ex M3), then settlement dated 9.1.91 is 4th settlement and settlement dated 30.7.96 is 5th settlement (Ex M6). In between there is minutes of conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.95 marked as Ex M5. That due to all these settlements which were extended by subsequent settlements thereby created reasonable expectations in the list of the selected candidates arose with that it's a question of time their appointments or services would be regularized in the services of the bank. The Workman was working with the bank on temporary basis was under the bonafide hope that sooner his services will be regularized with the bank. He is thereby closed all his options elsewhere. It is needless to point out that employing person to whom hope of employment in substantial terms was made is a facet of Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

7. Further Workman submits that the Government of India issued Circular No. F-3/3/104/87-IR, dated 16.8.1990. Under said circular the chief Executives of all public sector banks including the Management herein were specifically instructed that until the problem of existing temporary employees is fully resolved, no bank is permitted to make any permanent appointments. That some of the persons similarly situated like this Workman aggrieved by the inaction on the part of the management of the bank is not regularizing their services from out of the selected panel and not clearly focusing the vacancy position, filed W.P. No. 4194/97 before Hon'ble High court of A.P.. It is specifically averred in the said writ petition that the Management of the bank had failed to implement the settlement and that it violates the various fundamental rights guaranteed under the constitution of India. The Hon'ble High court of A.P .. by order dated 5.3.97 directed the bank to implement the settlement as amended from time to time. It also directed the bank to carry out the terms of settlement before the expiry of March, 1997. The Hon'ble High Court also recorded finding that the Bank cannot escape its liability of enforcement of the Settlement. In view of the directions given by the High Court all candidates whose names appeared in the select panels prepared on the basis of the agreement entered into on 17.11.87 under which the panel was valid upto December, 1991, and on the basis of a settlement dated 27.10.1988 whereby the panels were made alive upto 31.3.1997 under which the panel was valid upto December, 1999. The other agreement dated 16.7.1988 under which the panel was valid upto 1992 and on the basis of the settlement dated 27.10.1998 whereby the panels were made alive upto 31.3.1997 were under the bonafide impression that their cases will be considered for regularization and were living on the basis of the said reasonable expectation. Unfortunately, contrary to the aforesaid directions given by the High Court and contrary to the

settlements entered into between the parties, the bank issued proceedings dated 25.3.1997, dated 27.3.1997 and 31.3.1997 instructing the various authorities of the Management not to continue the temporary employees those who are in services of the bank from 1.4.97. The said order was followed by the Management. Aggrieved by the said action the Workman herein and similarly situated candidates have filed a writ petition before the Hon'ble High Court and by way of Writ Petition No.9206/97 seeking a declaration that the proceedings issued by the Deputy General Manager and the Assistant General Manager (Respondents 3,4 and 5 therein) on 25.3.97, 27.3.97 and 31.3.97 as illegal and also non-continuance of the Workmen therein in service by absorbing them in the services of the bank as violative of Section 2(p) and 18(1) read with Rule 58 of Central Rules and sought for specific direction to the bank to absorb them in service.

8. Further, Workman submits that in the counter affidavit filed in Writ Petition No.9206/97, the bank has submitted that it has about 805 branches in Andhra Pradesh alone. It has stated that due to exigencies of circumstances and on account of the urgent need in its banks, it employed temporary employees in subordinate cadre. It is pertinent to mention that it does not state the urgent or need or the nature of temporary employees that it had engaged. Enquiry into the same would reveal that the stand taken by the bank either on the ground of urgent need or of temporary employees is a façade to perpetuate unfair labour practice. It is designed to on the one hand, keep the employed in the erroneous zone of hope and on the other to ensure that benefits that a model employer will extend under various statutes to its employees is not required to be borne out by the bank. A reading of the counter affidavit would show that the bank would opines that being just fair and reasonable are which obviously is reprehensible and is a facet of unfair labour practice.

9. The Workman submits that the bank had referred in its counter affidavit to three settlements dated 17.11.87, 16.7.88 and 27.10.88. The bank in the guise of extending the benefits of the circular of Government dated 16.8.90 stated in its counter affidavit that as follows:

"Government of India, vide its letter dated 16.8.1990, issued guidelines to all the public sector banks with regard to recruitment and absorption of temporary employees in public sector banks. The said guidelines were issued to implement on the lines of the approach paper on the issue provided by a committee constituted in this regard. The Government of India guidelines made it clear that all the public sector banks may follow the provisions laid down in the approach paper.

The approach paper specified that the cases of temporary employees who had put in not less than 240 days of temporary service in 12 consecutive Months and who are entitled to benefit of Section 25-F may be decided by entering into a settlement with the representative union. In respect of temporary employees who had put in less than 240 days of service in 12 consecutive months or less, a settlement could be avoided and however if the Management so desired, they could enter into a conciliation settlement with the representative union. Para 6(h), it is mentioned that only those temporary employees who had put in temporary service of 90 or more days after 1.1 1982 would be eligible for considering under the scheme. Although the Government guidelines envisaged for a settlement in respect of employees who had put in temporary service of 90 or more days, the bank by way of further concession entered into settlements Even in respect of those who had put in less than 90 days. As such, it could be Seen that the settlements are more beneficial to the temporary employees concerned. The approach paper also specify at para 6(c) that the banks would provide one time opportunity to all the temporary employees and for that purpose temporary employees worked in the bank on or after 1.1.1982 could be considered for re-employment in terms of the scheme. The Respondents have gone further wherein even persons working after 1975 were also considered.

As could be seen from the above, there was a genuine effort on the part of the Respondent bank to provide permanent employment for as many as possible subject to availability of the vacancies.

It is further submitted that at para 6(k) of the approach paper, it was made clear that this would be one time exercise in full and final settlement of all the aims and disputes for the past period in respect of temporary workmen covered by the settlement. This would mean that the Government of India guidelines would cover only those persons who were temporarily employed for the period specified therein and not otherwise. As such, it is submitted that the Respondents have not only followed the Government of India guidelines but in fact covered cases of the employees who had worked for less than 90 days. As such, question of violation does not arise and in any case those were only broad guidelines and not directives".

10. The Workman submits that the bank also referred a subsequent settlement dated 9.1.1991 wherein there is a clause to the effect- that the panel of temporary employees and the panel of daily wage employees will be operated to a particular period. Therefore, their cases will not be considered. The Management herein relying upon this settlement in their impugned action. It is submitted that even the settlement dated 9.1.1991 will not empower the management to terminate the services of the temporary employees who are working in the bank services like the Workman herein as it does not specify the termination of the employees. In fact there are so many vacancies wherein the Management has engaged several new persons as temporary messengers/ attendars/ sweepers etc., even after the judgment of Hon’ble High Court without considering the cases of the similarly situated candidates like the Workman herein. It is submitted inspite of engaging fresh candidates as is now being done by the Management they would have continued

the similarly situated candidates like the Workman herein in the services of the bank and consider their cases for absorption in view of the circulars issued by Central Government as well as the directions of this Hon'ble Court in Writ Petition No.4194/97, dated 5.3.97. In view of the circulars issued by the Central Government, the Management should not have relied upon the settlement dated 9.1.1991. Hence, the impugned action of the Management is illegal, unjust, violative of fundamental rights such as Articles 14,16 and 21 of the Constitution of India.

11. The Workman submits that in W.P. No.4194/97 filed by the union of temporary employees where in they have complained about the non- implementation of the settlements arrived between the parties and sought for absorption. Such employees in the bank services on permanent basis before the date fixed for carrying out the terms of settlement, the Court held that the members of the union had been empanelled in the list, they were not regularized and the time was going to run out to the near future and the Respondent bank and its officers cannot escape from the liability of enforcing the settlement which has been reached and therefore directed that the bank and the officers shall implement the settlement dated 17.11.87 as amended from time to time before the expiry of 31.3.97.

12. Further, it is submitted that in the clause of Settlement it is specifically mentioned that the workmen to be absorbed/appointed in the bank prohibiting any temporary appointments subsequent to the date of settlement even the authorities want to make temporary appointments that should be made only from among the empanelled can be appointed either for temporary vacancy or permanent vacancy except from among the empanelled candidates like the Workman and that should be continued till they are absorbed. The management committed unfair labour practices and terminated the services of the candidates with effect from 31.3.1997 which is arbitrary, discriminatory, contrary to their own guidelines and violative of the constitutional provisions which are guaranteed in Chapter-III of the Constitution of India.

13. The Workman submits that it is strange as to how the panels were allowed to lapse by a so-called Memorandum of Understanding dated 25.2.1997, that the action of terminating such employees like the Workman by virtue of an impugned oral proceedings without implementing the settlement would be illegal and unfair labour practice which cannot be allowed to be perpetuated. That the discontinuance of the Workman after 31.3.97 who had served in the bank in any capacity amounts to retrenchment. It could not have been done without any notice and it violates Sec.25FF of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and the said action is violative of principles of natural justice guaranteed under Chapter III of the Constitution of India. This amounts to retrenchment without one month's notice and taken in view of such notice. Thus, the main proceedings issued by the Respondent is without jurisdiction and is arbitrary, illegal and therefore liable to be quashed. That the alleged Memorandum of Understanding dated 27.2.97, Ex.M5 does not own any legal entity, as the said Memorandum of Understanding is not published anywhere to brought to the notice of the Workman whose rights are being affected. It is submitted that Management did not adhere to the procedure envisaged by the Central Government in its' instructions dated 16.8.90 in the year 1995. The same was not followed in the year 1997 despite there being vacancies. The management has followed the procedure of calling candidates through Employment exchange instead of giving chance to the empanelled candidates like the Workman here. It is pertinent to mention here that the Respondent Management sent letters to the all similarly situated candidates like the Workman in the month of June, 1997, subsequent to the passing of impugned termination orders. After knowing the facts that the candidates are litigating, the Management refused to engage these candidates. It is once again reiterated that the panels are meant for absorption but not for termination. It was the duty of the Management to engage the empanelled candidates like the Workman even in temporary vacancies till they are absorbed permanently in regular vacancies. Hence, the action of the Respondent Management terminating the services of the Workman by oral order dated 31.3.97 is unjust, illegal, violative of principles of natural justice and hence, the Management be directed to reinstate and absorb the Workman and to grant all incidental and consequential benefits.

14. Per contra, Respondent had filed counter and made a contentions that the reference is not tenable and contrary to the provisions of I.D. Act, 1947. Respondent submitted that to tide over severe sub-ordinate staff constraints which arose out of leave vacancies, exigencies, etc., and also owning to the restrictions imposed by the Government of India/Reserve Bank of India on intake of staff, the Respondent bank used to engage sub-ordinate staff like messengers, sweepers, sweeper cum water boys, etc., depending on the availability of work on purely temporary basis for the smooth and uninterrupted functioning of the branches. It is submitted that the All India State Bank of India Staff Federation which represents majority of the employees in the State Bank of India comprising about 98% of the work force as its' members espoused the cause of temporary employees who have put in less than 240 days of temporary service in 12 calendar months in the bank and who were ineligible for any protection under Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 to give a chance for being considered for absorption and permanent appointments.

15. Discussions were held and on 17.11.1987 an agreement was signed between the federation and the Management bank under Sec. 2(p) read with Sec 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules 1957. A copy of the said settlement dated 17.11.87 which may be herein after referred as first settlement is filed and 4 categories were made as it has already been mentioned in the claim statement above, it need not be repeated here. In the first settlement, it was agreed that the temporary employees as categorized would be given a chance for being considered for permanent appointment in the bank's service against the vacancies which are likely to arise during the period 1987 to 1991. On 16.7.88 second settlement was arrived between the

Federation and the Bank whereby it was agreed to substitute the period of consideration of vacancies as 1987 to 1992 in place of 1987 to 1991 as contemplated under the first settlement dated 17.11.1987. This is the second settlement. A 3rd settlement was entered into on 27.10.88 and it was agreed that the bank's service against the vacancies likely to arise from 1988 to 1992 was to be considered. Government of India vide its letter dated 16.8.90 issued guidelines to all the public sector banks with regard to recruitment and absorption of temporary employees in public sector banks. The said guidelines were issued to implement on the lines of approach paper on the issue provided by a committee constituted in this regard. Government of India guidelines made it clear that all the public sector banks may follow the provisions laid down in the approach paper. The approach paper specified that the cases of temporary service in 12 consecutive months and who are entitled to benefit of Sec.25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 may be decided by entering into a settlement with the representative union. In respect of temporary employees who had put in less than 240 days of service in 12 consecutive months or less, a settlement could be avoided and however if the Management so desired they could enter into a conciliation settlement with the representative union. In para. 6(h) it is mentioned that only those temporary employees who had put in temporary service of 90 days or more days after 1.1.82 would be eligible for considering under the scheme. Although the Government guidelines envisaged for a settlement in respect of employees who had put in temporary service of 90 days or more days, the bank by way of a further concession entered into settlements. Even in respect of those who had put in less than 90 days and also the bank went a step further and said those persons who are working after 1975 were also considered. Hence, there was a genuine effort on the part of the Respondent bank to provide as many as possible jobs subject to the availability of the vacancies. However, para 6 (k) of the approach paper made it clear that it is a one time, exercise in full and final, settlement of all the claims and disputes for the past period, in respect of temporary workmen covered by the settlement. Another settlement was entered on 9.1.91 herein after referred as 4th settlement and the time limit was extended upto 1994 and separate panel was prepared for temporary employees, casual/daily wagers. It was agreed that while vacancies arising between 1988 to 1994 in respect of temporary employees and in respect of casual/daily wagers, they can be considered for the vacancies arising between 1995-96 only.

16. It is submitted that the administrative set up of the Hyderabad Local Head Office comprises of four Zonal Offices (Zones) at Hyderabad, Vijayawada, Visakhapatnam and Tirupathi covering all the Districts of Andhra Pradesh. In terms of the settlement the Management after following the procedure laid down therein prepared the panels of qualified candidates of temporary employees denoted as 1989 panel and also panel of casual/daily wagers denoted as 1992 panel for giving a chance for being considered for permanent absorption. These panels were prepared zone-wise separately for messengers and non-messengers in the descending order of temporary service put in by the candidates during the stipulated period i.e., 1.7.1975 to 31.7.1988. That the Federation approached the Regional Labour Commissioner(C) for implementation of bi-partite settlement in respect of absorption of temporary employees. The Regional Labour Commissioner(C) conducted conciliation proceedings and an agreement was arrived between the Federation and the bank. It was agreed that it would be kept alive upto March, 1997. A copy of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.2.1995 signed by the parties is filed as material paper. A settlement was arrived at and an agreement was signed between the Federation and the Management bank on 30.7.1996 under Sec.2 (p) read with Sec.18(1) of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957, which is hereinafter called as 5th settlement. That on 27.2.1997 a Memorandum of understanding was also signed by the federation's affiliate and the bank Management recording the fact that the exercise of identifying the messengerial vacancies as on 31.12.1994 has since been completed by Central Office and thereby 403 messengerial vacancies were sanctioned . It was agreed that these vacancies may be filled from 1989 panel of temporary employees after effecting conversion from full time non-messengerial staff in the usual manner and the agreement was reached accordingly. It was agreed between the Federation's affiliate and the Management bank that in terms of the settlement dated 30.7.1996 both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees would lapse on 31.3.1997. That as agreed upon vacancies were filled from the panels. The Workman who has put in an aggregate temporary service of less than 240 days in a continuous block of 12 months period during 1.7.1975 to 31.7.1988 has no right to seek a direction to consider his candidature for absorption in the Management bank under any rule/law except under the settlement entered into thereon.

17. Respondent contended that, in fact, the case of the Workman can be considered under all the five settlements having got his case considered under provisions of these settlements. All the other provisions and terms of the settlements are also binding on him/her. The Management bank has not violated any of the provisions of the terms of the said settlement. That the very preparation and maintenance of panel is in compliance of the terms agreed under these settlements. These settlements were time bound and they ceased to exist on 31.3.1997. That the bank has never promised that all the candidates in the panel will be absorbed. In the advertisement itself it was made clear that candidates will be considered for absorption in the vacancies that may arise upto 1992. Keeping alive the panels after 31.3.1997 is contrary to the settlements arrived between the State Bank of India Staff Federation and the Management bank. That the settlements are binding on the parties. The Workman is also bound under the terms of the said settlement. The settlement does not suffer from any ambiguity as their language is very clear. The right under the settlements is to give them a chance to be considered for future appointment in the bank's services against the vacancies likely to arise. The settlements were effected to balance the expectations of the temporary employees to be absorbed in permanent service as against the constitutional rights for all eligible persons to be considered for

employment every time a vacancy arises. That the alleged dispute including the demand for reinstatement has to be decided in this context. It is submitted that the period of panel list got expired on 31.3.97 and it is an integral term of the settlement and cannot be modified in any proceedings under the law. These temporary employees who unfortunately could not be accommodated for want of vacancies have no further rights to be considered for regularization. That the Hon'ble High Court in WP No.12964/94, held as follows, "It is needless to state that the settlement arrived at between the All India State Bank of India Staff Federation which, is the majority union and the bank Management is binding on the Workmen also. It is not at all the case of the Workman that any of the terms of the settlement has been violated by the bank's Management. If the Workman had worked in the bank on part-time basis before 31.5.94, that itself would not vest in him a right to claim that his services should be regularized on permanent basis against a full time cadre post. The claim put forth by the Workman in the present petition is therefore misconceived and not tenable. However, it is open to the Workman to claim any right which flows from the settlement between the union and the bank Management. As already pointed out that it is not the grievance of the Workman that some right which has flown from the settlement in favour of the Workman has been denied by the bank Management. Therefore, I do not find any ground, let alone substantial ground, to grant the kind of relief sought for by the Workman. Writ Petition fails and is accordingly dismissed. No costs."

18. Further, it is contended that if the panels were not lapsed at the end of designated period and allowed to be continued it would result in making the contracts of temporary employment indirectly permanent through back door entry, which would not only be contrary to the settlements but also to Articles 14 and 16 of Constitution of India and deprive the chances of original claimants who would Come through proper recruitment procedure. As their rights have been crystallized by operation of the settlements. Hence, there is no question of any Legitimate expectation being violated.

19. Similarly placed ex-employees filed WP No.9206/1995 and the batch before the Hon'ble High Court of A.P. and the learned Single Judge allowed the Writ Petitions. Aggrieved by the same WA No.86/98 and the batch was filed and the Division Bench set aside the order of the Single Judge. Thereafter the ex-temporary employees filed Special Leave Petition No.11886-11888 of 1998 before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India also dismissed the SLP. Therefore, reference to the Judgement of the Learned Single Judge in WP No.9206/97 is of no consequences as the same has already been set aside. The observations made in the Judgements cannot be relied upon for any purpose what so ever. The question of operation of Sec.25F would not come into play. Further the issue is covered by various Judgements of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India and various Hon'ble High Courts. Hence, the reference may be ordered that the Workman is not entitled for any relief.

20. In order to fortify his claim Workman has examined himself as WW1 and also filed documents in evidence which has been exhibited as Ex.W1 to W5. Further, the Workman has filed photocopies of documents in support of his claim which are discussed as under:-

Ex.W1 and Ex.W2 are the service certificates. Ex.W3 is the study certificate. Ex.W4 is the nativity certificate. Ex.W5 is the caste certificate.

21. On the other hand, Respondent has examined witness MW1 Sri I.S. Appa Rao and this witness has exhibited 12 documents, marked as Ex.M1 to M12. The details of these documents are as follows:-

Ex.M.1 is the Settlement dated 17.11.1987. Ex.M2 is the Settlement dated 16.7.1988. Ex.M3 is the Settlement dated 27.10.1988. Ex.M4 is the Settlement dated 9.1.1991. Ex.M5 is the Minutes of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.1995. Ex.M6 is the Settlement dated 30.7.1996. Ex.M7 is the Memorandum of Understanding dt. 27.2.1997. Ex.M8 is the Particulars of 1989 Messengerial Panel. Ex.M9 is the Particulars of 1989 Non-Messengerial Panel. Ex.M10 is the Particulars of 1992 General Attendant Panel. Ex.M11 is the Judgment of Hon’ble High Court of A.P. in Writ Appeal No.86/98 dt.1.5.1998. Ex.M12 is the Judgment of Hon’ble Supreme Court of India in SLP No. 11886-11888 of 1998 dt.10.8.1998.

22. Apart from afore mentioned documents, Learned Counsel for Workman has also filed a long list of various judgements of Hon’ble Supreme Court as well as Hon’ble High Court, which we will discuss at appropriate place in this Award.

23. Heard the argument of Learned Counsel for Workman as well as for Respondent.

24. On the basis of rival pleadings of both the parties and submissions made by the Learned Counsel for both the parties, following points arise for determination in the industrial dispute :-

I. Whether the 1st settlement dated 17.11.1987, 2nd settlement dated 16.7.1988, 3rd settlement dated 27.10.1988, 4th settlement dated 9.1.1991 and 5th settlement dated 30.7.1996 entered into between State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and also Memorandum of Understanding are binding upon both the parties?

II. Whether the action of State Bank of India, Oletivaripalem branch, in terminating the services of Workman Sri Sadu China Mala Kondaiah, a Messenger with effect from March, 1996 is justified?

III. Whether the Workman is entitled for absorption on permanent post in the Branch of Respondent management as per averments made by him in the claim statement?

IV. To what relief if any the Workman is entitled for?

Findings:-

25. Point No.I:- Undisputedly settlements dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988, 9.1.1991 and 30.7.1996, minutes of conciliation proceedings and memorandum of understanding dated 27.2.1997 were executed between the State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation under section 2(p) and 18 (1) of I.D. Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Disputes (Central Rules), 1957.

Section 2(p) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 as follows:-

(p) "settlement" means a settlement arrived at in the course of conciliation proceeding and includes a written agreement between the employer and workmen arrived at otherwise than in the course of conciliation proceeding where such agreement has been signed by the parties thereto in such manner as may be prescribed and a copy thereof has been sent to an officer authorised in this behalf by the appropriate Government and the conciliation officer;

Section 18(1) provides as follows:-

18. Persons on whom settlements and awards are binding.

- [(1) A settlement arrived at by agreement between the employer and Workman otherwise than in the course of conciliation proceeding shall be binding on the parties to the agreement.

Therefore, in view of the provision contained u/s.18 (1) I.D. Act, 1947, terms and conditions enumerated in the aforesaid settlements are binding on the parties to the agreement. The Learned Counsel for Workman has argued that the Workman after going through the selection procedure has successfully been listed in the panel for appointment on the permanent basis in the Respondent management and the empanelled list has to be valid till last person in the empanelled list is appointed on permanent basis. But the impugned order dated 25.3.97, 27.3.97 and 31.3.97, has been issued by Respondent management thereby the services of the Workman has been terminated and the said order is not in consonance of the terms of the agreement entered into between the parties. Further, Workman submits that the Respondent in the 5th settlement has mentioned the date i.e., 31.3.1997 for lapse of empanel list which is illegal and that is not binding upon the Workman. The condition of lapse of empanelment list on 31.3.97 incorporated in the aforesaid 5th settlement, is arbitrary and illegal.

26. The perusal of the impugned order dated 25.3.1997 goes to reveal that the Chief/Branch Manager, SBI Zonal Office has issued the letter to all the branches with regard to the subject not to make any temporary appointments in the Branch in messengerial category from 31.3.1997. The extract of the said letter is given below:-

"We have been advised by the Deputy General Manager, Zonal Office, Hyderabad that as both the panels of temporary employees of 1989 and daily wagers/casual labours of 1992 will lapse by 31.3.1997, it has been decided by Central Office not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial category from 31.3.1997."

Thus, from the contents of the aforesaid letter, it manifest that Head Office of State Bank of India vide letter dated 25.3.1997 has issued direction to all its branches not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial category from 31.3.1997 due to reason of lapse of both panels i.e., 1989 & 1992 on 31.3.1997 as per terms of settlements entered into by both parties. Further, the contents of the subsequent letter dated 27.3.1997 issued by Respondent Management is also direction to Branch Manager, State Bank of India not to make any temporary messengerial category appointment with effect from 31.3.1997 and it has also been communicated to all concerned that the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers maintained by Zonal offices stand lapsed from 31.1.1997. Further, office order dated 31.3.1997 has been issued by Respondent management that goes to reveal that the said office order has been issued to this effect that, "Consequent on absorption of temporary employees in permanent cadre, it has been decided by the competent authority that no one onwards, no further daily labour or temporary employees/appointments should be resorted to/engaged/employed." Therefore, it reflects from the contents of the aforesaid orders that the temporary appointment in messengerial category and daily labour has been stopped by the Respondent management with effect from 31.3.1997 because of the lapsed of panel of temporary workers and daily wagers by 31.3.1997. The agreement for lapse of both the panels on 31.3.1997 is contained in the 5th settlement which has been arrived at between the parties on dated 30.7.1996 with the consensus of both the parties. Therefore, Workman can not challenge the terms and conditions contained in settlement dated 30.7.1996 regarding lapse of panel on 31.3.1997 as agreed between State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation. As per provision contained u/s.18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 the said Agreement dated 30.7.1996 is binding on both the parties.

In the case of **Allied Sales Corporation Secunderabad vs.The Authority Under Andhra Pradesh..... 1990 II LLJ 510 AP para 414, Hon'ble Court have held:-**

"*4. There was a settlement between the Management and the workmen under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act on 25th April 1983 under which the age of superannuation of the workmen was fixed at 55 years. The settlement*

was to be in force upto 30th June 1986 and the next settlement, incorporating practically the same terms, was again entered into on 4th February 1987 under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act. There is no dispute that these settlements are under Section 18(1).

14. Now the Authority constituted under Section 41(1) of the Act is an authority with very limited jurisdiction. It can only decide in the first appeal whether a termination by the management is valid or not and is within the parameters of Section 40 of the Act. The said Authority, in our view, has absolutely no jurisdiction to decide whether a settlement entered into under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act between the representatives of the Workmen and of the Management, is vitiated by undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion on the part of the Management. The Authority, namely, the Assistant Commissioner of Labour, was never intended by the A.P. Legislature to have jurisdiction to go into the question of the validity of a settlement arrived at under Section 18 of the Industrial Disputes Act by an Industrial Court. That Parliament has, in fact, constituted Industrial Courts under the Industrial Disputes Act, with extensive powers cannot be disputed. What we mean to say is that the Authority under Section 41(1) of the A.P. Act has no jurisdiction what-so-ever either to question or to decide about the validity of any such settlements. If parties to a settlement have a grievance about the validity of a settlement, it is for them to agitate the matter before the appropriate forum and they cannot ask an Authority constituted under Section 41(1) of the A.P. Shops and Establishments Act, 1966 with limited jurisdiction, to go into any such question and, that too, incidentally while deciding whether retirement as per the contract of employment, is legal or not."

It is not the case of Workman that aforesaid settlements are vitiated by undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion on the part of the management. If the Workman feeling aggrieved by any terms of settlement/ agreement on the aforementioned grounds then he can challenge of settlement before a competent authority under the Act, 1947. But here in the instant matter it is not a case of Workman that aforementioned settlement has been entered into between the parties on the ground of undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion. Therefore, Workman is barred to raise any objection in respect of fixing the date of lapse of both panels on 31.3.1997 as agreed between both the parties and Workman can not challenge any terms of said Agreement.

Further in the case of **Herbertsons Limited Vs. Workmen of Herbertsons Limited and Ors, 1977 AIR 322,** Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

The Tribunal thought that the question of the quantum of membership of the 2nd Respondent did not call for a finding at all in view of 1his Court's order. As observed above that was not a correct assumption. On the other hand, we feel that this view of the Tribunal has led it to approach the matter in an entirely erroneous manner. The Tribunal is, rightly enough, conscious that under section 18 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act the settlement was binding on the company and the members of the 3rd Respondent union. Even so, the Tribunal devoted nearly half of its order in scanning the evidence given by the company and Respondent No. 3 to find out whether the terms of the settlement had been explained by the President of the union to the workmen or not and whether the workers voluntarily accepted the settlement knowing all the "consequences". This to our mind is again an entirely wrong approach.

"When a recognised union negotiates with an employer the workers as individuals do not come into the picture. It is not necessary that each individual worker should know the implications of the settlement since a recognised union, which is expected to protect the legitimate interests of labour, enters into a settlement in the best interests of labour. This would be the normal rule. We cannot altogether rule out exceptional cases where there may be allegations of mala fides, fraud or even corruption or other induce- ments. Nothing of that kind has been suggested against the President of the 3rd Respondent in this case. That being the position, prima facie, this is a settlement in the course of collective bargaining and, therefore, is entitled to due weight and consideration.

It is not possible to scan the settlement in bits and pieces and hold some parts good and acceptable and others bad. Unless it can be demonstrated that the objectionable portion is such that it completely outweighs all the other advantages gained the Court will be slow to hold a settle- ment as unfair and unjust. The settlement has to be accepted or rejected as a whole and we are unable to reject it as a whole as unfair or unjust. Even before this Court the 3rd Respondent representing admittedly the large majority of the workmen has stood by this settlement and that is a strong factor which it is difficult to ignore. As stated elsewhere in the judgment, we cannot also be oblivious of the fact that all workmen of the company have accepted the settlement. Besides, the period of settlement has since expired and we are informed that the employer and the 3rd Respondent are negotiating another settlement with further improvements. These factors, apart from what has been stated above, and the need for industrial peace and harmony when a union backed by a large majority of workmen has accepted a settlement in the course of collective bargaining have impelled us not to interfere with this settlement. That being the position, we unhold the settlement as fair and just and order that the award of the Tribunal shall be substituted by the settlement dated October 18, 1973. The said settlement shall be the substituted award. The appeal is disposed of accordingly. There will be no order as to costs."

Therefore, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above, the contention of the Workman that the date fixed for lapse of empanelled list on 31.3.1997 for appointment to the permanent post vide 5th Settlement dated 30.7.1996 is arbitrary, illegal is not untenable. The recognized union of Workmen has negotiated with the Respondent Bank Management representing large number of Workmen and the Workman as individual do not come into picture. Workman in the instant case has work as temporary Workmen in the Respondent Branch and

in response of Notification he had applied for inclusion of his name in the panel and he was selected for inclusion his name in the panel list to be utilized for absorption of such Workman to permanent post in order of their seniority in the list. The Settlement dated 30.7.1996 between State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation under Sec.2(p) and Sec.18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 has clearly provided as regard non-messengerial position and it is agreed that all such posts sanctioned fallen vacant upto 31.3.1997 shall be filled before empanel list is allowed to lapse. Thus, in view of law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, in the instant case, Agreement dated 30.7.1996 was entered into between both the parties in respect of lapsing of the both the panels on 31.3.1997 and absorption of the Workmen from panel list was subject to availability of vacancy of post likely to arise upto 31.3.1997, have a binding force on Workman as well as management of State Bank of India in view of provision contained under section 18 (1) of I.D. Act, 1947.

Thus, Point No.I is answered against the Workman and in favour of the Respondent.

27. **Point No.II**:- Firstly, it is submitted on behalf of the Workman that the Respondent has terminated his services by oral order on March, 1996 without issuing any notice or paying any salary or compensation in lieu thereof. Therefore, the termination order of the Workman from service is in violation of provision contained Under Section 25 F of I.D. Act, 1947. Therefore, the order is liable to be set aside.

28. On the other hand, Respondent counsel contended that Workman has not worked for 240 days in any preceding calendar year. Therefore, reference of the industrial dispute is not relevant. In this context, the Workman has examined himself as WW1 who has reiterated that Workman has been terminated from service by Respondent on March, 1996 without notice of salary or compensation in lieu thereof. Before examining the claim of the Workman on merit it would be apposite to reproduce the provision contained under section 25 F:-

Section 25F provides:-

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].

Compensation to workmen in case of transfer of undertakings.

Section 25B defines the term continuous service which provides

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 authorized 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;

In order to prove the fact of 240 days of service within 12 months of a calendar year just preceding from the date of termination, the initial burden of proof lies upon the Workman and the Workman has to prove this factum by adducing his oral as well as documentary evidence in support of his claim.

Further, how to calculate 240 days of service by the Workman in a calendar year. In this context the reference of decisions of Hon'ble Supreme Court is relevant and the same are discussed below:-

In Rajasthan State Ganganagar S. Mills Ltd. v. State of Rajasthan and Anr. (2004) Apex Court held:

"It was the case of the Workman that he had worked for more than 240 days in the year concerned. This claim was denied by the appellant. It was for the claimant to lead evidence to show that he had worked for 240 days in the year preceding the date of his termination. He has filed an affidavit. It is statement which is in his favor and that cannot be regarded as sufficient evidence for any Court or Tribunal to come to the conclusion that in fact the claimant had worked for 240 days in a year These aspects were highlighted in Range Forest Officer v. S.T. Hadimani (2002 (3)

SCC 25. No proof of receipt of salary or wages for 240 days or order or record in that regard was produced. Mere non-production of the muster roll for a particular period was not sufficient for the Labour Court held that the Workman had worked for 240 days as claimed."

In Municipal Corporation, Faridabad v. Siri Niwas (2004 (8) SCC 195), held "*the burden was on the Workman to show that he was working for more than 240 days in the preceding one year prior to his alleged retrenchment." In M.P. Electricity Board v. Hariram (2004 (8) SCC 246) the position was again reiterated in paragraph 11 as follows: "The above burden having not been discharged and the Labour Court having held so, in our opinion, the Industrial Court and the High Court erred in basing an order of reinstatement solely on an adverse inference drawn erroneously ..*"

In the case of Manager, RBI, Bangalore vs. S Mani (2005) SCC Page 100, the 3 Judges Bench of the Apex Court held that "*the initial burden of proof was on the Workman to show that he had completed 240 days of service."*

Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of Mohan Lal vs Management BEL 1981 SCC page 225 has laid down the principle that how to count 240 days of service within one year it is held: *"Clause (2)(a) provides for a fiction to treat a Workman in continuous service for a period of one year despite the fact that he has not rendered uninterrupted service for a period of one year but he has rendered period of 240 days during the period of 12 calendar service for months counting backwards and just preceding the relevant date being the date of retrenchment. In other words, in order to invoke the fiction enacted in clause (2)(a) it is necessary to determine first the relevant date, ie the date of termination of service which is complained of as retrenchment. After that date is ascertained. move backward to a period of 12 months just preceding the date of retrenchment and then ascertain whether within the period of 12 months, the Workman has rendered service for a period of 240 days. If these three facts are affirmatively answered in favor of the Workman pursuant to the deeming fiction enacted in clause (2)(a) it will have to be assumed that the Workman is in continuous service for a period of one year and he will satisfy the eligibility qualification enacted in Section 25-F"*

"14. We have already extracted section 25B since its amendment and the change in language is the legislative exposition of which note must be taken. In fact, we need not further dilate upon this aspect because in Surendra Kumar Verma and Ors. v. Central Government Industrial-cum-Labour Court, New Delhi and Anr., Chinnappa Reddy. J., after noticing the amendment and referring to the decision in Sur Enamel and Stamping Works (P) Ltd case, held as under:

"These changes brought about by Act 36 of 1964 appear to be clearly designed to provide that a Workman who has actually worked under the employer for not less than 240 days during a period of twelve months shall be deemed to have been in continuous service for a period of one year whether or not he has in fact been in such continuous service for a period of one year. It is enough that he has worked for 240 days in a period of 12 months, it is not necessary that he should have been in the service of the employer for one whole year."

In a concurring judgment Pathak J. agreed with this interpretation of section 25B(2). Therefore, both on principle and on precedent it must be held that section 25B(2) comprehends a situation where a Workman is not in employment for a period of 12 calendar months, but has rendered service for a period of 240 days within the period of 12 calendar months commencing and counting backwards from the relevant date, i.e. the date of retrenchment. If he has, he would be deemed to be in continuous service for a period of one year for the purpose of section 25B and Chapter VA."

Thus, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above the initial burden of proof lies upon the Workman to show that he has completed 240 days of the service with the Respondent just preceding from the date of his termination. Further, in respect of the employment of calculating the 240 days service provision contained under Section 25-F read with Section 25-B of the I.D. Act, 1947.

29. Now, in view of the provision contained under Section 25 F and law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, we have to examine whether the Workman has discharged his initial burden of proof in respect of his claim of 240 days continuous service in a calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination i.e., March, 1996.

In this context, WW1 in his cross examination has stated that,

"I was not sponsored by any employment exchange.."

"I did not work for 240 days in any year."

Thus, it is clear from the testimony of WW1 that the Workman had not worked for 240 days continuously in any 12 months of a calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination in the Respondent bank. Therefore, Workman failed to establish his plea by his oral and documentary evidence that he had worked for 240 days continuously in calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination i.e., March, 1996. Thus, the claim of the Workman that he has been terminated by oral order without issuing notice or payment in lieu after termination, in contravention of Section 25 F of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is not tenable. However the documents filed by the Workman in support of his claim, number of days worked with the Respondent goes to reveal that the Workman

had worked intermittently as daily wager depending upon availability of work in branch. Workman did not file any document of appointment letter or salary slips in support of his claim for appointment as a non-messenger in the Respondent branch on temporary basis.

30. Per contra, the Learned Counsel for Respondent has submitted the allegation of Workman that he was terminated from services is not correct. As the vacancies were filled up on regular basis in order of their respective seniority the non-engagement of the Workman does not amount to termination. Further, Respondent contended that no law provide that even though there is no work temporary employee should be continued in the bank work as the very engagement of Workman was subject to availability of work. Therefore, the allegation that the bank has indulged in unfair labour practice is incorrect.

31. Thus, in view of the fore gone discussion and contentions made by the Respondent, I find the force in the argument advanced by the Respondent that in the instant matter, Workman was not terminated from service by order dated March, 1996 rather he was disengaged in view of the non-availability of the work in the branch. Further, there was direction issued by the Head Office of the Respondent authority not to engage any daily wager Workman/ temporary Worker w.e.f. 31.3.1997. Thus, such disengagement of Workman does not amount to termination. Moreover, the Workman failed to prove his claim that he was terminated in contravention of provision of Sec.25F of the I.D. Act, 1947 as he failed to establish his plea by any oral or documentary evidence that he had worked for 240 days continuously in a twelve months of calendar year just preceding from date of termination i.e., 31.3.1997.

32. Further, perusal of the order dated 25.3.1997 goes to reveal that the Chief Branch Manager, State Bank of India has issued the letter to Zonal Office with direction to all its branches to this effect that they have been advised by the DGM, Zonal Office, Hyderabad that as both the panel of temporary employees of 1989 and daily wagers/casual labour of 1992 will lapse on 31.3.1997 it has been decided by central office not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial cadre from 31.3.1997, therefore it was directed to issue suitable instructions not to make temporary appointments from 31.3.1997. There is no mention in this order that the Workman herein has been terminated from service by this order.

33. Further, the circular dated 27.3.1997 was issued by DGM, SBI to all branches in commercial network in respect of the non-appointment of temporary employees in subordinate cadre and it has directed not to make any temporary employment in the subordinate cadre with effect from 1.4.97 and further, it has directed to ensure that no temporary/casual/daily basis appointment of the petty cash. Further, it is directed to all Branch Managers that any deviation in this regard will be viewed seriously. Thus, these circulars do not reflect that the Workman has been terminated from service by this order.

34. Similarly, office order dated 31.3.1997 is simply a direction to all branches of the Respondent bank by DGM that no further daily labour should be engaged or employed. Therefore, the plea of the Workman that he has been terminated by the aforesaid order dated 25.3.1997, 27.3.1997 and 31.3.1997 from the service by the Respondent is not acceptable. The evidence adduced by the Workman clearly goes to reveal that he had worked as a daily wager for which he has been paid wages according to number of working days. As there was an order for prohibition for engaging temporary workmen, in the bank, therefore, Workman could not be engaged by the Respondent for work from March, 1996 and there after. It is settled law that the daily wagers are engaged by the employer depending upon the availability of work and as the work was not available the Workman was not engaged further by the Respondent management. Therefore, the Workman on the ground of number of days he had worked in the Respondent bank cannot claim any right to reinstate him into the employment. As the Workman failed to prove the mandatory condition of 240 days of continuous service as required under Sec.25F of I.D. Act, 1947. Therefore, the disengagement of Workman from work can not be termed in contravention of provision contained under Sec.25F and 25 B of the I.D. Act, 1947.

Thus, this point is answered against the Workman and in favour of Respondent.

35. **Point No.III**:- In this context, the Workman has contended that the management failed to implement the selected panels during its valid tenure. The management adopted the back door methods contrary to the settlements and filled up the vacancies. The same is evident from the proceedings dated 18.11.1993 a copy of the same is filed in the material papers and the same may be read as part of the claim statement. Further, it is submitted that management has to adhere the procedure issued by the Central Government, the instructions dated 16.8.1990 in the year 1995, but same was not followed in the year 1997 despite there being vacancies. The management has followed the procedure of calling candidates through employment exchange instead of giving chance to the empanelled candidates like the Workman herein. The management sent call letters to the similarly situated candidates like the Workman in the month of June 1997 subsequent to issuance of impugned termination orders. After knowing the fact that they are litigating the issue by way of dispute, the management has refused to engage those candidates, the copies of call letters issued are filed herein along with claim petition. The Workman herein reiterates that the panels are meant for absorption but not for termination. In view of the same a duty is cast upon the Respondent management to engage the empanelled candidates like the Workman herein even in temporary vacancies till they are absorbed permanently in regular vacancies.

36. On the other hand, Respondent has contended that the Federation approached Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) for implementation of bipartite settlement in respect of the absorption of temporary employees. The Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) conducted conciliation proceedings and agreement was arrived at between the Federation and the Management bank. It is submitted that it was agreed between the Federation and the Management that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers /casual labour would be kept alive upto March, 1997 and the vacancies as agreed to under the afore set out settlements will be filled from both the lists concurrently. A copy of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.1995 signed by the parties to the dispute is filed as a material paper. Further, it is submitted that the settlement was arrived at and an agreement was signed between the Federation and the Management bank on 30.7.1996 under Section 2(p) read with Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules 1957 which is binding on the parties. A copy of this agreement which hereinafter may be referred to as 5th settlement for brevity, is also filed as a material paper. The 5th settlement dated 30.7.1996 whereunder the earlier four settlements dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988 and 9.1.1991 were also referred, it was agreed to, by the Federation and the Management bank that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees will be kept alive upto March, 1997 for filling the vacancies existing/arrived at as on 31.12.1994 as per the norms agreed to between the bank and Federation and that thereafter the said panels would lapse. It was also agreed that within the framework of the above settlements the modalities about drawing names from either the panel of temporary employees or the panel of daily wagers and casual labour would be decided administratively on circle to circle basis depending upon the local requirements in consultation with the Federation's affiliate by the Circle management. It was further agreed that all messenger real vacancies/positions in the subordinate cadre including part-time attendants specifically provided as leave reserve will be filled by the end of 31.3.1997. Further, Respondent contended that on 27.2.1997 a memorandum of understanding was also signed between the Federation's affiliate and the bank management regarding the fact that the exercise of identifying the messengerial vacancies as on 31.12.1994 has since been completed by central office and thereby 403 messengerial vacancies were sanctioned to the circle of the Management bank and it was agreed that these vacancies may be filled from 1989 panel of temporary employees after effecting conversion from full time non-messengerial staff in the usual manner and the agreement was reached upon. Further, it was agreed between the Federations affiliate and the management bank that in terms of the settlement dated 30.7.1996 both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers /casual employees would lapse on 31.3.1997.

37. The Workman has contended that the empanelled list prepared by the Respondent management for appointment of temporary and daily wage Workers to the permanent post cannot lapse unless until it is exhausted by appointing all the empanelled persons and it should continue even after 31.3.1997, i.e., the date fixed for the lapse of panel. It is undisputed that the date of lapse of empanelled list of Workmen has been fixed to 31.3.1997 as mentioned in the settlement dated 30.7.1996, and agreed between the parties. It is settled law that and once the life of panel list lapses on the date as agreed between the parties it cannot be extended beyond that date. In the instant case the panel list of the workmen was valid upto 31.3.1997 in view of the terms and conditions enumerated in the 5th Settlement entered into between the parties. As the lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997 has been agreed by State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation through 5th Settlement, the Workman is not competent to challenge the same.

In this context I would like to take reference of the decision of the apex court in the case of **Syndicate Bank and Ors vs. Shankar Paul and Ors , AIR 1997 SC 3091, therein the Hon'ble Apex Court** have held:-

"Till 1982, the branches of the appellant Bank in Calcutta region were recruiting persons locally to work as temporary attenders in leave vacancies. In view of the revised procedure prescribed by the Government of India in respect of such temporary appointments, the Calcutta regional office of the appellant Bank issued a circular to all of its branches on 14.8.1982, instructing all the branches under it to discontinue the old practice from 1.6.1982 and appoint only empanelled candidates. The regional office was to prepare a panel of eligible candidates, after calling names from the local/district employment exchange, and split it up branch-wise. Following that new procedure yearly panels were prepared thereafter. Names of the Respondents were for the first time included in the panel prepared for the period 7.2.1987 to 6.2.1988. By its letter dated 7.2.1987 the Bank had informed the Respondents that the panel was valid for one year only and that inclusion of their names in the panel was not to confer on them any right to seek permanent appointment in the service of the bank. Considering the object with which the panel was prepared and the fact that it was an yearly panel expiring on 6.2.1988, we are of the opinion that the Respondents did not get any right, because of inclusion of their names in the said panel, for permanent absorption in the service of the Bank. Whatever conditional right they had came to an end with the expiry of the panel. The claim of the Respondents, as contained in the writ petition was thus misconceived and therefore the learned single Judge and the Division Bench, when it first decided the appeal, were right in dismissing the writ petition and the appeal respectively."

Thus, in view of the above law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court and in view of the terms and conditions of the 5th Settlement the contention of the Workman that empanelled list should continue even after 31.3.1997 till the last Workman in the panel is absorbed is not tenable. The contention of the Workman is baseless in view of recital in the settlement. Therefore, in view of the fore gone discussion and finding given at Point No. I regarding binding nature of Settlements and terms and conditions enumerated therein, in view of the provision contained u/s.18(1) of the

I.D. Act, 1947, I am of the considered view that life of panels lapsed on 31.3.1997 in view of terms of settlement dated 30.7.1996 and plea of Workman that the panel shall continue even after 31.3.1997 till last man absorbed has no legal force and same is untenable.

38. Undisputedly, settlement agreement dated 30.7.1996 was executed between the State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation and in that settlement it was agreed that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/ casual employees will be used for filling vacancies existing as on 31.12.1994 as per the norms agreed between the bank and the Federation. These empanelled workmen were to be given a chance for permanent appointment in the bank against vacancies arising up to December 1994 whereas the daily wagers/ casual employees were to be considered against the vacancies arise from January 1995 to December 1996, whereby the said panel would lapse. It was agreed that the vacancies falls upto 31.3.1997 shall be filled before the empanelled list is allowed to lapse. Thus, the claim of the Workman to the post of permanent non-messenger in the Respondent management was subject to the availability of the sanctioned post and vacancies arising upto 31.3.1997. The workmen given chance to the permanent post were seniors in number of working days in panel list and Workman herein was junior to those workmen. Therefore, Workman could not be given absorption to permanent post being junior to other workmen in the panel list.

39. Moreover, the Respondent management witness MW1 in chief statement has given the evidence that, "The Petitioner did not work continuously for 240 days in any year or over a period of 36 months." Although this witness was cross examined by the Petitioner but the above statement of the management witness in chief remained uncontroverted, as the witness MW1 was not cross examined by Petitioner on this point. Therefore, the claim of the Petitioner that he has been removed from service by the management illegally is untenable. Therefore, the Petitioner Workman as per number of working days, failed to fulfil eligibility criteria of working days as required for regularisation. Therefore, he was not given regularisation in the employment of the Respondent. Further, witness MW1 in his chief statement has stated that, the workman was engaged in leave vacancies in the bank on Temporary basis. Further, WW1 states that he do not know particulars of the settlement reached between the management and staff union. Therefore, in view of the statement of WW1 in cross examination, the claim of the Petitioner that he was refused regularization by the Respondent management illegally, is untenable.

40. However, Workman has taken the plea that the panels of Workmen for absorption in the employment of the Respondent banks (panels of temporary employees and daily wagers) has been lapsed on 31.3.1997 in contravention of terms of settlement as the object of preparing the entire empanelment of temporary and daily wagers was to provide them permanent employment and till the both the panel lists exhausted the panel list cannot be lapsed on 31.3.1997 and the date of lapsing of the panel on 31.3.1997 has been fixed by the Respondent arbitrarily without any authority.

41. In this context, the perusal of Settlement dated 30.7.1996 reveals that the 5th Settlement dated 30.7.1996 was entered under Section 2(p) and 18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Dispute (Central) Rules 1957. This settlement has been entered into by the competent parties and in this settlement parties thereto agreed that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees will lapse on 31.3.1997. Thus the date of lapse of panel was fixed by both the parties with consensus under the settlement dated 30.7.1996 and same is binding upon the Workman under the provision of Section 18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947. Moreover, this issue of binding force of the settlement dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988 and 9.1.1991 has already been discussed, decided at finding in Point No.I of this award. However, the legality and validity of the aforementioned settlement has not been challenged by the Workman before any competent forum. Thus, claim of Workman that the date of lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997 has been fixed arbitrarily by the Respondent bank is untenable. As regard the claim of Workman for his absorption to the permanent post it is settled law that the Workman can not claim his regularization to permanent post merely on the basis of number of working days.

42. In this context the reference of the decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Oil and Natural Gas Corporation vs Krishan Gopal 2020(3) SCALE 272, date of decision 7.2.2020** is relevant therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have has laid down principle regarding regularization of the Workman on permanent posts. Hon'ble Supreme Court have laid down the prepositions of regularization of the workmen to permanent post is as under:-

"*(i) Wide as they are, the powers of the Labour Court and the Industrial Court cannot extend to a direction to order regularisation, where such a direction would in the context of public employment offend the provisions contained in Article 14 of the Constitution;*

(ii) The statutory power of the Labour Court or Industrial Court to grant relief to workmen including the status of permanency continues to exist in circumstances where the employer has indulged in an unfair labour practice by not filling up permanent posts even though such posts are available and by continuing to employ workmen as temporary or daily wage employees despite their performing the same work as regular workmen on lower wages;

(iii) The power to create permanent or sanctioned posts lies outside the judicial domain and where no posts are available, a direction to grant regularisation would be impermissible merely on the basis of the number of years of service;

(iv) Where an employer has regularised similarly situated workmen either in a scheme or otherwise, it would be open to workmen who have been deprived of the same benefit at par with the workmen who have been regularised to make a complaint before the Labour or Industrial Court, since the deprivation of the benefit would amount to a violation of Article 14; and

(v) In order to constitute an unfair labour practice under Section 2(ra) read with Item 10 of the Vth Schedule of the ID Act, the employer should be engaging workmen as badlis, temporaries or casuals, and continuing them for years, with the object of depriving them of the benefits payable to permanent workmen.

Thus, in view of the principles laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court as discussed above, in the instant matter the Workman utterly failed to prove his claim by adducing any documentary or oral evidence that the employer has indulged in unfair labour practice by not filling the permanent posts even though such posts are available and by continuing to employ workmen as temporary or daily wage employees despite their performance was the same work, as regular workmen on lower wages.

43. Respondent has contended that all the vacancies exist and arise upto 31.3.1997 has been filled up from the panel list in order of seniority and no vacancy exists or arises as on 31.3.1997 remained unfilled. Further, it is contended that as per terms of settlement the life of panel lists has been lapsed on 31.3.1997, hence, there is no occasion to extend the life of panel lists beyond 31.3.1997. However, the workman failed to prove contrary by any evidence to the aforesaid contention of the Respondent that the vacancies were existing as on 31.3.1997 and the workman was not given absorption to the permanent post in order of his seniority. It is settled law that the power to create permanent or sanctioned post lies outside the judicial domain and where no posts are available, a direction to grant regularization would be impermissible merely on the basis of the number of years of service. Therefore, the claim of the workman on this ground also not acceptable.

44. Further, as per the of settlement, panel was prepared for absorption of the workmen on the permanent posts has already been lapsed on 31.3.1997 and the vacancies existing and arising upto 31.12.1994 and upto 31.3.1997 as settlement dated 30.7.1996 has been filled up from the panel by appointing the workmen as per seniority in the panel list. Workman witness WW1 in his cross examination has himself admitted this fact that, some of the temporary employees whose names were included in the panel were given regular appointment in the bank in order of their seniority in the panel. The Workman failed to show that there was any breach of terms of settlement has been committed by the Respondent in appointment to permanent post from aforesaid panel list.

45. As discussed in preceding paragraph of this Award, the life of the panel has not been extended beyond 31.3.1997, by any further settlement hence, the panel list in which name of the Workman was included got expired on 31.3.1997. It is not the case of the Workman that Respondent has regularized similarly situated workmen either in the scheme or otherwise and the Workman has been deprived of same benefit on par with those workmen or the vacancies remained unfilled on the date of lapse of panels i.e., 31.3.1997, Industrial Tribunal has no jurisdiction to extend the date of lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997. This Tribunal can not order for regularization of workmen to the permanent post in contravention of the provision of Article 14 of the Constitution of India.

In the case of **Mahboob Deepak vs. Nagar Panchayat Gajraula & Anr, Civil Appeal No.5875/2007 date of judgement 13.12.2007,** Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

"8. Respondent is a Local Authority. The terms and conditions of employment of the employees are governed by a statute and statutory rules. No appointment can be made by a Local Authority without following the provisions of the recruitment rules. Any appointment made in violation of the said rules as also the constitutional scheme of equality as contained in Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India would be a nullity.

9. Due to some exigency of work, although recruitment on daily wages or on an ad hoc basis was permissible, but by reason thereof an employee cannot claim any right to be permanently absorbed in service or made permanent in absence of any statute or statutory rules. Merely because an employee has completed 240 days of work in a year preceding the date of retrenchment, the same would not mean that his services were liable to be regularized."

Therefore, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, the claim of the Workman for absorption merely on the basis of number of day of work in the Respondent bank Branch is not acceptable. As regard plea of the Workman that the Workman should have been given employment even after 31.3.1997 as temporary Workman, it is the discretion of Respondent to engage the Workman depending upon availability of work and this Tribunal can not direct the Respondent to engage the Workman in the absent of such rule/scheme.

46. In view of principle laid down by Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above, in the instant matter Workman utterly failed to establish the fact of rendering continuous service for a period of 240 days of service within a period of 12 calendar months commencing and coming backward from relevant date i.e., the date of retrenchment, if has he would be denied to be in continuous service for a period of one year. Therefore, the provision contained under Sec.25F of retrenchment is not applicable to Workman.

Counsel for Workman has relied upon number of decisions of Hon'ble High Court and Hon'ble Supreme Court and few of them are discussed herein:-

In the case of **F.C.I., vs. Kamdhenu Cattle Feed Industries 1993 (1) SCC 71,** therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

"7. In contractual sphere as in all other State actions, the State and all its instrumentalities have to conform to Article 14 of the Constitution of which non-arbitrariness is a significant facet. There is no unfettered discretion in public law: A public authority possesses powers only to use them for public good. This impose the duty to act fairly and to adopt a procedure which is `fairplay in action'. Due observance of this obligation as a part of good administration raises a reasonable or legitimate expectation in every citizen to be treated fairly in his interaction with the State and its instrumentalities, with this element forming a necessary component of the decision making process in all State actions. To satisfy this requirement of non- arbitrariness in a State action, it is, therefore, necessary to consider and give due weight to the reasonable or legitimate expectations of the persons likely lo be affected by the decision or else that unfairness in the exercise of the power may amount to an abuse or excess of power apart from affecting the bona fides of the decision in a given case. The decision so made would be exposed to challenge on the ground of arbitrariness. Rule of law does not completely eliminate discretion in the exercise of power, as it is unrealistic, but providers for control of its exercise by judicial review."

In the case of **State Bank of India, R.O., Vijayawada vs. Industrial Tribunal, Hyderabad WP No.193/1997,** therein Hon'ble High Court have held,

"*Sri Krovvidi Narasimham, the learned counsel for the 2nd respondent contends, supporting the award that it was a permanent vacancy and even though the 2nd respondent was appointed on temporary basis, his services were not liable to be terminated and he was to be regularised into service on permanent basis. Shastry award warrants that no temporary appointment can be made to a permanent post. But the matter is now covered by two division bench judgements dated 28.11.1986 in W.A. No.791 of 1986 and 25.8.1987 in W.A. No.270 of 1982. The ratio decided in the two judgements is to the effect that there cannot be any mandate to appoint employees on permanent basis when the requirement was for appointment on temporary basis. But it is held in the said judgements that when a temporary appointee is ousted from service and not for misconduct and, if again temporary appointment is to be made, then, the case of such temporary appointee who was ousted, has got to be considered in accordance with Sec. 25-H of the Act."*

In the case of **State of Haryana and others vs. Piara Singh and others. 1992 (4) SCC 118,** therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

" 49. If for any reason an adhoc or temporary employee is continued for a fairly long spell, the authorities must consider his case for regularization provided he is eligible and qualified according to the rules and his service record is satisfactory and his appointment does not run counter to the reservation policy of the state."

In the above cited judgements by the Workman the facts of the case are different hence do not apply to instant case of Workman.

47. On the other hand, in support of his contention Respondent has examined witness MW1 and MW1 in chief examination states that, Settlements i.e., on 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988, 9.1.1991 were entered into between the SBI and SBI Staff Federation for filling up of the vacancies that arise up to 1994 for those temporary employees who has worked on scale wages. Further, MW1 states that two different panels for messengers and non-messengers as per the eligibility criteria prescribed by the bank. There are four modules in Andhra Pradesh and they are Hyderabad, Tirupathi, Vijayawada and Visakhapatnam. MW1 states that the temporary employees so empanelled were given permanent absorption depending upon the vacancies so arise strictly in terms of the settlement. MW1 states that on 9.6.1995 conciliation proceeding was held before the RLC(C), Hyderabad and in said proceedings it was decided that the panels will be kept live up to 31.3.1997 and vacancies will be filled from both the lists concurrently. A copy of the said minutes of proceedings is Ex.M5. Further, MW1 states that on 30.7.1996 another settlement was entered between the SBI and All India SBI Staff Federation providing for filling up of the vacancies arising up to December 1994 in respect of subordinate cadre and daily wage /casual wage employees out of panel so prepared were to be considered against vacancies arising from January 1995 to December 1996, thereafter the said panels lapse. MW1 states that it was also agreed that all the non- messenger positions in subordinate cadre including part time attendants specially provided as leave reserve will be filled before 31.3.1997 and as regards to non-messengerial positions it is agreed that all such posts sanctioned and fallen vacant up to 31.3.1997 shall be filled before the empanelled list is allowed to lapse. Thus in both the cases empanelled list were lapsed on 31.3.1997. Ex.M6 is the copy of the settlement dated 30.7.1996. Further, witness states that on 27.2.1997 a memorandum of understanding was reached between the SBI and SBI Staff Federation providing that both the panels above mentioned will lapse on 31.3.1997. Ex.M7 is the copy of the memorandum of understanding and Ex.M8 is the copy of the statements giving the particulars of 1989 non-messenger panel, Ex.M9 is the copy of the statement of 1989 non-

messenger panel, Ex.M10 is the copy of statement of 1992 panel. Further, witness states that petitioner was included in the 1989 panel. As the existing vacancies at that time were exhausted and his turn did not come he could not be given permanent employment in the bank as per the agreements. All the appointments were made strictly in accordance with the settlements reached from time to time between SBI and SBI staff federation and as per seniority, number of days of temporary service put in by them in the bank in the given period. Further, MW1 states petitioner was not sponsored by any employment exchange he did not undergo the regular process of selection required for appointment as a regular non-messenger the petitioner has not worked for 240 days in any year in his entire temporary service in the bank. The petitioner and other temporary employees were terminated from service by the bank. Further, MW1 states that the vacancies were filled up on regular basis with the temporary employees from the panels and these panels were expired in terms of the settlements so reached and there were no vacancies to absorb such employees. Thus, witness MW1 has proved the documents Ex.M1 to Ex.M12 and also contentions made in the counter. However, MW1 was cross examined by the Petitioner Counsel. But nothing has been elicited in his cross examination so as to discredit the testimony of the witness MW1 as regards the date of lapse of both the panels on 31.3.1997 and reasons assigned for non-absorption of the Petitioner from the panel list to the permanent post. Moreover the witness MW1 was re-examined by the Respondent and the witness MW1 states that panels were expired in terms of the settlement send absorptions to the extent of the available vacancies were made. There was no termination of any temporary messenger as such but their services were not utilized after the cut off date as the available vacancies were already filled up and most of these Petitioners were not in the service of the bank as on the date of the expiry date of the panels. Therefore, in view of the aforesaid testimony of the MW1 in re-examination in the absence of cross examination remained uncontraverted, the claim of the Workman that he was entitled for absorption in permanent post in the branch of Respondent Management on the basis of panel list is found not established.

This point is answered against the Workman.

48. **Point No.IV**:- In view of the discussion and finding given at Point Nos. I, II and III, the Workman is not entitled for any relief and claim statement of Workman sans merit and liable to be dismissed.

This Point is answered accordingly.

AWARD

In view of the fore gone discussion, it is held that the action of the Respondent bank in terminating the services of Sri Sadu China Mala Kondaiah, Ex. Messenger by way of oral orders w.e.f. March, 1996 is justified. Hence, the Petitioner is not entitled for any relief as prayed for. The claim statement filed by Workman sans merit, hence, dismissed.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, Personal Assistant, transcribed by her, corrected and signed by me on this the 1st day of July, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner	Witnesses examined for the Respondent
WW1: Sri Sadu China Mala Kondaiah	MW1: Sri I.S. Appa Rao

Documents marked for the Petitioner

Ex.W1: Photocopy of service certificate

Ex.W2: Photocopy of service certificate

Ex.W3: Photocopy of study certificate

Ex.W4: Photocopy of nativity certificate

Ex.W5: Photocopy of caste certificate

Documents marked for the Respondent

Ex.M1: Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.17.11.87

Ex.M2: Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.16.7.88

Ex.M3: Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.27.10.1988

Ex.M4: Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.9.1.1991

Ex.M5:	Photocopy of conciliation proceedings before the Regional Labour Commissioner(C) dt.9.6.1995
Ex.M6:	Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.30.7.1996
Ex.M7:	Photocopy of Memorandum of understanding dt. 27.1.1997
Ex.M8:	Photocopy of statements giving the particulars of 1989 messenger panel.
Ex.M9:	Photocopy of statement of 1989 Non-messenger panel
Ex.M10:	Photocopy of statement of 1992 panel
Ex.M11:	Photocopy of order of Hon'ble High Court in WA No.86/98 dt. 1.5.98
Ex.M12:	Photocopy of order in SLP No.11886-11888 of 1998 dated 10.8.98

नई दिल्ली, 27 जुलाई, 2026

का.आ. 1687.— औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार भारतीय स्टेट बैंक के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजको और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण – सह - श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद के पंचाट (सन्दर्भ संख्या 93/2003) को प्रकाशित करती है,

[सं. एल. 39025/01/2026-आई.आर.(बी-II)-90]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 27th July, 2026

S.O. 1687.— In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (.No.LC.93/2003) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Hyderabad as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the Management of State Bank of India and their workmen,

[No. L-39025/01/2026- IR (B-II)- 90]

SALONI, Dy. Director

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD

Present: - **Sri Irfan Qamar**

Presiding Officer

Dated the 24th day of June, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE L.C.No.93/2003

Between:

Sri J. Subba Rao

S/o Satyanrayana (Late)

Saranga Dola Street,

Sri Rama Mandiram Near,

Srikakulam – 532001.

… Petitioner

And

The Dy. General Manager,

State Bank of India,

Zonal Office,

Visakhapatnam. …..Respondent

Appearances:

For the Petitioner : Sri B. Vikas, Advocate

For the Respondent: Sri Y. Ranjeeth Reddy, Advocate

AWARD

Sri J. Subba Rao who worked as Messenger (who will be referred to as the workman) has filed this petition under Sec. 2A(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 against the Respondents State Bank of India seeking for reinstatement into service as Messenger/Sweeper duly granting all the consequential benefits such as continuity of service, back wages and all other attendant benefits etc., and such other reliefs as this court may deem fit.

2. Before unfolding the factual matrix of the instant industrial dispute it would be apposite to have a bird eye view of a chequered history of the instant industrial dispute. Earlier instant industrial dispute along with the batch cases was decided by this Tribunal vide common award dated 17.5.2005 and the reference was answered in favour of the Respondent and against the Workman. That said common award dated 17.5.2005 was challenged by the aggrieved Workmen in various Writ petition No.6470/2014 along with batch of writ petitions before the Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh and Hon'ble High Court vide its' judgement dated 23.6.2014 allowed all batch of writ petitions and set aside the common award dated 17.5.2005 passed in ID No.222 of 2001 and other batch of ID cases by Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad and the Respondent management of State Bank of India was directed to reengage the Writ Petitioners in position, which they have been occupying prior to their termination and further directed to consider their cases for regularization as and when the substantive vacancy arises. This judgement dated 23.6.2014 of Hon'ble High Court of AP, passed in WP No.6470/2014 and batch petitions was challenged by Respondent management before the Hon'ble High Court in Writ Appeal No. 1268 of 2014. The aforesaid Writ Appeals No.1268/2014 and other Writ Appeals were decided by Division Bench of High Court of Andhra Pradesh by a common judgement dated 20.3.2019. Hon'ble High Court in aforesaid Writ Appeal was pleased to pass the order which is extracted as below:-

" 7. Hearing the learned senior counsel for the SBI and the learned senior counsel for the contesting unofficial Respondents, we see that while the learned single Judge was justified in setting aside the award af the Tribunal, the proper course to be adopted was to remit all the cases to the Tribunal. This we say for reasons more than one. Firstly, in such matters, claims have to be decided on individual basis, as different persons have different claims as to the length of officiation or discharge of duties and functions; quality of engagement, drawings, accounting of the post for each one of them, who have worked etc. All these issues will not be the same in all the cases. Therefore, each case ought to have been directed to be decided by the Tribunal afresh on individual basis. The second and most important aspect is the learned single Judge has in one go ordered re-employment of all the workmen. This is not a relief that could have been granted without answering the individual issues; each issue relating to each case could not have been decided by the writ Court within the format of its adjudication procedures and scope. The adjudicating body, which has to do that activity, is the Industrial Tribunal. Therefore, we are of the view that while we would sustain the order of the learned singe Judge insofar as it interfered and sets aside the award of the Tribunal, the further findings and directions, issued through the impugned order have to go and the individual cases have to be sent back for consideration of the Tribunal. Such further procedure before the Tribunal will have to be carried forward with the materials already on record and also by affording an opportunity to the persons, who have claims as well as the management to place their rival contentions and further material before the Tribunal. The learned counsel appearing for the workmen are justified in pointing out that enormous delay has already happened and further action by the Tribunal in this line may be expedited.

9. In the result, these writ appeals are ordered;

(1) affirming the impugned common order of the learned single Judge to the extent it sets aside the common award dated 17.05.2005 of the Industrial Tribunal;

(2) the further findings and directions issued through the impugned common order are vacated:

(3) all the matters shall be remitted to the Industrial Tribunal with a direction to dispose of them within an outer limit of five (5) months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order; and,

(4) the parties to make appearance before the Tribunal on the given date."

Thus, in view of the above direction of Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh in W.A.No.1268 of 2014 and batch cases. This Tribunal has taken up the matter of industrial dispute for hearing and deciding it afresh in view of the aforesaid guidelines laid down by the Hon'ble High Court in Writ Appeal No.1268/2014 vide judgement dated 20.3.019.

3. The factual matrix of instant industrial dispute as narrated by the Workman in his claim statement are that, the Workman joined in the service of the management institution as Messenger from 27.6.1985 to 1997, and has rendered unblemished service spreading over a period of about 12 years. The Respondent has terminated services of Workman by oral orders with effect from 1.4.1997. Further, it is submitted that the management of Respondent bank decided to give a chance to temporarily employed personnel "found suitable for permanent appointment" by wait- listing them by offering permanent appointment or waitlisting till such opportunity arises.

4. That on 17.11.1987 a settlement was reached between All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and the Management of State Bank of India - settlement one, under this settlement three categories of employees were listed. That is, A) those who have completed 240 days in 12 months or less after 1.7.1975. B) those who have completed 270 days in any continuous block of 36 calendar months after 1.7.1975. C) (i) those who have completed minimum of 30 days aggregate temporary service in any calendar year after 1.7.1975 or (ii) 70 days aggregate temporary service in continuous block of 36 months after 1.7.1975.

5. The persons who satisfied in all the above 4 categories were to be interviewed by a selection committee and the said selection committee would determine the suitability of the said candidate for permanent appointment. Therefore, the bank prescribed certain qualifications and from among the candidates satisfying the qualifications the suitable candidates were enlisted by a selection committee. The Clause 7 of the said agreement provided with the selected candidate would be wait listed in order of their respective categorization and the selected panel would be valid upto December, 1991. Clause 10 of the settlement specifically provided that henceforth. "there will be no temporary appointments in the subordinate cadre", except on a restrictive basis in the specified category, "from amongst empanelled candidates as per existing guidelines of the bank". The Workman further submits that consequent upon the said agreement and the draft, a notification was issued in the newspapers. The last date for responding to the advertisement was 30.8.1988. A written examination followed by viva-voce in May, 1989 was held. A selected panel was prepared, as per Clause 7 of the agreement, ie. Settlement No.1, the selected panel was to be valid upto December, 1991, the Workman submits that circular was issued on 26.4.91 by the said letter it is mentioned that the terms of the agreement dated 17.11.87 was modified vide second agreement dated 16.7.88 was entered into between the parties. In terms of the said agreement a chance was to be given, "to all eligible temporary employees for permanent appointments. The appointments were against the vacancies likely to arise during the years 1995-96, circular made it clear that in view of the enormity of the problem an extension of the currency of the panel, eligible temporary employees who have been empanelled could not appear in the earlier interviews and have been pursuing their cases thereafter, "will be given another chance to appear for interview".

6. Workman submits that there were total five settlements. The settlement dated 17.11.87 is the 1st settlement (Ex M1), settlement dated 16.7.88 is 2nd settlement (Ex M2), settlement dated 27.10.88 is the 3rd settlement (Ex M3), then settlement dated 9.1.91 is 4th settlement and settlement dated 30.7.96 is 5th settlement (Ex M6). In between there is minutes of conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.95 marked as Ex M5. That due to all these settlements which were extended by subsequent settlements thereby created reasonable expectations in the list of the selected candidates arose with that it's a question of time their appointments or services would be regularized in the services of the bank. The Workman was working with the bank on temporary basis was under the bonafide hope that sooner his services will be regularized with the bank. He is thereby closed all his options elsewhere. It is needless to point out that employing person to whom hope of employment in substantial terms was made is a facet of Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

7. Further Workman submits that the Government of India issued Circular No. F-3/3/104/87-IR, dated 16.8.1990. Under said circular the chief Executives of all public sector banks including the Management herein were specifically instructed that until the problem of existing temporary employees is fully resolved, no bank is permitted to make any permanent appointments. That some of the persons similarly situated like this Workman aggrieved by the inaction on the part of the management of the bank is not regularizing their services from out of the selected panel and not clearly focusing the vacancy position, filed W.P. No. 4194/97 before Hon'ble High court of A.P.. It is specifically averred in the said writ petition that the Management of the bank had failed to implement the settlement and that it violates the various fundamental rights guaranteed under the constitution of India. The Hon'ble High court of A.P .. by order dated 5.3.97 directed the bank to implement the settlement as amended from time to time. It also directed the bank to carry out the terms of settlement before the expiry of March, 1997. The Hon'ble High Court also recorded finding that the Bank cannot escape its liability of enforcement of the Settlement. In view of the directions given by the High Court all candidates whose names appeared in the select panels prepared on the basis of the agreement entered into on 17.11.87 under which the panel was valid upto December, 1991, and on the basis of a settlement dated 27.10.1988 whereby the panels were made alive upto 31.3.1997 under which the panel was valid upto December, 1999. The other agreement dated 16.7.1988 under which the panel was valid upto 1992 and on the basis of the settlement dated 27.10.1998 whereby the panels were made alive upto 31.3.1997 were under the bonafide impression that their cases will be considered for regularization and were living on the basis of the said reasonable expectation. Unfortunately, contrary to the aforesaid directions given by the High Court and contrary to the settlements entered into between the parties, the bank issued proceedings dated 25.3.1997, dated 27.3.1997 and 31.3.1997 instructing the various authorities of the Management not to continue the temporary employees those who

are in services of the bank from 1.4.97. The said order was followed by the Management. Aggrieved by the said action the Workman herein and similarly situated candidates have filed a writ petition before the Hon'ble High Court and by way of Writ Petition No.9206/97 seeking a declaration that the proceedings issued by the Deputy General Manager and the Assistant General Manager (Respondents 3,4 and 5 therein) on 25.3.97, 27.3.97 and 31.3.97 as illegal and also non-continuance of the Workmen therein in service by absorbing them in the services of the bank as violative of Section 2(p) and 18(1) read with Rule 58 of Central Rules and sought for specific direction to the bank to absorb them in service.

8. Further, Workman submits that in the counter affidavit filed in Writ Petition No.9206/97, the bank has submitted that it has about 805 branches in Andhra Pradesh alone. It has stated that due to exigencies of circumstances and on account of the urgent need in its banks, it employed temporary employees in subordinate cadre. It is pertinent to mention that it does not state the urgent or need or the nature of temporary employees that it had engaged. Enquiry into the same would reveal that the stand taken by the bank either on the ground of urgent need or of temporary employees is a façade to perpetuate unfair labour practice. It is designed to on the one hand, keep the employed in the erroneous zone of hope and on the other to ensure that benefits that a model employer will extend under various statutes to its employees is not required to be borne out by the bank. A reading of the counter affidavit would show that the bank would opines that being just fair and reasonable are which obviously is reprehensible and is a facet of unfair labour practice.

9. The Workman submits that the bank had referred in its counter affidavit to three settlements dated 17.11.87, 16.7.88 and 27.10.88. The bank in the guise of extending the benefits of the circular of Government dated 16.8.90 stated in its counter affidavit that as follows:

"Government of India, vide its letter dated 16.8.1990, issued guidelines to all the public sector banks with regard to recruitment and absorption of temporary employees in public sector banks. The said guidelines were issued to implement on the lines of the approach paper on the issue provided by a committee constituted in this regard. The Government of India guidelines made it clear that all the public sector banks may follow the provisions laid down in the approach paper.

The approach paper specified that the cases of temporary employees who had put in not less than 240 days of temporary service in 12 consecutive Months and who are entitled to benefit of Section 25-F may be decided by entering into a settlement with the representative union. In respect of temporary employees who had put in less than 240 days of service in 12 consecutive months or less, a settlement could be avoided and however if the Management so desired, they could enter into a conciliation settlement with the representative union. Para 6(h), it is mentioned that only those temporary employees who had put in temporary service of 90 or more days after 1.1 1982 would be eligible for considering under the scheme. Although the Government guidelines envisaged for a settlement in respect of employees who had put in temporary service of 90 or more days, the bank by way of further concession entered into settlements Even in respect of those who had put in less than 90 days. As such, it could be Seen that the settlements are more beneficial to the temporary employees concerned. The approach paper also specify at para 6(c) that the banks would provide one time opportunity to all the temporary employees and for that purpose temporary employees worked in the bank on or after 1.1.1982 could be considered for re-employment in terms of the scheme. The Respondents have gone further wherein even persons working after 1975 were also considered.

As could be seen from the above, there was a genuine effort on the part of the Respondent bank to provide permanent employment for as many as possible subject to availability of the vacancies.

It is further submitted that at para 6(k) of the approach paper, it was made clear that this would be one time exercise in full and final settlement of all the aims and disputes for the past period in respect of temporary workmen covered by the settlement. This would mean that the Government of India guidelines would cover only those persons who were temporarily employed for the period specified therein and not otherwise. As such, it is submitted that the Respondents have not only followed the Government of India guidelines but in fact covered cases of the employees who had worked for less than 90 days. As such, question of violation does not arise and in any case those were only broad guidelines and not directives".

10. The Workman submits that the bank also referred a subsequent settlement dated 9.1.1991 wherein there is a clause to the effect- that the panel of temporary employees and the panel of daily wage employees will be operated to a particular period. Therefore, their cases will not be considered. The Management herein relying upon this settlement in their impugned action. It is submitted that even the settlement dated 9.1.1991 will not empower the management to terminate the services of the temporary employees who are working in the bank services like the Workman herein as it does not specify the termination of the employees. In fact there are so many vacancies wherein the Management has engaged several new persons as temporary messengers/ attendars/ sweepers etc., even after the judgment of Hon'ble High Court without considering the cases of the similarly situated candidates like the Workman herein. It is submitted inspite of engaging fresh candidates as is now being done by the Management they would have continued the similarly situated candidates like the Workman herein in the services of the bank and consider their cases for absorption in view of the circulars issued by Central Government as well as the directions of this Hon'ble Court in Writ Petition No.4194/97, dated 5.3.97. In view of the circulars issued by the Central Government, the Management

should not have relied upon the settlement dated 9.1.1991. Hence, the impugned action of the Management is illegal, unjust, violative of fundamental rights such as Articles 14,16 and 21 of the Constitution of India.

11. The Workman submits that in W.P. No.4194/97 filed by the union of temporary employees where in they have complained about the non- implementation of the settlements arrived between the parties and sought for absorption. Such employees in the bank services on permanent basis before the date fixed for carrying out the terms of settlement, the Court held that the members of the union had been empanelled in the list, they were not regularized and the time was going to run out to the near future and the Respondent bank and its officers cannot escape from the liability of enforcing the settlement which has been reached and therefore directed that the bank and the officers shall implement the settlement dated 17.11.87 as amended from time to time before the expiry of 31.3.97.

12. Further, it is submitted that in the clause of Settlement it is specifically mentioned that the workmen to be absorbed/appointed in the bank prohibiting any temporary appointments subsequent to the date of settlement even the authorities want to make temporary appointments that should be made only from among the empanelled can be appointed either for temporary vacancy or permanent vacancy except from among the empanelled candidates like the Workman and that should be continued till they are absorbed. The management committed unfair labour practices and terminated the services of the candidates with effect from 1.4.1997 which is arbitrary, discriminatory, contrary to their own guidelines and violative of the constitutional provisions which are guaranteed in Chapter-III of the Constitution of India.

13. The Workman submits that it is strange as to how the panels were allowed to lapse by a so-called Memorandum of Understanding dated 25.2.1997, that the action of terminating such employees like the Workman by virtue of an impugned oral proceedings without implementing the settlement would be illegal and unfair labour practice which cannot be allowed to be perpetuated. That the discontinuance of the Workman after 31.3.97 who had served in the bank in any capacity amounts to retrenchment. It could not have been done without any notice and it violates Sec.25FF of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and the said action is violative of principles of natural justice guaranteed under Chapter III of the Constitution of India. This amounts to retrenchment without one month's notice and taken in view of such notice. Thus, the main proceedings issued by the Respondent is without jurisdiction and is arbitrary, illegal and therefore liable to be quashed. That the alleged Memorandum of Understanding dated 27.2.97, Ex.M5 does not own any legal entity, as the said Memorandum of Understanding is not published anywhere to brought to the notice of the Workman whose rights are being affected. It is submitted that Management did not adhere to the procedure envisaged by the Central Government in its' instructions dated 16.8.90 in the year 1995. The same was not followed in the year 1997 despite there being vacancies. The management has followed the procedure of calling candidates through Employment exchange instead of giving chance to the empanelled candidates like the Workman here. It is pertinent to mention here that the Respondent Management sent letters to the all similarly situated candidates like the Workman in the month of June, 1997, subsequent to the passing of impugned termination orders. After knowing the facts that the candidates are litigating, the Management refused to engage these candidates. It is once again reiterated that the panels are meant for absorption but not for termination. It was the duty of the Management to engage the empanelled candidates like the Workman even in temporary vacancies till they are absorbed permanently in regular vacancies. Hence, the action of the Respondent Management terminating the services of the Workman by oral order dated 31.3.97 is unjust, illegal, violative of principles of natural justice and hence, the Management be directed to reinstate and absorb the Workman and to grant all incidental and consequential benefits.

14. Per contra, Respondent had filed counter and made a contentions that the reference is not tenable and contrary to the provisions of I.D. Act, 1947. Respondent submitted that to tide over severe sub-ordinate staff constraints which arose out of leave vacancies, exigencies, etc., and also owning to the restrictions imposed by the Government of India/Reserve Bank of India on intake of staff, the Respondent bank used to engage sub-ordinate staff like messengers, sweepers, sweeper cum water boys, etc., depending on the availability of work on purely temporary basis for the smooth and uninterrupted functioning of the branches. It is submitted that the All India State Bank of India Staff Federation which represents majority of the employees in the State Bank of India comprising about 98% of the work force as its' members espoused the cause of temporary employees who have put in less than 240 days of temporary service in 12 calendar months in the bank and who were ineligible for any protection under Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 to give a chance for being considered for absorption and permanent appointments.

15. Discussions were held and on 17.11.1987 an agreement was signed between the federation and the Management bank under Sec. 2(p) read with Sec 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules 1957. A copy of the said settlement dated 17.11.87 which may be herein after referred as first settlement is filed and 4 categories were made as it has already been mentioned in the claim statement above, it need not be repeated here. In the first settlement, it was agreed that the temporary employees as categorized would be given a chance for being considered for permanent appointment in the bank's service against the vacancies which are likely to arise during the period 1987 to 1991. On 16.7.88 second settlement was arrived between the Federation and the Bank whereby it was agreed to substitute the period of consideration of vacancies as 1987 to 1992 in place of 1987 to 1991 as contemplated under the first settlement dated 17.11.1987. This is the second settlement.

A 3rd settlement was entered into on 27.10.88 and it was agreed that the bank's service against the vacancies likely to arise from 1988 to 1992 was to be considered. Government of India vide its letter dated 16.8.90 issued guidelines to all the public sector banks with regard to recruitment and absorption of temporary employees in public sector banks. The said guidelines were issued to implement on the lines of approach paper on the issue provided by a committee constituted in this regard. Government of India guidelines made it clear that all the public sector banks may follow the provisions laid down in the approach paper. The approach paper specified that the cases of temporary service in 12 consecutive months and who are entitled to benefit of Sec.25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 may be decided by entering into a settlement with the representative union. In respect of temporary employees who had put in less than 240 days of service in 12 consecutive months or less, a settlement could be avoided and however if the Management so desired they could enter into a conciliation settlement with the representative union. In para. 6(h) it is mentioned that only those temporary employees who had put in temporary service of 90 days or more days after 1.1.82 would be eligible for considering under the scheme. Although the Government guidelines envisaged for a settlement in respect of employees who had put in temporary service of 90 days or more days, the bank by way of a further concession entered into settlements. Even in respect of those who had put in less than 90 days and also the bank went a step further and said those persons who are working after 1975 were also considered. Hence, there was a genuine effort on the part of the Respondent bank to provide as many as possible jobs subject to the availability of the vacancies. However, para 6 (k) of the approach paper made it clear that it is a one time, exercise in full and final, settlement of all the claims and disputes for the past period, in respect of temporary workmen covered by the settlement. Another settlement was entered on 9.1.91 herein after referred as 4th settlement and the time limit was extended upto 1994 and separate panel was prepared for temporary employees, casual/daily wagers. It was agreed that while vacancies arising between 1988 to 1994 in respect of temporary employees and in respect of casual/daily wagers, they can be considered for the vacancies arising between 1995-96 only.

16. It is submitted that the administrative set up of the Hyderabad Local Head Office comprises of four Zonal Offices (Zones) at Hyderabad, Vijayawada, Visakhapatnam and Tirupathi covering all the Districts of Andhra Pradesh. In terms of the settlement the Management after following the procedure laid down therein prepared the panels of qualified candidates of temporary employees denoted as 1989 panel and also panel of casual/daily wagers denoted as 1992 panel for giving a chance for being considered for permanent absorption. These panels were prepared zone-wise separately for messengers and non-messengers in the descending order of temporary service put in by the candidates during the stipulated period i.e., 1.7.1975 to 31.7.1988. That the Federation approached the Regional Labour Commissioner(C) for implementation of bi-partite settlement in respect of absorption of temporary employees. The Regional Labour Commissioner(C) conducted conciliation proceedings and an agreement was arrived between the Federation and the bank. It was agreed that it would be kept alive upto March, 1997. A copy of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.2.1995 signed by the parties is filed as material paper. A settlement was arrived at and an agreement was signed between the Federation and the Management bank on 30.7.1996 under Sec.2 (p) read with Sec.18(1) of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957, which is hereinafter called as 5th settlement. That on 27.2.1997 a Memorandum of understanding was also signed by the federation's affiliate and the bank Management recording the fact that the exercise of identifying the messengerial vacancies as on 31.12.1994 has since been completed by Central Office and thereby 403 messengerial vacancies were sanctioned . It was agreed that these vacancies may be filled from 1989 panel of temporary employees after effecting conversion from full time non-messengerial staff in the usual manner and the agreement was reached accordingly. It was agreed between the Federation's affiliate and the Management bank that in terms of the settlement dated 30.7.1996 both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees would lapse on 31.3.1997. That as agreed upon vacancies were filled from the panels. The Workman who has put in an aggregate temporary service of less than 240 days in a continuous block of 12 months period during 1.7.1975 to 31.7.1988 has no right to seek a direction to consider his candidature for absorption in the Management bank under any rule/law except under the settlement entered into thereon.

17. Respondent contended that, in fact, the case of the Workman can be considered under all the five settlements having got his case considered under provisions of these settlements. All the other provisions and terms of the settlements are also binding on him/her. The Management bank has not violated any of the provisions of the terms of the said settlement. That the very preparation and maintenance of panel is in compliance of the terms agreed under these settlements. These settlements were time bound and they ceased to exist on 31.3.1997. That the bank has never promised that all the candidates in the panel will be absorbed. In the advertisement itself it was made clear that candidates will be considered for absorption in the vacancies that may arise upto 1992. Keeping alive the panels after 31.3.1997 is contrary to the settlements arrived between the State Bank of India Staff Federation and the Management bank. That the settlements are binding on the parties. The Workman is also bound under the terms of the said settlement. The settlement does not suffer from any ambiguity as their language is very clear. The right under the settlements is to give them a chance to be considered for future appointment in the bank's services against the vacancies likely to arise. The settlements were effected to balance the expectations of the temporary employees to be absorbed in permanent service as against the constitutional rights for all eligible persons to be considered for employment every time a vacancy arises. That the alleged dispute including the demand for reinstatement has to be decided in this context. It is submitted that the period of panel list got expired on 31.3.97 and it is an integral term of

the settlement and cannot be modified in any proceedings under the law. These temporary employees who unfortunately could not be accommodated for want of vacancies have no further rights to be considered for regularization. That the Hon'ble High Court in WP No.12964/94, held as follows, "It is needless to state that the settlement arrived at between the All India State Bank of India Staff Federation which, is the majority union and the bank Management is binding on the Workmen also. It is not at all the case of the Workman that any of the terms of the settlement has been violated by the bank's Management. If the Workman had worked in the bank on part-time basis before 31.5.94, that itself would not vest in him a right to claim that his services should be regularized on permanent basis against a full time cadre post. The claim put forth by the Workman in the present petition is therefore misconceived and not tenable. However, it is open to the Workman to claim any right which flows from the settlement between the union and the bank Management. As already pointed out that it is not the grievance of the Workman that some right which has flown from the settlement in favour of the Workman has been denied by the bank Management. Therefore, I do not find any ground, let alone substantial ground, to grant the kind of relief sought for by the Workman. Writ Petition fails and is accordingly dismissed. No costs."

18. Further, it is contended that if the panels were not lapsed at the end of designated period and allowed to be continued it would result in making the contracts of temporary employment indirectly permanent through back door entry, which would not only be contrary to the settlements but also to Articles 14 and 16 of Constitution of India and deprive the chances of original claimants who would Come through proper recruitment procedure. As their rights have been crystallized by operation of the settlements. Hence, there is no question of any Legitimate expectation being violated.

19. Similarly placed ex-employees filed WP No.9206/1995 and the batch before the Hon'ble High Court of A.P. and the learned Single Judge allowed the Writ Petitions. Aggrieved by the same WA No.86/98 and the batch was filed and the Division Bench set aside the order of the Single Judge. Thereafter the ex-temporary employees filed Special Leave Petition No.11886-11888 of 1998 before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India also dismissed the SLP. Therefore, reference to the Judgement of the Learned Single Judge in WP No.9206/97 is of no consequences as the same has already been set aside. The observations made in the Judgements cannot be relied upon for any purpose what so ever. The question of operation of Sec.25F would not come into play. Further the issue is covered by various Judgements of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India and various Hon'ble High Courts. Hence, the reference may be ordered that the Workman is not entitled for any relief.

20. In order to fortify his claim Workman has examined himself as WW1 and he has not filed any document in evidence in support of his claim.

21. On the other hand, Respondent has examined witness MW1 Sri C.R.M. Sastry and this witness has exhibited 2 documents, marked as Ex.M1 to M2. The details of these documents are as follows:-

Ex.M.1 is the working days particulars of workman. Ex.M2 is the printed book containing settlement between the staff federation and Management for regularization of services of the temporary employees and casual employees.

22. Apart from afore mentioned documents, Learned Counsel for Workman has also filed a long list of various judgements of Hon'ble Supreme Court as well as Hon'ble High Court, which we will discuss at appropriate place in this Award.

23. Heard the argument of Learned Counsel for Workman as well as for Respondent.

24. On the basis of rival pleadings of both the parties and submissions made by the Learned Counsel for both the parties, following points arise for determination in the industrial dispute :-

I. Whether the 1st settlement dated 17.11.1987, 2nd settlement dated 16.7.1988, 3rd settlement dated 27.10.1988, 4th settlement dated 9.1.1991 and 5th settlement dated 30.7.1996 entered into between State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and also Memorandum of Understanding are binding upon both the parties?

II. Whether the action of State Bank of India, in terminating the services of Workman Sri J. Subba Rao, a Messenger with effect from 1.4.1997 is justified?

III. Whether the Workman is entitled for absorption on permanent post in the Branch of Respondent management as per averments made by him in the claim statement?

IV. To what relief if any the Workman is entitled for?

Findings:-

25. Point No.I:- Undisputedly settlements dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988, 9.1.1991 and 30.7.1996, minutes of conciliation proceedings and memorandum of understanding dated 27.2.1997 were executed between the State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation under section 2(p) and 18 (1) of I.D. Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Disputes (Central Rules), 1957.

Section 2(p) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 as follows:-

(p) "settlement" means a settlement arrived at in the course of conciliation proceeding and includes a written agreement between the employer and workmen arrived at otherwise than in the course of conciliation proceeding where such agreement has been signed by the parties thereto in such manner as may be prescribed and a copy thereof has been sent to an officer authorised in this behalf by the appropriate Government and the conciliation officer;

Section 18(1) provides as follows:-

18. Persons on whom settlements and awards are binding.

- [(1) A settlement arrived at by agreement between the employer and Workman otherwise than in the course of conciliation proceeding shall be binding on the parties to the agreement.

Therefore, in view of the provision contained u/s.18 (1) I.D. Act, 1947, terms and conditions enumerated in the aforesaid settlements are binding on the parties to the agreement. The Learned Counsel for Workman has argued that the Workman after going through the selection procedure has successfully been listed in the panel for appointment on the permanent basis in the Respondent management and the empanelled list has to be valid till last person in the empanelled list is appointed on permanent basis. But the impugned order dated 25.3.97, 27.3.97 and 31.3.97, has been issued by Respondent management thereby the services of the Workman has been terminated and the said order is not in consonance of the terms of the agreement entered into between the parties. Further, Workman submits that the Respondent in the 5th settlement has mentioned the date i.e., 31.3.1997 for lapse of empanel list which is illegal and that is not binding upon the Workman. The condition of lapse of empanelment list on 31.3.97 incorporated in the aforesaid 5th settlement, is arbitrary and illegal.

26. The perusal of the impugned order dated 25.3.1997 goes to reveal that the Chief/Branch Manager, SBI Zonal Office has issued the letter to all the branches with regard to the subject not to make any temporary appointments in the Branch in messengerial category from 1.4.1997. The extract of the said letter is given below:-

"We have been advised by the Deputy General Manager, Zonal Office, Hyderabad that as both the panels of temporary employees of 1989 and daily wagers/casual labours of 1992 will lapse by 31.3.1997, it has been decided by Central Office not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial category from 1.4.1997."

Thus, from the contents of the aforesaid letter, it manifest that Head Office of State Bank of India vide letter dated 25.3.1997 has issued direction to all its branches not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial category from 1.4.1997 due to reason of lapse of both panels i.e., 1989 & 1992 on 31.3.1997 as per terms of settlements entered into by both parties. Further, the contents of the subsequent letter dated 27.3.1997 issued by Respondent Management is also direction to Branch Manager, State Bank of India not to make any temporary messengerial category appointment with effect from 1.4.1997 and it has also been communicated to all concerned that the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers maintained by Zonal offices stand lapsed from 31.1.1997. Further, office order dated 31.3.1997 has been issued by Respondent management that goes to reveal that the said office order has been issued to this effect that, "Consequent on absorption of temporary employees in permanent cadre, it has been decided by the competent authority that no one onwards, no further daily labour or temporary employees/appointments should be resorted to/engaged/employed." Therefore, it reflects from the contents of the aforesaid orders that the temporary appointment in messengerial category and daily labour has been stopped by the Respondent management with effect from 1.4.1997 because of the lapsed of panel of temporary workers and daily wagers by 31.3.1997. The agreement for lapse of both the panels on 31.3.1997 is contained in the 5th settlement which has been arrived at between the parties on dated 30.7.1996 with the consensus of both the parties. Therefore, Workman can not challenge the terms and conditions contained in settlement dated 30.7.1996 regarding lapse of panel on 31.3.1997 as agreed between State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation. As per provision contained u/s.18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 the said Agreement dated 30.7.1996 is binding on both the parties.

In the case of **Allied Sales Corporation Secunderabad vs.The Authority Under Andhra Pradesh..... 1990 II LLJ 510 AP para 414, Hon'ble Court have held:-**

"*4. There was a settlement between the Management and the workmen under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act on 25th April 1983 under which the age of superannuation of the workmen was fixed at 55 years. The settlement was to be in force upto 30th June 1986 and the next settlement, incorporating practically the same terms, was again entered into on 4th February 1987 under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act. There is no dispute that these settlements are under Section 18(1).*

14. Now the Authority constituted under Section 41(1) of the Act is an authority with very limited jurisdiction. It can only decide in the first appeal whether a termination by the management is valid or not and is within the parameters of Section 40 of the Act. The said Authority, in our view, has absolutely no jurisdiction to decide whether a settlement entered into under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act between the representatives of the Workmen and of the Management, is vitiated by undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion on the part of the Management. The Authority, namely, the Assistant Commissioner of Labour, was never intended by the A.P. Legislature to have jurisdiction to go into the question of the validity of a settlement arrived at under Section 18 of the Industrial Disputes

Act by an Industrial Court. That Parliament has, in fact, constituted Industrial Courts under the Industrial Disputes Act, with extensive powers cannot be disputed. What we mean to say is that the Authority under Section 41(1) of the A.P. Act has no jurisdiction what-so-ever either to question or to decide about the validity of any such settlements. If parties to a settlement have a grievance about the validity of a settlement, it is for them to agitate the matter before the appropriate forum and they cannot ask an Authority constituted under Section 41(1) of the A.P. Shops and Establishments Act, 1966 with limited jurisdiction, to go into any such question and, that too, incidentally while deciding whether retirement as per the contract of employment, is legal or not."

It is not the case of Workman that aforesaid settlements are vitiated by undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion on the part of the management. If the Workman feeling aggrieved by any terms of settlement/ agreement on the aforementioned grounds then he can challenge of settlement before a competent authority under the Act, 1947. But here in the instant matter it is not a case of Workman that aforementioned settlement has been entered into between the parties on the ground of undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion. Therefore, Workman is barred to raise any objection in respect of fixing the date of lapse of both panels on 31.3.1997 as agreed between both the parties and Workman can not challenge any terms of said Agreement.

Further in the case of **Herbertsons Limited Vs. Workmen of Herbertsons Limited and Ors, 1977 AIR 322,** Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

The Tribunal thought that the question of the quantum of membership of the 2nd Respondent did not call for a finding at all in view of 1his Court's order. As observed above that was not a correct assumption. On the other hand, we feel that this view of the Tribunal has led it to approach the matter in an entirely erroneous manner. The Tribunal is, rightly enough, conscious that under section 18 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act the settlement was binding on the company and the members of the 3rd Respondent union. Even so, the Tribunal devoted nearly half of its order in scanning the evidence given by the company and Respondent No. 3 to find out whether the terms of the settlement had been explained by the President of the union to the workmen or not and whether the workers voluntarily accepted the settlement knowing all the "consequences". This to our mind is again an entirely wrong approach.

"When a recognised union negotiates with an employer the workers as individuals do not come into the picture. It is not necessary that each individual worker should know the implications of the settlement since a recognised union, which is expected to protect the legitimate interests of labour, enters into a settlement in the best interests of labour. This would be the normal rule. We cannot altogether rule out exceptional cases where there may be allegations of mala fides, fraud or even corruption or other induce- ments. Nothing of that kind has been suggested against the President of the 3rd Respondent in this case. That being the position, prima facie, this is a settlement in the course of collective bargaining and, therefore, is entitled to due weight and consideration.

It is not possible to scan the settlement in bits and pieces and hold some parts good and acceptable and others bad. Unless it can be demonstrated that the objectionable portion is such that it completely outweighs all the other advantages gained the Court will be slow to hold a settle- ment as unfair and unjust. The settlement has to be accepted or rejected as a whole and we are unable to reject it as a whole as unfair or unjust. Even before this Court the 3rd Respondent representing admittedly the large majority of the workmen has stood by this settlement and that is a strong factor which it is difficult to ignore. As stated elsewhere in the judgment, we cannot also be oblivious of the fact that all workmen of the company have accepted the settlement. Besides, the period of settlement has since expired and we are informed that the employer and the 3rd Respondent are negotiating another settlement with further improvements. These factors, apart from what has been stated above, and the need for industrial peace and harmony when a union backed by a large majority of workmen has accepted a settlement in the course of collective bargaining have impelled us not to interfere with this settlement. That being the position, we unhold the settlement as fair and just and order that the award of the Tribunal shall be substituted by the settlement dated October 18, 1973. The said settlement shall be the substituted award. The appeal is disposed of accordingly. There will be no order as to costs."

Therefore, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above, the contention of the Workman that the date fixed for lapse of empanelled list on 31.3.1997 for appointment to the permanent post vide 5th Settlement dated 30.7.1996 is arbitrary, illegal is not untenable. The recognized union of Workmen has negotiated with the Respondent Bank Management representing large number of Workmen and the Workman as individual do not come into picture. Workman in the instant case has work as temporary Workmen in the Respondent Branch and in response of Notification he had applied for inclusion of his name in the panel and he was selected for inclusion his name in the panel list to be utilized for absorption of such Workman to permanent post in order of their seniority in the list. The Settlement dated 30.7.1996 between State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation under Sec.2(p) and Sec.18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 has clearly provided as regard non-messengerial position and it is agreed that all such posts sanctioned fallen vacant upto 31.3.1997 shall be filled before empanel list is allowed to lapse. Thus, in view of law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, in the instant case, Agreement dated 30.7.1996 was entered into between both the parties in respect of lapsing of the both the panels on 31.3.1997 and absorption of the Workmen from panel list was subject to availability of vacancy of post likely to arise upto 31.3.1997, have a binding force on Workman as well as management of State Bank of India in view of provision contained under section 18 (1) of I.D. Act, 1947.

Thus, Point No.I is answered against the Workman and in favour of the Respondent.

27. **Point No.II**:- Firstly, it is submitted on behalf of the Workman that the Respondent has terminated his services by oral order on 31.3.1997 without issuing any notice or paying any salary or compensation in lieu thereof. Therefore, the termination order of the Workman from service is in violation of provision contained Under Section 25 F of I.D. Act, 1947. Therefore, the order is liable to be set aside.

28. On the other hand, Respondent counsel contended that Workman has not worked for 240 days in any preceding calendar year. Therefore, reference of the industrial dispute is not relevant. In this context, the Workman has examined himself as WW1 who has reiterated that Workman has been terminated from service by Respondent on 31.3.1997 without notice of salary or compensation in lieu thereof. Before examining the claim of the Workman on merit it would be apposite to reproduce the provision contained under section 25 F:-

Section 25F provides:-

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].

Compensation to workmen in case of transfer of undertakings.

Section 25B defines the term continuous service which provides

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 authorized 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;

In order to prove the fact of 240 days of service within 12 months of a calendar year just preceding from the date of termination, the initial burden of proof lies upon the Workman and the Workman has to prove this factum by adducing his oral as well as documentary evidence in support of his claim.

Further, how to calculate 240 days of service by the Workman in a calendar year. In this context the reference of decisions of Hon'ble Supreme Court is relevant and the same are discussed below:-

In Rajasthan State Ganganagar S. Mills Ltd. v. State of Rajasthan and Anr. (2004) Apex Court held:

"It was the case of the Workman that he had worked for more than 240 days in the year concerned. This claim was denied by the appellant. It was for the claimant to lead evidence to show that he had worked for 240 days in the year preceding the date of his termination. He has filed an affidavit. It is statement which is in his favor and that cannot be regarded as sufficient evidence for any Court or Tribunal to come to the conclusion that in fact the claimant had worked for 240 days in a year These aspects were highlighted in Range Forest Officer v. S.T. Hadimani (2002 (3) SCC 25. No proof of receipt of salary or wages for 240 days or order or record in that regard was produced. Mere non-production of the muster roll for a particular period was not sufficient for the Labour Court held that the Workman had worked for 240 days as claimed."

In Municipal Corporation, Faridabad v. Siri Niwas (2004 (8) SCC 195), held "*the burden was on the Workman to show that he was working for more than 240 days in the preceding one year prior to his alleged retrenchment." In M.P. Electricity Board v. Hariram (2004 (8) SCC 246) the position was again reiterated in paragraph 11 as follows: "The above burden having not been discharged and the Labour Court having held so, in our opinion, the Industrial Court and the High Court erred in basing an order of reinstatement solely on an adverse inference drawn erroneously ..*"

In the case of Manager, RBI, Bangalore vs. S Mani (2005) SCC Page 100, the 3 Judges Bench of the Apex Court held that "*the initial burden of proof was on the Workman to show that he had completed 240 days of service."*

Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of Mohan Lal vs Management BEL 1981 SCC page 225 has laid down the principle that how to count 240 days of service within one year it is held: *"Clause (2)(a) provides for a fiction to treat a Workman in continuous service for a period of one year despite the fact that he has not rendered uninterrupted service for a period of one year but he has rendered period of 240 days during the period of 12 calendar service for months counting backwards and just preceding the relevant date being the date of retrenchment. In other words, in order to invoke the fiction enacted in clause (2)(a) it is necessary to determine first the relevant date, ie the date of termination of service which is complained of as retrenchment. After that date is ascertained. move backward to a period of 12 months just preceding the date of retrenchment and then ascertain whether within the period of 12 months, the Workman has rendered service for a period of 240 days. If these three facts are affirmatively answered in favor of the Workman pursuant to the deeming fiction enacted in clause (2)(a) it will have to be assumed that the Workman is in continuous service for a period of one year and he will satisfy the eligibility qualification enacted in Section 25-F"*

"14. We have already extracted section 25B since its amendment and the change in language is the legislative exposition of which note must be taken. In fact, we need not further dilate upon this aspect because in Surendra Kumar Verma and Ors. v. Central Government Industrial-cum-Labour Court, New Delhi and Anr., Chinnappa Reddy. J., after noticing the amendment and referring to the decision in Sur Enamel and Stamping Works (P) Ltd case, held as under:

"These changes brought about by Act 36 of 1964 appear to be clearly designed to provide that a Workman who has actually worked under the employer for not less than 240 days during a period of twelve months shall be deemed to have been in continuous service for a period of one year whether or not he has in fact been in such continuous service for a period of one year. It is enough that he has worked for 240 days in a period of 12 months, it is not necessary that he should have been in the service of the employer for one whole year."

In a concurring judgment Pathak J. agreed with this interpretation of section 25B(2). Therefore, both on principle and on precedent it must be held that section 25B(2) comprehends a situation where a Workman is not in employment for a period of 12 calendar months, but has rendered service for a period of 240 days within the period of 12 calendar months commencing and counting backwards from the relevant date, i.e. the date of retrenchment. If he has, he would be deemed to be in continuous service for a period of one year for the purpose of section 25B and Chapter VA."

Thus, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above the initial burden of proof lies upon the Workman to show that he has completed 240 days of the service with the Respondent just preceding from the date of his termination. Further, in respect of the employment of calculating the 240 days service provision contained under Section 25-F read with Section 25-B of the I.D. Act, 1947.

29. Now, in view of the provision contained under Section 25 F and law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, we have to examine whether the Workman has discharged his initial burden of proof in respect of his claim of 240 days continuous service in a calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination i.e., 31.3.1997. The witness WW1 in chief examination has stated that he had worked for 90 days in the said branch in the year 1985. Further, witness states, "*I have been not given more than 200 days in any calendar year inspite of heavy work load and just to avoid us to get regularised. The bank calculations of ½ and 3/4 days are wrong. This squarely an unfair labour practice."* As per provision contained u/s.25 F read with Sec.25 B of I.D.Act, 1947, the Petitioner has to adduce the evidence of continuous service of 240 days in a calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination i.e., 1.4.1997. But as per the chief statement of witness WW1, he had worked continuously for 90 days in the branch in the year 1985. Further, Petitioner witness has not adduced any evidence that he had worked for 240 days continuously in a calendar year of 12 months just preceding from the date of his termination i.e., 1.4.1997. Therefore, the claim of the Petitioner that he has been terminated in contravention of provision contained under section 25 F of the Act is not corroborated by his oral or documentary evidence. Thus, it is clear from the testimony of WW1 that the Workman had not worked for 240 days continuously in any 12 months of a calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination in the Respondent bank. Therefore, Workman failed to establish his plea by his oral and documentary evidence that he had worked for 240 days continuously in calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination i.e., 31.3.1997. Thus, the claim of the Workman that he has been terminated by oral order without issuing notice or payment in lieu after termination, in contravention of Section 25 F of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is not tenable. However the documents filed by the Workman in support of his claim, number of days worked with the Respondent goes to reveal that the Workman had worked intermittently as daily wager depending upon availability of work in branch. Workman did not file any document of appointment letter or salary slips in support of his claim for appointment as a non-messenger in the Respondent branch on temporary basis.

30. Per contra, the Learned Counsel for Respondent has submitted the allegation of Workman that he was terminated from services is not correct. As the vacancies were filled up on regular basis in order of their respective

seniority the non-engagement of the Workman does not amount to termination. Further, Respondent contended that no law provide that even though there is no work temporary employee should be continued in the bank work as the very engagement of Workman was subject to availability of work. Therefore, the allegation that the bank has indulged in unfair labour practice is incorrect.

31. Thus, in view of the fore gone discussion and contentions made by the Respondent, I find the force in the argument advanced by the Respondent that in the instant matter, Workman was not terminated from service by order dated 31.3.1997 rather he was disengaged in view of the non-availability of the work in the branch. Further, there was direction issued by the Head Office of the Respondent authority not to engage any daily wager Workman/ temporary Worker w.e.f. 1.4.1997. Thus, such disengagement of Workman does not amount to termination. Moreover, the Workman failed to prove his claim that he was terminated in contravention of provision of Sec.25F of the I.D. Act, 1947 as he failed to establish his plea by any oral or documentary evidence that he had worked for 240 days continuously in a twelve months of calendar year just preceding from date of termination i.e., 31.3.1997.

32. Further, perusal of the order dated 25.3.1997 goes to reveal that the Chief Branch Manager, State Bank of India has issued the letter to Zonal Office with direction to all its branches to this effect that they have been advised by the DGM, Zonal Office, Hyderabad that as both the panel of temporary employees of 1989 and daily wagers/casual labour of 1992 will lapse on 31.3.1997 it has been decided by central office not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial cadre from 1.4.1997, therefore it was directed to issue suitable instructions not to make temporary appointments from 1.4.1997. There is no mention in this order that the Workman herein has been terminated from service by this order.

33. Further, the circular dated 27.3.1997 was issued by DGM, SBI to all branches in commercial network in respect of the non-appointment of temporary employees in subordinate cadre and it has directed not to make any temporary employment in the subordinate cadre with effect from 1.4.97 and further, it has directed to ensure that no temporary/casual/daily basis appointment of the petty cash. Further, it is directed to all Branch Managers that any deviation in this regard will be viewed seriously. Thus, these circulars do not reflect that the Workman has been terminated from service by this order.

34. Similarly, office order dated 31.3.1997 is simply a direction to all branches of the Respondent bank by DGM that no further daily labour should be engaged or employed. Therefore, the plea of the Workman that he has been terminated by the aforesaid order dated 25.3.1997, 27.3.1997 and 31.3.1997 from the service by the Respondent is not acceptable. The evidence adduced by the Workman clearly goes to reveal that he had worked as a daily wager for which he has been paid wages according to number of working days. As there was an order for prohibition for engaging temporary workmen, in the bank, therefore, Workman could not be engaged by the Respondent for work from 1.4.1997 and there after. It is settled law that the daily wagers are engaged by the employer depending upon the availability of work and as the work was not available the Workman was not engaged further by the Respondent management. Therefore, the Workman on the ground of number of days he had worked in the Respondent bank cannot claim any right to reinstate him into the employment. As the Workman failed to prove the mandatory condition of 240 days of continuous service as required under Sec.25F of I.D. Act, 1947. Therefore, the disengagement of Workman from work can not be termed in contravention of provision contained under Sec.25F and 25 B of the I.D. Act, 1947.

Thus, this point is answered against the Workman and in favour of Respondent.

35. **Point No.III**:- In this context, the Workman has contended that the management failed to implement the selected panels during its valid tenure. The management adopted the back door methods contrary to the settlements and filled up the vacancies. The same is evident from the proceedings dated 18.11.1993 a copy of the same is filed in the material papers and the same may be read as part of the claim statement. Further, it is submitted that management has to adhere the procedure issued by the Central Government, the instructions dated 16.8.1990 in the year 1995, but same was not followed in the year 1997 despite there being vacancies. The management has followed the procedure of calling candidates through employment exchange instead of giving chance to the empanelled candidates like the Workman herein. The management sent call letters to the similarly situated candidates like the Workman in the month of June 1997 subsequent to issuance of impugned termination orders. After knowing the fact that they are litigating the issue by way of dispute, the management has refused to engage those candidates, the copies of call letters issued are filed herein along with claim petition. The Workman herein reiterates that the panels are meant for absorption but not for termination. In view of the same a duty is cast upon the Respondent management to engage the empanelled candidates like the Workman herein even in temporary vacancies till they are absorbed permanently in regular vacancies.

36. On the other hand, Respondent has contended that the Federation approached Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) for implementation of bipartite settlement in respect of the absorption of temporary employees. The Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) conducted conciliation proceedings and agreement was arrived at between the Federation and the Management bank. It is submitted that it was agreed between the Federation and the Management that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers /casual labour would be kept alive upto March, 1997 and the vacancies as agreed to under the afore set out settlements will be filled from

both the lists concurrently. A copy of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.1995 signed by the parties to the dispute is filed as a material paper. Further, it is submitted that the settlement was arrived at and an agreement was signed between the Federation and the Management bank on 30.7.1996 under Section 2(p) read with Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules 1957 which is binding on the parties. A copy of this agreement which hereinafter may be referred to as 5th settlement for brevity, is also filed as a material paper. The 5th settlement dated 30.7.1996 whereunder the earlier four settlements dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988 and 9.1.1991 were also referred, it was agreed to, by the Federation and the Management bank that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees will be kept alive upto March, 1997 for filling the vacancies existing/arrived at as on 31.12.1994 as per the norms agreed to between the bank and Federation and that thereafter the said panels would lapse. It was also agreed that within the framework of the above settlements the modalities about drawing names from either the panel of temporary employees or the panel of daily wagers and casual labour would be decided administratively on circle to circle basis depending upon the local requirements in consultation with the Federation's affiliate by the Circle management. It was further agreed that all messenger real vacancies/positions in the subordinate cadre including part-time attendants specifically provided as leave reserve will be filled by the end of 31.3.1997. Further, Respondent contended that on 27.2.1997 a memorandum of understanding was also signed between the Federation's affiliate and the bank management regarding the fact that the exercise of identifying the messengerial vacancies as on 31.12.1994 has since been completed by central office and thereby 403 messengerial vacancies were sanctioned to the circle of the Management bank and it was agreed that these vacancies may be filled from 1989 panel of temporary employees after effecting conversion from full time non-messengerial staff in the usual manner and the agreement was reached upon. Further, it was agreed between the Federations affiliate and the management bank that in terms of the settlement dated 30.7.1996 both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers /casual employees would lapse on 31.3.1997.

37. The Workman has contended that the empanelled list prepared by the Respondent management for appointment of temporary and daily wage Workers to the permanent post cannot lapse unless until it is exhausted by appointing all the empanelled persons and it should continue even after 31.3.1997, i.e., the date fixed for the lapse of panel. It is undisputed that the date of lapse of empanelled list of Workmen has been fixed to 31.3.1997 as mentioned in the settlement dated 30.7.1996, and agreed between the parties. It is settled law that and once the life of panel list lapses on the date as agreed between the parties it cannot be extended beyond that date. In the instant case the panel list of the workmen was valid upto 31.3.1997 in view of the terms and conditions enumerated in the 5th Settlement entered into between the parties. As the lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997 has been agreed by State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation through 5th Settlement, the Workman is not competent to challenge the same.

In this context I would like to take reference of the decision of the apex court in the case of **Syndicate Bank and Ors vs. Shankar Paul and Ors , AIR 1997 SC 3091, therein the Hon'ble Apex Court** have held:-

"Till 1982, the branches of the appellant Bank in Calcutta region were recruiting persons locally to work as temporary attenders in leave vacancies. In view of the revised procedure prescribed by the Government of India in respect of such temporary appointments, the Calcutta regional office of the appellant Bank issued a circular to all of its branches on 14.8.1982, instructing all the branches under it to discontinue the old practice from 1.6.1982 and appoint only empanelled candidates. The regional office was to prepare a panel of eligible candidates, after calling names from the local/district employment exchange, and split it up branch-wise. Following that new procedure yearly panels were prepared thereafter. Names of the Respondents were for the first time included in the panel prepared for the period 7.2.1987 to 6.2.1988. By its letter dated 7.2.1987 the Bank had informed the Respondents that the panel was valid for one year only and that inclusion of their names in the panel was not to confer on them any right to seek permanent appointment in the service of the bank. Considering the object with which the panel was prepared and the fact that it was an yearly panel expiring on 6.2.1988, we are of the opinion that the Respondents did not get any right, because of inclusion of their names in the said panel, for permanent absorption in the service of the Bank. Whatever conditional right they had came to an end with the expiry of the panel. The claim of the Respondents, as contained in the writ petition was thus misconceived and therefore the learned single Judge and the Division Bench, when it first decided the appeal, were right in dismissing the writ petition and the appeal respectively."

Thus, in view of the above law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court and in view of the terms and conditions of the 5th Settlement the contention of the Workman that empanelled list should continue even after 31.3.1997 till the last Workman in the panel is absorbed is not tenable. The contention of the Workman is baseless in view of recital in the settlement. Therefore, in view of the fore gone discussion and finding given at Point No. I regarding binding nature of Settlements and terms and conditions enumerated therein, in view of the provision contained u/s.18(1) of the I.D. Act, 1947, I am of the considered view that life of panels lapsed on 31.3.1997 in view of terms of settlement dated 30.7.1996 and plea of Workman that the panel shall continue even after 31.3.1997 till last man absorbed has no legal force and same is untenable.

38. Undisputedly, settlement agreement dated 30.7.1996 was executed between the State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation and in that settlement it was agreed that both the panels of temporary employees

and daily wagers/ casual employees will be used for filling vacancies existing as on 31.12.1994 as per the norms agreed between the bank and the Federation. These empanelled workmen were to be given a chance for permanent appointment in the bank against vacancies arising up to December 1994 whereas the daily wagers/ casual employees were to be considered against the vacancies arise from January 1995 to December 1996, whereby the said panel would lapse. It was agreed that the vacancies falls upto 31.3.1997 shall be filled before the empanelled list is allowed to lapse. Thus, the claim of the Workman to the post of permanent non-messenger in the Respondent management was subject to the availability of the sanctioned post and vacancies arising upto 31.3.1997. The workmen given chance to the permanent post were seniors in number of working days in panel list and Workman herein was junior to those workmen. Therefore, Workman could not be given absorption to permanent post being junior to other workmen in the panel list.

39. Moreover, the Respondent management witness MW1 in chief statement has given the evidence that, "It is not true to say that bank has removed the Workman from service by taking care to see that he did not complete 240 days of the service continuously within a period of 12 months. The engagement of the service of the workmen was need based and there is no continuous availability of leave vacancies for engaging his services." Although this witness was cross examined by the Petitioner but the above statement of the management witness in chief remained uncontroverted, as the witness MW1 was not cross examined by Petitioner on this point. Therefore, the claim of the Petitioner that he has been removed from service by the management illegally is untenable. Further, witness MW1 in his chief statement has stated that, the workman was engaged in leave vacancies in the bank on Temporary basis. This witness has categorically stated that, "The last person whose services was regularised has completed 168 days of employment during the crucial period as per settlement whereas the Workman herein worked for 90 days during that period." This statement of witness MW1 remained uncontroverted as the Petitioner did not cross examine the witness MW1 on this point. Therefore, the Petitioner Workman as per number of working days, failed to fulfil eligibility criteria of working days as required for regularisation. Therefore, he was not given regularisation in the employment of the Respondent. Therefore, in view of the statement of WW1 in cross examination, the claim of the Petitioner that he was refused regularization by the Respondent management illegally, is untenable. Thus, from the above statement of the Workman witness WW1 it is clear that the panel was prepared in terms of various settlements entered into between Staff Federation of State Bank of India and State Bank of India and it was prepared on the basis of number of days of work put in by the temporary employees. Further, the Workman himself admitted that some of the temporary employees whose names were included in the panel were given regular appointment in the bank in order of their seniority in the panel and he is not having any document to show that any person who worked for less number of days than the Workman was given appointment in the bank. Therefore, the allegation of the Workman that the regular appointment has been made by the bank from the panel list in breach of the terms of the settlement and violation of seniority of panel list is not proved by this evidence of WW1. Thus, there is no evidence on record that bank has given the appointment to the temporary employees as well as daily wagers from the panel list 1989 and 1992 in breach of seniority of the temporary employees in the list. There is no evidence of jumbling in the panel list to make appointment of any permanent Workman in breach of the seniority. Therefore, I am constrained to hold that the Respondent Management has appointed the workmen from panel list in order of seniority and there is no jumbling of workmen in the panel list before it got lapsed on 31.3.1997.

40. However, Workman has taken the plea that the panels of Workmen for absorption in the employment of the Respondent banks (panels of temporary employees and daily wagers) has been lapsed on 31.3.1997 in contravention of terms of settlement as the object of preparing the entire empanelment of temporary and daily wagers was to provide them permanent employment and till the both the panel lists exhausted the panel list cannot be lapsed on 31.3.1997 and the date of lapsing of the panel on 31.3.1997 has been fixed by the Respondent arbitrarily without any authority.

41. In this context, the perusal of Settlement dated 30.7.1996 reveals that the 5th Settlement dated 30.7.1996 was entered under Section 2(p) and 18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Dispute (Central) Rules 1957. This settlement has been entered into by the competent parties and in this settlement parties thereto agreed that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees will lapse on 31.3.1997. Thus the date of lapse of panel was fixed by both the parties with consensus under the settlement dated 30.7.1996 and same is binding upon the Workman under the provision of Section 18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947. Moreover, this issue of binding force of the settlement dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988 and 9.1.1991 has already been discussed, decided at finding in Point No.I of this award. However, the legality and validity of the aforementioned settlement has not been challenged by the Workman before any competent forum. Thus, claim of Workman that the date of lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997 has been fixed arbitrarily by the Respondent bank is untenable. As regard the claim of Workman for his absorption to the permanent post it is settled law that the Workman can not claim his regularization to permanent post merely on the basis of number of working days.

42. In this context the reference of the decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Oil and Natural Gas Corporation vs Krishan Gopal 2020(3) SCALE 272, date of decision 7.2.2020** is relevant therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have has laid down principle regarding regularization of the Workman on permanent posts. Hon'ble Supreme Court have laid down the prepositions of regularization of the workmen to permanent post is as under:-

"*(i) Wide as they are, the powers of the Labour Court and the Industrial Court cannot extend to a direction to order regularisation, where such a direction would in the context of public employment offend the provisions contained in Article 14 of the Constitution;*

(ii) The statutory power of the Labour Court or Industrial Court to grant relief to workmen including the status of permanency continues to exist in circumstances where the employer has indulged in an unfair labour practice by not filling up permanent posts even though such posts are available and by continuing to employ workmen as temporary or daily wage employees despite their performing the same work as regular workmen on lower wages;

(iii) The power to create permanent or sanctioned posts lies outside the judicial domain and where no posts are available, a direction to grant regularisation would be impermissible merely on the basis of the number of years of service;

(iv) Where an employer has regularised similarly situated workmen either in a scheme or otherwise, it would be open to workmen who have been deprived of the same benefit at par with the workmen who have been regularised to make a complaint before the Labour or Industrial Court, since the deprivation of the benefit would amount to a violation of Article 14; and

(v) In order to constitute an unfair labour practice under Section 2(ra) read with Item 10 of the Vth Schedule of the ID Act, the employer should be engaging workmen as badlis, temporaries or casuals, and continuing them for years, with the object of depriving them of the benefits payable to permanent workmen.

Thus, in view of the principles laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court as discussed above, in the instant matter the Workman utterly failed to prove his claim by adducing any documentary or oral evidence that the employer has indulged in unfair labour practice by not filling the permanent posts even though such posts are available and by continuing to employ workmen as temporary or daily wage employees despite their performance was the same work, as regular workmen on lower wages.

43. Respondent has contended that all the vacancies exist and arise upto 31.3.1997 has been filled up from the panel list in order of seniority and no vacancy exists or arises as on 31.3.1997 remained unfilled. Further, it is contended that as per terms of settlement the life of panel lists has been lapsed on 31.3.1997, hence, there is no occasion to extend the life of panel lists beyond 31.3.1997. However, the workman failed to prove contrary by any evidence to the aforesaid contention of the Respondent that the vacancies were existing as on 31.3.1997 and the workman was not given absorption to the permanent post in order of his seniority. It is settled law that the power to create permanent or sanctioned post lies outside the judicial domain and where no posts are available, a direction to grant regularization would be impermissible merely on the basis of the number of years of service. Therefore, the claim of the workman on this ground also not acceptable.

44. Further, as per the of settlement, panel was prepared for absorption of the workmen on the permanent posts has already been lapsed on 31.3.1997 and the vacancies existing and arising upto 31.12.1994 and upto 31.3.1997 as settlement dated 30.7.1996 has been filled up from the panel by appointing the workmen as per seniority in the panel list. Workman witness WW1 in his cross examination has himself admitted this fact that, some of the temporary employees whose names were included in the panel were given regular appointment in the bank in order of their seniority in the panel. The Workman failed to show that there was any breach of terms of settlement has been committed by the Respondent in appointment to permanent post from aforesaid panel list.

45. As discussed in preceding paragraph of this Award, the life of the panel has not been extended beyond 31.3.1997, by any further settlement hence, the panel list in which name of the Workman was included got expired on 31.3.1997. It is not the case of the Workman that Respondent has regularized similarly situated workmen either in the scheme or otherwise and the Workman has been deprived of same benefit on par with those workmen or the vacancies remained unfilled on the date of lapse of panels i.e., 31.3.1997, Industrial Tribunal has no jurisdiction to extend the date of lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997. This Tribunal can not order for regularization of workmen to the permanent post in contravention of the provision of Article 14 of the Constitution of India.

In the case of **Mahboob Deepak vs. Nagar Panchayat Gajraula & Anr, Civil Appeal No.5875/2007 date of judgement 13.12.2007,** Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

"8. Respondent is a Local Authority. The terms and conditions of employment of the employees are governed by a statute and statutory rules. No appointment can be made by a Local Authority without following the provisions of the recruitment rules. Any appointment made in violation of the said rules as also the constitutional scheme of equality as contained in Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India would be a nullity.

9. Due to some exigency of work, although recruitment on daily wages or on an ad hoc basis was permissible, but by reason thereof an employee cannot claim any right to be permanently absorbed in service or made permanent in absence of any statute or statutory rules. Merely because an employee has completed 240 days of work in a year preceding the date of retrenchment, the same would not mean that his services were liable to be regularized."

Therefore, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, the claim of the Workman for absorption merely on the basis of number of day of work in the Respondent bank Branch is not acceptable. As regard plea of the Workman that the Workman should have been given employment even after 31.3.1997 as temporary Workman, it is the discretion of Respondent to engage the Workman depending upon availability of work and this Tribunal can not direct the Respondent to engage the Workman in the absent of such rule/scheme.

46. In view of principle laid down by Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above, in the instant matter Workman utterly failed to establish the fact of rendering continuous service for a period of 240 days of service within a period of 12 calendar months commencing and coming backward from relevant date i.e., the date of retrenchment, if has he would be denied to be in continuous service for a period of one year. Therefore, the provision contained under Sec.25F of retrenchment is not applicable to Workman.

Counsel for Workman has relied upon number of decisions of Hon'ble High Court and Hon'ble Supreme Court and few of them are discussed herein:-

In the case of **F.C.I., vs. Kamdhenu Cattle Feed Industries 1993 (1) SCC 71,** therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

"7. In contractual sphere as in all other State actions, the State and all its instrumentalities have to conform to Article 14 of the Constitution of which non-arbitrariness is a significant facet. There is no unfettered discretion in public law: A public authority possesses powers only to use them for public good. This impose the duty to act fairly and to adopt a procedure which is `fairplay in action'. Due observance of this obligation as a part of good administration raises a reasonable or legitimate expectation in every citizen to be treated fairly in his interaction with the State and its instrumentalities, with this element forming a necessary component of the decision making process in all State actions. To satisfy this requirement of non- arbitrariness in a State action, it is, therefore, necessary to consider and give due weight to the reasonable or legitimate expectations of the persons likely lo be affected by the decision or else that unfairness in the exercise of the power may amount to an abuse or excess of power apart from affecting the bona fides of the decision in a given case. The decision so made would be exposed to challenge on the ground of arbitrariness. Rule of law does not completely eliminate discretion in the exercise of power, as it is unrealistic, but providers for control of its exercise by judicial review."

In the case of **State Bank of India, R.O., Vijayawada vs. Industrial Tribunal, Hyderabad WP No.193/1997,** therein Hon'ble High Court have held,

"*Sri Krovvidi Narasimham, the learned counsel for the 2nd respondent contends, supporting the award that it was a permanent vacancy and even though the 2nd respondent was appointed on temporary basis, his services were not liable to be terminated and he was to be regularised into service on permanent basis. Shastry award warrants that no temporary appointment can be made to a permanent post. But the matter is now covered by two division bench judgements dated 28.11.1986 in W.A. No.791 of 1986 and 25.8.1987 in W.A. No.270 of 1982. The ratio decided in the two judgements is to the effect that there cannot be any mandate to appoint employees on permanent basis when the requirement was for appointment on temporary basis. But it is held in the said judgements that when a temporary appointee is ousted from service and not for misconduct and, if again temporary appointment is to be made, then, the case of such temporary appointee who was ousted, has got to be considered in accordance with Sec. 25-H of the Act."*

In the case of **State of Haryana and others vs. Piara Singh and others. 1992 (4) SCC 118,** therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

" 49. If for any reason an adhoc or temporary employee is continued for a fairly long spell, the authorities must consider his case for regularization provided he is eligible and qualified according to the rules and his service record is satisfactory and his appointment does not run counter to the reservation policy of the state."

In the above cited judgements by the Workman the facts of the case are different hence do not apply to instant case of Workman.

47. On the other hand, in support of his contention Respondent has examined witness MW1 and MW1 in chief examination states that, Settlements i.e., on 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988, 9.1.1991 were entered into between the SBI and SBI Staff Federation for filling up of the vacancies that arise up to 1994 for those temporary employees who has worked on scale wages. Further, MW1 states that two different panels for messengers and non-messengers as per the eligibility criteria prescribed by the bank. There are four modules in Andhra Pradesh and they are Hyderabad, Tirupathi, Vijayawada and Visakhapatnam. MW1 states that the temporary employees so empanelled were given permanent absorption depending upon the vacancies so arise strictly in terms of the settlement. MW1 states that on 9.6.1995 conciliation proceeding was held before the RLC(C), Hyderabad and in said proceedings it was decided that the panels will be kept live up to 31.3.1997 and vacancies will be filled from both the lists concurrently. Further, MW1 states that on 30.7.1996 another settlement was entered between the SBI and All India SBI Staff Federation providing for filling up of the vacancies arising up to December 1994 in respect of subordinate cadre and daily wage /casual wage employees out of panel so prepared were to be considered against

vacancies arising from January 1995 to December 1996, thereafter the said panels lapse. MW1 states that it was also agreed that all the non- messenger positions in subordinate cadre including part time attendants specially provided as leave reserve will be filled before 31.3.1997 and as regards to non-messengerial positions it is agreed that all such posts sanctioned and fallen vacant up to 31.3.1997 shall be filled before the empanelled list is allowed to lapse. Thus in both the cases empanelled list were lapsed on 1.4.1997. Further, witness states that on 27.2.1997 a memorandum of understanding was reached between the SBI and SBI Staff Federation providing that both the panels above mentioned will lapse on 31.3.1997. Ex.M2 contains, Memorandum of understanding and statements giving the particulars of 1989 non-messenger panel, statement of 1989 non- messenger panel and statement of 1992 panel. Further, witness states that petitioner was included in the 1989 panel. As the existing vacancies at that time were exhausted and his turn did not come he could not be given permanent employment in the bank as per the agreements. All the appointments were made strictly in accordance with the settlements reached from time to time between SBI and SBI staff federation and as per seniority, number of days of temporary service put in by them in the bank in the given period. Further, MW1 states petitioner was not sponsored by any employment exchange he did not undergo the regular process of selection required for appointment as a regular non-messenger the petitioner has not worked for 240 days in any year in his entire temporary service in the bank. The petitioner and other temporary employees were terminated from service by the bank. Further, MW1 states that the vacancies were filled up on regular basis with the temporary employees from the panels and these panels were expired in terms of the settlements so reached and there were no vacancies to absorb such employees. Thus, witness MW1 has proved the documents Ex.M1 and Ex.M2 and also contentions made in the counter. However, MW1 was cross examined by the Petitioner Counsel. But nothing has been elicited in his cross examination so as to discredit the testimony of the witness MW1 as regards the date of lapse of both the panels on 31.3.1997 and reasons assigned for non-absorption of the Petitioner from the panel list to the permanent post. Moreover the witness MW1 was re-examined by the Respondent and the witness MW1 states that panels were expired in terms of the settlement send absorptions to the extent of the available vacancies were made. There was no termination of any temporary messenger as such but their services were not utilized after the cut off date as the available vacancies were already filled up and most of these Petitioners were not in the service of the bank as on the date of the expiry date of the panels. Therefore, in view of the aforesaid testimony of the MW1 in re-examination in the absence of cross examination remained uncontraverted, the claim of the Workman that he was entitled for absorption in permanent post in the branch of Respondent Management on the basis of panel list is found not established.

This point is answered against the Workman.

48. **Point No.IV**:- In view of the discussion and finding given at Point Nos. I, II and III, the Workman is not entitled for any relief and claim statement of Workman sans merit and liable to be dismissed.

This Point is answered accordingly.

AWARD

In view of the fore gone discussion, it is held that the action of the Respondent bank in terminating the services of Sri J. Subba Rao, Ex. Messenger by way of oral orders w.e.f. 1.4.1997 is justified. Hence, the Petitioner is not entitled for any relief as prayed for. The claim statement filed by Workman sans merit, hence, dismissed.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, Personal Assistant, transcribed by her, corrected and signed by me on this the 24th day of June, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner	Witnesses examined for the Respondent
WW1: Sri J. Subba Rao	MW1: Sri C.R.M. Sastry

Documents marked for the Petitioner

NIL

Documents marked for the Respondent

Ex.M1: Photocopy of statement showing no. of working days of Petitioner

Ex.M2: Photocopy of printed book containing settlement between the staff federation and Management for regularization of services of the temporary employees and casual employees.

नई दिल्ली, 27 जुलाई, 2026

का.आ. 1688.— औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एस बी आई भारत का के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजको और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण – सह - श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद के पंचाट (सन्दर्भ संख्या 23/2003) को प्रकाशित करती है,

[सं. एल. 39025/01/2026–आई.आर.(बी–II)-72]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 27th July, 2026

S.O. 1688.— In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (.No.LC.23/2003) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Hyderabad as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the Management of Satate Bank of India and their workmen,

[No. L-39025/01/2026- IR (B-II)-72]

SALONI, Dy. Director

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD

Present: - **Sri Irfan Qamar**

Presiding Officer

Dated the 10th day of June, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE L.C.No. 23/2003

[Old ID No. 242/2000 of Labour Court, Guntur]

Between:

Sri Y. Venkaiah,

S/o Luther,

R/o Molakaluru,

Narasaraopet Mandal,

Guntur District. …. Petitioner

And

1. The Chairman,
   State Bank of India,
   Central office,
   Mumbai.
2. The Chief General Manager,
   (Personnel)
   State Bank of India,
   Bank Street
   Hyderabad-500 095.
3. The Regional Asst. General Manager,
   State Bank of India,
   Zonal Office, Vijayawada Zone,
   Vijayawada.

4. The Branch Manager,

State Bank of India,

Narasaraopet branch(ADB),

Guntur district. …..Respondents

Appearances:

For the Petitioner : Sri Macherla Rangaiah, Advocate

For the Respondent: Sri Y. Ranjeeth Reddy, Advocate

AWARD

Sri Y. Venkaiah who worked as Messenger (who will be referred to as the workman) has filed this petition under Sec. 2A(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 against the Respondents State Bank of India seeking for reinstatement into service as Messenger/Sweeper duly granting all the consequential benefits such as continuity of service, back wages and all other attendant benefits etc., and such other reliefs as this court may deem fit. Earlier Petitioner has filed this dispute before the Labour Court, Guntur for adjudication and later the same has been transferred to this Tribunal bearing ID No. 242/2000, as per orders of Central Government vide Lr.No.H-11026/1/2001-IR(C.II) dated 18.10.2001 and registered, numbered in this Tribunal as LC No. 23/2003.

2. Before unfolding the factual matrix of the instant industrial dispute it would be apposite to have a bird eye view of a chequered history of the instant industrial dispute. Earlier instant industrial dispute along with the batch cases was decided by this Tribunal vide common award dated 17.5.2005 and the reference was answered in favour of the Respondent and against the Workman. That said common award dated 17.5.2005 was challenged by the aggrieved Workmen in various Writ petition No.6470/2014 along with batch of writ petitions before the Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh and Hon'ble High Court vide its' judgement dated 23.6.2014 allowed all batch of writ petitions and set aside the common award dated 17.5.2005 passed in ID No.222 of 2001 and other batch of ID cases by Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad and the Respondent management of State Bank of India was directed to reengage the Writ Petitioners in position, which they have been occupying prior to their termination and further directed to consider their cases for regularization as and when the substantive vacancy arises. This judgement dated 23.6.2014 of Hon'ble High Court of AP, passed in WP No.6470/2014 and batch petitions was challenged by Respondent management before the Hon'ble High Court in Writ Appeal No. 1268 of 2014. The aforesaid Writ Appeals No.1268/2014 and other Writ Appeals were decided by Division Bench of High Court of Andhra Pradesh by a common judgement dated 20.3.2019. Hon'ble High Court in aforesaid Writ Appeal was pleased to pass the order which is extracted as below:-

" 7. Hearing the learned senior counsel for the SBI and the learned senior counsel for the contesting unofficial Respondents, we see that while the learned single Judge was justified in setting aside the award af the Tribunal, the proper course to be adopted was to remit all the cases to the Tribunal. This we say for reasons more than one. Firstly, in such matters, claims have to be decided on individual basis, as different persons have different claims as to the length of officiation or discharge of duties and functions; quality of engagement, drawings, accounting of the post for each one of them, who have worked etc. All these issues will not be the same in all the cases. Therefore, each case ought to have been directed to be decided by the Tribunal afresh on individual basis. The second and most important aspect is the learned single Judge has in one go ordered re-employment of all the workmen. This is not a relief that could have been granted without answering the individual issues; each issue relating to each case could not have been decided by the writ Court within the format of its adjudication procedures and scope. The adjudicating body, which has to do that activity, is the Industrial Tribunal. Therefore, we are of the view that while we would sustain the order of the learned singe Judge insofar as it interfered and sets aside the award of the Tribunal, the further findings and directions, issued through the impugned order have to go and the individual cases have to be sent back for consideration of the Tribunal. Such further procedure before the Tribunal will have to be carried forward with the materials already on record and also by affording an opportunity to the persons, who have claims as well as the management to place their rival contentions and further material before the Tribunal. The learned counsel appearing for the workmen are justified in pointing out that enormous delay has already happened and further action by the Tribunal in this line may be expedited.

9. In the result, these writ appeals are ordered;

(1) affirming the impugned common order of the learned single Judge to the extent it sets aside the common award dated 17.05.2005 of the Industrial Tribunal;

(2) the further findings and directions issued through the impugned common order are vacated:

(3) all the matters shall be remitted to the Industrial Tribunal with a direction to dispose of them within an outer limit of five (5) months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order; and,

(4) the parties to make appearance before the Tribunal on the given date."

Thus, in view of the above direction of Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh in W.A.No.1268 of 2014 and batch cases. This Tribunal has taken up the matter of industrial dispute for hearing and deciding it afresh in view of the aforesaid guidelines laid down by the Hon'ble High Court in Writ Appeal No.1268/2014 vide judgement dated 20.3.019.

3. The factual matrix of instant industrial dispute as narrated by the Workman in his claim statement are that, the Workman joined in the service of the management institution as Messenger and worked from 1.4.1986 to December, 1996 and has rendered unblemished service spreading over a period of about 10 years. The Respondent has terminated services of Workman by oral orders with effect from 1997. Further, it is submitted that the management of Respondent bank decided to give a chance to temporarily employed personnel "found suitable for permanent appointment" by wait- listing them by offering permanent appointment or waitlisting till such opportunity arises.

4. That on 17.11.1987 a settlement was reached between All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and the Management of State Bank of India - settlement one, under this settlement three categories of employees were listed. That is, A) those who have completed 240 days in 12 months or less after 1.7.1975. B) those who have completed 270 days in any continuous block of 36 calendar months after 1.7.1975. C) (i) those who have completed minimum of 30 days aggregate temporary service in any calendar year after 1.7.1975 or (ii) 70 days aggregate temporary service in continuous block of 36 months after 1.7.1975.

5. The persons who satisfied in all the above 4 categories were to be interviewed by a selection committee and the said selection committee would determine the suitability of the said candidate for permanent appointment. Therefore, the bank prescribed certain qualifications and from among the candidates satisfying the qualifications the suitable candidates were enlisted by a selection committee. The Clause 7 of the said agreement provided with the selected candidate would be wait listed in order of their respective categorization and the selected panel would be valid upto December, 1991. Clause 10 of the settlement specifically provided that henceforth. "there will be no temporary appointments in the subordinate cadre", except on a restrictive basis in the specified category, "from amongst empanelled candidates as per existing guidelines of the bank". The Workman further submits that consequent upon the said agreement and the draft, a notification was issued in the newspapers. The last date for responding to the advertisement was 30.8.1988. A written examination followed by viva-voce in May, 1989 was held. A selected panel was prepared, as per Clause 7 of the agreement, ie. Settlement No.1, the selected panel was to be valid upto December, 1991, the Workman submits that circular was issued on 26.4.91 by the said letter it is mentioned that the terms of the agreement dated 17.11.87 was modified vide second agreement dated 16.7.88 was entered into between the parties. In terms of the said agreement a chance was to be given, "to all eligible temporary employees for permanent appointments. The appointments were against the vacancies likely to arise during the years 1995-96, circular made it clear that in view of the enormity of the problem an extension of the currency of the panel, eligible temporary employees who have been empanelled could not appear in the earlier interviews and have been pursuing their cases thereafter, "will be given another chance to appear for interview".

6. Workman submits that there were total five settlements. The settlement dated 17.11.87 is the 1st settlement, settlement dated 16.7.88 is 2nd settlement, settlement dated 27.10.88 is the 3rd settlement, then settlement dated 9.1.91 is 4th settlement and settlement dated 30.7.96 is 5th settlement. In between there is minutes of conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.95. That due to all these settlements which were extended by subsequent settlements thereby created reasonable expectations in the list of the selected candidates arose with that it's a question of time their appointments or services would be regularized in the services of the bank. The Workman was working with the bank on temporary basis was under the bonafide hope that sooner his services will be regularized with the bank. He is thereby closed all his options elsewhere. It is needless to point out that employing person to whom hope of employment in substantial terms was made is a facet of Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

7. Further Workman submits that the Government of India issued Circular No. F-3/3/104/87-IR, dated 16.8.1990. Under said circular the chief Executives of all public sector banks including the Management herein were specifically instructed that until the problem of existing temporary employees is fully resolved, no bank is permitted to make any permanent appointments. That some of the persons similarly situated like this Workman aggrieved by the inaction on the part of the management of the bank is not regularizing their services from out of the selected panel and not clearly focusing the vacancy position, filed W.P. No. 4194/97 before Hon'ble High court of A.P.. It is specifically averred in the said writ petition that the Management of the bank had failed to implement the settlement and that it violates the various fundamental rights guaranteed under the constitution of India. The Hon'ble High court of A.P .. by order dated 5.3.97 directed the bank to implement the settlement as amended from time to time. It also directed the bank to carry out the terms of settlement before the expiry of March, 1997. The Hon'ble High Court also recorded finding that the Bank cannot escape its liability of enforcement of the Settlement. In view of the

directions given by the High Court all candidates whose names appeared in the select panels prepared on the basis of the agreement entered into on 17.11.87 under which the panel was valid upto December, 1991, and on the basis of a settlement dated 27.10.1988 whereby the panels were made alive upto 31.3.1997 under which the panel was valid upto December, 1999. The other agreement dated 16.7.1988 under which the panel was valid upto 1992 and on the basis of the settlement dated 27.10.1998 whereby the panels were made alive upto 31.3.1997 were under the bonafide impression that their cases will be considered for regularization and were living on the basis of the said reasonable expectation. Unfortunately, contrary to the aforesaid directions given by the High Court and contrary to the settlements entered into between the parties, the bank issued proceedings dated 25.3.1997, dated 27.3.1997 and 31.3.1997 instructing the various authorities of the Management not to continue the temporary employees those who are in services of the bank from 1.4.97. The said order was followed by the Management. Aggrieved by the said action the Workman herein and similarly situated candidates have filed a writ petition before the Hon'ble High Court and by way of Writ Petition No.9206/97 seeking a declaration that the proceedings issued by the Deputy General Manager and the Assistant General Manager (Respondents 3,4 and 5 therein) on 25.3.97, 27.3.97 and 31.3.97 as illegal and also non-continuance of the Workmen therein in service by absorbing them in the services of the bank as violative of Section 2(p) and 18(1) read with Rule 58 of Central Rules and sought for specific direction to the bank to absorb them in service.

8. Further, Workman submits that in the counter affidavit filed in Writ Petition No.9206/97, the bank has submitted that it has about 805 branches in Andhra Pradesh alone. It has stated that due to exigencies of circumstances and on account of the urgent need in its banks, it employed temporary employees in subordinate cadre. It is pertinent to mention that it does not state the urgent or need or the nature of temporary employees that it had engaged. Enquiry into the same would reveal that the stand taken by the bank either on the ground of urgent need or of temporary employees is a façade to perpetuate unfair labour practice. It is designed to on the one hand, keep the employed in the erroneous zone of hope and on the other to ensure that benefits that a model employer will extend under various statutes to its employees is not required to be borne out by the bank. A reading of the counter affidavit would show that the bank would opines that being just fair and reasonable are which obviously is reprehensible and is a facet of unfair labour practice.

9. The Workman submits that the bank had referred in its counter affidavit to three settlements dated 17.11.87, 16.7.88 and 27.10.88. The bank in the guise of extending the benefits of the circular of Government dated 16.8.90 stated in its counter affidavit that as follows:

"Government of India, vide its letter dated 16.8.1990, issued guidelines to all the public sector banks with regard to recruitment and absorption of temporary employees in public sector banks. The said guidelines were issued to implement on the lines of the approach paper on the issue provided by a committee constituted in this regard. The Government of India guidelines made it clear that all the public sector banks may follow the provisions laid down in the approach paper.

The approach paper specified that the cases of temporary employees who had put in not less than 240 days of temporary service in 12 consecutive Months and who are entitled to benefit of Section 25-F may be decided by entering into a settlement with the representative union. In respect of temporary employees who had put in less than 240 days of service in 12 consecutive months or less, a settlement could be avoided and however if the Management so desired, they could enter into a conciliation settlement with the representative union. Para 6(h), it is mentioned that only those temporary employees who had put in temporary service of 90 or more days after 1.1 1982 would be eligible for considering under the scheme. Although the Government guidelines envisaged for a settlement in respect of employees who had put in temporary service of 90 or more days, the bank by way of further concession entered into settlements Even in respect of those who had put in less than 90 days. As such, it could be Seen that the settlements are more beneficial to the temporary employees concerned. The approach paper also specify at para 6(c) that the banks would provide one time opportunity to all the temporary employees and for that purpose temporary employees worked in the bank on or after 1.1.1982 could be considered for re-employment in terms of the scheme. The Respondents have gone further wherein even persons working after 1975 were also considered.

As could be seen from the above, there was a genuine effort on the part of the Respondent bank to provide permanent employment for as many as possible subject to availability of the vacancies.

It is further submitted that at para 6(k) of the approach paper, it was made clear that this would be one time exercise in full and final settlement of all the aims and disputes for the past period in respect of temporary workmen covered by the settlement. This would mean that the Government of India guidelines would cover only those persons who were temporarily employed for the period specified therein and not otherwise. As such, it is submitted that the Respondents have not only followed the Government of India guidelines but in fact covered cases of the employees who had worked for less than 90 days. As such, question of violation does not arise and in any case those were only broad guidelines and not directives".

10. The Workman submits that the bank also referred a subsequent settlement dated 9.1.1991 wherein there is a clause to the effect- that the panel of temporary employees and the panel of daily wage employees will be operated to

a particular period. Therefore, their cases will not be considered. The Management herein relying upon this settlement in their impugned action. It is submitted that even the settlement dated 9.1.1991 will not empower the management to terminate the services of the temporary employees who are working in the bank services like the Workman herein as it does not specify the termination of the employees. In fact there are so many vacancies wherein the Management has engaged several new persons as temporary messengers/ attendars/ sweepers etc., even after the judgment of Hon'ble High Court without considering the cases of the similarly situated candidates like the Workman herein. It is submitted inspite of engaging fresh candidates as is now being done by the Management they would have continued the similarly situated candidates like the Workman herein in the services of the bank and consider their cases for absorption in view of the circulars issued by Central Government as well as the directions of this Hon'ble Court in Writ Petition No.4194/97, dated 5.3.97. In view of the circulars issued by the Central Government, the Management should not have relied upon the settlement dated 9.1.1991. Hence, the impugned action of the Management is illegal, unjust, violative of fundamental rights such as Articles 14,16 and 21 of the Constitution of India.

11. The Workman submits that in W.P. No.4194/97 filed by the union of temporary employees where in they have complained about the non- implementation of the settlements arrived between the parties and sought for absorption. Such employees in the bank services on permanent basis before the date fixed for carrying out the terms of settlement, the Court held that the members of the union had been empanelled in the list, they were not regularized and the time was going to run out to the near future and the Respondent bank and its officers cannot escape from the liability of enforcing the settlement which has been reached and therefore directed that the bank and the officers shall implement the settlement dated 17.11.87 as amended from time to time before the expiry of 31.3.97.

12. Further, it is submitted that in the clause of Settlement it is specifically mentioned that the workmen to be absorbed/appointed in the bank prohibiting any temporary appointments subsequent to the date of settlement even the authorities want to make temporary appointments that should be made only from among the empanelled can be appointed either for temporary vacancy or permanent vacancy except from among the empanelled candidates like the Workman and that should be continued till they are absorbed. The management committed unfair labour practices and terminated the services of the candidates with effect from 1.4.1997 which is arbitrary, discriminatory, contrary to their own guidelines and violative of the constitutional provisions which are guaranteed in Chapter-III of the Constitution of India.

13. The Workman submits that it is strange as to how the panels were allowed to lapse by a so-called Memorandum of Understanding dated 25.2.1997, that the action of terminating such employees like the Workman by virtue of an impugned oral proceedings without implementing the settlement would be illegal and unfair labour practice which cannot be allowed to be perpetuated. That the discontinuance of the Workman after 1997 who had served in the bank in any capacity amounts to retrenchment. It could not have been done without any notice and it violates Sec.25FF of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and the said action is violative of principles of natural justice guaranteed under Chapter III of the Constitution of India. This amounts to retrenchment without one month's notice and taken in view of such notice. Thus, the main proceedings issued by the Respondent is without jurisdiction and is arbitrary, illegal and therefore liable to be quashed. That the alleged Memorandum of Understanding dated 27.2.97 does not own any legal entity, as the said Memorandum of Understanding is not published anywhere to brought to the notice of the Workman whose rights are being affected. It is submitted that Management did not adhere to the procedure envisaged by the Central Government in its' instructions dated 16.8.90 in the year 1995. The same was not followed in the year 1997 despite there being vacancies. The management has followed the procedure of calling candidates through Employment exchange instead of giving chance to the empanelled candidates like the Workman here. It is pertinent to mention here that the Respondent Management sent letters to the all similarly situated candidates like the Workman in the month of June, 1997, subsequent to the passing of impugned termination orders. After knowing the facts that the candidates are litigating, the Management refused to engage these candidates. It is once again reiterated that the panels are meant for absorption but not for termination. It was the duty of the Management to engage the empanelled candidates like the Workman even in temporary vacancies till they are absorbed permanently in regular vacancies. Hence, the action of the Respondent Management terminating the services of the Workman by oral order dated 1997 is unjust, illegal, violative of principles of natural justice and hence, the Management be directed to reinstate and absorb the Workman and to grant all incidental and consequential benefits.

14. Per contra, Respondent had filed counter and made a contentions that the reference is not tenable and contrary to the provisions of I.D. Act, 1947. Respondent submitted that to tide over severe sub-ordinate staff constraints which arose out of leave vacancies, exigencies, etc., and also owning to the restrictions imposed by the Government of India/Reserve Bank of India on intake of staff, the Respondent bank used to engage sub-ordinate staff like messengers, sweepers, sweeper cum water boys, etc., depending on the availability of work on purely temporary basis for the smooth and uninterrupted functioning of the branches. It is submitted that the All India State Bank of India Staff Federation which represents majority of the employees in the State Bank of India comprising about 98% of the work force as its' members espoused the cause of temporary employees who have put in less than 240 days of temporary service in 12 calendar months in the bank and who were ineligible for any protection under Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 to give a chance for being considered for absorption and permanent appointments.

15. Discussions were held and on 17.11.1987 an agreement was signed between the federation and the Management bank under Sec. 2(p) read with Sec 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules 1957. A copy of the said settlement dated 17.11.87 which may be herein after referred as first settlement is filed and 4 categories were made as it has already been mentioned in the claim statement above, it need not be repeated here. In the first settlement, it was agreed that the temporary employees as categorized would be given a chance for being considered for permanent appointment in the bank's service against the vacancies which are likely to arise during the period 1987 to 1991. On 16.7.88 second settlement was arrived between the Federation and the Bank whereby it was agreed to substitute the period of consideration of vacancies as 1987 to 1992 in place of 1987 to 1991 as contemplated under the first settlement dated 17.11.1987. This is the second settlement. A 3rd settlement was entered into on 27.10.88 and it was agreed that the bank's service against the vacancies likely to arise from 1988 to 1992 was to be considered. Government of India vide its letter dated 16.8.90 issued guidelines to all the public sector banks with regard to recruitment and absorption of temporary employees in public sector banks. The said guidelines were issued to implement on the lines of approach paper on the issue provided by a committee constituted in this regard. Government of India guidelines made it clear that all the public sector banks may follow the provisions laid down in the approach paper. The approach paper specified that the cases of temporary service in 12 consecutive months and who are entitled to benefit of Sec.25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 may be decided by entering into a settlement with the representative union. In respect of temporary employees who had put in less than 240 days of service in 12 consecutive months or less, a settlement could be avoided and however if the Management so desired they could enter into a conciliation settlement with the representative union. In para. 6(h) it is mentioned that only those temporary employees who had put in temporary service of 90 days or more days after 1.1.82 would be eligible for considering under the scheme. Although the Government guidelines envisaged for a settlement in respect of employees who had put in temporary service of 90 days or more days, the bank by way of a further concession entered into settlements. Even in respect of those who had put in less than 90 days and also the bank went a step further and said those persons who are working after 1975 were also considered. Hence, there was a genuine effort on the part of the Respondent bank to provide as many as possible jobs subject to the availability of the vacancies. However, para 6 (k) of the approach paper made it clear that it is a one time, exercise in full and final, settlement of all the claims and disputes for the past period, in respect of temporary workmen covered by the settlement. Another settlement was entered on 9.1.91 herein after referred as 4th settlement and the time limit was extended upto 1994 and separate panel was prepared for temporary employees, casual/daily wagers. It was agreed that while vacancies arising between 1988 to 1994 in respect of temporary employees and in respect of casual/daily wagers, they can be considered for the vacancies arising between 1995-96 only.

16. It is submitted that the administrative set up of the Hyderabad Local Head Office comprises of four Zonal Offices (Zones) at Hyderabad, Vijayawada, Visakhapatnam and Tirupathi covering all the Districts of Andhra Pradesh. In terms of the settlement the Management after following the procedure laid down therein prepared the panels of qualified candidates of temporary employees denoted as 1989 panel and also panel of casual/daily wagers denoted as 1992 panel for giving a chance for being considered for permanent absorption. These panels were prepared zone-wise separately for messengers and non-messengers in the descending order of temporary service put in by the candidates during the stipulated period i.e., 1.7.1975 to 31.7.1988. That the Federation approached the Regional Labour Commissioner(C) for implementation of bi-partite settlement in respect of absorption of temporary employees. The Regional Labour Commissioner(C) conducted conciliation proceedings and an agreement was arrived between the Federation and the bank. It was agreed that it would be kept alive upto March, 1997. A copy of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.2.1995 signed by the parties is filed as material paper. A settlement was arrived at and an agreement was signed between the Federation and the Management bank on 30.7.1996 under Sec.2 (p) read with Sec.18(1) of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957, which is hereinafter called as 5th settlement. That on 27.2.1997 a Memorandum of understanding was also signed by the federation's affiliate and the bank Management recording the fact that the exercise of identifying the messengerial vacancies as on 31.12.1994 has since been completed by Central Office and thereby 403 messengerial vacancies were sanctioned . It was agreed that these vacancies may be filled from 1989 panel of temporary employees after effecting conversion from full time non-messengerial staff in the usual manner and the agreement was reached accordingly. It was agreed between the Federation's affiliate and the Management bank that in terms of the settlement dated 30.7.1996 both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees would lapse on 31.3.1997. That as agreed upon vacancies were filled from the panels. The Workman who has put in an aggregate temporary service of less than 240 days in a continuous block of 12 months period during 1.7.1975 to 31.7.1988 has no right to seek a direction to consider his candidature for absorption in the Management bank under any rule/law except under the settlement entered into thereon.

17. Respondent contended that, in fact, the case of the Workman can be considered under all the five settlements having got his case considered under provisions of these settlements. All the other provisions and terms of the settlements are also binding on him/her. The Management bank has not violated any of the provisions of the terms of the said settlement. That the very preparation and maintenance of panel is in compliance of the terms agreed under these settlements. These settlements were time bound and they ceased to exist on 31.3.1997. That the bank has never promised that all the candidates in the panel will be absorbed. In the advertisement itself it was made clear that

candidates will be considered for absorption in the vacancies that may arise upto 1992. Keeping alive the panels after 31.3.1997 is contrary to the settlements arrived between the State Bank of India Staff Federation and the Management bank. That the settlements are binding on the parties. The Workman is also bound under the terms of the said settlement. The settlement does not suffer from any ambiguity as their language is very clear. The right under the settlements is to give them a chance to be considered for future appointment in the bank's services against the vacancies likely to arise. The settlements were effected to balance the expectations of the temporary employees to be absorbed in permanent service as against the constitutional rights for all eligible persons to be considered for employment every time a vacancy arises. That the alleged dispute including the demand for reinstatement has to be decided in this context. It is submitted that the period of panel list got expired on 31.3.97 and it is an integral term of the settlement and cannot be modified in any proceedings under the law. These temporary employees who unfortunately could not be accommodated for want of vacancies have no further rights to be considered for regularization. That the Hon'ble High Court in WP No.12964/94, held as follows, "It is needless to state that the settlement arrived at between the All India State Bank of India Staff Federation which, is the majority union and the bank Management is binding on the Workmen also. It is not at all the case of the Workman that any of the terms of the settlement has been violated by the bank's Management. If the Workman had worked in the bank on part-time basis before 31.5.94, that itself would not vest in him a right to claim that his services should be regularized on permanent basis against a full time cadre post. The claim put forth by the Workman in the present petition is therefore misconceived and not tenable. However, it is open to the Workman to claim any right which flows from the settlement between the union and the bank Management. As already pointed out that it is not the grievance of the Workman that some right which has flown from the settlement in favour of the Workman has been denied by the bank Management. Therefore, I do not find any ground, let alone substantial ground, to grant the kind of relief sought for by the Workman. Writ Petition fails and is accordingly dismissed. No costs."

18. Further, it is contended that if the panels were not lapsed at the end of designated period and allowed to be continued it would result in making the contracts of temporary employment indirectly permanent through back door entry, which would not only be contrary to the settlements but also to Articles 14 and 16 of Constitution of India and deprive the chances of original claimants who would Come through proper recruitment procedure. As their rights have been crystallized by operation of the settlements. Hence, there is no question of any Legitimate expectation being violated.

19. Similarly placed ex-employees filed WP No.9206/1995 and the batch before the Hon'ble High Court of A.P. and the learned Single Judge allowed the Writ Petitions. Aggrieved by the same WA No.86/98 and the batch was filed and the Division Bench set aside the order of the Single Judge. Thereafter the ex-temporary employees filed Special Leave Petition No.11886-11888 of 1998 before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India also dismissed the SLP. Therefore, reference to the Judgement of the Learned Single Judge in WP No.9206/97 is of no consequences as the same has already been set aside. The observations made in the Judgements cannot be relied upon for any purpose what so ever. The question of operation of Sec.25F would not come into play. Further the issue is covered by various Judgements of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India and various Hon'ble High Courts. Hence, the reference may be ordered that the Workman is not entitled for any relief.

20. In order to fortify his claim Workman has examined himself as WW1 and also filed documents in evidence which has been exhibited as Ex.W1 to W13. Further, the Workman has filed photocopies of documents in support of his claim which are discussed as under:-

Ex.W1 is the service certificate. Ex.W2 is the service certificate. Ex.W3 is the service certificate. Ex.W4 is the service certificate. Ex.W5 is the service certificate. Ex.W6 is the transfer certificate. Ex.W7 is the caste certificate. Ex.W8 is the panel list. Ex.W9 is the employment card. Ex.W10 is the interview call letter. Ex.W11 is the stay order. Ex.W12 is the 1992 panel list. Ex.W13 is the legal notice.

21. On the other hand, Respondent has examined witness MW1 Sri K. Chandra Sekhar Goud and this witness has exhibited 13 documents, marked as Ex.M1 to M13. The details of these documents are as follows:-

Ex.M.1 is the Settlement dated 17.11.1987. Ex.M2 is the Settlement dated 16.7.1988. Ex.M3 is the Settlement dated 27.10.1988. Ex.M4 is the Settlement dated 9.1.1991. Ex.M5 is the Minutes of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.1995. Ex.M6 is the Settlement dated 30.7.1996. Ex.M7 is the Memorandum of Understanding dt. 27.2.1997. Ex.M8 is the Particulars of 1989 Messengerial Panel. Ex.M9 is the Particulars of 1989 Non-Messengerial Panel. Ex.M10 is the Particulars of 1992 General Attendant Panel. Ex.M11 is the Judgment of Hon’ble High Court of A.P. in Writ Appeal No.86/98 dt.1.5.1998. Ex.M12 is the Judgment of Hon’ble Supreme Court of India in SLP No. 11886-11888 of 1998 dt.10.8.1998. Ex.M13 is the notification dated 4.5.1991.

22. Apart from afore mentioned documents, Learned Counsel for Workman has also filed a long list of various judgements of Hon’ble Supreme Court as well as Hon’ble High Court, which we will discuss at appropriate place in this Award.

23. Heard the argument of Learned Counsel for Workman as well as for Respondent.

24. On the basis of rival pleadings of both the parties and submissions made by the Learned Counsel for both the parties, following points arise for determination in the industrial dispute :-

I. Whether the 1st settlement dated 17.11.1987, 2nd settlement dated 16.7.1988, 3rd settlement dated 27.10.1988, 4th settlement dated 9.1.1991 and 5th settlement dated 30.7.1996 entered into between State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and also Memorandum of Understanding are binding upon both the parties?

II. Whether the action of State Bank of India, Narasaraopet in terminating the services of Workman Sri Y. Venkaiah, a Messenger with effect from 1997 is justified?

III. Whether the Workman is entitled for absorption on permanent post in the Branch of Respondent management as per averments made by him in the claim statement?

IV. To what relief if any the Workman is entitled for?

Findings:-

25. Point No.I:- Undisputedly settlements dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988, 9.1.1991 and 30.7.1996, minutes of conciliation proceedings and memorandum of understanding dated 27.2.1997 were executed between the State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation under section 2(p) and 18 (1) of I.D. Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Disputes (Central Rules), 1957.

Section 2(p) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 as follows:-

(p) "settlement" means a settlement arrived at in the course of conciliation proceeding and includes a written agreement between the employer and workmen arrived at otherwise than in the course of conciliation proceeding where such agreement has been signed by the parties thereto in such manner as may be prescribed and a copy thereof has been sent to an officer authorised in this behalf by the appropriate Government and the conciliation officer;

Section 18(1) provides as follows:-

18. Persons on whom settlements and awards are binding.

- [(1) A settlement arrived at by agreement between the employer and Workman otherwise than in the course of conciliation proceeding shall be binding on the parties to the agreement.

Therefore, in view of the provision contained u/s.18 (1) I.D. Act, 1947, terms and conditions enumerated in the aforesaid settlements are binding on the parties to the agreement. The Learned Counsel for Workman has argued that the Workman after going through the selection procedure has successfully been listed in the panel for appointment on the permanent basis in the Respondent management and the empanelled list has to be valid till last person in the empanelled list is appointed on permanent basis. But the impugned order dated 25.3.97, 27.3.97 and 31.3.97, has been issued by Respondent management thereby the services of the Workman has been terminated and the said order is not in consonance of the terms of the agreement entered into between the parties. Further, Workman submits that the Respondent in the 5th settlement has mentioned the date i.e., 31.3.1997 for lapse of empanel list which is illegal and that is not binding upon the Workman. The condition of lapse of empanelment list on 31.3.97 incorporated in the aforesaid 5th settlement, is arbitrary and illegal.

26. The perusal of the impugned order dated 25.3.1997 goes to reveal that the Chief/Branch Manager, SBI Zonal Office has issued the letter to all the branches with regard to the subject not to make any temporary appointments in the Branch in messengerial category from 01.01.1997. The extract of the said letter is given below:-

"We have been advised by the Deputy General Manager, Zonal Office, Hyderabad that as both the panels of temporary employees of 1989 and daily wagers/casual labours of 1992 will lapse by 31.3.1997, it has been decided by Central Office not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial category from 01.01.1997."

Thus, from the contents of the aforesaid letter, it manifest that Head Office of State Bank of India vide letter dated 25.3.1997 has issued direction to all its branches not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial category from 1997due to reason of lapse of both panels i.e., 1989 & 1992 on 31.3.1997 as per terms of settlements entered into by both parties. Further, the contents of the subsequent letter dated 27.3.1997 issued by Respondent Management is also direction to Branch Manager, State Bank of India not to make any temporary messengerial category appointment with effect from 1997and it has also been communicated to all concerned that the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers maintained by Zonal offices stand lapsed from 31.1.1997. Further, office order dated 31.3.1997 has been issued by Respondent management that goes to reveal that the said office order has been issued to this effect that, "Consequent on absorption of temporary employees in permanent cadre, it has been decided by the competent authority that no one onwards, no further daily labour or temporary employees/appointments should be resorted to/engaged/employed." Therefore, it reflects from the contents of the aforesaid orders that the temporary appointment in messengerial category and daily labour has been stopped by the Respondent management with effect from 1997because of the lapsed of panel of temporary workers and daily wagers

by 31.3.1997. The agreement for lapse of both the panels on 31.3.1997 is contained in the 5th settlement which has been arrived at between the parties on dated 30.7.1996 with the consensus of both the parties. Therefore, Workman can not challenge the terms and conditions contained in settlement dated 30.7.1996 regarding lapse of panel on 31.3.1997 as agreed between State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation. As per provision contained u/s.18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 the said Agreement dated 30.7.1996 is binding on both the parties.

In the case of **Allied Sales Corporation Secunderabad vs.The Authority Under Andhra Pradesh..... 1990 II LLJ 510 AP para 414, Hon'ble Court have held:-**

"*4. There was a settlement between the Management and the workmen under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act on 25th April 1983 under which the age of superannuation of the workmen was fixed at 55 years. The settlement was to be in force upto 30th June 1986 and the next settlement, incorporating practically the same terms, was again entered into on 4th February 1987 under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act. There is no dispute that these settlements are under Section 18(1).*

14. Now the Authority constituted under Section 41(1) of the Act is an authority with very limited jurisdiction. It can only decide in the first appeal whether a termination by the management is valid or not and is within the parameters of Section 40 of the Act. The said Authority, in our view, has absolutely no jurisdiction to decide whether a settlement entered into under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act between the representatives of the Workmen and of the Management, is vitiated by undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion on the part of the Management. The Authority, namely, the Assistant Commissioner of Labour, was never intended by the A.P. Legislature to have jurisdiction to go into the question of the validity of a settlement arrived at under Section 18 of the Industrial Disputes Act by an Industrial Court. That Parliament has, in fact, constituted Industrial Courts under the Industrial Disputes Act, with extensive powers cannot be disputed. What we mean to say is that the Authority under Section 41(1) of the A.P. Act has no jurisdiction what-so-ever either to question or to decide about the validity of any such settlements. If parties to a settlement have a grievance about the validity of a settlement, it is for them to agitate the matter before the appropriate forum and they cannot ask an Authority constituted under Section 41(1) of the A.P. Shops and Establishments Act, 1966 with limited jurisdiction, to go into any such question and, that too, incidentally while deciding whether retirement as per the contract of employment, is legal or not."

It is not the case of Workman that aforesaid settlements are vitiated by undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion on the part of the management. If the Workman feeling aggrieved by any terms of settlement/ agreement on the aforementioned grounds then he can challenge of settlement before a competent authority under the Act, 1947. But here in the instant matter it is not a case of Workman that aforementioned settlement has been entered into between the parties on the ground of undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion. Therefore, Workman is barred to raise any objection in respect of fixing the date of lapse of both panels on 31.3.1997 as agreed between both the parties and Workman can not challenge any terms of said Agreement.

Further in the case of **Herbertsons Limited Vs. Workmen of Herbertsons Limited and Ors, 1977 AIR 322,** Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

The Tribunal thought that the question of the quantum of membership of the 2nd Respondent did not call for a finding at all in view of 1his Court's order. As observed above that was not a correct assumption. On the other hand, we feel that this view of the Tribunal has led it to approach the matter in an entirely erroneous manner. The Tribunal is, rightly enough, conscious that under section 18 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act the settlement was binding on the company and the members of the 3rd Respondent union. Even so, the Tribunal devoted nearly half of its order in scanning the evidence given by the company and Respondent No. 3 to find out whether the terms of the settlement had been explained by the President of the union to the workmen or not and whether the workers voluntarily accepted the settlement knowing all the "consequences". This to our mind is again an entirely wrong approach.

"When a recognised union negotiates with an employer the workers as individuals do not come into the picture. It is not necessary that each individual worker should know the implications of the settlement since a recognised union, which is expected to protect the legitimate interests of labour, enters into a settlement in the best interests of labour. This would be the normal rule. We cannot altogether rule out exceptional cases where there may be allegations of mala fides, fraud or even corruption or other induce- ments. Nothing of that kind has been suggested against the President of the 3rd Respondent in this case. That being the position, prima facie, this is a settlement in the course of collective bargaining and, therefore, is entitled to due weight and consideration.

It is not possible to scan the settlement in bits and pieces and hold some parts good and acceptable and others bad. Unless it can be demonstrated that the objectionable portion is such that it completely outweighs all the other advantages gained the Court will be slow to hold a settle- ment as unfair and unjust. The settlement has to be accepted or rejected as a whole and we are unable to reject it as a whole as unfair or unjust. Even before this Court the 3rd Respondent representing admittedly the large majority of the workmen has stood by this settlement and that is a strong factor which it is difficult to ignore. As stated elsewhere in the judgment, we cannot also be oblivious of the fact that all workmen of the company have accepted the settlement. Besides, the period of settlement has since expired and we are informed that the employer and the 3rd Respondent are negotiating another settlement with further

improvements. These factors, apart from what has been stated above, and the need for industrial peace and harmony when a union backed by a large majority of workmen has accepted a settlement in the course of collective bargaining have impelled us not to interfere with this settlement. That being the position, we unhold the settlement as fair and just and order that the award of the Tribunal shall be substituted by the settlement dated October 18, 1973. The said settlement shall be the substituted award. The appeal is disposed of accordingly. There will be no order as to costs."

Therefore, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above, the contention of the Workman that the date fixed for lapse of empanelled list on 31.3.1997 for appointment to the permanent post vide 5th Settlement dated 30.7.1996 is arbitrary, illegal is not untenable. The recognized union of Workmen has negotiated with the Respondent Bank Management representing large number of Workmen and the Workman as individual do not come into picture. Workman in the instant case has work as temporary Workmen in the Respondent Branch and in response of Notification he had applied for inclusion of his name in the panel and he was selected for inclusion his name in the panel list to be utilized for absorption of such Workman to permanent post in order of their seniority in the list. The Settlement dated 30.7.1996 between State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation under Sec.2(p) and Sec.18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 has clearly provided as regard non-messengerial position and it is agreed that all such posts sanctioned fallen vacant upto 31.3.1997 shall be filled before empanel list is allowed to lapse. Thus, in view of law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, in the instant case, Agreement dated 30.7.1996 was entered into between both the parties in respect of lapsing of the both the panels on 31.3.1997 and absorption of the Workmen from panel list was subject to availability of vacancy of post likely to arise upto 31.3.1997, have a binding force on Workman as well as management of State Bank of India in view of provision contained under section 18 (1) of I.D. Act, 1947.

Thus, Point No.I is answered against the Workman and in favour of the Respondent.

27. **Point No.II**:- Firstly, it is submitted on behalf of the Workman that the Respondent has terminated his services by oral order on 1997without issuing any notice or paying any salary or compensation in lieu thereof. Therefore, the termination order of the Workman from service is in violation of provision contained Under Section 25 F of I.D. Act, 1947. Therefore, the order is liable to be set aside.

28. On the other hand, Respondent counsel contended that Workman has not worked for 240 days in any preceding calendar year. Therefore, reference of the industrial dispute is not relevant. In this context, the Workman has examined himself as WW1 who has reiterated that Workman has been terminated from service by Respondent on 1997without notice of salary or compensation in lieu thereof. Before examining the claim of the Workman on merit it would be apposite to reproduce the provision contained under section 25 F:-

Section 25F provides:-

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].

Compensation to workmen in case of transfer of undertakings.

Section 25B defines the term continuous service which provides

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 authorized 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;

In order to prove the fact of 240 days of service within 12 months of a calendar year just preceding from the date of termination, the initial burden of proof lies upon the Workman and the Workman has to prove this factum by adducing his oral as well as documentary evidence in support of his claim.

Further, how to calculate 240 days of service by the Workman in a calendar year. In this context the reference of decisions of Hon'ble Supreme Court is relevant and the same are discussed below:-

In Rajasthan State Ganganagar S. Mills Ltd. v. State of Rajasthan and Anr. (2004) Apex Court held:

"It was the case of the Workman that he had worked for more than 240 days in the year concerned. This claim was denied by the appellant. It was for the claimant to lead evidence to show that he had worked for 240 days in the year preceding the date of his termination. He has filed an affidavit. It is statement which is in his favor and that cannot be regarded as sufficient evidence for any Court or Tribunal to come to the conclusion that in fact the claimant had worked for 240 days in a year These aspects were highlighted in Range Forest Officer v. S.T. Hadimani (2002 (3) SCC 25. No proof of receipt of salary or wages for 240 days or order or record in that regard was produced. Mere non-production of the muster roll for a particular period was not sufficient for the Labour Court held that the Workman had worked for 240 days as claimed."

In Municipal Corporation, Faridabad v. Siri Niwas (2004 (8) SCC 195), held "*the burden was on the Workman to show that he was working for more than 240 days in the preceding one year prior to his alleged retrenchment." In M.P. Electricity Board v. Hariram (2004 (8) SCC 246) the position was again reiterated in paragraph 11 as follows: "The above burden having not been discharged and the Labour Court having held so, in our opinion, the Industrial Court and the High Court erred in basing an order of reinstatement solely on an adverse inference drawn erroneously ..*"

In the case of Manager, RBI, Bangalore vs. S Mani (2005) SCC Page 100, the 3 Judges Bench of the Apex Court held that "*the initial burden of proof was on the Workman to show that he had completed 240 days of service."*

Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of Mohan Lal vs Management BEL 1981 SCC page 225 has laid down the principle that how to count 240 days of service within one year it is held: *"Clause (2)(a) provides for a fiction to treat a Workman in continuous service for a period of one year despite the fact that he has not rendered uninterrupted service for a period of one year but he has rendered period of 240 days during the period of 12 calendar service for months counting backwards and just preceding the relevant date being the date of retrenchment. In other words, in order to invoke the fiction enacted in clause (2)(a) it is necessary to determine first the relevant date, ie the date of termination of service which is complained of as retrenchment. After that date is ascertained. move backward to a period of 12 months just preceding the date of retrenchment and then ascertain whether within the period of 12 months, the Workman has rendered service for a period of 240 days. If these three facts are affirmatively answered in favor of the Workman pursuant to the deeming fiction enacted in clause (2)(a) it will have to be assumed that the Workman is in continuous service for a period of one year and he will satisfy the eligibility qualification enacted in Section 25-F"*

"14. We have already extracted section 25B since its amendment and the change in language is the legislative exposition of which note must be taken. In fact, we need not further dilate upon this aspect because in Surendra Kumar Verma and Ors. v. Central Government Industrial-cum-Labour Court, New Delhi and Anr., Chinnappa Reddy. J., after noticing the amendment and referring to the decision in Sur Enamel and Stamping Works (P) Ltd case, held as under:

"These changes brought about by Act 36 of 1964 appear to be clearly designed to provide that a Workman who has actually worked under the employer for not less than 240 days during a period of twelve months shall be deemed to have been in continuous service for a period of one year whether or not he has in fact been in such continuous service for a period of one year. It is enough that he has worked for 240 days in a period of 12 months, it is not necessary that he should have been in the service of the employer for one whole year."

In a concurring judgment Pathak J. agreed with this interpretation of section 25B(2). Therefore, both on principle and on precedent it must be held that section 25B(2) comprehends a situation where a Workman is not in employment for a period of 12 calendar months, but has rendered service for a period of 240 days within the period of 12 calendar months commencing and counting backwards from the relevant date, i.e. the date of retrenchment. If he has, he would be deemed to be in continuous service for a period of one year for the purpose of section 25B and Chapter VA."

Thus, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above the initial burden of proof lies upon the Workman to show that he has completed 240 days of the service with the Respondent just preceding from the date of his termination. Further, in respect of the employment of calculating the 240 days service in view of the contents of Section 25-F read with Section 25-B of the I.D. Act, 1947.

29. Now, in view of the provision contained under Section 25 F and law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, we have to examine whether the Workman has discharged his initial burden of proof in respect of his claim of 240 days continuous service in a calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination i.e., 01.01.1997.

In this context, WW1 in his cross examination has stated that,

"I was not sponsored by any employment exchange AND did not undergo the regular process of selection before my engagement as temporary Non-Messenger in the branch.."

"It is true that I did not work for 240 days in any year in my entire service in the bank in any branch."

Thus, it is clear from the testimony of WW1 that the Workman had not worked for 240 days continuously in any 12 months of a calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination in the Respondent bank. Therefore, Workman failed to establish his plea by his oral and documentary evidence that he had worked for 240 days continuously in calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination i.e., 01.01.1997. Thus, the claim of the Workman that he has been terminated by oral order without issuing notice or payment in lieu after termination, in contravention of Section 25 F of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is not tenable. However the documents filed by the Workman in support of his claim, number of days worked with the Respondent goes to reveal that the Workman had worked intermittently as daily wager depending upon availability of work in branch. Workman did not file any document of appointment letter or salary slips in support of his claim for appointment as a non-messenger in the Respondent branch on temporary basis.

30. Per contra, the Learned Counsel for Respondent has submitted the allegation of Workman that he was terminated from services is not correct. As the vacancies were filled up on regular basis in order of their respective seniority the non-engagement of the Workman does not amount to termination. Further, Respondent contended that no law provide that even though there is no work temporary employee should be continued in the bank work as the very engagement of Workman was subject to availability of work. Therefore, the allegation that the bank has indulged in unfair labour practice is incorrect.

31. Thus, in view of the fore gone discussion and contentions made by the Respondent, I find the force in the argument advanced by the Respondent that in the instant matter, Workman was not terminated from service by order dated 1997rather he was disengaged in view of the non-availability of the work in the branch. Further, there was direction issued by the Head Office of the Respondent authority not to engage any daily wager Workman/ temporary Worker w.e.f. 01.01.1997. Thus, such disengagement of Workman does not amount to termination. Moreover, the Workman failed to prove his claim that he was terminated in contravention of provision of Sec.25F of the I.D. Act, 1947 as he failed to establish his plea by any oral or documentary evidence that he had worked for 240 days continuously in a twelve months of calendar year just preceding from date of termination i.e., 01.01.1997.

32. Further, perusal of the order dated 25.3.1997 goes to reveal that the Chief Branch Manager, State Bank of India has issued the letter to Zonal Office with direction to all its branches to this effect that they have been advised by the DGM, Zonal Office, Hyderabad that as both the panel of temporary employees of 1989 and daily wagers/casual labour of 1992 will lapse on 31.3.1997 it has been decided by central office not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial cadre from 01.01.1997, therefore it was directed to issue suitable instructions not to make temporary appointments from 01.01.1997. There is no mention in this order that the Workman herein has been terminated from service by this order.

33. Further, the circular dated 27.3.1997 was issued by DGM, SBI to all branches in commercial network in respect of the non-appointment of temporary employees in subordinate cadre and it has directed not to make any temporary employment in the subordinate cadre with effect from 1.4.97 and further, it has directed to ensure that no temporary/casual/daily basis appointment of the petty cash. Further, it is directed to all Branch Managers that any deviation in this regard will be viewed seriously. Thus, these circulars do not reflect that the Workman has been terminated from service by this order.

34. Similarly, office order dated 31.3.1997 is simply a direction to all branches of the Respondent bank by DGM that no further daily labour should be engaged or employed. Therefore, the plea of the Workman that he has been terminated by the aforesaid order dated 25.3.1997, 27.3.1997 and 31.3.1997 from the service by the Respondent is not acceptable. The evidence adduced by the Workman clearly goes to reveal that he had worked as a daily wager for which he has been paid wages according to number of working days. As there was an order for prohibition for engaging temporary workmen, in the bank, therefore, Workman could not be engaged by the Respondent for work from 1997 and there after. It is settled law that the daily wagers are engaged by the employer depending upon the availability of work and as the work was not available the Workman was not engaged further by the Respondent management. Therefore, the Workman on the ground of number of days he had worked in the Respondent bank cannot claim any right to reinstate him into the employment. As the Workman failed to prove the mandatory condition of 240 days of continuous service as required under Sec.25F of I.D. Act, 1947. Therefore, the disengagement of Workman from work can not be termed in contravention of provision contained under Sec.25F and 25 B of the I.D. Act, 1947.

Thus, this point is answered against the Workman and in favour of Respondent.

35. **Point No.III**:- In this context, the Workman has contended that the management failed to implement the selected panels during its valid tenure. The management adopted the back door methods contrary to the settlements

and filled up the vacancies. The same is evident from the proceedings dated 18.11.1993 a copy of the same is filed in the material papers and the same may be read as part of the claim statement. Further, it is submitted that management has to adhere the procedure issued by the Central Government, the instructions dated 16.8.1990 in the year 1995, but same was not followed in the year 1997 despite there being vacancies. The management has followed the procedure of calling candidates through employment exchange instead of giving chance to the empanelled candidates like the Workman herein. The management sent call letters to the similarly situated candidates like the Workman in the month of June 1997 subsequent to issuance of impugned termination orders. After knowing the fact that they are litigating the issue by way of dispute, the management has refused to engage those candidates, the copies of call letters issued are filed herein along with claim petition. The Workman herein reiterates that the panels are meant for absorption but not for termination. In view of the same a duty is cast upon the Respondent management to engage the empanelled candidates like the Workman herein even in temporary vacancies till they are absorbed permanently in regular vacancies.

36. On the other hand, Respondent has contended that the Federation approached Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) for implementation of bipartite settlement in respect of the absorption of temporary employees. The Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) conducted conciliation proceedings and agreement was arrived at between the Federation and the Management bank. It is submitted that it was agreed between the Federation and the Management that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers /casual labour would be kept alive upto March, 1997 and the vacancies as agreed to under the afore set out settlements will be filled from both the lists concurrently. A copy of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.1995 signed by the parties to the dispute is filed as a material paper. Further, it is submitted that the settlement was arrived at and an agreement was signed between the Federation and the Management bank on 30.7.1996 under Section 2(p) read with Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules 1957 which is binding on the parties. A copy of this agreement which hereinafter may be referred to as 5th settlement for brevity, is also filed as a material paper. The 5th settlement dated 30.7.1996 whereunder the earlier four settlements dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988 and 9.1.1991 were also referred, it was agreed to, by the Federation and the Management bank that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees will be kept alive upto March, 1997 for filling the vacancies existing/arrived at as on 31.12.1994 as per the norms agreed to between the bank and Federation and that thereafter the said panels would lapse. It was also agreed that within the framework of the above settlements the modalities about drawing names from either the panel of temporary employees or the panel of daily wagers and casual labour would be decided administratively on circle to circle basis depending upon the local requirements in consultation with the Federation's affiliate by the Circle management. It was further agreed that all messenger real vacancies/positions in the subordinate cadre including part-time attendants specifically provided as leave reserve will be filled by the end of 31.3.1997. Further, Respondent contended that on 27.2.1997 a memorandum of understanding was also signed between the Federation's affiliate and the bank management regarding the fact that the exercise of identifying the messengerial vacancies as on 31.12.1994 has since been completed by central office and thereby 403 messengerial vacancies were sanctioned to the circle of the Management bank and it was agreed that these vacancies may be filled from 1989 panel of temporary employees after effecting conversion from full time non-messengerial staff in the usual manner and the agreement was reached upon. Further, it was agreed between the Federations affiliate and the management bank that in terms of the settlement dated 30.7.1996 both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers /casual employees would lapse on 31.3.1997.

37. The Workman has contended that the empanelled list prepared by the Respondent management for appointment of temporary and daily wage Workers to the permanent post cannot lapse unless until it is exhausted by appointing all the empanelled persons and it should continue even after 31.3.1997, i.e., the date fixed for the lapse of panel. It is undisputed that the date of lapse of empanelled list of Workmen has been fixed to 31.3.1997 as mentioned in the settlement dated 30.7.1996, and agreed between the parties. It is settled law that and once the life of panel list lapses on the date as agreed between the parties it cannot be extended beyond that date. In the instant case the panel list of the workmen was valid upto 31.3.1997 in view of the terms and conditions enumerated in the 5th Settlement entered into between the parties. As the lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997 has been agreed by State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation through 5th Settlement, the Workman is not competent to challenge the same.

In this context I would like to take reference of the decision of the apex court in the case of **Syndicate Bank and Ors vs. Shankar Paul and Ors , AIR 1997 SC 3091, therein the Hon'ble Apex Court** have held:-

"Till 1982, the branches of the appellant Bank in Calcutta region were recruiting persons locally to work as temporary attenders in leave vacancies. In view of the revised procedure prescribed by the Government of India in respect of such temporary appointments, the Calcutta regional office of the appellant Bank issued a circular to all of its branches on 14.8.1982, instructing all the branches under it to discontinue the old practice from 1.6.1982 and appoint only empanelled candidates. The regional office was to prepare a panel of eligible candidates, after calling names from the local/district employment exchange, and split it up branch-wise. Following that new procedure yearly panels were prepared thereafter. Names of the Respondents were for the first time included in the panel prepared for the period 7.2.1987 to 6.2.1988. By its letter dated 7.2.1987 the Bank had informed the Respondents that the panel

was valid for one year only and that inclusion of their names in the panel was not to confer on them any right to seek permanent appointment in the service of the bank. Considering the object with which the panel was prepared and the fact that it was an yearly panel expiring on 6.2.1988, we are of the opinion that the Respondents did not get any right, because of inclusion of their names in the said panel, for permanent absorption in the service of the Bank. Whatever conditional right they had came to an end with the expiry of the panel. The claim of the Respondents, as contained in the writ petition was thus misconceived and therefore the learned single Judge and the Division Bench, when it first decided the appeal, were right in dismissing the writ petition and the appeal respectively."

Thus, in view of the above law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court and in view of the terms and conditions of the 5th Settlement the contention of the Workman that empanelled list should continue even after 31.3.1997 till the last Workman in the panel is absorbed is not tenable. The contention of the Workman is baseless in view of recital in the settlement. Therefore, in view of the fore gone discussion and finding given at Point No. I regarding binding nature of Settlements and terms and conditions enumerated therein, in view of the provision contained u/s.18(1) of the I.D. Act, 1947, I am of the considered view that life of panels lapsed on 31.3.1997 in view of terms of settlement dated 30.7.1996 and plea of Workman that the panel shall continue even after 31.3.1997 till last man absorbed has no legal force and same is untenable.

38. Undisputedly, settlement agreement dated 30.7.1996 was executed between the State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation and in that settlement it was agreed that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/ casual employees will be used for filling vacancies existing as on 31.12.1994 as per the norms agreed between the bank and the Federation. These empanelled workmen were to be given a chance for permanent appointment in the bank against vacancies arising up to December 1994 whereas the daily wagers/ casual employees were to be considered against the vacancies arise from January 1995 to December 1996, whereby the said panel would lapse. It was agreed that the vacancies falls upto 31.3.1997 shall be filled before the empanelled list is allowed to lapse. Thus, the claim of the Workman to the post of permanent non-messenger in the Respondent management was subject to the availability of the sanctioned post and vacancies arising upto 31.3.1997. The workmen given chance to the permanent post were seniors in number of working days in panel list and Workman herein was junior to those workmen. Therefore, Workman could not be given absorption to permanent post being junior to other workmen in the panel list.

39. In this context the Workman witness WW1 was cross examined by the Respondent counsel and in the cross examination the witness WW1 states:-

"I used to work depending upon availability of work in the branch. I am not aware of the settlements between the federation and the Management." Further witness states, *"It is true that I am not having any documents to show that any of my juniors are continuing in service in the bank."*

Thus, from the above statement of the Workman witness WW1 it is clear that the panel was prepared in terms of various settlements entered into between Staff Federation of State Bank of India and State Bank of India and it was prepared on the basis of number of days of work put in by the temporary employees. Further, the Workman himself admitted that some of the temporary employees whose names were included in the panel were given regular appointment in the bank in order of their seniority in the panel and he is not having any document to show that any person who worked for less number of days than the Workman was given appointment in the bank. Therefore, the allegation of the Workman that the regular appointment has been made by the bank from the panel list in breach of the terms of the settlement and violation of seniority of panel list is not proved by this evidence of WW1. Thus, there is no evidence on record that bank has given the appointment to the temporary employees as well as daily wagers from the panel list 1989 and 1992 in breach of seniority of the temporary employees in the list. There is no evidence of jumbling in the panel list to make appointment of any permanent Workman in breach of the seniority. Therefore, I am constrained to hold that the Respondent Management has appointed the workmen from panel list in order of seniority and there is no jumbling of workmen in the panel list before it got lapsed on 31.3.1997.

40. However, Workman has taken the plea that the panels of Workmen for absorption in the employment of the Respondent banks (panels of temporary employees and daily wagers) has been lapsed on 31.3.1997 in contravention of terms of settlement as the object of preparing the entire empanelment of temporary and daily wagers was to provide them permanent employment and till the both the panel lists exhausted the panel list cannot be lapsed on 31.3.1997 and the date of lapsing of the panel on 31.3.1997 has been fixed by the Respondent arbitrarily without any authority.

41. In this context, the perusal of Settlement dated 30.7.1996 reveals that the 5th Settlement dated 30.7.1996 was entered under Section 2(p) and 18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Dispute (Central) Rules 1957. This settlement has been entered into by the competent parties and in this settlement parties thereto agreed that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees will lapse on 31.3.1997. Thus the date of lapse of panel was fixed by both the parties with consensus under the settlement dated 30.7.1996 and same is binding upon the Workman under the provision of Section 18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947. Moreover, this issue of binding force of the settlement dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988 and 9.1.1991 has already been discussed, decided at

finding in Point No.I of this award. However, the legality and validity of the aforementioned settlement has not been challenged by the Workman before any competent forum. Thus, claim of Workman that the date of lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997 has been fixed arbitrarily by the Respondent bank is untenable. As regard the claim of Workman for his absorption to the permanent post it is settled law that the Workman can not claim his regularization to permanent post merely on the basis of number of working days.

42. In this context the reference of the decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Oil and Natural Gas Corporation vs Krishan Gopal 2020(3) SCALE 272, date of decision 7.2.2020** is relevant therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have has laid down principle regarding regularization of the Workman on permanent posts. Hon'ble Supreme Court have laid down the prepositions of regularization of the workmen to permanent post is as under:-

"*(i) Wide as they are, the powers of the Labour Court and the Industrial Court cannot extend to a direction to order regularisation, where such a direction would in the context of public employment offend the provisions contained in Article 14 of the Constitution;*

(ii) The statutory power of the Labour Court or Industrial Court to grant relief to workmen including the status of permanency continues to exist in circumstances where the employer has indulged in an unfair labour practice by not filling up permanent posts even though such posts are available and by continuing to employ workmen as temporary or daily wage employees despite their performing the same work as regular workmen on lower wages;

(iii) The power to create permanent or sanctioned posts lies outside the judicial domain and where no posts are available, a direction to grant regularisation would be impermissible merely on the basis of the number of years of service;

(iv) Where an employer has regularised similarly situated workmen either in a scheme or otherwise, it would be open to workmen who have been deprived of the same benefit at par with the workmen who have been regularised to make a complaint before the Labour or Industrial Court, since the deprivation of the benefit would amount to a violation of Article 14; and

(v) In order to constitute an unfair labour practice under Section 2(ra) read with Item 10 of the Vth Schedule of the ID Act, the employer should be engaging workmen as badlis, temporaries or casuals, and continuing them for years, with the object of depriving them of the benefits payable to permanent workmen.

Thus, in view of the principles laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court as discussed above, in the instant matter the Workman utterly failed to prove his claim by adducing any documentary or oral evidence that the employer has indulged in unfair labour practice by not filling the permanent posts even though such posts are available and by continuing to employ workmen as temporary or daily wage employees despite their performance was the same work, as regular workmen on lower wages.

43. Respondent has contended that all the vacancies exist and arise upto 31.3.1997 has been filled up from the panel list in order of seniority and no vacancy exists or arises as on 31.3.1997 remained unfilled. Further, it is contended that as per terms of settlement the life of panel lists has been lapsed on 31.3.1997, hence, there is no occasion to extend the life of panel lists beyond 31.3.1997. However, the workman failed to prove contrary by any evidence to the aforesaid contention of the Respondent that the vacancies were existing as on 31.3.1997 and the workman was not given absorption to the permanent post in order of his seniority. It is settled law that the power to create permanent or sanctioned post lies outside the judicial domain and where no posts are available, a direction to grant regularization would be impermissible merely on the basis of the number of years of service. Therefore, the claim of the workman on this ground also not acceptable.

44. Further, as per the of settlement, panel was prepared for absorption of the workmen on the permanent posts has already been lapsed on 31.3.1997 and the vacancies existing and arising upto 31.12.1994 and upto 31.3.1997 as settlement dated 30.7.1996 has been filled up from the panel by appointing the workmen as per seniority in the panel list. Workman witness WW1 in his cross examination has himself admitted this fact that, some of the temporary employees whose names were included in the panel were given regular appointment in the bank in order of their seniority in the panel. The Workman failed to show that there was any breach of terms of settlement has been committed by the Respondent in appointment to permanent post from aforesaid panel list.

45. As discussed in preceding paragraph of this Award, the life of the panel has not been extended beyond 31.3.1997, by any further settlement hence, the panel list in which name of the Workman was included got expired on 31.3.1997. It is not the case of the Workman that Respondent has regularized similarly situated workmen either in the scheme or otherwise and the Workman has been deprived of same benefit on par with those workmen or the vacancies remained unfilled on the date of lapse of panels i.e., 31.3.1997, Industrial Tribunal has no jurisdiction to extend the date of lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997. This Tribunal can not order for regularization of workmen to the permanent post in contravention of the provision of Article 14 of the Constitution of India.

In the case of **Mahboob Deepak vs. Nagar Panchayat Gajraula & Anr, Civil Appeal No.5875/2007 date of judgement 13.12.2007,** Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

"8. Respondent is a Local Authority. The terms and conditions of employment of the employees are governed by a statute and statutory rules. No appointment can be made by a Local Authority without following the provisions of the recruitment rules. Any appointment made in violation of the said rules as also the constitutional scheme of equality as contained in Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India would be a nullity.

9. Due to some exigency of work, although recruitment on daily wages or on an ad hoc basis was permissible, but by reason thereof an employee cannot claim any right to be permanently absorbed in service or made permanent in absence of any statute or statutory rules. Merely because an employee has completed 240 days of work in a year preceding the date of retrenchment, the same would not mean that his services were liable to be regularized."

Therefore, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, the claim of the Workman for absorption merely on the basis of number of day of work in the Respondent bank Branch is not acceptable. As regard plea of the Workman that the Workman should have been given employment even after 31.3.1997 as temporary Workman, it is the discretion of Respondent to engage the Workman depending upon availability of work and this Tribunal can not direct the Respondent to engage the Workman in the absent of such rule/scheme.

46. In view of principle laid down by Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above, in the instant matter Workman utterly failed to establish the fact of rendering continuous service for a period of 240 days of service within a period of 12 calendar months commencing and coming backward from relevant date i.e., the date of retrenchment, if has he would be denied to be in continuous service for a period of one year. Therefore, the provision contained under Sec.25F of retrenchment is not applicable to Workman.

Counsel for Workman has relied upon number of decisions of Hon'ble High Court and Hon'ble Supreme Court and few of them are discussed herein:-

In the case of **F.C.I., vs. Kamdhenu Cattle Feed Industries 1993 (1) SCC 71,** therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

"7. In contractual sphere as in all other State actions, the State and all its instrumentalities have to conform to Article 14 of the Constitution of which non-arbitrariness is a significant facet. There is no unfettered discretion in public law: A public authority possesses powers only to use them for public good. This impose the duty to act fairly and to adopt a procedure which is `fairplay in action'. Due observance of this obligation as a part of good administration raises a reasonable or legitimate expectation in every citizen to be treated fairly in his interaction with the State and its instrumentalities, with this element forming a necessary component of the decision making process in all State actions. To satisfy this requirement of non- arbitrariness in a State action, it is, therefore, necessary to consider and give due weight to the reasonable or legitimate expectations of the persons likely lo be affected by the decision or else that unfairness in the exercise of the power may amount to an abuse or excess of power apart from affecting the bona fides of the decision in a given case. The decision so made would be exposed to challenge on the ground of arbitrariness. Rule of law does not completely eliminate discretion in the exercise of power, as it is unrealistic, but providers for control of its exercise by judicial review."

In the case of **State Bank of India, R.O., Vijayawada vs. Industrial Tribunal, Hyderabad WP No.193/1997,** therein Hon'ble High Court have held,

"*Sri Krovvidi Narasimham, the learned counsel for the 2nd Respondent contends, supporting the award that it was a permanent vacancy and even though the 2nd Respondent was appointed on temporary basis, his services were not liable to be terminated and he was to be regularised into service on permanent basis. Shastry award warrants that no temporary appointment can be made to a permanent post. But the matter is now covered by two division bench judgements dated 28.11.1986 in W.A. No.791 of 1986 and 25.8.1987 in W.A. No.270 of 1982. The ratio decided in the two judgements is to the effect that there cannot be any mandate to appoint employees on permanent basis when the requirement was for appointment on temporary basis. But it is held in the said judgements that when a temporary appointee is ousted from service and not for misconduct and, if again temporary appointment is to be made, then, the case of such temporary appointee who was ousted, has got to be considered in accordance with Sec. 25-H of the Act."*

In the case of **State of Haryana and others vs. Piara Singh and others. 1992 (4) SCC 118,** therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

" 49. If for any reason an adhoc or temporary employee is continued for a fairly long spell, the authorities must consider his case for regularization provided he is eligible and qualified according to the rules and his service record is satisfactory and his appointment does not run counter to the reservation policy of the state."

In the above cited judgements by the Workman the facts of the case are different hence do not apply to instant case of Workman.

47. On the other hand, in support of his contention Respondent has examined witness MW1 and MW1 in chief examination states that, Settlements i.e., on 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988, 9.1.1991 were entered into between the SBI and SBI Staff Federation for filling up of the vacancies that arise up to 1994 for those temporary employees who has worked on scale wages. Further, MW1 states that two different panels for messengers and non-messengers as per the eligibility criteria prescribed by the bank. There are four modules in Andhra Pradesh and they are Hyderabad, Tirupathi, Vijayawada and Visakhapatnam. MW1 states that the temporary employees so empanelled were given permanent absorption depending upon the vacancies so arise strictly in terms of the settlement. MW1 states that on 9.6.1995 conciliation proceeding was held before the RLC(C), Hyderabad and in said proceedings it was decided that the panels will be kept live up to 31.3.1997 and vacancies will be filled from both the lists concurrently. A copy of the said minutes of proceedings is Ex.M5. Further, MW1 states that on 30.7.1996 another settlement was entered between the SBI and All India SBI Staff Federation providing for filling up of the vacancies arising up to December 1994 in respect of subordinate cadre and daily wage /casual wage employees out of panel so prepared were to be considered against vacancies arising from January 1995 to December 1996, thereafter the said panels lapse. MW1 states that it was also agreed that all the non- messenger positions in subordinate cadre including part time attendants specially provided as leave reserve will be filled before 31.3.1997 and as regards to non-messengerial positions it is agreed that all such posts sanctioned and fallen vacant up to 31.3.1997 shall be filled before the empanelled list is allowed to lapse. Thus in both the cases empanelled list were lapsed on 01.01.1997. Ex.M6 is the copy of the settlement dated 30.7.1996. Further, witness states that on 27.2.1997 a memorandum of understanding was reached between the SBI and SBI Staff Federation providing that both the panels above mentioned will lapse on 31.3.1997. Ex.M7 is the copy of the memorandum of understanding and Ex.M8 is the copy of the statements giving the particulars of 1989 non-messenger panel, Ex.M9 is the copy of the statement of 1989 non-messenger panel, Ex.M10 is the copy of statement of 1992 panel. Further, witness states that Petitioner was included in the 1989 panel. As the existing vacancies at that time were exhausted and his turn did not come he could not be given permanent employment in the bank as per the agreements. All the appointments were made strictly in accordance with the settlements reached from time to time between SBI and SBI staff federation and as per seniority, number of days of temporary service put in by them in the bank in the given period. Further, MW1 states Petitioner was not sponsored by any employment exchange he did not undergo the regular process of selection required for appointment as a regular non-messenger the Petitioner has not worked for 240 days in any year in his entire temporary service in the bank. The Petitioner and other temporary employees were terminated from service by the bank. Further, MW1 states that the vacancies were filled up on regular basis with the temporary employees from the panels and these panels were expired in terms of the settlements so reached and there were no vacancies to absorb such employees. Thus, witness MW1 has proved the documents Ex.M1 to Ex.M12 and also contentions made in the counter. However, MW1 was cross examined by the Petitioner Counsel. But nothing has been elicited in his cross examination so as to discredit the testimony of the witness MW1 as regards the date of lapse of both the panels on 31.3.1997 and reasons assigned for non-absorption of the Petitioner from the panel list to the permanent post. Moreover the witness MW1 was re-examined by the Respondent and the witness MW1 states that panels were expired in terms of the settlement send absorptions to the extent of the available vacancies were made. There was no termination of any temporary messenger as such but their services were not utilized after the cut off date as the available vacancies were already filled up and most of these Petitioners were not in the service of the bank as on the date of the expiry date of the panels. Therefore, in view of the aforesaid testimony of the MW1 in re-examination in the absence of cross examination remained uncontraverted, the claim of the Workman that he was entitled for absorption in permanent post in the branch of Respondent Management on the basis of panel list is found not established.

This point is answered against the Workman.

48. **Point No.IV**:- In view of the discussion and finding given at Point Nos. I, II and III, the Workman is not entitled for any relief and claim statement of Workman sans merit and liable to be dismissed.

This Point is answered accordingly.

AWARD

In view of the fore gone discussion, it is held that the action of the Respondent bank in terminating the services of Sri Y. Venkaiah, Ex. Messenger by way of oral orders w.e.f. 31.3.1997 is justified. Hence, the Petitioner is not entitled for any relief as prayed for. The claim statement filed by Workman sans merit, hence, dismissed.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, Personal Assistant, transcribed by her, corrected and signed by me on this the 10th day of June, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner	Witnesses examined for the Respondent
WW1: Sri Y. Venkaiah	MW1: Sri K. Chandra Sekhar Goud

Documents marked for the Petitioner

Ex.W1:	Photocopy of service certificate
Ex.W2:	Photocopy of service certificate
Ex.W3:	Photocopy of service certificate
Ex.W4:	Photocopy of service certificate
Ex.W5:	Photocopy of service certificate
Ex.W6:	Photocopy of transfer certificate
Ex.W7:	Photocopy of caste certificate
Ex.W8:	Photocopy of panel list
Ex.W9:	Photocopy of employment card
Ex.W10:	Photocopy of interview call letter
Ex.W11:	Photocopy of Panel list
Ex.W12:	Photocopy of stay order
Ex.W13:	Photocopy of legal notice

Documents marked for the Respondent

Ex.M1:	Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.17.11.87
Ex.M2:	Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.16.7.88
Ex.M3:	Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.27.10.1988
Ex.M4:	Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.9.1.1991
Ex.M5:	Photocopy of conciliation proceedings before the Regional Labour Commissioner(C) dt.9.6.1995
Ex.M6:	Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.30.7.1996
Ex.M7:	Photocopy of Memorandum of understanding dt. 27.1.1997
Ex.M8:	Photocopy of statements giving the particulars of 1989 messenger panel.
Ex.M9:	Photocopy of statement of 1989 Non-messenger panel
Ex.M10:	Photocopy of statement of 1992 panel
Ex.M11:	Photocopy of order of Hon'ble High Court in WA No.86/98 dt. 1.5.98
Ex.M12:	Photocopy of order in SLP No.11886-11888 of 1998 dated 10.8.98
Ex.M13:	Photocopy of notification dated 4.5.1991

नई दिल्ली, 3 अगस्त, 2026

का.आ. 1689.— औघोगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार स्टेट बैंक ऑफ़ इंडिया के प्रबंधतत्र, संबद्ध नियोजको और उनके कर्मकार के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औघोगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औघोगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद के पंचाट (36/2003) प्रकाशित करती है।

[सं. एल- 12025/01/2026- आई आर (बी-I)-159]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 3rd August, 2026

S.O. 1689.— In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the **Award (Ref. 36/2003*)*** of the ***Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court Hyderabad*** as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of **State Bank of India** and **their workman.**

[No. L-12025/01/2026-IR(B-I)-159]

SALONI, Dy. Director

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD

Present: - **Sri Irfan Qamar**

Presiding Officer

Dated the 12th day of June, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE L.C.No. 36/2003

[Old ID No. 276/99 of Labour Court, Guntur]

Between:

Sri P. Anjaneyulu,

S/o Brahmam,

Ravinuthala,

Corsipadu Mandal,

Prakasam distt. ….. Petitioner

And

1. The Chairman,
   State Bank of India,
   Central office,
   Mumbai.
2. The Chief General Manager,
   (Personnel)
   State Bank of India,
   Bank Street
   Hyderabad.
3. The Branch Manager,
   State Bank of India ,
   Ongole branch,
   Ongole.

4. The Zonal Manager,

State Bank of India,

Zonal Office,

Tirupathi. …..Respondents

Appearances:

For the Petitioner : Sri Macherla Rangaiah, Advocate

For the Respondent: Sri K. Rathanga Pani Reddy, Advocate

AWARD

Sri P. Anjaneyulu who worked as Messenger (who will be referred to as the workman) has filed this petition under Sec. 2A(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 against the Respondents State Bank of India seeking for reinstatement into service as Messenger duly granting all the consequential benefits such as continuity of service, back wages and all other attendant benefits etc., and such other reliefs as this court may deem fit. Earlier Petitioner has filed this dispute before the Labour Court, Guntur for adjudication and later the same has been transferred to this Tribunal bearing ID No. 276/99, as per orders of Central Government vide Lr.No.H-11026/1/2001-IR(C.II) dated 18.10.2001 and registered, numbered in this Tribunal as LC No. 36 /2003.

2. Before unfolding the factual matrix of the instant industrial dispute it would be apposite to have a bird eye view of a chequered history of the instant industrial dispute. Earlier instant industrial dispute along with the batch cases was decided by this Tribunal vide common award dated 17.5.2005 and the reference was answered in favour of the Respondent and against the Workman. That said common award dated 17.5.2005 was challenged by the aggrieved Workmen in various Writ petition No.6470/2014 along with batch of writ petitions before the Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh and Hon'ble High Court vide its' judgement dated 23.6.2014 allowed all batch of writ petitions and set aside the common award dated 17.5.2005 passed in ID No.222 of 2001 and other batch of ID cases by Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad and the Respondent management of State Bank of India was directed to reengage the Writ Petitioners in position, which they have been occupying prior to their termination and further directed to consider their cases for regularization as and when the substantive vacancy arises. This judgement dated 23.6.2014 of Hon'ble High Court of AP, passed in WP No.6470/2014 and batch petitions was challenged by Respondent management before the Hon'ble High Court in Writ Appeal No. 1268 of 2014. The aforesaid Writ Appeals No.1268/2014 and other Writ Appeals were decided by Division Bench of High Court of Andhra Pradesh by a common judgement dated 20.3.2019. Hon'ble High Court in aforesaid Writ Appeal was pleased to pass the order which is extracted as below:-

" 7. Hearing the learned senior counsel for the SBI and the learned senior counsel for the contesting unofficial Respondents, we see that while the learned single Judge was justified in setting aside the award af the Tribunal, the proper course to be adopted was to remit all the cases to the Tribunal. This we say for reasons more than one. Firstly, in such matters, claims have to be decided on individual basis, as different persons have different claims as to the length of officiation or discharge of duties and functions; quality of engagement, drawings, accounting of the post for each one of them, who have worked etc. All these issues will not be the same in all the cases. Therefore, each case ought to have been directed to be decided by the Tribunal afresh on individual basis. The second and most important aspect is the learned single Judge has in one go ordered re-employment of all the workmen. This is not a relief that could have been granted without answering the individual issues; each issue relating to each case could not have been decided by the writ Court within the format of its adjudication procedures and scope. The adjudicating body, which has to do that activity, is the Industrial Tribunal. Therefore, we are of the view that while we would sustain the order of the learned singe Judge insofar as it interfered and sets aside the award of the Tribunal, the further findings and directions, issued through the impugned order have to go and the individual cases have to be sent back for consideration of the Tribunal. Such further procedure before the Tribunal will have to be carried forward with the materials already on record and also by affording an opportunity to the persons, who have claims as well as the management to place their rival contentions and further material before the Tribunal. The learned counsel appearing for the workmen are justified in pointing out that enormous delay has already happened and further action by the Tribunal in this line may be expedited.

9. In the result, these writ appeals are ordered;

(1) affirming the impugned common order of the learned single Judge to the extent it sets aside the common award dated 17.05.2005 of the Industrial Tribunal;

(2) the further findings and directions issued through the impugned common order are vacated:

(3) all the matters shall be remitted to the Industrial Tribunal with a direction to dispose of them within an outer limit of five (5) months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order; and,

(4) the parties to make appearance before the Tribunal on the given date."

Thus, in view of the above direction of Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh in W.A.No.1268 of 2014 and batch cases. This Tribunal has taken up the matter of industrial dispute for hearing and deciding it afresh in view of the aforesaid guidelines laid down by the Hon'ble High Court in Writ Appeal No.1268/2014 vide judgement dated 20.3.019.

3. The factual matrix of instant industrial dispute as narrated by the Workman in his claim statement are that, the Workman joined in the service of the management institution as Messenger from 24.4.85 to 1993, and has rendered unblemished service spreading over a period of about 8 years. The Respondent has terminated services of Workman by oral orders with effect from the year 1993. Further, it is submitted that the management of Respondent bank decided to give a chance to temporarily employed personnel "found suitable for permanent appointment" by wait- listing them by offering permanent appointment or waitlisting till such opportunity arises.

4. That on 17.11.1987 a settlement was reached between All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and the Management of State Bank of India - settlement one, under this settlement three categories of employees were listed. That is, A) those who have completed 240 days in 12 months or less after 1.7.1975. B) those who have completed 270 days in any continuous block of 36 calendar months after 1.7.1975. C) (i) those who have completed minimum of 30 days aggregate temporary service in any calendar year after 1.7.1975 or (ii) 70 days aggregate temporary service in continuous block of 36 months after 1.7.1975.

5. The persons who satisfied in all the above 4 categories were to be interviewed by a selection committee and the said selection committee would determine the suitability of the said candidate for permanent appointment. Therefore, the bank prescribed certain qualifications and from among the candidates satisfying the qualifications the suitable candidates were enlisted by a selection committee. The Clause 7 of the said agreement provided with the selected candidate would be wait listed in order of their respective categorization and the selected panel would be valid upto December, 1991. Clause 10 of the settlement specifically provided that henceforth. "there will be no temporary appointments in the subordinate cadre", except on a restrictive basis in the specified category, "from amongst empanelled candidates as per existing guidelines of the bank". The Workman further submits that consequent upon the said agreement and the draft, a notification was issued in the newspapers. The last date for responding to the advertisement was 30.8.1988. A written examination followed by viva-voce in May, 1989 was held. A selected panel was prepared, as per Clause 7 of the agreement, ie. Settlement No.1, the selected panel was to be valid upto December, 1991, the Workman submits that circular was issued on 26.4.91 by the said letter it is mentioned that the terms of the agreement dated 17.11.87 was modified vide second agreement dated 16.7.88 was entered into between the parties. In terms of the said agreement a chance was to be given, "to all eligible temporary employees for permanent appointments. The appointments were against the vacancies likely to arise during the years 1995-96, circular made it clear that in view of the enormity of the problem an extension of the currency of the panel, eligible temporary employees who have been empanelled could not appear in the earlier interviews and have been pursuing their cases thereafter, "will be given another chance to appear for interview".

6. Workman submits that there were total five settlements. The settlement dated 17.11.87 is the 1st settlement (Ex M1), settlement dated 16.7.88 is 2nd settlement (Ex M2), settlement dated 27.10.88 is the 3rd settlement (Ex M3), then settlement dated 9.1.91 is 4th settlement and settlement dated 30.7.96 is 5th settlement (Ex M6). In between there is minutes of conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.95 marked as Ex M5. That due to all these settlements which were extended by subsequent settlements thereby created reasonable expectations in the list of the selected candidates arose with that it's a question of time their appointments or services would be regularized in the services of the bank. The Workman was working with the bank on temporary basis was under the bonafide hope that sooner his services will be regularized with the bank. He is thereby closed all his options elsewhere. It is needless to point out that employing person to whom hope of employment in substantial terms was made is a facet of Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

7. Further Workman submits that the Government of India issued Circular No. F-3/3/104/87-IR, dated 16.8.1990. Under said circular the chief Executives of all public sector banks including the Management herein were specifically instructed that until the problem of existing temporary employees is fully resolved, no bank is permitted to make any permanent appointments. That some of the persons similarly situated like this Workman aggrieved by the inaction on the part of the management of the bank is not regularizing their services from out of the selected panel and not clearly focusing the vacancy position, filed W.P. No. 4194/97 before Hon'ble High court of A.P.. It is specifically averred in the said writ petition that the Management of the bank had failed to implement the settlement and that it violates the various fundamental rights guaranteed under the constitution of India. The Hon'ble High court of A.P .. by order dated 5.3.97 directed the bank to implement the settlement as amended from time to time. It also directed the bank to carry out the terms of settlement before the expiry of March, 1997. The Hon'ble High Court also recorded finding that the Bank cannot escape its liability of enforcement of the Settlement. In view of the directions given by the High Court all candidates whose names appeared in the select panels prepared on the basis of the agreement entered into on 17.11.87 under which the panel was valid upto December, 1991, and on the basis of a

settlement dated 27.10.1988 whereby the panels were made alive upto 31.3.1997 under which the panel was valid upto December, 1999. The other agreement dated 16.7.1988 under which the panel was valid upto 1992 and on the basis of the settlement dated 27.10.1998 whereby the panels were made alive upto 31.3.1997 were under the bonafide impression that their cases will be considered for regularization and were living on the basis of the said reasonable expectation. Unfortunately, contrary to the aforesaid directions given by the High Court and contrary to the settlements entered into between the parties, the bank issued proceedings dated 25.3.1997, dated 27.3.1997 and 31.3.1997 instructing the various authorities of the Management not to continue the temporary employees those who are in services of the bank from 1.4.97. The said order was followed by the Management. Aggrieved by the said action the Workman herein and similarly situated candidates have filed a writ petition before the Hon'ble High Court and by way of Writ Petition No.9206/97 seeking a declaration that the proceedings issued by the Deputy General Manager and the Assistant General Manager (Respondents 3,4 and 5 therein) on 25.3.97, 27.3.97 and 31.3.97 as illegal and also non-continuance of the Workmen therein in service by absorbing them in the services of the bank as violative of Section 2(p) and 18(1) read with Rule 58 of Central Rules and sought for specific direction to the bank to absorb them in service.

8. Further, Workman submits that in the counter affidavit filed in Writ Petition No.9206/97, the bank has submitted that it has about 805 branches in Andhra Pradesh alone. It has stated that due to exigencies of circumstances and on account of the urgent need in its banks, it employed temporary employees in subordinate cadre. It is pertinent to mention that it does not state the urgent or need or the nature of temporary employees that it had engaged. Enquiry into the same would reveal that the stand taken by the bank either on the ground of urgent need or of temporary employees is a façade to perpetuate unfair labour practice. It is designed to on the one hand, keep the employed in the erroneous zone of hope and on the other to ensure that benefits that a model employer will extend under various statutes to its employees is not required to be borne out by the bank. A reading of the counter affidavit would show that the bank would opines that being just fair and reasonable are which obviously is reprehensible and is a facet of unfair labour practice.

9. The Workman submits that the bank had referred in its counter affidavit to three settlements dated 17.11.87, 16.7.88 and 27.10.88. The bank in the guise of extending the benefits of the circular of Government dated 16.8.90 stated in its counter affidavit that as follows:

"Government of India, vide its letter dated 16.8.1990, issued guidelines to all the public sector banks with regard to recruitment and absorption of temporary employees in public sector banks. The said guidelines were issued to implement on the lines of the approach paper on the issue provided by a committee constituted in this regard. The Government of India guidelines made it clear that all the public sector banks may follow the provisions laid down in the approach paper.

The approach paper specified that the cases of temporary employees who had put in not less than 240 days of temporary service in 12 consecutive Months and who are entitled to benefit of Section 25-F may be decided by entering into a settlement with the representative union. In respect of temporary employees who had put in less than 240 days of service in 12 consecutive months or less, a settlement could be avoided and however if the Management so desired, they could enter into a conciliation settlement with the representative union. Para 6(h), it is mentioned that only those temporary employees who had put in temporary service of 90 or more days after 1.1 1982 would be eligible for considering under the scheme. Although the Government guidelines envisaged for a settlement in respect of employees who had put in temporary service of 90 or more days, the bank by way of further concession entered into settlements Even in respect of those who had put in less than 90 days. As such, it could be Seen that the settlements are more beneficial to the temporary employees concerned. The approach paper also specify at para 6(c) that the banks would provide one time opportunity to all the temporary employees and for that purpose temporary employees worked in the bank on or after 1.1.1982 could be considered for re-employment in terms of the scheme. The Respondents have gone further wherein even persons working after 1975 were also considered.

As could be seen from the above, there was a genuine effort on the part of the Respondent bank to provide permanent employment for as many as possible subject to availability of the vacancies.

It is further submitted that at para 6(k) of the approach paper, it was made clear that this would be one time exercise in full and final settlement of all the aims and disputes for the past period in respect of temporary workmen covered by the settlement. This would mean that the Government of India guidelines would cover only those persons who were temporarily employed for the period specified therein and not otherwise. As such, it is submitted that the Respondents have not only followed the Government of India guidelines but in fact covered cases of the employees who had worked for less than 90 days. As such, question of violation does not arise and in any case those were only broad guidelines and not directives".

10. The Workman submits that the bank also referred a subsequent settlement dated 9.1.1991 wherein there is a clause to the effect- that the panel of temporary employees and the panel of daily wage employees will be operated to a particular period. Therefore, their cases will not be considered. The Management herein relying upon this settlement in their impugned action. It is submitted that even the settlement dated 9.1.1991 will not empower the management

to terminate the services of the temporary employees who are working in the bank services like the Workman herein as it does not specify the termination of the employees. In fact there are so many vacancies wherein the Management has engaged several new persons as temporary messengers/ attendars/ sweepers etc., even after the judgment of Hon'ble High Court without considering the cases of the similarly situated candidates like the Workman herein. It is submitted inspite of engaging fresh candidates as is now being done by the Management they would have continued the similarly situated candidates like the Workman herein in the services of the bank and consider their cases for absorption in view of the circulars issued by Central Government as well as the directions of this Hon'ble Court in Writ Petition No.4194/97, dated 5.3.97. In view of the circulars issued by the Central Government, the Management should not have relied upon the settlement dated 9.1.1991. Hence, the impugned action of the Management is illegal, unjust, violative of fundamental rights such as Articles 14,16 and 21 of the Constitution of India.

11. The Workman submits that in W.P. No.4194/97 filed by the union of temporary employees where in they have complained about the non- implementation of the settlements arrived between the parties and sought for absorption. Such employees in the bank services on permanent basis before the date fixed for carrying out the terms of settlement, the Court held that the members of the union had been empanelled in the list, they were not regularized and the time was going to run out to the near future and the Respondent bank and its officers cannot escape from the liability of enforcing the settlement which has been reached and therefore directed that the bank and the officers shall implement the settlement dated 17.11.87 as amended from time to time before the expiry of 31.3.97.

12. Further, it is submitted that in the clause of Settlement it is specifically mentioned that the workmen to be absorbed/appointed in the bank prohibiting any temporary appointments subsequent to the date of settlement even the authorities want to make temporary appointments that should be made only from among the empanelled can be appointed either for temporary vacancy or permanent vacancy except from among the empanelled candidates like the Workman and that should be continued till they are absorbed. The management committed unfair labour practices and terminated the services of the candidates with effect from the year 1993 which is arbitrary, discriminatory, contrary to their own guidelines and violative of the constitutional provisions which are guaranteed in Chapter-III of the Constitution of India.

13. The Workman submits that it is strange as to how the panels were allowed to lapse by a so-called Memorandum of Understanding dated 25.2.1997, that the action of terminating such employees like the Workman by virtue of an impugned oral proceedings without implementing the settlement would be illegal and unfair labour practice which cannot be allowed to be perpetuated. That the discontinuance of the Workman after 31.3.97 who had served in the bank in any capacity amounts to retrenchment. It could not have been done without any notice and it violates Sec.25FF of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and the said action is violative of principles of natural justice guaranteed under Chapter III of the Constitution of India. This amounts to retrenchment without one month's notice and taken in view of such notice. Thus, the main proceedings issued by the Respondent is without jurisdiction and is arbitrary, illegal and therefore liable to be quashed. That the alleged Memorandum of Understanding dated 27.2.97, Ex.M5 does not own any legal entity, as the said Memorandum of Understanding is not published anywhere to brought to the notice of the Workman whose rights are being affected. It is submitted that Management did not adhere to the procedure envisaged by the Central Government in its' instructions dated 16.8.90 in the year 1995. The same was not followed in the year 1997 despite there being vacancies. The management has followed the procedure of calling candidates through Employment exchange instead of giving chance to the empanelled candidates like the Workman here. It is pertinent to mention here that the Respondent Management sent letters to the all similarly situated candidates like the Workman in the month of June, 1997, subsequent to the passing of impugned termination orders. After knowing the facts that the candidates are litigating, the Management refused to engage these candidates. It is once again reiterated that the panels are meant for absorption but not for termination. It was the duty of the Management to engage the empanelled candidates like the Workman even in temporary vacancies till they are absorbed permanently in regular vacancies. Hence, the action of the Respondent Management terminating the services of the Workman by oral order dated 31.3.97 is unjust, illegal, violative of principles of natural justice and hence, the Management be directed to reinstate and absorb the Workman and to grant all incidental and consequential benefits.

14. Per contra, Respondent had filed counter and made a contentions that the reference is not tenable and contrary to the provisions of I.D. Act, 1947. Respondent submitted that to tide over severe sub-ordinate staff constraints which arose out of leave vacancies, exigencies, etc., and also owning to the restrictions imposed by the Government of India/Reserve Bank of India on intake of staff, the Respondent bank used to engage sub-ordinate staff like messengers, sweepers, sweeper cum water boys, etc., depending on the availability of work on purely temporary basis for the smooth and uninterrupted functioning of the branches. It is submitted that the All India State Bank of India Staff Federation which represents majority of the employees in the State Bank of India comprising about 98% of the work force as its' members espoused the cause of temporary employees who have put in less than 240 days of

temporary service in 12 calendar months in the bank and who were ineligible for any protection under Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 to give a chance for being considered for absorption and permanent appointments.

15. Discussions were held and on 17.11.1987 an agreement was signed between the federation and the Management bank under Sec. 2(p) read with Sec 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules 1957. A copy of the said settlement dated 17.11.87 which may be herein after referred as first settlement is filed and 4 categories were made as it has already been mentioned in the claim statement above, it need not be repeated here. In the first settlement, it was agreed that the temporary employees as categorized would be given a chance for being considered for permanent appointment in the bank's service against the vacancies which are likely to arise during the period 1987 to 1991. On 16.7.88 second settlement was arrived between the Federation and the Bank whereby it was agreed to substitute the period of consideration of vacancies as 1987 to 1992 in place of 1987 to 1991 as contemplated under the first settlement dated 17.11.1987. This is the second settlement. A 3rd settlement was entered into on 27.10.88 and it was agreed that the bank's service against the vacancies likely to arise from 1988 to 1992 was to be considered. Government of India vide its letter dated 16.8.90 issued guidelines to all the public sector banks with regard to recruitment and absorption of temporary employees in public sector banks. The said guidelines were issued to implement on the lines of approach paper on the issue provided by a committee constituted in this regard. Government of India guidelines made it clear that all the public sector banks may follow the provisions laid down in the approach paper. The approach paper specified that the cases of temporary service in 12 consecutive months and who are entitled to benefit of Sec.25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 may be decided by entering into a settlement with the representative union. In respect of temporary employees who had put in less than 240 days of service in 12 consecutive months or less, a settlement could be avoided and however if the Management so desired they could enter into a conciliation settlement with the representative union. In para. 6(h) it is mentioned that only those temporary employees who had put in temporary service of 90 days or more days after 1.1.82 would be eligible for considering under the scheme. Although the Government guidelines envisaged for a settlement in respect of employees who had put in temporary service of 90 days or more days, the bank by way of a further concession entered into settlements. Even in respect of those who had put in less than 90 days and also the bank went a step further and said those persons who are working after 1975 were also considered. Hence, there was a genuine effort on the part of the Respondent bank to provide as many as possible jobs subject to the availability of the vacancies. However, para 6 (k) of the approach paper made it clear that it is a one time, exercise in full and final, settlement of all the claims and disputes for the past period, in respect of temporary workmen covered by the settlement. Another settlement was entered on 9.1.91 herein after referred as 4th settlement and the time limit was extended upto 1994 and separate panel was prepared for temporary employees, casual/daily wagers. It was agreed that while vacancies arising between 1988 to 1994 in respect of temporary employees and in respect of casual/daily wagers, they can be considered for the vacancies arising between 1995-96 only.

16. It is submitted that the administrative set up of the Hyderabad Local Head Office comprises of four Zonal Offices (Zones) at Hyderabad, Vijayawada, Visakhapatnam and Tirupathi covering all the Districts of Andhra Pradesh. In terms of the settlement the Management after following the procedure laid down therein prepared the panels of qualified candidates of temporary employees denoted as 1989 panel and also panel of casual/daily wagers denoted as 1992 panel for giving a chance for being considered for permanent absorption. These panels were prepared zone-wise separately for messengers and non-messengers in the descending order of temporary service put in by the candidates during the stipulated period i.e., 1.7.1975 to 31.7.1988. That the Federation approached the Regional Labour Commissioner(C) for implementation of bi-partite settlement in respect of absorption of temporary employees. The Regional Labour Commissioner(C) conducted conciliation proceedings and an agreement was arrived between the Federation and the bank. It was agreed that it would be kept alive upto March, 1997. A copy of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.2.1995 signed by the parties is filed as material paper. A settlement was arrived at and an agreement was signed between the Federation and the Management bank on 30.7.1996 under Sec.2 (p) read with Sec.18(1) of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957, which is hereinafter called as 5th settlement. That on 27.2.1997 a Memorandum of understanding was also signed by the federation's affiliate and the bank Management recording the fact that the exercise of identifying the messengerial vacancies as on 31.12.1994 has since been completed by Central Office and thereby 403 messengerial vacancies were sanctioned . It was agreed that these vacancies may be filled from 1989 panel of temporary employees after effecting conversion from full time non-messengerial staff in the usual manner and the agreement was reached accordingly. It was agreed between the Federation's affiliate and the Management bank that in terms of the settlement dated 30.7.1996 both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees would lapse on 31.3.1997. That as agreed upon vacancies were filled from the panels. The Workman who has put in an aggregate temporary service of less than 240 days in a continuous block of 12 months period during 1.7.1975 to 31.7.1988 has no right to seek a direction to consider his candidature for absorption in the Management bank under any rule/law except under the settlement entered into thereon.

17. Respondent contended that, in fact, the case of the Workman can be considered under all the five settlements having got his case considered under provisions of these settlements. All the other provisions and terms of the settlements are also binding on him/her. The Management bank has not violated any of the provisions of the terms of

the said settlement. That the very preparation and maintenance of panel is in compliance of the terms agreed under these settlements. These settlements were time bound and they ceased to exist on 31.3.1997. That the bank has never promised that all the candidates in the panel will be absorbed. In the advertisement itself it was made clear that candidates will be considered for absorption in the vacancies that may arise upto 1992. Keeping alive the panels after 31.3.1997 is contrary to the settlements arrived between the State Bank of India Staff Federation and the Management bank. That the settlements are binding on the parties. The Workman is also bound under the terms of the said settlement. The settlement does not suffer from any ambiguity as their language is very clear. The right under the settlements is to give them a chance to be considered for future appointment in the bank's services against the vacancies likely to arise. The settlements were effected to balance the expectations of the temporary employees to be absorbed in permanent service as against the constitutional rights for all eligible persons to be considered for employment every time a vacancy arises. That the alleged dispute including the demand for reinstatement has to be decided in this context. It is submitted that the period of panel list got expired on 31.3.97 and it is an integral term of the settlement and cannot be modified in any proceedings under the law. These temporary employees who unfortunately could not be accommodated for want of vacancies have no further rights to be considered for regularization. That the Hon'ble High Court in WP No.12964/94, held as follows, "It is needless to state that the settlement arrived at between the All India State Bank of India Staff Federation which, is the majority union and the bank Management is binding on the Workmen also. It is not at all the case of the Workman that any of the terms of the settlement has been violated by the bank's Management. If the Workman had worked in the bank on part-time basis before 31.5.94, that itself would not vest in him a right to claim that his services should be regularized on permanent basis against a full time cadre post. The claim put forth by the Workman in the present petition is therefore misconceived and not tenable. However, it is open to the Workman to claim any right which flows from the settlement between the union and the bank Management. As already pointed out that it is not the grievance of the Workman that some right which has flown from the settlement in favour of the Workman has been denied by the bank Management. Therefore, I do not find any ground, let alone substantial ground, to grant the kind of relief sought for by the Workman. Writ Petition fails and is accordingly dismissed. No costs."

18. Further, it is contended that if the panels were not lapsed at the end of designated period and allowed to be continued it would result in making the contracts of temporary employment indirectly permanent through back door entry, which would not only be contrary to the settlements but also to Articles 14 and 16 of Constitution of India and deprive the chances of original claimants who would Come through proper recruitment procedure. As their rights have been crystallized by operation of the settlements. Hence, there is no question of any Legitimate expectation being violated.

19. Similarly placed ex-employees filed WP No.9206/1995 and the batch before the Hon'ble High Court of A.P. and the learned Single Judge allowed the Writ Petitions. Aggrieved by the same WA No.86/98 and the batch was filed and the Division Bench set aside the order of the Single Judge. Thereafter the ex-temporary employees filed Special Leave Petition No.11886-11888 of 1998 before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India also dismissed the SLP. Therefore, reference to the Judgement of the Learned Single Judge in WP No.9206/97 is of no consequences as the same has already been set aside. The observations made in the Judgements cannot be relied upon for any purpose what so ever. The question of operation of Sec.25F would not come into play. Further the issue is covered by various Judgements of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India and various Hon'ble High Courts. Hence, the reference may be ordered that the Workman is not entitled for any relief.

20. In order to fortify his claim Workman has examined himself as WW1 and also filed documents in evidence which has been exhibited as Ex.W1 to W4. Further, the Workman has filed photocopies of documents in support of his claim which are discussed as under:-

Ex.W1 is the interview call letter. Ex.W2 is the service certificate. Ex.W3 is the physically handicapped certificate. Ex.W4 is the transfer certificate.

21. On the other hand, Respondent has examined witness MW1 Sri I.S. Appa Rao and this witness has exhibited 12 documents, marked as Ex.M1 to M12. The details of these documents are as follows:-

Ex.M.1 is the Settlement dated 17.11.1987. Ex.M2 is the Settlement dated 16.7.1988. Ex.M3 is the Settlement dated 27.10.1988. Ex.M4 is the Settlement dated 9.1.1991. Ex.M5 is the Minutes of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.1995. Ex.M6 is the Settlement dated 30.7.1996. Ex.M7 is the Memorandum of Understanding dt. 27.2.1997. Ex.M8 is the Particulars of 1989 Messengerial Panel. Ex.M9 is the Particulars of 1989 Non-Messengerial Panel. Ex.M10 is the Particulars of 1992 General Attendant Panel. Ex.M11 is the Judgment of Hon'ble High Court of A.P. in Writ Appeal No.86/98 dt.1.5.1998. Ex.M12 is the Judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in SLP No. 11886-11888 of 1998 dt.10.8.1998.

22. Apart from afore mentioned documents, Learned Counsel for Workman has also filed a long list of various judgements of Hon'ble Supreme Court as well as Hon'ble High Court, which we will discuss at appropriate place in this Award.

23. Heard the argument of Learned Counsel for Workman as well as for Respondent.

24. On the basis of rival pleadings of both the parties and submissions made by the Learned Counsel for both the parties, following points arise for determination in the industrial dispute :-

I. Whether the 1st settlement dated 17.11.1987, 2nd settlement dated 16.7.1988, 3rd settlement dated 27.10.1988, 4th settlement dated 9.1.1991 and 5th settlement dated 30.7.1996 entered into between State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and also Memorandum of Understanding are binding upon both the parties?

II. Whether the action of State Bank of India, Ongole branch in terminating the services of Workman Sri P. Anjaneyulu, a Messenger with effect from the year 1993 is justified?

III. Whether the Workman is entitled for absorption on permanent post in the Branch of Respondent management as per averments made by him in the claim statement?

IV. To what relief if any the Workman is entitled for?

Findings:-

25. Point No.I:- Undisputedly settlements dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988, 9.1.1991 and 30.7.1996, minutes of conciliation proceedings and memorandum of understanding dated 27.2.1997 were executed between the State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation under section 2(p) and 18 (1) of I.D. Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Disputes (Central Rules), 1957.

Section 2(p) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 as follows:-

(p) "settlement" means a settlement arrived at in the course of conciliation proceeding and includes a written agreement between the employer and workmen arrived at otherwise than in the course of conciliation proceeding where such agreement has been signed by the parties thereto in such manner as may be prescribed and a copy thereof has been sent to an officer authorised in this behalf by the appropriate Government and the conciliation officer;

Section 18(1) provides as follows:-

18. Persons on whom settlements and awards are binding.

- [(1) A settlement arrived at by agreement between the employer and Workman otherwise than in the course of conciliation proceeding shall be binding on the parties to the agreement.

Therefore, in view of the provision contained u/s.18 (1) I.D. Act, 1947, terms and conditions enumerated in the aforesaid settlements are binding on the parties to the agreement. The Learned Counsel for Workman has argued that the Workman after going through the selection procedure has successfully been listed in the panel for appointment on the permanent basis in the Respondent management and the empanelled list has to be valid till last person in the empanelled list is appointed on permanent basis. But the impugned order dated 25.3.97, 27.3.97 and 31.3.97, has been issued by Respondent management thereby the services of the Workman has been terminated and the said order is not in consonance of the terms of the agreement entered into between the parties. Further, Workman submits that the Respondent in the 5th settlement has mentioned the date i.e., 31.3.1997 for lapse of empanel list which is illegal and that is not binding upon the Workman. The condition of lapse of empanelment list on 31.3.97 incorporated in the aforesaid 5th settlement, is arbitrary and illegal.

26. The perusal of the impugned order dated 25.3.1997 goes to reveal that the Chief/Branch Manager, SBI Zonal Office has issued the letter to all the branches with regard to the subject not to make any temporary appointments in the Branch in messengerial category from the year 1993. The extract of the said letter is given below:-

"We have been advised by the Deputy General Manager, Zonal Office, Hyderabad that as both the panels of temporary employees of 1989 and daily wagers/casual labours of 1992 will lapse by 31.3.1997, it has been decided by Central Office not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial category from the year 1993."

Thus, from the contents of the aforesaid letter, it manifest that Head Office of State Bank of India vide letter dated 25.3.1997 has issued direction to all its branches not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial category from the year 1993 due to reason of lapse of both panels i.e., 1989 & 1992 on 31.3.1997 as per terms of settlements entered into by both parties. Further, the contents of the subsequent letter dated 27.3.1997 issued by Respondent Management is also direction to Branch Manager, State Bank of India not to make any temporary messengerial category appointment with effect from the year 1993 and it has also been communicated to all concerned that the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers maintained by Zonal offices stand lapsed from 31.1.1997. Further, office order dated 31.3.1997 has been issued by Respondent management that goes to reveal that the said office order has been issued to this effect that, "Consequent on absorption of temporary employees in permanent cadre, it has been decided by the competent authority that no one onwards, no further daily labour or temporary

employees/appointments should be resorted to/engaged/employed." Therefore, it reflects from the contents of the aforesaid orders that the temporary appointment in messengerial category and daily labour has been stopped by the Respondent management with effect from the year 1993 because of the lapsed of panel of temporary workers and daily wagers by 31.3.1997. The agreement for lapse of both the panels on 31.3.1997 is contained in the 5th settlement which has been arrived at between the parties on dated 30.7.1996 with the consensus of both the parties. Therefore, Workman can not challenge the terms and conditions contained in settlement dated 30.7.1996 regarding lapse of panel on 31.3.1997 as agreed between State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation. As per provision contained u/s.18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 the said Agreement dated 30.7.1996 is binding on both the parties.

In the case of **Allied Sales Corporation Secunderabad vs.The Authority Under Andhra Pradesh..... 1990 II LLJ 510 AP para 414, Hon'ble Court have held:-**

"*4. There was a settlement between the Management and the workmen under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act on 25th April 1983 under which the age of superannuation of the workmen was fixed at 55 years. The settlement was to be in force upto 30th June 1986 and the next settlement, incorporating practically the same terms, was again entered into on 4th February 1987 under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act. There is no dispute that these settlements are under Section 18(1).*

14. Now the Authority constituted under Section 41(1) of the Act is an authority with very limited jurisdiction. It can only decide in the first appeal whether a termination by the management is valid or not and is within the parameters of Section 40 of the Act. The said Authority, in our view, has absolutely no jurisdiction to decide whether a settlement entered into under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act between the representatives of the Workmen and of the Management, is vitiated by undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion on the part of the Management. The Authority, namely, the Assistant Commissioner of Labour, was never intended by the A.P. Legislature to have jurisdiction to go into the question of the validity of a settlement arrived at under Section 18 of the Industrial Disputes Act by an Industrial Court. That Parliament has, in fact, constituted Industrial Courts under the Industrial Disputes Act, with extensive powers cannot be disputed. What we mean to say is that the Authority under Section 41(1) of the A.P. Act has no jurisdiction what-so-ever either to question or to decide about the validity of any such settlements. If parties to a settlement have a grievance about the validity of a settlement, it is for them to agitate the matter before the appropriate forum and they cannot ask an Authority constituted under Section 41(1) of the A.P. Shops and Establishments Act, 1966 with limited jurisdiction, to go into any such question and, that too, incidentally while deciding whether retirement as per the contract of employment, is legal or not."

It is not the case of Workman that aforesaid settlements are vitiated by undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion on the part of the management. If the Workman feeling aggrieved by any terms of settlement/ agreement on the aforementioned grounds then he can challenge of settlement before a competent authority under the Act, 1947. But here in the instant matter it is not a case of Workman that aforementioned settlement has been entered into between the parties on the ground of undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion. Therefore, Workman is barred to raise any objection in respect of fixing the date of lapse of both panels on 31.3.1997 as agreed between both the parties and Workman can not challenge any terms of said Agreement.

Further in the case of **Herbertsons Limited Vs. Workmen of Herbertsons Limited and Ors, 1977 AIR 322,** Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

The Tribunal thought that the question of the quantum of membership of the 2nd Respondent did not call for a finding at all in view of 1his Court's order. As observed above that was not a correct assumption. On the other hand, we feel that this view of the Tribunal has led it to approach the matter in an entirely erroneous manner. The Tribunal is, rightly enough, conscious that under section 18 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act the settlement was binding on the company and the members of the 3rd Respondent union. Even so, the Tribunal devoted nearly half of its order in scanning the evidence given by the company and Respondent No. 3 to find out whether the terms of the settlement had been explained by the President of the union to the workmen or not and whether the workers voluntarily accepted the settlement knowing all the "consequences". This to our mind is again an entirely wrong approach.

"When a recognised union negotiates with an employer the workers as individuals do not come into the picture. It is not necessary that each individual worker should know the implications of the settlement since a recognised union, which is expected to protect the legitimate interests of labour, enters into a settlement in the best interests of labour. This would be the normal rule. We cannot altogether rule out exceptional cases where there may be allegations of mala fides, fraud or even corruption or other induce- ments. Nothing of that kind has been suggested against the President of the 3rd Respondent in this case. That being the position, prima facie, this is a settlement in the course of collective bargaining and, therefore, is entitled to due weight and consideration.

It is not possible to scan the settlement in bits and pieces and hold some parts good and acceptable and others bad. Unless it can be demonstrated that the objectionable portion is such that it completely outweighs all the other advantages gained the Court will be slow to hold a settle- ment as unfair and unjust. The settlement has to be accepted or rejected as a whole and we are unable to reject it as a whole as unfair or unjust. Even before this Court the 3rd Respondent representing admittedly the large majority of the workmen has stood by this settlement and that is

a strong factor which it is difficult to ignore. As stated elsewhere in the judgment, we cannot also be oblivious of the fact that all workmen of the company have accepted the settlement. Besides, the period of settlement has since expired and we are informed that the employer and the 3rd Respondent are negotiating another settlement with further improvements. These factors, apart from what has been stated above, and the need for industrial peace and harmony when a union backed by a large majority of workmen has accepted a settlement in the course of collective bargaining have impelled us not to interfere with this settlement. That being the position, we unhold the settlement as fair and just and order that the award of the Tribunal shall be substituted by the settlement dated October 18, 1973. The said settlement shall be the substituted award. The appeal is disposed of accordingly. There will be no order as to costs."

Therefore, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above, the contention of the Workman that the date fixed for lapse of empanelled list on 31.3.1997 for appointment to the permanent post vide 5th Settlement dated 30.7.1996 is arbitrary, illegal is not untenable. The recognized union of Workmen has negotiated with the Respondent Bank Management representing large number of Workmen and the Workman as individual do not come into picture. Workman in the instant case has work as temporary Workmen in the Respondent Branch and in response of Notification he had applied for inclusion of his name in the panel and he was selected for inclusion his name in the panel list to be utilized for absorption of such Workman to permanent post in order of their seniority in the list. The Settlement dated 30.7.1996 between State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation under Sec.2(p) and Sec.18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 has clearly provided as regard non-messengerial position and it is agreed that all such posts sanctioned fallen vacant upto 31.3.1997 shall be filled before empanel list is allowed to lapse. Thus, in view of law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, in the instant case, Agreement dated 30.7.1996 was entered into between both the parties in respect of lapsing of the both the panels on 31.3.1997 and absorption of the Workmen from panel list was subject to availability of vacancy of post likely to arise upto 31.3.1997, have a binding force on Workman as well as management of State Bank of India in view of provision contained under section 18 (1) of I.D. Act, 1947.

Thus, Point No.I is answered against the Workman and in favour of the Respondent.

27. **Point No.II**:- Firstly, it is submitted on behalf of the Workman that the Respondent has terminated his services by oral order on the year 1993 without issuing any notice or paying any salary or compensation in lieu thereof. Therefore, the termination order of the Workman from service is in violation of provision contained Under Section 25 F of I.D. Act, 1947. Therefore, the order is liable to be set aside.

28. On the other hand, Respondent counsel contended that Workman has not worked for 240 days in any preceding calendar year. Therefore, reference of the industrial dispute is not relevant. In this context, the Workman has examined himself as WW1 who has reiterated that Workman has been terminated from service by Respondent on the year 1993 without notice of salary or compensation in lieu thereof. Before examining the claim of the Workman on merit it would be apposite to reproduce the provision contained under section 25 F:-

Section 25F provides:-

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].

Compensation to workmen in case of transfer of undertakings.

Section 25B defines the term continuous service which provides

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 authorized 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;

In order to prove the fact of 240 days of service within 12 months of a calendar year just preceding from the date of termination, the initial burden of proof lies upon the Workman and the Workman has to prove this factum by adducing his oral as well as documentary evidence in support of his claim.

Further, how to calculate 240 days of service by the Workman in a calendar year. In this context the reference of decisions of Hon'ble Supreme Court is relevant and the same are discussed below:-

In Rajasthan State Ganganagar S. Mills Ltd. v. State of Rajasthan and Anr. (2004) Apex Court held:

"It was the case of the Workman that he had worked for more than 240 days in the year concerned. This claim was denied by the appellant. It was for the claimant to lead evidence to show that he had worked for 240 days in the year preceding the date of his termination. He has filed an affidavit. It is statement which is in his favor and that cannot be regarded as sufficient evidence for any Court or Tribunal to come to the conclusion that in fact the claimant had worked for 240 days in a year These aspects were highlighted in Range Forest Officer v. S.T. Hadimani (2002 (3) SCC 25. No proof of receipt of salary or wages for 240 days or order or record in that regard was produced. Mere non-production of the muster roll for a particular period was not sufficient for the Labour Court held that the Workman had worked for 240 days as claimed."

In Municipal Corporation, Faridabad v. Siri Niwas (2004 (8) SCC 195), held "*the burden was on the Workman to show that he was working for more than 240 days in the preceding one year prior to his alleged retrenchment." In M.P. Electricity Board v. Hariram (2004 (8) SCC 246) the position was again reiterated in paragraph 11 as follows: "The above burden having not been discharged and the Labour Court having held so, in our opinion, the Industrial Court and the High Court erred in basing an order of reinstatement solely on an adverse inference drawn erroneously ..*"

In the case of Manager, RBI, Bangalore vs. S Mani (2005) SCC Page 100, the 3 Judges Bench of the Apex Court held that "*the initial burden of proof was on the Workman to show that he had completed 240 days of service."*

Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of Mohan Lal vs Management BEL 1981 SCC page 225 has laid down the principle that how to count 240 days of service within one year it is held: *"Clause (2)(a) provides for a fiction to treat a Workman in continuous service for a period of one year despite the fact that he has not rendered uninterrupted service for a period of one year but he has rendered period of 240 days during the period of 12 calendar service for months counting backwards and just preceding the relevant date being the date of retrenchment. In other words, in order to invoke the fiction enacted in clause (2)(a) it is necessary to determine first the relevant date, ie the date of termination of service which is complained of as retrenchment. After that date is ascertained. move backward to a period of 12 months just preceding the date of retrenchment and then ascertain whether within the period of 12 months, the Workman has rendered service for a period of 240 days. If these three facts are affirmatively answered in favor of the Workman pursuant to the deeming fiction enacted in clause (2)(a) it will have to be assumed that the Workman is in continuous service for a period of one year and he will satisfy the eligibility qualification enacted in Section 25-F"*

"14. We have already extracted section 25B since its amendment and the change in language is the legislative exposition of which note must be taken. In fact, we need not further dilate upon this aspect because in Surendra Kumar Verma and Ors. v. Central Government Industrial-cum-Labour Court, New Delhi and Anr., Chinnappa Reddy. J., after noticing the amendment and referring to the decision in Sur Enamel and Stamping Works (P) Ltd case, held as under:

"These changes brought about by Act 36 of 1964 appear to be clearly designed to provide that a Workman who has actually worked under the employer for not less than 240 days during a period of twelve months shall be deemed to have been in continuous service for a period of one year whether or not he has in fact been in such continuous service for a period of one year. It is enough that he has worked for 240 days in a period of 12 months, it is not necessary that he should have been in the service of the employer for one whole year."

In a concurring judgment Pathak J. agreed with this interpretation of section 25B(2). Therefore, both on principle and on precedent it must be held that section 25B(2) comprehends a situation where a Workman is not in employment for a period of 12 calendar months, but has rendered service for a period of 240 days within the period of 12 calendar months commencing and counting backwards from the relevant date, i.e. the date of retrenchment. If he has, he would be deemed to be in continuous service for a period of one year for the purpose of section 25B and Chapter VA."

Thus, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above the initial burden of proof lies upon the Workman to show that he has completed 240 days of the service with the Respondent just preceding from the date of his termination. Further, in respect of the employment of calculating the 240 days service provision contained under Section 25-F read with Section 25-B of the I.D. Act, 1947.

29. Now, in view of the provision contained under Section 25 F and law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, we have to examine whether the Workman has discharged his initial burden of proof in respect of his claim of 240 days continuous service in a calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination i.e., the year 1993.

In this context, WW1 in his cross examination has stated that,

"I worked for a total no. of 168 days. For the rest of days service I do not have any service certificate….

I was not sponsored by any employment exchange. ….. It is not true to suggest that I never worked for 240 days in a year continuously and I was casual worker I am not entitled for any relief."

Thus, it is clear from the testimony of WW1 that the Workman had not worked for 240 days continuously in any 12 months of a calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination in the Respondent bank. Therefore, Workman failed to establish his plea by his oral and documentary evidence that he had worked for 240 days continuously in calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination i.e., the year 1993. Thus, the claim of the Workman that he has been terminated by oral order without issuing notice or payment in lieu after termination, in contravention of Section 25 F of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is not tenable. However the documents filed by the Workman in support of his claim, number of days worked with the Respondent goes to reveal that the Workman had worked intermittently as daily wager depending upon availability of work in branch. Workman did not file any document of appointment letter or salary slips in support of his claim for appointment as a non-messenger in the Respondent branch on temporary basis.

30. Per contra, the Learned Counsel for Respondent has submitted the allegation of Workman that he was terminated from services is not correct. As the vacancies were filled up on regular basis in order of their respective seniority the non-engagement of the Workman does not amount to termination. Further, Respondent contended that no law provide that even though there is no work temporary employee should be continued in the bank work as the very engagement of Workman was subject to availability of work. Therefore, the allegation that the bank has indulged in unfair labour practice is incorrect.

31. Thus, in view of the fore gone discussion and contentions made by the Respondent, I find the force in the argument advanced by the Respondent that in the instant matter, Workman was not terminated from service by order dated the year 1993 rather he was disengaged in view of the non-availability of the work in the branch. Further, there was direction issued by the Head Office of the Respondent authority not to engage any daily wager Workman/ temporary Worker w.e.f. the year 1993. Thus, such disengagement of Workman does not amount to termination. Moreover, the Workman failed to prove his claim that he was terminated in contravention of provision of Sec.25F of the I.D. Act, 1947 as he failed to establish his plea by any oral or documentary evidence that he had worked for 240 days continuously in a twelve months of calendar year just preceding from date of termination i.e., the year 1993.

32. Further, perusal of the order dated 25.3.1997 goes to reveal that the Chief Branch Manager, State Bank of India has issued the letter to Zonal Office with direction to all its branches to this effect that they have been advised by the DGM, Zonal Office, Hyderabad that as both the panel of temporary employees of 1989 and daily wagers/casual labour of 1992 will lapse on 31.3.1997 it has been decided by central office not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial cadre from the year 1993, therefore it was directed to issue suitable instructions not to make temporary appointments from the year 1993. There is no mention in this order that the Workman herein has been terminated from service by this order.

33. Further, the circular dated 27.3.1997 was issued by DGM, SBI to all branches in commercial network in respect of the non-appointment of temporary employees in subordinate cadre and it has directed not to make any temporary employment in the subordinate cadre with effect from 1.4.97 and further, it has directed to ensure that no temporary/casual/daily basis appointment of the petty cash. Further, it is directed to all Branch Managers that any deviation in this regard will be viewed seriously. Thus, these circulars do not reflect that the Workman has been terminated from service by this order.

34. Similarly, office order dated 31.3.1997 is simply a direction to all branches of the Respondent bank by DGM that no further daily labour should be engaged or employed. Therefore, the plea of the Workman that he has been terminated by the aforesaid order dated 25.3.1997, 27.3.1997 and 31.3.1997 from the service by the Respondent is not acceptable. The evidence adduced by the Workman clearly goes to reveal that he had worked as a daily wager for which he has been paid wages according to number of working days. As there was an order for prohibition for engaging temporary workmen, in the bank, therefore, Workman could not be engaged by the Respondent for work from the year 1993 and there after. It is settled law that the daily wagers are engaged by the employer depending upon the availability of work and as the work was not available the Workman was not engaged further by the Respondent management. Therefore, the Workman on the ground of number of days he had worked in the Respondent bank cannot claim any right to reinstate him into the employment. As the Workman failed to prove the mandatory condition of 240 days of continuous service as required under Sec.25F of I.D. Act, 1947. Therefore, the disengagement of Workman from work can not be termed in contravention of provision contained under Sec.25F and 25 B of the I.D. Act, 1947.

Thus, this point is answered against the Workman and in favour of Respondent.

35. **Point No.III**:- In this context, the Workman has contended that the management failed to implement the selected panels during its valid tenure. The management adopted the back door methods contrary to the settlements and filled up the vacancies. The same is evident from the proceedings dated 18.11.1993 a copy of the same is filed in the material papers and the same may be read as part of the claim statement. Further, it is submitted that management has to adhere the procedure issued by the Central Government, the instructions dated 16.8.1990 in the year 1995, but same was not followed in the year 1997 despite there being vacancies. The management has followed the procedure of calling candidates through employment exchange instead of giving chance to the empanelled candidates like the Workman herein. The management sent call letters to the similarly situated candidates like the Workman in the month of June 1997 subsequent to issuance of impugned termination orders. After knowing the fact that they are litigating the issue by way of dispute, the management has refused to engage those candidates, the copies of call letters issued are filed herein along with claim petition. The Workman herein reiterates that the panels are meant for absorption but not for termination. In view of the same a duty is cast upon the Respondent management to engage the empanelled candidates like the Workman herein even in temporary vacancies till they are absorbed permanently in regular vacancies.

36. On the other hand, Respondent has contended that the Federation approached Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) for implementation of bipartite settlement in respect of the absorption of temporary employees. The Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) conducted conciliation proceedings and agreement was arrived at between the Federation and the Management bank. It is submitted that it was agreed between the Federation and the Management that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers /casual labour would be kept alive upto March, 1997 and the vacancies as agreed to under the afore set out settlements will be filled from both the lists concurrently. A copy of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.1995 signed by the parties to the dispute is filed as a material paper. Further, it is submitted that the settlement was arrived at and an agreement was signed between the Federation and the Management bank on 30.7.1996 under Section 2(p) read with Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules 1957 which is binding on the parties. A copy of this agreement which hereinafter may be referred to as 5th settlement for brevity, is also filed as a material paper. The 5th settlement dated 30.7.1996 whereunder the earlier four settlements dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988 and 9.1.1991 were also referred, it was agreed to, by the Federation and the Management bank that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees will be kept alive upto March, 1997 for filling the vacancies existing/arrived at as on 31.12.1994 as per the norms agreed to between the bank and Federation and that thereafter the said panels would lapse. It was also agreed that within the framework of the above settlements the modalities about drawing names from either the panel of temporary employees or the panel of daily wagers and casual labour would be decided administratively on circle to circle basis depending upon the local requirements in consultation with the Federation's affiliate by the Circle management. It was further agreed that all messenger real vacancies/positions in the subordinate cadre including part-time attendants specifically provided as leave reserve will be filled by the end of 31.3.1997. Further, Respondent contended that on 27.2.1997 a memorandum of understanding was also signed between the Federation's affiliate and the bank management regarding the fact that the exercise of identifying the messengerial vacancies as on 31.12.1994 has since been completed by central office and thereby 403 messengerial vacancies were sanctioned to the circle of the Management bank and it was agreed that these vacancies may be filled from 1989 panel of temporary employees after effecting conversion from full time non-messengerial staff in the usual manner and the agreement was reached upon. Further, it was agreed between the Federations affiliate and the management bank that in terms of the settlement dated 30.7.1996 both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers /casual employees would lapse on 31.3.1997.

37. The Workman has contended that the empanelled list prepared by the Respondent management for appointment of temporary and daily wage Workers to the permanent post cannot lapse unless until it is exhausted by appointing all the empanelled persons and it should continue even after 31.3.1997, i.e., the date fixed for the lapse of panel. It is undisputed that the date of lapse of empanelled list of Workmen has been fixed to 31.3.1997 as mentioned in the settlement dated 30.7.1996, and agreed between the parties. It is settled law that and once the life of panel list lapses on the date as agreed between the parties it cannot be extended beyond that date. In the instant case the panel list of the workmen was valid upto 31.3.1997 in view of the terms and conditions enumerated in the 5th Settlement entered into between the parties. As the lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997 has been agreed by State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation through 5th Settlement, the Workman is not competent to challenge the same.

In this context I would like to take reference of the decision of the apex court in the case of **Syndicate Bank and Ors vs. Shankar Paul and Ors , AIR 1997 SC 3091, therein the Hon'ble Apex Court** have held:-

"Till 1982, the branches of the appellant Bank in Calcutta region were recruiting persons locally to work as temporary attenders in leave vacancies. In view of the revised procedure prescribed by the Government of India in respect of such temporary appointments, the Calcutta regional office of the appellant Bank issued a circular to all of its branches on 14.8.1982, instructing all the branches under it to discontinue the old practice from 1.6.1982 and appoint only empanelled candidates. The regional office was to prepare a panel of eligible candidates, after calling

names from the local/district employment exchange, and split it up branch-wise. Following that new procedure yearly panels were prepared thereafter. Names of the Respondents were for the first time included in the panel prepared for the period 7.2.1987 to 6.2.1988. By its letter dated 7.2.1987 the Bank had informed the Respondents that the panel was valid for one year only and that inclusion of their names in the panel was not to confer on them any right to seek permanent appointment in the service of the bank. Considering the object with which the panel was prepared and the fact that it was an yearly panel expiring on 6.2.1988, we are of the opinion that the Respondents did not get any right, because of inclusion of their names in the said panel, for permanent absorption in the service of the Bank. Whatever conditional right they had came to an end with the expiry of the panel. The claim of the Respondents, as contained in the writ petition was thus misconceived and therefore the learned single Judge and the Division Bench, when it first decided the appeal, were right in dismissing the writ petition and the appeal respectively."

Thus, in view of the above law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court and in view of the terms and conditions of the 5th Settlement the contention of the Workman that empanelled list should continue even after 31.3.1997 till the last Workman in the panel is absorbed is not tenable. The contention of the Workman is baseless in view of recital in the settlement. Therefore, in view of the fore gone discussion and finding given at Point No. I regarding binding nature of Settlements and terms and conditions enumerated therein, in view of the provision contained u/s.18(1) of the I.D. Act, 1947, I am of the considered view that life of panels lapsed on 31.3.1997 in view of terms of settlement dated 30.7.1996 and plea of Workman that the panel shall continue even after 31.3.1997 till last man absorbed has no legal force and same is untenable.

38. Undisputedly, settlement agreement dated 30.7.1996 was executed between the State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation and in that settlement it was agreed that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/ casual employees will be used for filling vacancies existing as on 31.12.1994 as per the norms agreed between the bank and the Federation. These empanelled workmen were to be given a chance for permanent appointment in the bank against vacancies arising up to December 1994 whereas the daily wagers/ casual employees were to be considered against the vacancies arise from January 1995 to December 1996, whereby the said panel would lapse. It was agreed that the vacancies falls upto 31.3.1997 shall be filled before the empanelled list is allowed to lapse. Thus, the claim of the Workman to the post of permanent non-messenger in the Respondent management was subject to the availability of the sanctioned post and vacancies arising upto 31.3.1997. The workmen given chance to the permanent post were seniors in number of working days in panel list and Workman herein was junior to those workmen. Therefore, Workman could not be given absorption to permanent post being junior to other workmen in the panel list.

39. Although the witness WW1 states in his cross examination that his junior Sri David is working in the Respondent organization but he failed to substantiate his claim by filing any relevant documents in this regard. Therefore, the claim of the workman that he has been refused regularization in the service of the Respondent illegally is untenable.

40. However, Workman has taken the plea that the panels of Workmen for absorption in the employment of the Respondent banks (panels of temporary employees and daily wagers) has been lapsed on 31.3.1997 in contravention of terms of settlement as the object of preparing the entire empanelment of temporary and daily wagers was to provide them permanent employment and till the both the panel lists exhausted the panel list cannot be lapsed on 31.3.1997 and the date of lapsing of the panel on 31.3.1997 has been fixed by the Respondent arbitrarily without any authority.

41. In this context, the perusal of Settlement dated 30.7.1996 reveals that the 5th Settlement dated 30.7.1996 was entered under Section 2(p) and 18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Dispute (Central) Rules 1957. This settlement has been entered into by the competent parties and in this settlement parties thereto agreed that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees will lapse on 31.3.1997. Thus the date of lapse of panel was fixed by both the parties with consensus under the settlement dated 30.7.1996 and same is binding upon the Workman under the provision of Section 18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947. Moreover, this issue of binding force of the settlement dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988 and 9.1.1991 has already been discussed, decided at finding in Point No.I of this award. However, the legality and validity of the aforementioned settlement has not been challenged by the Workman before any competent forum. Thus, claim of Workman that the date of lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997 has been fixed arbitrarily by the Respondent bank is untenable. As regard the claim of Workman for his absorption to the permanent post it is settled law that the Workman can not claim his regularization to permanent post merely on the basis of number of working days.

42. In this context the reference of the decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Oil and Natural Gas Corporation vs Krishan Gopal 2020(3) SCALE 272, date of decision 7.2.2020** is relevant therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have has laid down principle regarding regularization of the Workman on permanent posts. Hon'ble Supreme Court have laid down the prepositions of regularization of the workmen to permanent post is as under:-

"*(i) Wide as they are, the powers of the Labour Court and the Industrial Court cannot extend to a direction to order regularisation, where such a direction would in the context of public employment offend the provisions contained in Article 14 of the Constitution;*

(ii) The statutory power of the Labour Court or Industrial Court to grant relief to workmen including the status of permanency continues to exist in circumstances where the employer has indulged in an unfair labour practice by not filling up permanent posts even though such posts are available and by continuing to employ workmen as temporary or daily wage employees despite their performing the same work as regular workmen on lower wages;

(iii) The power to create permanent or sanctioned posts lies outside the judicial domain and where no posts are available, a direction to grant regularisation would be impermissible merely on the basis of the number of years of service;

(iv) Where an employer has regularised similarly situated workmen either in a scheme or otherwise, it would be open to workmen who have been deprived of the same benefit at par with the workmen who have been regularised to make a complaint before the Labour or Industrial Court, since the deprivation of the benefit would amount to a violation of Article 14; and

(v) In order to constitute an unfair labour practice under Section 2(ra) read with Item 10 of the Vth Schedule of the ID Act, the employer should be engaging workmen as badlis, temporaries or casuals, and continuing them for years, with the object of depriving them of the benefits payable to permanent workmen.

Thus, in view of the principles laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court as discussed above, in the instant matter the Workman utterly failed to prove his claim by adducing any documentary or oral evidence that the employer has indulged in unfair labour practice by not filling the permanent posts even though such posts are available and by continuing to employ workmen as temporary or daily wage employees despite their performance was the same work, as regular workmen on lower wages.

43. Respondent has contended that all the vacancies exist and arise upto 31.3.1997 has been filled up from the panel list in order of seniority and no vacancy exists or arises as on 31.3.1997 remained unfilled. Further, it is contended that as per terms of settlement the life of panel lists has been lapsed on 31.3.1997, hence, there is no occasion to extend the life of panel lists beyond 31.3.1997. However, the workman failed to prove contrary by any evidence to the aforesaid contention of the Respondent that the vacancies were existing as on 31.3.1997 and the workman was not given absorption to the permanent post in order of his seniority. It is settled law that the power to create permanent or sanctioned post lies outside the judicial domain and where no posts are available, a direction to grant regularization would be impermissible merely on the basis of the number of years of service. Therefore, the claim of the workman on this ground also not acceptable.

44. Further, as per the of settlement, panel was prepared for absorption of the workmen on the permanent posts has already been lapsed on 31.3.1997 and the vacancies existing and arising upto 31.12.1994 and upto 31.3.1997 as settlement dated 30.7.1996 has been filled up from the panel by appointing the workmen as per seniority in the panel list. Workman witness WW1 in his cross examination has himself admitted this fact that, some of the temporary employees whose names were included in the panel were given regular appointment in the bank in order of their seniority in the panel. The Workman failed to show that there was any breach of terms of settlement has been committed by the Respondent in appointment to permanent post from aforesaid panel list.

45. As discussed in preceding paragraph of this Award, the life of the panel has not been extended beyond 31.3.1997, by any further settlement hence, the panel list in which name of the Workman was included got expired on 31.3.1997. It is not the case of the Workman that Respondent has regularized similarly situated workmen either in the scheme or otherwise and the Workman has been deprived of same benefit on par with those workmen or the vacancies remained unfilled on the date of lapse of panels i.e., 31.3.1997, Industrial Tribunal has no jurisdiction to extend the date of lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997. This Tribunal can not order for regularization of workmen to the permanent post in contravention of the provision of Article 14 of the Constitution of India.

In the case of **Mahboob Deepak vs. Nagar Panchayat Gajraula & Anr, Civil Appeal No.5875/2007 date of judgement 13.12.2007,** Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

"8. Respondent is a Local Authority. The terms and conditions of employment of the employees are governed by a statute and statutory rules. No appointment can be made by a Local Authority without following the provisions of the recruitment rules. Any appointment made in violation of the said rules as also the constitutional scheme of equality as contained in Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India would be a nullity.

9. Due to some exigency of work, although recruitment on daily wages or on an ad hoc basis was permissible, but by reason thereof an employee cannot claim any right to be permanently absorbed in service or made permanent in absence of any statute or statutory rules. Merely because an employee has completed 240 days of work in a year preceding the date of retrenchment, the same would not mean that his services were liable to be regularized."

Therefore, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, the claim of the Workman for absorption merely on the basis of number of day of work in the Respondent bank Branch is not acceptable. As regard plea of the Workman that the Workman should have been given employment even after 31.3.1997 as temporary Workman, it is the discretion of Respondent to engage the Workman depending upon availability of work and this Tribunal can not direct the Respondent to engage the Workman in the absent of such rule/scheme.

46. In view of principle laid down by Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above, in the instant matter Workman utterly failed to establish the fact of rendering continuous service for a period of 240 days of service within a period of 12 calendar months commencing and coming backward from relevant date i.e., the date of retrenchment, if has he would be denied to be in continuous service for a period of one year. Therefore, the provision contained under Sec.25F of retrenchment is not applicable to Workman.

Counsel for Workman has relied upon number of decisions of Hon'ble High Court and Hon'ble Supreme Court and few of them are discussed herein:-

In the case of **F.C.I., vs. Kamdhenu Cattle Feed Industries 1993 (1) SCC 71,** therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

"7. In contractual sphere as in all other State actions, the State and all its instrumentalities have to conform to Article 14 of the Constitution of which non-arbitrariness is a significant facet. There is no unfettered discretion in public law: A public authority possesses powers only to use them for public good. This impose the duty to act fairly and to adopt a procedure which is `fairplay in action'. Due observance of this obligation as a part of good administration raises a reasonable or legitimate expectation in every citizen to be treated fairly in his interaction with the State and its instrumentalities, with this element forming a necessary component of the decision making process in all State actions. To satisfy this requirement of non- arbitrariness in a State action, it is, therefore, necessary to consider and give due weight to the reasonable or legitimate expectations of the persons likely lo be affected by the decision or else that unfairness in the exercise of the power may amount to an abuse or excess of power apart from affecting the bona fides of the decision in a given case. The decision so made would be exposed to challenge on the ground of arbitrariness. Rule of law does not completely eliminate discretion in the exercise of power, as it is unrealistic, but providers for control of its exercise by judicial review."

In the case of **State Bank of India, R.O., Vijayawada vs. Industrial Tribunal, Hyderabad WP No.193/1997,** therein Hon'ble High Court have held,

"*Sri Krovvidi Narasimham, the learned counsel for the 2nd respondent contends, supporting the award that it was a permanent vacancy and even though the 2nd respondent was appointed on temporary basis, his services were not liable to be terminated and he was to be regularised into service on permanent basis. Shastry award warrants that no temporary appointment can be made to a permanent post. But the matter is now covered by two division bench judgements dated 28.11.1986 in W.A. No.791 of 1986 and 25.8.1987 in W.A. No.270 of 1982. The ratio decided in the two judgements is to the effect that there cannot be any mandate to appoint employees on permanent basis when the requirement was for appointment on temporary basis. But it is held in the said judgements that when a temporary appointee is ousted from service and not for misconduct and, if again temporary appointment is to be made, then, the case of such temporary appointee who was ousted, has got to be considered in accordance with Sec. 25-H of the Act."*

In the case of **State of Haryana and others vs. Piara Singh and others. 1992 (4) SCC 118,** therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

" 49. If for any reason an adhoc or temporary employee is continued for a fairly long spell, the authorities must consider his case for regularization provided he is eligible and qualified according to the rules and his service record is satisfactory and his appointment does not run counter to the reservation policy of the state."

In the above cited judgements by the Workman the facts of the case are different hence do not apply to instant case of Workman.

47. On the other hand, in support of his contention Respondent has examined witness MW1 and MW1 in chief examination states that, Settlements i.e., on 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988, 9.1.1991 were entered into between the SBI and SBI Staff Federation for filling up of the vacancies that arise up to 1994 for those temporary employees who has worked on scale wages. Further, MW1 states that two different panels for messengers and non-messengers as per the eligibility criteria prescribed by the bank. There are four modules in Andhra Pradesh and they are Hyderabad, Tirupathi, Vijayawada and Visakhapatnam. MW1 states that the temporary employees so empanelled were given permanent absorption depending upon the vacancies so arise strictly in terms of the settlement. MW1 states that on 9.6.1995 conciliation proceeding was held before the RLC(C), Hyderabad and in said proceedings it was decided that the panels will be kept live up to 31.3.1997 and vacancies will be filled from both the lists concurrently. A copy of the said minutes of proceedings is Ex.M5. Further, MW1 states that on 30.7.1996 another settlement was entered between the SBI and All India SBI Staff Federation providing for filling up of the vacancies arising up to December 1994 in respect of subordinate cadre and daily wage /casual wage employees out of panel so

prepared were to be considered against vacancies arising from January 1995 to December 1996, thereafter the said panels lapse. MW1 states that it was also agreed that all the non- messenger positions in subordinate cadre including part time attendants specially provided as leave reserve will be filled before 31.3.1997 and as regards to non-messengerial positions it is agreed that all such posts sanctioned and fallen vacant up to 31.3.1997 shall be filled before the empanelled list is allowed to lapse. Thus in both the cases empanelled list were lapsed on the year 1993. Ex.M6 is the copy of the settlement dated 30.7.1996. Further, witness states that on 27.2.1997 a memorandum of understanding was reached between the SBI and SBI Staff Federation providing that both the panels above mentioned will lapse on 31.3.1997. Ex.M7 is the copy of the memorandum of understanding and Ex.M8 is the copy of the statements giving the particulars of 1989 non-messenger panel, Ex.M9 is the copy of the statement of 1989 non-messenger panel, Ex.M10 is the copy of statement of 1992 panel. Further, witness states that petitioner was included in the 1989 panel. As the existing vacancies at that time were exhausted and his turn did not come he could not be given permanent employment in the bank as per the agreements. All the appointments were made strictly in accordance with the settlements reached from time to time between SBI and SBI staff federation and as per seniority, number of days of temporary service put in by them in the bank in the given period. Further, MW1 states petitioner was not sponsored by any employment exchange he did not undergo the regular process of selection required for appointment as a regular non-messenger the petitioner has not worked for 240 days in any year in his entire temporary service in the bank. The petitioner and other temporary employees were terminated from service by the bank. Further, MW1 states that the vacancies were filled up on regular basis with the temporary employees from the panels and these panels were expired in terms of the settlements so reached and there were no vacancies to absorb such employees. Thus, witness MW1 has proved the documents Ex.M1 to Ex.M12 and also contentions made in the counter. However, MW1 was cross examined by the Petitioner Counsel. But nothing has been elicited in his cross examination so as to discredit the testimony of the witness MW1 as regards the date of lapse of both the panels on 31.3.1997 and reasons assigned for non-absorption of the Petitioner from the panel list to the permanent post. Moreover the witness MW1 was re-examined by the Respondent and the witness MW1 states that panels were expired in terms of the settlement send absorptions to the extent of the available vacancies were made. There was no termination of any temporary messenger as such but their services were not utilized after the cut off date as the available vacancies were already filled up and most of these Petitioners were not in the service of the bank as on the date of the expiry date of the panels. Therefore, in view of the aforesaid testimony of the MW1 in re-examination in the absence of cross examination remained uncontraverted, the claim of the Workman that he was entitled for absorption in permanent post in the branch of Respondent Management on the basis of panel list is found not established.

This point is answered against the Workman.

48. **Point No.IV**:- In view of the discussion and finding given at Point Nos. I, II and III, the Workman is not entitled for any relief and claim statement of Workman sans merit and liable to be dismissed.

This Point is answered accordingly.

AWARD

In view of the fore gone discussion, it is held that the action of the Respondent bank in terminating the services of Sri P. Anjaneyulu, Ex. Messenger by way of oral orders w.e.f. the year 1993 is justified. Hence, the Petitioner is not entitled for any relief as prayed for. The claim statement filed by Workman sans merit, hence, dismissed.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, Personal Assistant, transcribed by her, corrected and signed by me on this the 12th day of June, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner	Witnesses examined for the Respondent
WW1: Sri P. Anjaneyulu	MW1: Sri I.S. Appa Rao

Documents marked for the Petitioner

Ex.W1:	Photocopy of interview card
Ex.W2:	Photocopy of service certificate
Ex.W3:	Photocopy of physically handicapped certificate
Ex.W4:	Photocopy of transfer certificate

Documents marked for the Respondent

Ex.M1:	Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.17.11.87
Ex.M2:	Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.16.7.88
Ex.M3:	Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.27.10.1988
Ex.M4:	Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.9.1.1991
Ex.M5:	Photocopy of conciliation proceedings before the Regional Labour Commissioner(C) dt.9.6.1995
Ex.M6:	Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.30.7.1996
Ex.M7:	Photocopy of Memorandum of understanding dt. 27.1.1997
Ex.M8:	Photocopy of statements giving the particulars of 1989 messenger panel.
Ex.M9:	Photocopy of statement of 1989 Non-messenger panel
Ex.M10:	Photocopy of statement of 1992 panel
Ex.M11:	Photocopy of order of Hon'ble High Court in WA No.86/98 dt. 1.5.98
Ex.M12:	Photocopy of order in SLP No.11886-11888 of 1998 dated 10.8.98

नई दिल्ली, 4 अगस्त, 2026

का.आ. 1690.— औघोगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार **स्टेट बैंक ऑफ़ इंडिया** के प्रबंधतत्र, संबद्ध नियोजको और उनके कर्मकार **श्री एम. चिन्ना वीरा रागावुलु** के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औघोगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औघोगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, **हैदराबाद** के **पंचाट (19/2003)** प्रकाशित करती है।

[सं. एल- 12025/01/2026- आई आर (बी-I)-160]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 4th August, 2026

S.O. 1690.— In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the **Award (Ref. 19/2003*)*** of the ***Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court Hyderabad*** as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of **State Bank of India** and their workman **Sri M. Chinna Veera Ragavulu.**

[No. L-12025/01/2026-IR(B-I)-160]

SALONI, Dy. Director

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD

Present: - **Sri Irfan Qamar**

Presiding Officer

Dated the 15th day of June, 2026

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE L.C.No. 19/2003

[Old ID No. 281/99 of Labour Court, Guntur]

Between:

Sri M. Chinna Veera Ragavulu,

S/o Venkatasubbaiah,

Kandukur,

Prakasam distt. ….. Petitioner

And

1. The Chairman,
State Bank of India,
Central office,
Mumbai.

2. The Chief General Manager,
(Personnel)
State Bank of India,
Bank Street
Hyderabad.

3. The Branch Manager,
State Bank of India,
Kandukur branch.

4. The Regional Manager,
State Bank of India,
Zonal Office,
Tirupathi. …..Respondents

Appearances:

For the Petitioner : M/s. S. Prasada Rao, Advocates

For the Respondent: Sri Y. Ranjeeth Reddy, Advocate

AWARD

Sri M. Chinna Veera Ragavulu who worked as Messenger (who will be referred to as the workman) has filed this petition under Sec. 2A(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 against the Respondents State Bank of India seeking for reinstatement into service as Messenger duly granting all the consequential benefits such as continuity of service, back wages and all 82her attendant benefits etc., and such other reliefs as this court may deem fit. Earlier Petitioner has filed this dispute before the Labour Court, Guntur for adjudication and later the same has been transferred to this Tribunal bearing ID No. 281/99, as per orders of Central Government vide Lr.No.H-11026/1/2001-IR(C.II) dated 18.10.2001 and registered, numbered in this Tribunal as LC No. 19/2003.

2. Before unfolding the factual matrix of the instant industrial dispute it would be apposite to have a bird eye view of a chequered history of the instant industrial dispute. Earlier instant industrial dispute along with the batch cases was decided by this Tribunal vide common award dated 17.5.2005 and the reference was answered in favour of the Respondent and against the Workman. That said common award dated 17.5.2005 was challenged by the aggrieved Workmen in various Writ petition No.6470/2014 along with batch of writ petitions before the Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh and Hon'ble High Court vide its' judgement dated 23.6.2014 allowed all batch of writ petitions and set aside the common award dated 17.5.2005 passed in ID No.222 of 2001 and other batch of ID cases by Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Hyderabad and the Respondent management of State Bank of India was directed to reengage the Writ Petitioners in position, which they have been occupying prior to their termination and further directed to consider their cases for regularization as and when the substantive vacancy arises. This judgement dated 23.6.2014 of Hon'ble High Court of AP, passed in WP No.6470/2014 and batch petitions was challenged by Respondent management before the Hon'ble High Court in Writ Appeal No. 1268 of 2014. The aforesaid Writ Appeals No.1268/2014 and other Writ Appeals were decided by Division Bench of High Court of Andhra Pradesh by a common judgement dated 20.3.2019. Hon'ble High Court in aforesaid Writ Appeal was pleased to pass the order which is extracted as below:-

" 7. Hearing the learned senior counsel for the SBI and the learned senior counsel for the contesting unofficial Respondents, we see that while the learned single Judge was justified in setting aside the award af the Tribunal, the proper course to be adopted was to remit all the cases to the Tribunal. This we say for reasons more than one. Firstly, in such matters, claims have to be decided on individual basis, as different persons have different claims as to the length of officiation or discharge of duties and functions; quality of engagement, drawings, accounting of the post for each one of them, who have worked etc. All these issues will not be the same in all the cases. Therefore, each case

ought to have been directed to be decided by the Tribunal afresh on individual basis. The second and most important aspect is the learned single Judge has in one go ordered re-employment of all the workmen. This is not a relief that could have been granted without answering the individual issues; each issue relating to each case could not have been decided by the writ Court within the format of its adjudication procedures and scope. The adjudicating body, which has to do that activity, is the Industrial Tribunal. Therefore, we are of the view that while we would sustain the order of the learned singe Judge insofar as it interfered and sets aside the award of the Tribunal, the further findings and directions, issued through the impugned order have to go and the individual cases have to be sent back for consideration of the Tribunal. Such further procedure before the Tribunal will have to be carried forward with the materials already on record and also by affording an opportunity to the persons, who have claims as well as the management to place their rival contentions and further material before the Tribunal. The learned counsel appearing for the workmen are justified in pointing out that enormous delay has already happened and further action by the Tribunal in this line may be expedited.

9. In the result, these writ appeals are ordered;

(1) affirming the impugned common order of the learned single Judge to the extent it sets aside the common award dated 17.05.2005 of the Industrial Tribunal;

(2) the further findings and directions issued through the impugned common order are vacated:

(3) all the matters shall be remitted to the Industrial Tribunal with a direction to dispose of them within an outer limit of five (5) months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order; and,

(4) the parties to make appearance before the Tribunal on the given date."

Thus, in view of the above direction of Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh in W.A.No.1268 of 2014 and batch cases. This Tribunal has taken up the matter of industrial dispute for hearing and deciding it afresh in view of the aforesaid guidelines laid down by the Hon'ble High Court in Writ Appeal No.1268/2014 vide judgement dated 20.3.019.

3. The factual matrix of instant industrial dispute as narrated by the Workman in his claim statement are that, the Workman joined in the service of the management institution as Messenger from 1983 to 1996, and has rendered unblemished service spreading over a period of about 13 years. The Respondent has terminated services of Workman by oral orders with effect from 12.9.88. Further, it is submitted that the management of Respondent bank decided to give a chance to temporarily employed personnel "found suitable for permanent appointment" by wait-listing them by offering permanent appointment or waitlisting till such opportunity arises.

4. That on 17.11.1987 a settlement was reached between All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and the Management of State Bank of India - settlement one, under this settlement three categories of employees were listed. That is, A) those who have completed 240 days in 12 months or less after 1.7.1975. B) those who have completed 270 days in any continuous block of 36 calendar months after 1.7.1975. C) (i) those who have completed minimum of 30 days aggregate temporary service in any calendar year after 1.7.1975 or (ii) 70 days aggregate temporary service in continuous block of 36 months after 1.7.1975.

5. The persons who satisfied in all the above 4 categories were to be interviewed by a selection committee and the said selection committee would determine the suitability of the said candidate for permanent appointment. Therefore, the bank prescribed certain qualifications and from among the candidates satisfying the qualifications the suitable candidates were enlisted by a selection committee. The Clause 7 of the said agreement provided with the selected candidate would be wait listed in order of their respective categorization and the selected panel would be valid upto December, 1991. Clause 10 of the settlement specifically provided that henceforth. "there will be no temporary appointments in the subordinate cadre", except on a restrictive basis in the specified category, "from amongst empanelled candidates as per existing guidelines of the bank". The Workman further submits that consequent upon the said agreement and the draft, a notification was issued in the newspapers. The last date for responding to the advertisement was 30.8.1988. A written examination followed by viva-voce in May, 1989 was held. A selected panel was prepared, as per Clause 7 of the agreement, ie. Settlement No.1, the selected panel was to be valid upto December, 1991, the Workman submits that circular was issued on 26.4.91 by the said letter it is mentioned that the terms of the agreement dated 17.11.87 was modified vide second agreement dated 16.7.88 was entered into between the parties. In terms of the said agreement a chance was to be given, "to all eligible temporary employees for permanent appointments. The appointments were against the vacancies likely to arise during the years 1995-96, circular made it clear that in view of the enormity of the problem an extension of the currency of the panel, eligible temporary employees who have been empanelled could not appear in the earlier interviews and have been pursuing their cases thereafter, "will be given another chance to appear for interview".

6. Workman submits that there were total five settlements. The settlement dated 17.11.87 is the 1st settlement (Ex M1), settlement dated 16.7.88 is 2nd settlement (Ex M2), settlement dated 27.10.88 is the 3rd settlement (Ex M3), then settlement dated 9.1.91 is 4th settlement and settlement dated 30.7.96 is 5th settlement (Ex M6). In between there is minutes of conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.95 marked as Ex M5. That due to all

these settlements which were extended by subsequent settlements thereby created reasonable expectations in the list of the selected candidates arose with that it's a question of time their appointments or services would be regularized in the services of the bank. The Workman was working with the bank on temporary basis was under the bonafide hope that sooner his services will be regularized with the bank. He is thereby closed all his options elsewhere. It is needless to point out that employing person to whom hope of employment in substantial terms was made is a facet of Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

7. Further Workman submits that the Government of India issued Circular No. F-3/3/104/87-IR, dated 16.8.1990. Under said circular the chief Executives of all public sector banks including the Management herein were specifically instructed that until the problem of existing temporary employees is fully resolved, no bank is permitted to make any permanent appointments. That some of the persons similarly situated like this Workman aggrieved by the inaction on the part of the management of the bank is not regularizing their services from out of the selected panel and not clearly focusing the vacancy position, filed W.P. No. 4194/97 before Hon'ble High court of A.P.. It is specifically averred in the said writ petition that the Management of the bank had failed to implement the settlement and that it violates the various fundamental rights guaranteed under the constitution of India. The Hon'ble High court of A.P .. by order dated 5.3.97 directed the bank to implement the settlement as amended from time to time. It also directed the bank to carry out the terms of settlement before the expiry of March, 1997. The Hon'ble High Court also recorded finding that the Bank cannot escape its liability of enforcement of the Settlement. In view of the directions given by the High Court all candidates whose names appeared in the select panels prepared on the basis of the agreement entered into on 17.11.87 under which the panel was valid upto December, 1991, and on the basis of a settlement dated 27.10.1988 whereby the panels were made alive upto 31.3.1997 under which the panel was valid upto December, 1999. The other agreement dated 16.7.1988 under which the panel was valid upto 1992 and on the basis of the settlement dated 27.10.1998 whereby the panels were made alive upto 31.3.1997 were under the bonafide impression that their cases will be considered for regularization and were living on the basis of the said reasonable expectation. Unfortunately, contrary to the aforesaid directions given by the High Court and contrary to the settlements entered into between the parties, the bank issued proceedings dated 25.3.1997, dated 27.3.1997 and 31.3.1997 instructing the various authorities of the Management not to continue the temporary employees those who are in services of the bank from 1.4.97. The said order was followed by the Management. Aggrieved by the said action the Workman herein and similarly situated candidates have filed a writ petition before the Hon'ble High Court and by way of Writ Petition No.9206/97 seeking a declaration that the proceedings issued by the Deputy General Manager and the Assistant General Manager (Respondents 3,4 and 5 therein) on 25.3.97, 27.3.97 and 31.3.97 as illegal and also non-continuance of the Workmen therein in service by absorbing them in the services of the bank as violative of Section 2(p) and 18(1) read with Rule 58 of Central Rules and sought for specific direction to the bank to absorb them in service.

8. Further, Workman submits that in the counter affidavit filed in Writ Petition No.9206/97, the bank has submitted that it has about 805 branches in Andhra Pradesh alone. It has stated that due to exigencies of circumstances and on account of the urgent need in its banks, it employed temporary employees in subordinate cadre. It is pertinent to mention that it does not state the urgent or need or the nature of temporary employees that it had engaged. Enquiry into the same would reveal that the stand taken by the bank either on the ground of urgent need or of temporary employees is a façade to perpetuate unfair labour practice. It is designed to on the one hand, keep the employed in the erroneous zone of hope and on the other to ensure that benefits that a model employer will extend under various statutes to its employees is not required to be borne out by the bank. A reading of the counter affidavit would show that the bank would opines that being just fair and reasonable are which obviously is reprehensible and is a facet of unfair labour practice.

9. The Workman submits that the bank had referred in its counter affidavit to three settlements dated 17.11.87, 16.7.88 and 27.10.88. The bank in the guise of extending the benefits of the circular of Government dated 16.8.90 stated in its counter affidavit that as follows:

"Government of India, vide its letter dated 16.8.1990, issued guidelines to all the public sector banks with regard to recruitment and absorption of temporary employees in public sector banks. The said guidelines were issued to implement on the lines of the approach paper on the issue provided by a committee constituted in this regard. The Government of India guidelines made it clear that all the public sector banks may follow the provisions laid down in the approach paper.

The approach paper specified that the cases of temporary employees who had put in not less than 240 days of temporary service in 12 consecutive Months and who are entitled to benefit of Section 25-F may be decided by entering into a settlement with the representative union. In respect of temporary employees who had put in less than 240 days of service in 12 consecutive months or less, a settlement could be avoided and however if the Management so desired, they could enter into a conciliation settlement with the representative union. Para 6(h), it is mentioned that only those temporary employees who had put in temporary service of 90 or more days after 1.1 1982 would be eligible for considering under the scheme. Although the Government guidelines envisaged for a settlement in respect of employees who had put in temporary service of 90 or more days, the bank by way of further concession entered into settlements Even in respect of those who had put in less than 90 days. As such, it could be Seen that the

settlements are more beneficial to the temporary employees concerned. The approach paper also specify at para 6(c) that the banks would provide one time opportunity to all the temporary employees and for that purpose temporary employees worked in the bank on or after 1.1.1982 could be considered for re-employment in terms of the scheme. The Respondents have gone further wherein even persons working after 1975 were also considered.

As could be seen from the above, there was a genuine effort on the part of the Respondent bank to provide permanent employment for as many as possible subject to availability of the vacancies.

It is further submitted that at para 6(k) of the approach paper, it was made clear that this would be one time exercise in full and final settlement of all the aims and disputes for the past period in respect of temporary workmen covered by the settlement. This would mean that the Government of India guidelines would cover only those persons who were temporarily employed for the period specified therein and not otherwise. As such, it is submitted that the Respondents have not only followed the Government of India guidelines but in fact covered cases of the employees who had worked for less than 90 days. As such, question of violation does not arise and in any case those were only broad guidelines and not directives".

10. The Workman submits that the bank also referred a subsequent settlement dated 9.1.1991 wherein there is a clause to the effect- that the panel of temporary employees and the panel of daily wage employees will be operated to a particular period. Therefore, their cases will not be considered. The Management herein relying upon this settlement in their impugned action. It is submitted that even the settlement dated 9.1.1991 will not empower the management to terminate the services of the temporary employees who are working in the bank services like the Workman herein as it does not specify the termination of the employees. In fact there are so many vacancies wherein the Management has engaged several new persons as temporary messengers/ attendars/ sweepers etc., even after the judgment of Hon'ble High Court without considering the cases of the similarly situated candidates like the Workman herein. It is submitted inspite of engaging fresh candidates as is now being done by the Management they would have continued the similarly situated candidates like the Workman herein in the services of the bank and consider their cases for absorption in view of the circulars issued by Central Government as well as the directions of this Hon'ble Court in Writ Petition No.4194/97, dated 5.3.97. In view of the circulars issued by the Central Government, the Management should not have relied upon the settlement dated 9.1.1991. Hence, the impugned action of the Management is illegal, unjust, violative of fundamental rights such as Articles 14,16 and 21 of the Constitution of India.

11. The Workman submits that in W.P. No.4194/97 filed by the union of temporary employees where in they have complained about the non- implementation of the settlements arrived between the parties and sought for absorption. Such employees in the bank services on permanent basis before the date fixed for carrying out the terms of settlement, the Court held that the members of the union had been empanelled in the list, they were not regularized and the time was going to run out to the near future and the Respondent bank and its officers cannot escape from the liability of enforcing the settlement which has been reached and therefore directed that the bank and the officers shall implement the settlement dated 17.11.87 as amended from time to time before the expiry of 31.3.97.

12. Further, it is submitted that in the clause of Settlement it is specifically mentioned that the workmen to be absorbed/appointed in the bank prohibiting any temporary appointments subsequent to the date of settlement even the authorities want to make temporary appointments that should be made only from among the empanelled can be appointed either for temporary vacancy or permanent vacancy except from among the empanelled candidates like the Workman and that should be continued till they are absorbed. The management committed unfair labour practices and terminated the services of the candidates with effect from 1985 which is arbitrary, discriminatory, contrary to their own guidelines and violative of the constitutional provisions which are guaranteed in Chapter-III of the Constitution of India.

13. The Workman submits that it is strange as to how the panels were allowed to lapse by a so-called Memorandum of Understanding dated 25.2.1997, that the action of terminating such employees like the Workman by virtue of an impugned oral proceedings without implementing the settlement would be illegal and unfair labour practice which cannot be allowed to be perpetuated. That the discontinuance of the Workman after 31.3.97 who had served in the bank in any capacity amounts to retrenchment. It could not have been done without any notice and it violates Sec.25FF of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and the said action is violative of principles of natural justice guaranteed under Chapter III of the Constitution of India. This amounts to retrenchment without one month's notice and taken in view of such notice. Thus, the main proceedings issued by the Respondent is without jurisdiction and is arbitrary, illegal and therefore liable to be quashed. That the alleged Memorandum of Understanding dated 27.2.97, Ex.M5 does not own any legal entity, as the said Memorandum of Understanding is not published anywhere to brought to the notice of the Workman whose rights are being affected. It is submitted that Management did not adhere to the procedure envisaged by the Central Government in its' instructions dated 16.8.90 in the year 1995. The same was not followed in the year 1997 despite there being vacancies. The management has followed the procedure of calling candidates through Employment exchange instead of giving chance to the empanelled candidates like the Workman here. It is pertinent to mention here that the Respondent Management sent letters to the all similarly situated candidates like the Workman in the month of June, 1997, subsequent to the passing of impugned termination orders. After knowing the facts that the candidates are litigating,

the Management refused to engage these candidates. It is once again reiterated that the panels are meant for absorption but not for termination. It was the duty of the Management to engage the empanelled candidates like the Workman even in temporary vacancies till they are absorbed permanently in regular vacancies. Hence, the action of the Respondent Management terminating the services of the Workman by oral order dated 31.3.97 is unjust, illegal, violative of principles of natural justice and hence, the Management be directed to reinstate and absorb the Workman and to grant all incidental and consequential benefits.

14. Per contra, Respondent had filed counter and made a contentions that the reference is not tenable and contrary to the provisions of I.D. Act, 1947. Respondent submitted that to tide over severe sub-ordinate staff constraints which arose out of leave vacancies, exigencies, etc., and also owning to the restrictions imposed by the Government of India/Reserve Bank of India on intake of staff, the Respondent bank used to engage sub-ordinate staff like messengers, sweepers, sweeper cum water boys, etc., depending on the availability of work on purely temporary basis for the smooth and uninterrupted functioning of the branches. It is submitted that the All India State Bank of India Staff Federation which represents majority of the employees in the State Bank of India comprising about 98% of the work force as its' members espoused the cause of temporary employees who have put in less than 240 days of temporary service in 12 calendar months in the bank and who were ineligible for any protection under Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 to give a chance for being considered for absorption and permanent appointments.

15. Discussions were held and on 17.11.1987 an agreement was signed between the federation and the Management bank under Sec. 2(p) read with Sec 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules 1957. A copy of the said settlement dated 17.11.87 which may be herein after referred as first settlement is filed and 4 categories were made as it has already been mentioned in the claim statement above, it need not be repeated here. In the first settlement, it was agreed that the temporary employees as categorized would be given a chance for being considered for permanent appointment in the bank's service against the vacancies which are likely to arise during the period 1987 to 1991. On 16.7.88 second settlement was arrived between the Federation and the Bank whereby it was agreed to substitute the period of consideration of vacancies as 1987 to 1992 in place of 1987 to 1991 as contemplated under the first settlement dated 17.11.1987. This is the second settlement. A 3rd settlement was entered into on 27.10.88 and it was agreed that the bank's service against the vacancies likely to arise from 1988 to 1992 was to be considered. Government of India vide its letter dated 16.8.90 issued guidelines to all the public sector banks with regard to recruitment and absorption of temporary employees in public sector banks. The said guidelines were issued to implement on the lines of approach paper on the issue provided by a committee constituted in this regard. Government of India guidelines made it clear that all the public sector banks may follow the provisions laid down in the approach paper. The approach paper specified that the cases of temporary service in 12 consecutive months and who are entitled to benefit of Sec.25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 may be decided by entering into a settlement with the representative union. In respect of temporary employees who had put in less than 240 days of service in 12 consecutive months or less, a settlement could be avoided and however if the Management so desired they could enter into a conciliation settlement with the representative union. In para. 6(h) it is mentioned that only those temporary employees who had put in temporary service of 90 days or more days after 1.1.82 would be eligible for considering under the scheme. Although the Government guidelines envisaged for a settlement in respect of employees who had put in temporary service of 90 days or more days, the bank by way of a further concession entered into settlements. Even in respect of those who had put in less than 90 days and also the bank went a step further and said those persons who are working after 1975 were also considered. Hence, there was a genuine effort on the part of the Respondent bank to provide as many as possible jobs subject to the availability of the vacancies. However, para 6 (k) of the approach paper made it clear that it is a one time, exercise in full and final, settlement of all the claims and disputes for the past period, in respect of temporary workmen covered by the settlement. Another settlement was entered on 9.1.91 herein after referred as 4th settlement and the time limit was extended upto 1994 and separate panel was prepared for temporary employees, casual/daily wagers. It was agreed that while vacancies arising between 1988 to 1994 in respect of temporary employees and in respect of casual/daily wagers, they can be considered for the vacancies arising between 1995-96 only.

16. It is submitted that the administrative set up of the Hyderabad Local Head Office comprises of four Zonal Offices (Zones) at Hyderabad, Vijayawada, Visakhapatnam and Tirupathi covering all the Districts of Andhra Pradesh. In terms of the settlement the Management after following the procedure laid down therein prepared the panels of qualified candidates of temporary employees denoted as 1989 panel and also panel of casual/daily wagers denoted as 1992 panel for giving a chance for being considered for permanent absorption. These panels were prepared zone-wise separately for messengers and non-messengers in the descending order of temporary service put in by the candidates during the stipulated period i.e., 1.7.1975 to 31.7.1988. That the Federation approached the Regional Labour Commissioner(C) for implementation of bi-partite settlement in respect of absorption of temporary employees. The Regional Labour Commissioner(C) conducted conciliation proceedings and an agreement was arrived between the Federation and the bank. It was agreed that it would be kept alive upto March, 1997. A copy of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.2.1995 signed by the parties is filed as material paper. A settlement was arrived at and an agreement was signed between the Federation and the Management bank on 30.7.1996 under Sec.2 (p) read with Sec.18(1) of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957, which is hereinafter called as 5th settlement. That on 27.2.1997 a Memorandum of understanding was also signed by the federation's affiliate and the bank Management

recording the fact that the exercise of identifying the messengerial vacancies as on 31.12.1994 has since been completed by Central Office and thereby 403 messengerial vacancies were sanctioned . It was agreed that these vacancies may be filled from 1989 panel of temporary employees after effecting conversion from full time non-messengerial staff in the usual manner and the agreement was reached accordingly. It was agreed between the Federation's affiliate and the Management bank that in terms of the settlement dated 30.7.1996 both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees would lapse on 31.3.1997. That as agreed upon vacancies were filled from the panels. The Workman who has put in an aggregate temporary service of less than 240 days in a continuous block of 12 months period during 1.7.1975 to 31.7.1988 has no right to seek a direction to consider his candidature for absorption in the Management bank under any rule/law except under the settlement entered into thereon.

17. Respondent contended that, in fact, the case of the Workman can be considered under all the five settlements having got his case considered under provisions of these settlements. All the other provisions and terms of the settlements are also binding on him/her. The Management bank has not violated any of the provisions of the terms of the said settlement. That the very preparation and maintenance of panel is in compliance of the terms agreed under these settlements. These settlements were time bound and they ceased to exist on 31.3.1997. That the bank has never promised that all the candidates in the panel will be absorbed. In the advertisement itself it was made clear that candidates will be considered for absorption in the vacancies that may arise upto 1992. Keeping alive the panels after 31.3.1997 is contrary to the settlements arrived between the State Bank of India Staff Federation and the Management bank. That the settlements are binding on the parties. The Workman is also bound under the terms of the said settlement. The settlement does not suffer from any ambiguity as their language is very clear. The right under the settlements is to give them a chance to be considered for future appointment in the bank's services against the vacancies likely to arise. The settlements were effected to balance the expectations of the temporary employees to be absorbed in permanent service as against the constitutional rights for all eligible persons to be considered for employment every time a vacancy arises. That the alleged dispute including the demand for reinstatement has to be decided in this context. It is submitted that the period of panel list got expired on 31.3.97 and it is an integral term of the settlement and cannot be modified in any proceedings under the law. These temporary employees who unfortunately could not be accommodated for want of vacancies have no further rights to be considered for regularization. That the Hon'ble High Court in WP No.12964/94, held as follows, "It is needless to state that the settlement arrived at between the All India State Bank of India Staff Federation which, is the majority union and the bank Management is binding on the Workmen also. It is not at all the case of the Workman that any of the terms of the settlement has been violated by the bank's Management. If the Workman had worked in the bank on part-time basis before 31.5.94, that itself would not vest in him a right to claim that his services should be regularized on permanent basis against a full time cadre post. The claim put forth by the Workman in the present petition is therefore misconceived and not tenable. However, it is open to the Workman to claim any right which flows from the settlement between the union and the bank Management. As already pointed out that it is not the grievance of the Workman that some right which has flown from the settlement in favour of the Workman has been denied by the bank Management. Therefore, I do not find any ground, let alone substantial ground, to grant the kind of relief sought for by the Workman. Writ Petition fails and is accordingly dismissed. No costs."

18. Further, it is contended that if the panels were not lapsed at the end of designated period and allowed to be continued it would result in making the contracts of temporary employment indirectly permanent through back door entry, which would not only be contrary to the settlements but also to Articles 14 and 16 of Constitution of India and deprive the chances of original claimants who would Come through proper recruitment procedure. As their rights have been crystallized by operation of the settlements. Hence, there is no question of any Legitimate expectation being violated.

19. Similarly placed ex-employees filed WP No.9206/1995 and the batch before the Hon'ble High Court of A.P. and the learned Single Judge allowed the Writ Petitions. Aggrieved by the same WA No.86/98 and the batch was filed and the Division Bench set aside the order of the Single Judge. Thereafter the ex-temporary employees filed Special Leave Petition No.11886-11888 of 1998 before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India also dismissed the SLP. Therefore, reference to the Judgement of the Learned Single Judge in WP No.9206/97 is of no consequences as the same has already been set aside. The observations made in the Judgements cannot be relied upon for any purpose what so ever. The question of operation of Sec.25F would not come into play. Further the issue is covered by various Judgements of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India and various Hon'ble High Courts. Hence, the reference may be ordered that the Workman is not entitled for any relief.

20. In order to fortify his claim Workman has examined himself as WW1 and has filed photocopies of four documents in evidence, which are marked as Ex.W1 to W5. The details of the documents are as under:

Ex.W1 is the qualification and conduct certificate. Ex.W2 is the service certificate. Ex.W3 is the service certificate. Ex.W4 is service certificate. Ex.W5 is the service including salary certificate.

21. On the other hand, Respondent has examined witness MW1 Sri I.S. Appa Rao and this witness has exhibited 12 documents, marked as Ex.M1 to M12. The details of these documents are as follows:-

Ex.M.1 is the Settlement dated 17.11.1987. Ex.M2 is the Settlement dated 16.7.1988. Ex.M3 is the Settlement dated 27.10.1988. Ex.M4 is the Settlement dated 9.1.1991. Ex.M5 is the Minutes of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.1995. Ex.M6 is the Settlement dated 30.7.1996. Ex.M7 is the Memorandum of Understanding dt. 27.2.1997. Ex.M8 is the Particulars of 1989 Messengerial Panel. Ex.M9 is the Particulars of 1989 Non-Messengerial Panel. Ex.M10 is the Particulars of 1992 General Attendant Panel. Ex.M11 is the Judgment of Hon'ble High Court of A.P. in Writ Appeal No.86/98 dt.1.5.1998. Ex.M12 is the Judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in SLP No. 11886-11888 of 1998 dt.10.8.1998.

22. Apart from afore mentioned documents, Learned Counsel for Workman has also filed a long list of various judgements of Hon'ble Supreme Court as well as Hon'ble High Court, which we will discuss at appropriate place in this Award.

23. Heard the argument of Learned Counsel for Workman as well as for Respondent.

24. On the basis of rival pleadings of both the parties and submissions made by the Learned Counsel for both the parties, following points arise for determination in the industrial dispute :-

I. Whether the 1st settlement dated 17.11.1987, 2nd settlement dated 16.7.1988, 3rd settlement dated 27.10.1988, 4th settlement dated 9.1.1991 and 5th settlement dated 30.7.1996 entered into between State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation and also Memorandum of Understanding are binding upon both the parties?

II. Whether the action of State Bank of India, Kandukur Main branch in terminating the services of Workman Sri M. Chinna Veera Ragavulu, a Messenger with effect from 12.9.88 is justified?

III. Whether the Workman is entitled for absorption on permanent post in the Branch of Respondent management as per averments made by him in the claim statement?

IV. To what relief if any the Workman is entitled for?

Findings:-

25. **Point No.I**:- Undisputedly settlements dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988, 9.1.1991 and 30.7.1996, minutes of conciliation proceedings and memorandum of understanding dated 27.2.1997 were executed between the State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation under section 2(p) and 18 (1) of I.D. Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Disputes (Central Rules), 1957.

Section 2(p) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 as follows:-

(p) "settlement" means a settlement arrived at in the course of conciliation proceeding and includes a written agreement between the employer and workmen arrived at otherwise than in the course of conciliation proceeding where such agreement has been signed by the parties thereto in such manner as may be prescribed and a copy thereof has been sent to an officer authorised in this behalf by the appropriate Government and the conciliation officer;

Section 18(1) provides as follows:-

18. Persons on whom settlements and awards are binding.

- [(1) A settlement arrived at by agreement between the employer and Workman otherwise than in the course of conciliation proceeding shall be binding on the parties to the agreement.

Therefore, in view of the provision contained u/s.18 (1) I.D. Act, 1947, terms and conditions enumerated in the aforesaid settlements are binding on the parties to the agreement. The Learned Counsel for Workman has argued that the Workman after going through the selection procedure has successfully been listed in the panel for appointment on the permanent basis in the Respondent management and the empanelled list has to be valid till last person in the empanelled list is appointed on permanent basis. But the impugned order dated 25.3.97, 27.3.97 and 31.3.97, has been issued by Respondent management thereby the services of the Workman has been terminated and the said order is not in consonance of the terms of the agreement entered into between the parties. Further, Workman submits that the Respondent in the 5th settlement has mentioned the date i.e., 31.3.1997 for lapse of empanel list which is illegal and that is not binding upon the Workman. The condition of lapse of empanelment list on 31.3.97 incorporated in the aforesaid 5th settlement, is arbitrary and illegal.

26. The perusal of the impugned order dated 25.3.1997 goes to reveal that the Chief/Branch Manager, SBI Zonal Office has issued the letter to all the branches with regard to the subject not to make any temporary appointments in the Branch in messengerial category from 1985. The extract of the said letter is given below:-

"We have been advised by the Deputy General Manager, Zonal Office, Hyderabad that as both the panels of temporary employees of 1989 and daily wagers/casual labours of 1992 will lapse by 31.3.1997, it has been decided by Central Office not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial category from 1985."

Thus, from the contents of the aforesaid letter, it manifest that Head Office of State Bank of India vide letter dated 25.3.1997 has issued direction to all its branches not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial category from 1985 due to reason of lapse of both panels i.e., 1989 & 1992 on 31.3.1997 as per terms of settlements entered into by both parties. Further, the contents of the subsequent letter dated 27.3.1997 issued by Respondent Management is also direction to Branch Manager, State Bank of India not to make any temporary messengerial category appointment with effect from 1985 and it has also been communicated to all concerned that the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers maintained by Zonal offices stand lapsed from 31.1.1997. Further, office order dated 31.3.1997 has been issued by Respondent management that goes to reveal that the said office order has been issued to this effect that, "Consequent on absorption of temporary employees in permanent cadre, it has been decided by the competent authority that no one onwards, no further daily labour or temporary employees/appointments should be resorted to/engaged/employed." Therefore, it reflects from the contents of the aforesaid orders that the temporary appointment in messengerial category and daily labour has been stopped by the Respondent management with effect from 1985 because of the lapsed of panel of temporary workers and daily wagers by 31.3.1997. The agreement for lapse of both the panels on 31.3.1997 is contained in the 5th settlement which has been arrived at between the parties on dated 30.7.1996 with the consensus of both the parties. Therefore, Workman can not challenge the terms and conditions contained in settlement dated 30.7.1996 regarding lapse of panel on 31.3.1997 as agreed between State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation. As per provision contained u/s.18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 the said Agreement dated 30.7.1996 is binding on both the parties.

In the case of **Allied Sales Corporation Secunderabad vs.The Authority Under Andhra Pradesh..... 1990 II LLJ 510 AP para 414, Hon'ble Court have held:-**

"*4. There was a settlement between the Management and the workmen under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act on 25th April 1983 under which the age of superannuation of the workmen was fixed at 55 years. The settlement was to be in force upto 30th June 1986 and the next settlement, incorporating practically the same terms, was again entered into on 4th February 1987 under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act. There is no dispute that these settlements are under Section 18(1).*

14. Now the Authority constituted under Section 41(1) of the Act is an authority with very limited jurisdiction. It can only decide in the first appeal whether a termination by the management is valid or not and is within the parameters of Section 40 of the Act. The said Authority, in our view, has absolutely no jurisdiction to decide whether a settlement entered into under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act between the representatives of the Workmen and of the Management, is vitiated by undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion on the part of the Management. The Authority, namely, the Assistant Commissioner of Labour, was never intended by the A.P. Legislature to have jurisdiction to go into the question of the validity of a settlement arrived at under Section 18 of the Industrial Disputes Act by an Industrial Court. That Parliament has, in fact, constituted Industrial Courts under the Industrial Disputes Act, with extensive powers cannot be disputed. What we mean to say is that the Authority under Section 41(1) of the A.P. Act has no jurisdiction what-so-ever either to question or to decide about the validity of any such settlements. If parties to a settlement have a grievance about the validity of a settlement, it is for them to agitate the matter before the appropriate forum and they cannot ask an Authority constituted under Section 41(1) of the A.P. Shops and Establishments Act, 1966 with limited jurisdiction, to go into any such question and, that too, incidentally while deciding whether retirement as per the contract of employment, is legal or not."

It is not the case of Workman that aforesaid settlements are vitiated by undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion on the part of the management. If the Workman feeling aggrieved by any terms of settlement/ agreement on the aforementioned grounds then he can challenge of settlement before a competent authority under the Act, 1947. But here in the instant matter it is not a case of Workman that aforementioned settlement has been entered into between the parties on the ground of undue influence or misrepresentation or coercion. Therefore, Workman is barred to raise any objection in respect of fixing the date of lapse of both panels on 31.3.1997 as agreed between both the parties and Workman can not challenge any terms of said Agreement.

Further in the case of **Herbertsons Limited Vs. Workmen of Herbertsons Limited and Ors, 1977 AIR 322,** Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

The Tribunal thought that the question of the quantum of membership of the 2nd Respondent did not call for a finding at all in view of 1his Court's order. As observed above that was not a correct assumption. On the other hand, we feel that this view of the Tribunal has led it to approach the matter in an entirely erroneous manner. The Tribunal is, rightly enough, conscious that under section 18 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act the settlement was binding on the company and the members of the 3rd Respondent union. Even so, the Tribunal devoted nearly half of its order in scanning the evidence given by the company and Respondent No. 3 to find out whether the terms of the settlement had been explained by the President of the union to the workmen or not and whether the workers voluntarily accepted the settlement knowing all the "consequences". This to our mind is again an entirely wrong approach.

"When a recognised union negotiates with an employer the workers as individuals do not come into the picture. It is not necessary that each individual worker should know the implications of the settlement since a recognised union,

which is expected to protect the legitimate interests of labour, enters into a settlement in the best interests of labour. This would be the normal rule. We cannot altogether rule out exceptional cases where there may be allegations of mala fides, fraud or even corruption or other induce- ments. Nothing of that kind has been suggested against the President of the 3rd Respondent in this case. That being the position, prima facie, this is a settlement in the course of collective bargaining and, therefore, is entitled to due weight and consideration.

It is not possible to scan the settlement in bits and pieces and hold some parts good and acceptable and others bad. Unless it can be demonstrated that the objectionable portion is such that it completely outweighs all the other advantages gained the Court will be slow to hold a settle- ment as unfair and unjust. The settlement has to be accepted or rejected as a whole and we are unable to reject it as a whole as unfair or unjust. Even before this Court the 3rd Respondent representing admittedly the large majority of the workmen has stood by this settlement and that is a strong factor which it is difficult to ignore. As stated elsewhere in the judgment, we cannot also be oblivious of the fact that all workmen of the company have accepted the settlement. Besides, the period of settlement has since expired and we are informed that the employer and the 3rd Respondent are negotiating another settlement with further improvements. These factors, apart from what has been stated above, and the need for industrial peace and harmony when a union backed by a large majority of workmen has accepted a settlement in the course of collective bargaining have impelled us not to interfere with this settlement. That being the position, we unhold the settlement as fair and just and order that the award of the Tribunal shall be substituted by the settlement dated October 18, 1973. The said settlement shall be the substituted award. The appeal is disposed of accordingly. There will be no order as to costs."

Therefore, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above, the contention of the Workman that the date fixed for lapse of empanelled list on 31.3.1997 for appointment to the permanent post vide 5th Settlement dated 30.7.1996 is arbitrary, illegal is not untenable. The recognized union of Workmen has negotiated with the Respondent Bank Management representing large number of Workmen and the Workman as individual do not come into picture. Workman in the instant case has work as temporary Workmen in the Respondent Branch and in response of Notification he had applied for inclusion of his name in the panel and he was selected for inclusion his name in the panel list to be utilized for absorption of such Workman to permanent post in order of their seniority in the list. The Settlement dated 30.7.1996 between State Bank of India and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation under Sec.2(p) and Sec.18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 has clearly provided as regard non-messengerial position and it is agreed that all such posts sanctioned fallen vacant upto 31.3.1997 shall be filled before empanel list is allowed to lapse. Thus, in view of law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, in the instant case, Agreement dated 30.7.1996 was entered into between both the parties in respect of lapsing of the both the panels on 31.3.1997 and absorption of the Workmen from panel list was subject to availability of vacancy of post likely to arise upto 31.3.1997, have a binding force on Workman as well as management of State Bank of India in view of provision contained under section 18 (1) of I.D. Act, 1947.

Thus, Point No.I is answered against the Workman and in favour of the Respondent.

27. **Point No.II**:- Firstly, it is submitted on behalf of the Workman that the Respondent has terminated his services by oral order on 12.9.88 without issuing any notice or paying any salary or compensation in lieu thereof. Therefore, the termination order of the Workman from service is in violation of provision contained Under Section 25 F of I.D. Act, 1947. Therefore, the order is liable to be set aside.

28. On the other hand, Respondent counsel contended that Workman has not worked for 240 days in any preceding calendar year. Therefore, reference of the industrial dispute is not relevant. In this context, the Workman has examined himself as WW1 who has reiterated that Workman has been terminated from service by Respondent on 12.9.88 without notice of salary or compensation in lieu thereof. Before examining the claim of the Workman on merit it would be apposite to reproduce the provision contained under section 25 F:-

Section 25F provides:-

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].

Compensation to workmen in case of transfer of undertakings.

Section 25B defines the term continuous service which provides

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 authorized 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;

In order to prove the fact of 240 days of service within 12 months of a calendar year just preceding from the date of termination, the initial burden of proof lies upon the Workman and the Workman has to prove this factum by adducing his oral as well as documentary evidence in support of his claim.

Further, how to calculate 240 days of service by the Workman in a calendar year. In this context the reference of decisions of Hon'ble Supreme Court is relevant and the same are discussed below:-

In Rajasthan State Ganganagar S. Mills Ltd. v. State of Rajasthan and Anr. (2004) Apex Court held:

"It was the case of the Workman that he had worked for more than 240 days in the year concerned. This claim was denied by the appellant. It was for the claimant to lead evidence to show that he had worked for 240 days in the year preceding the date of his termination. He has filed an affidavit. It is statement which is in his favor and that cannot be regarded as sufficient evidence for any Court or Tribunal to come to the conclusion that in fact the claimant had worked for 240 days in a year These aspects were highlighted in Range Forest Officer v. S.T. Hadimani (2002 (3) SCC 25. No proof of receipt of salary or wages for 240 days or order or record in that regard was produced. Mere non-production of the muster roll for a particular period was not sufficient for the Labour Court held that the Workman had worked for 240 days as claimed."

In Municipal Corporation, Faridabad v. Siri Niwas (2004 (8) SCC 195), held "*the burden was on the Workman to show that he was working for more than 240 days in the preceding one year prior to his alleged retrenchment." In M.P. Electricity Board v. Hariram (2004 (8) SCC 246) the position was again reiterated in paragraph 11 as follows: "The above burden having not been discharged and the Labour Court having held so, in our opinion, the Industrial Court and the High Court erred in basing an order of reinstatement solely on an adverse inference drawn erroneously ..*"

In the case of Manager, RBI, Bangalore vs. S Mani (2005) SCC Page 100, the 3 Judges Bench of the Apex Court held that "*the initial burden of proof was on the Workman to show that he had completed 240 days of service."*

Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of Mohan Lal vs Management BEL 1981 SCC page 225 has laid down the principle that how to count 240 days of service within one year it is held: *"Clause (2)(a) provides for a fiction to treat a Workman in continuous service for a period of one year despite the fact that he has not rendered uninterrupted service for a period of one year but he has rendered period of 240 days during the period of 12 calendar service for months counting backwards and just preceding the relevant date being the date of retrenchment. In other words, in order to invoke the fiction enacted in clause (2)(a) it is necessary to determine first the relevant date, ie the date of termination of service which is complained of as retrenchment. After that date is ascertained. move backward to a period of 12 months just preceding the date of retrenchment and then ascertain whether within the period of 12 months, the Workman has rendered service for a period of 240 days. If these three facts are affirmatively answered in favor of the Workman pursuant to the deeming fiction enacted in clause (2)(a) it will have to be assumed that the Workman is in continuous service for a period of one year and he will satisfy the eligibility qualification enacted in Section 25-F"*

"14. We have already extracted section 25B since its amendment and the change in language is the legislative exposition of which note must be taken. In fact, we need not further dilate upon this aspect because in Surendra Kumar Verma and Ors. v. Central Government Industrial-cum-Labour Court, New Delhi and Anr., Chinnappa Reddy. J., after noticing the amendment and referring to the decision in Sur Enamel and Stamping Works (P) Ltd case, held as under:

"These changes brought about by Act 36 of 1964 appear to be clearly designed to provide that a Workman who has actually worked under the employer for not less than 240 days during a period of twelve months shall be deemed to have been in continuous service for a period of one year whether or not he has in fact been in such continuous service for a period of one year. It is enough that he has worked for 240 days in a period of 12 months, it is not necessary that he should have been in the service of the employer for one whole year."

In a concurring judgment Pathak J. agreed with this interpretation of section 25B(2). Therefore, both on principle and on precedent it must be held that section 25B(2) comprehends a situation where a Workman is not in employment

for a period of 12 calendar months, but has rendered service for a period of 240 days within the period of 12 calendar months commencing and counting backwards from the relevant date, i.e. the date of retrenchment. If he has, he would be deemed to be in continuous service for a period of one year for the purpose of section 25B and Chapter VA."

Thus, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above the initial burden of proof lies upon the Workman to show that he has completed 240 days of the service with the Respondent just preceding from the date of his termination. Further, in respect of the employment of calculating the 240 days service provision contained under Section 25-F read with Section 25-B of the I.D. Act, 1947.

29. Now, in view of the provision contained under Section 25 F and law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, we have to examine whether the Workman has discharged his initial burden of proof in respect of his claim of 240 days continuous service in a calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination i.e., 12.9.88.

In this context, WW1 in his cross examination has stated that,

" I joined the Respondent bank in April, 1981 as temporary messenger and worked upto 1983 and totally worked for 221 days with gaps during the period from 1981 to 1983.....

I was not sponsored by any employment exchange. ... I was not given any written order removing me from service."

Further, MW1 in his cross examination has stated that, "The Petitioner has not completed 240 days of service in a calendar year."

Thus, it is clear from the testimony of WW1 that the Workman had not worked for 240 days continuously in any 12 months of a calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination in the Respondent bank. Therefore, Workman failed to establish his plea by his oral and documentary evidence that he had worked for 240 days continuously in calendar year just preceding from the date of his termination i.e., 12.9.88. Thus, the claim of the Workman that he has been terminated by oral order without issuing notice or payment in lieu after termination, in contravention of Section 25 F of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is not tenable. However the documents filed by the Workman in support of his claim, number of days worked with the Respondent goes to reveal that the Workman had worked intermittently as daily wager depending upon availability of work in branch. Workman did not file any document of appointment letter or salary slips in support of his claim for appointment as a non-messenger in the Respondent branch on temporary basis.

30. Per contra, the Learned Counsel for Respondent has submitted the allegation of Workman that he was terminated from services is not correct. As the vacancies were filled up on regular basis in order of their respective seniority the non-engagement of the Workman does not amount to termination. Further, Respondent contended that no law provide that even though there is no work temporary employee should be continued in the bank work as the very engagement of Workman was subject to availability of work. Therefore, the allegation that the bank has indulged in unfair labour practice is incorrect.

31. Thus, in view of the fore gone discussion and contentions made by the Respondent, I find the force in the argument advanced by the Respondent that in the instant matter, Workman was not terminated from service by order dated 12.9.88 rather he was disengaged in view of the non-availability of the work in the branch. Further, there was direction issued by the Head Office of the Respondent authority not to engage any daily wager Workman/ temporary Worker w.e.f. 12.9.88. Thus, such disengagement of Workman does not amount to termination. Moreover, the Workman failed to prove his claim that he was terminated in contravention of provision of Sec.25F of the I.D. Act, 1947 as he failed to establish his plea by any oral or documentary evidence that he had worked for 240 days continuously in a twelve months of calendar year just preceding from date of termination i.e., 12.9.88.

32. Further, perusal of the order dated 25.3.1997 goes to reveal that the Chief Branch Manager, State Bank of India has issued the letter to Zonal Office with direction to all its branches to this effect that they have been advised by the DGM, Zonal Office, Hyderabad that as both the panel of temporary employees of 1989 and daily wagers/casual labour of 1992 will lapse on 31.3.1997 it has been decided by central office not to make any temporary appointments in messengerial cadre from 12.9.88, therefore it was directed to issue suitable instructions not to make temporary appointments from 12.9.88. There is no mention in this order that the Workman herein has been terminated from service by this order.

33. Further, the circular dated 27.3.1997 was issued by DGM, SBI to all branches in commercial network in respect of the non-appointment of temporary employees in subordinate cadre and it has directed not to make any temporary employment in the subordinate cadre with effect from 1.4.97 and further, it has directed to ensure that no temporary/casual/daily basis appointment of the petty cash. Further, it is directed to all Branch Managers that any

deviation in this regard will be viewed seriously. Thus, these circulars do not reflect that the Workman has been terminated from service by this order.

34. Similarly, office order dated 31.3.1997 is simply a direction to all branches of the Respondent bank by DGM that no further daily labour should be engaged or employed. Therefore, the plea of the Workman that he has been terminated by the aforesaid order dated 25.3.1997, 27.3.1997 and 31.3.1997 from the service by the Respondent is not acceptable. The evidence adduced by the Workman clearly goes to reveal that he had worked as a daily wager for which he has been paid wages according to number of working days. As there was an order for prohibition for engaging temporary workmen, in the bank, therefore, Workman could not be engaged by the Respondent for work from 12.9.88 and there after. It is settled law that the daily wagers are engaged by the employer depending upon the availability of work and as the work was not available the Workman was not engaged further by the Respondent management. Therefore, the Workman on the ground of number of days he had worked in the Respondent bank cannot claim any right to reinstate him into the employment. As the Workman failed to prove the mandatory condition of 240 days of continuous service as required under Sec.25F of I.D. Act, 1947. Therefore, the disengagement of Workman from work can not be termed in contravention of provision contained under Sec.25F and 25 B of the I.D. Act, 1947.

Thus, this point is answered against the Workman and in favour of Respondent.

35. **Point No.III**:- In this context, the Workman has contended that the management failed to implement the selected panels during its valid tenure. The management adopted the back door methods contrary to the settlements and filled up the vacancies. The same is evident from the proceedings dated 18.11.1985 a copy of the same is filed in the material papers and the same may be read as part of the claim statement. Further, it is submitted that management has to adhere the procedure issued by the Central Government, the instructions dated 16.8.1990 in the year 1995, but same was not followed in the year 1997 despite there being vacancies. The management has followed the procedure of calling candidates through employment exchange instead of giving chance to the empanelled candidates like the Workman herein. The management sent call letters to the similarly situated candidates like the Workman in the month of June 1997 subsequent to issuance of impugned termination orders. After knowing the fact that they are litigating the issue by way of dispute, the management has refused to engage those candidates, the copies of call letters issued are filed herein along with claim petition. The Workman herein reiterates that the panels are meant for absorption but not for termination. In view of the same a duty is cast upon the Respondent management to engage the empanelled candidates like the Workman herein even in temporary vacancies till they are absorbed permanently in regular vacancies.

36. On the other hand, Respondent has contended that the Federation approached Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) for implementation of bipartite settlement in respect of the absorption of temporary employees. The Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) conducted conciliation proceedings and agreement was arrived at between the Federation and the Management bank. It is submitted that it was agreed between the Federation and the Management that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers /casual labour would be kept alive upto March, 1997 and the vacancies as agreed to under the afore set out settlements will be filled from both the lists concurrently. A copy of the conciliation proceedings dated 9.6.1995 signed by the parties to the dispute is filed as a material paper. Further, it is submitted that the settlement was arrived at and an agreement was signed between the Federation and the Management bank on 30.7.1996 under Section 2(p) read with Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules 1957 which is binding on the parties. A copy of this agreement which hereinafter may be referred to as 5th settlement for brevity, is also filed as a material paper. The 5th settlement dated 30.7.1996 whereunder the earlier four settlements dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988 and 9.1.1991 were also referred, it was agreed to, by the Federation and the Management bank that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees will be kept alive upto March, 1997 for filling the vacancies existing/arrived at as on 31.12.1994 as per the norms agreed to between the bank and Federation and that thereafter the said panels would lapse. It was also agreed that within the framework of the above settlements the modalities about drawing names from either the panel of temporary employees or the panel of daily wagers and casual labour would be decided administratively on circle to circle basis depending upon the local requirements in consultation with the Federation's affiliate by the Circle management. It was further agreed that all messenger real vacancies/positions in the subordinate cadre including part-time attendants specifically provided as leave reserve will be filled by the end of 31.3.1997. Further, Respondent contended that on 27.2.1997 a memorandum of understanding was also signed between the Federation's affiliate and the bank management regarding the fact that the exercise of identifying the messengerial vacancies as on 31.12.1994 has since been completed by central office and thereby 403 messengerial vacancies were sanctioned to the circle of the Management bank and it was agreed that these vacancies may be filled from 1989 panel of temporary employees after effecting conversion from full time non-messengerial staff in the usual manner and the agreement was reached upon. Further, it was agreed between the Federations affiliate and the management bank that in terms of the settlement dated 30.7.1996 both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers /casual employees would lapse on 31.3.1997.

37. The Workman has contended that the empanelled list prepared by the Respondent management for appointment of temporary and daily wage Workers to the permanent post cannot lapse unless until it is exhausted by appointing all the empanelled persons and it should continue even after 31.3.1997, i.e., the date fixed for the lapse of panel. It is undisputed that the date of lapse of empanelled list of Workmen has been fixed to 31.3.1997 as mentioned in the settlement dated 30.7.1996, and agreed between the parties. It is settled law that and once the life of panel list lapses on the date as agreed between the parties it cannot be extended beyond that date. In the instant case the panel list of the workmen was valid upto 31.3.1997 in view of the terms and conditions enumerated in the 5th Settlement entered into between the parties. As the lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997 has been agreed by State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation through 5th Settlement, the Workman is not competent to challenge the same.

In this context I would like to take reference of the decision of the apex court in the case of **Syndicate Bank and Ors vs. Shankar Paul and Ors , AIR 1997 SC 3091, therein the Hon'ble Apex Court** have held:-

"Till 1982, the branches of the appellant Bank in Calcutta region were recruiting persons locally to work as temporary attenders in leave vacancies. In view of the revised procedure prescribed by the Government of India in respect of such temporary appointments, the Calcutta regional office of the appellant Bank issued a circular to all of its branches on 14.8.1982, instructing all the branches under it to discontinue the old practice from 1.6.1982 and appoint only empanelled candidates. The regional office was to prepare a panel of eligible candidates, after calling names from the local/district employment exchange, and split it up branch-wise. Following that new procedure yearly panels were prepared thereafter. Names of the Respondents were for the first time included in the panel prepared for the period 7.2.1987 to 6.2.1988. By its letter dated 7.2.1987 the Bank had informed the Respondents that the panel was valid for one year only and that inclusion of their names in the panel was not to confer on them any right to seek permanent appointment in the service of the bank. Considering the object with which the panel was prepared and the fact that it was an yearly panel expiring on 6.2.1988, we are of the opinion that the Respondents did not get any right, because of inclusion of their names in the said panel, for permanent absorption in the service of the Bank. Whatever conditional right they had came to an end with the expiry of the panel. The claim of the Respondents, as contained in the writ petition was thus misconceived and therefore the learned single Judge and the Division Bench, when it first decided the appeal, were right in dismissing the writ petition and the appeal respectively."

Thus, in view of the above law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court and in view of the terms and conditions of the 5th Settlement the contention of the Workman that empanelled list should continue even after 31.3.1997 till the last Workman in the panel is absorbed is not tenable. The contention of the Workman is baseless in view of recital in the settlement. Therefore, in view of the fore gone discussion and finding given at Point No. I regarding binding nature of Settlements and terms and conditions enumerated therein, in view of the provision contained u/s.18(1) of the I.D. Act, 1947, I am of the considered view that life of panels lapsed on 31.3.1997 in view of terms of settlement dated 30.7.1996 and plea of Workman that the panel shall continue even after 31.3.1997 till last man absorbed has no legal force and same is untenable.

38. Undisputedly, settlement agreement dated 30.7.1996 was executed between the State Bank of India and State Bank of India Staff Federation and in that settlement it was agreed that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/ casual employees will be used for filling vacancies existing as on 31.12.1994 as per the norms agreed between the bank and the Federation. These empanelled workmen were to be given a chance for permanent appointment in the bank against vacancies arising up to December 1994 whereas the daily wagers/ casual employees were to be considered against the vacancies arise from January 1995 to December 1996, whereby the said panel would lapse. It was agreed that the vacancies falls upto 31.3.1997 shall be filled before the empanelled list is allowed to lapse. Thus, the claim of the Workman to the post of permanent non-messenger in the Respondent management was subject to the availability of the sanctioned post and vacancies arising upto 31.3.1997. The workmen given chance to the permanent post were seniors in number of working days in panel list and Workman herein was junior to those workmen. Therefore, Workman could not be given absorption to permanent post being junior to other workmen in the panel list.

39. Moreover, the Respondent management witness MW1 in chief statement has given the evidence that, "The Petitioner has not completed 240 days of service in a calendar year." Although this witness was cross examined by the Petitioner but the above statement of the management witness in chief remained uncontroverted, as the witness MW1 was not cross examined by Petitioner on this point. Therefore, the claim of the Petitioner that he has been removed from service by the management illegally is untenable. Further, witness MW1 in his chief statement has stated that, "The temporary messengers and Non-messengers were engaged by the bank in leave vacancies and for administrative exigencies. The Petitioner did not work continuously for 240 days in any year or over a period of 36 months." This statement of witness MW1 remained uncontroverted as the Petitioner did not cross examine the witness MW1 on this point. Therefore, the Petitioner Workman as per number of working days, failed to fulfil eligibility criteria of working days as required for regularisation. Therefore, he was not given regularisation in the employment of the Respondent. Therefore, in view of the statement of MW1, the claim of the Petitioner that he was refused regularization by the Respondent management illegally, is untenable.

40. However, Workman has taken the plea that the panels of Workmen for absorption in the employment of the Respondent banks (panels of temporary employees and daily wagers) has been lapsed on 31.3.1997 in contravention of terms of settlement as the object of preparing the entire empanelment of temporary and daily wagers was to provide them permanent employment and till the both the panel lists exhausted the panel list cannot be lapsed on 31.3.1997 and the date of lapsing of the panel on 31.3.1997 has been fixed by the Respondent arbitrarily without any authority.

41. In this context, the perusal of Settlement dated 30.7.1996 reveals that the 5th Settlement dated 30.7.1996 was entered under Section 2(p) and 18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947 read with Rule 58 of Industrial Dispute (Central) Rules 1957. This settlement has been entered into by the competent parties and in this settlement parties thereto agreed that both the panels of temporary employees and daily wagers/casual employees will lapse on 31.3.1997. Thus the date of lapse of panel was fixed by both the parties with consensus under the settlement dated 30.7.1996 and same is binding upon the Workman under the provision of Section 18(1) of I.D. Act, 1947. Moreover, this issue of binding force of the settlement dated 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988 and 9.1.1991 has already been discussed, decided at finding in Point No.I of this award. However, the legality and validity of the aforementioned settlement has not been challenged by the Workman before any competent forum. Thus, claim of Workman that the date of lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997 has been fixed arbitrarily by the Respondent bank is untenable. As regard the claim of Workman for his absorption to the permanent post it is settled law that the Workman can not claim his regularization to permanent post merely on the basis of number of working days.

42. In this context the reference of the decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Oil and Natural Gas Corporation vs Krishan Gopal 2020(3) SCALE 272, date of decision 7.2.2020** is relevant therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have has laid down principle regarding regularization of the Workman on permanent posts. Hon'ble Supreme Court have laid down the prepositions of regularization of the workmen to permanent post is as under:-

"*(i) Wide as they are, the powers of the Labour Court and the Industrial Court cannot extend to a direction to order regularisation, where such a direction would in the context of public employment offend the provisions contained in Article 14 of the Constitution;*

(ii) The statutory power of the Labour Court or Industrial Court to grant relief to workmen including the status of permanency continues to exist in circumstances where the employer has indulged in an unfair labour practice by not filling up permanent posts even though such posts are available and by continuing to employ workmen as temporary or daily wage employees despite their performing the same work as regular workmen on lower wages;

(iii) The power to create permanent or sanctioned posts lies outside the judicial domain and where no posts are available, a direction to grant regularisation would be impermissible merely on the basis of the number of years of service;

(iv) Where an employer has regularised similarly situated workmen either in a scheme or otherwise, it would be open to workmen who have been deprived of the same benefit at par with the workmen who have been regularised to make a complaint before the Labour or Industrial Court, since the deprivation of the benefit would amount to a violation of Article 14; and

(v) In order to constitute an unfair labour practice under Section 2(ra) read with Item 10 of the Vth Schedule of the ID Act, the employer should be engaging workmen as badlis, temporaries or casuals, and continuing them for years, with the object of depriving them of the benefits payable to permanent workmen.

Thus, in view of the principles laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court as discussed above, in the instant matter the Workman utterly failed to prove his claim by adducing any documentary or oral evidence that the employer has indulged in unfair labour practice by not filling the permanent posts even though such posts are available and by continuing to employ workmen as temporary or daily wage employees despite their performance was the same work, as regular workmen on lower wages.

43. Respondent has contended that all the vacancies exist and arise upto 31.3.1997 has been filled up from the panel list in order of seniority and no vacancy exists or arises as on 31.3.1997 remained unfilled. Further, it is contended that as per terms of settlement the life of panel lists has been lapsed on 31.3.1997, hence, there is no occasion to extend the life of panel lists beyond 31.3.1997. However, the workman failed to prove contrary by any evidence to the aforesaid contention of the Respondent that the vacancies were existing as on 31.3.1997 and the workman was not given absorption to the permanent post in order of his seniority. It is settled law that the power to create permanent or sanctioned post lies outside the judicial domain and where no posts are available, a direction to grant regularization would be impermissible merely on the basis of the number of years of service. Therefore, the claim of the workman on this ground also not acceptable.

44. Further, as per the of settlement, panel was prepared for absorption of the workmen on the permanent posts has already been lapsed on 31.3.1997 and the vacancies existing and arising upto 31.12.1994 and upto 31.3.1997 as settlement dated 30.7.1996 has been filled up from the panel by appointing the workmen as per seniority in the panel list. Workman witness WW1 in his cross examination has himself admitted this fact that, some of the temporary

employees whose names were included in the panel were given regular appointment in the bank in order of their seniority in the panel. The Workman failed to show that there was any breach of terms of settlement has been committed by the Respondent in appointment to permanent post from aforesaid panel list.

45. As discussed in preceding paragraph of this Award, the life of the panel has not been extended beyond 31.3.1997, by any further settlement hence, the panel list in which name of the Workman was included got expired on 31.3.1997. It is not the case of the Workman that Respondent has regularized similarly situated workmen either in the scheme or otherwise and the Workman has been deprived of same benefit on par with those workmen or the vacancies remained unfilled on the date of lapse of panels i.e., 31.3.1997, Industrial Tribunal has no jurisdiction to extend the date of lapse of panel i.e., 31.3.1997. This Tribunal can not order for regularization of workmen to the permanent post in contravention of the provision of Article 14 of the Constitution of India.

In the case of **Mahboob Deepak vs. Nagar Panchayat Gajraula & Anr, Civil Appeal No.5875/2007 date of judgement 13.12.2007,** Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

"8. Respondent is a Local Authority. The terms and conditions of employment of the employees are governed by a statute and statutory rules. No appointment can be made by a Local Authority without following the provisions of the recruitment rules. Any appointment made in violation of the said rules as also the constitutional scheme of equality as contained in Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India would be a nullity.

9. Due to some exigency of work, although recruitment on daily wages or on an ad hoc basis was permissible, but by reason thereof an employee cannot claim any right to be permanently absorbed in service or made permanent in absence of any statute or statutory rules. Merely because an employee has completed 240 days of work in a year preceding the date of retrenchment, the same would not mean that his services were liable to be regularized."

Therefore, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, the claim of the Workman for absorption merely on the basis of number of day of work in the Respondent bank Branch is not acceptable. As regard plea of the Workman that the Workman should have been given employment even after 31.3.1997 as temporary Workman, it is the discretion of Respondent to engage the Workman depending upon availability of work and this Tribunal can not direct the Respondent to engage the Workman in the absent of such rule/scheme.

46. In view of principle laid down by Hon'ble Apex Court as discussed above, in the instant matter Workman utterly failed to establish the fact of rendering continuous service for a period of 240 days of service within a period of 12 calendar months commencing and coming backward from relevant date i.e., the date of retrenchment, if has he would be denied to be in continuous service for a period of one year. Therefore, the provision contained under Sec.25F of retrenchment is not applicable to Workman.

Counsel for Workman has relied upon number of decisions of Hon'ble High Court and Hon'ble Supreme Court and few of them are discussed herein:-

In the case of **F.C.I., vs. Kamdhenu Cattle Feed Industries 1985 (1) SCC 71,** therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

"7. In contractual sphere as in all other State actions, the State and all its instrumentalities have to conform to Article 14 of the Constitution of which non-arbitrariness is a significant facet. There is no unfettered discretion in public law: A public authority possesses powers only to use them for public good. This impose the duty to act fairly and to adopt a procedure which is `fairplay in action'. Due observance of this obligation as a part of good administration raises a reasonable or legitimate expectation in every citizen to be treated fairly in his interaction with the State and its instrumentalities, with this element forming a necessary component of the decision making process in all State actions. To satisfy this requirement of non- arbitrariness in a State action, it is, therefore, necessary to consider and give due weight to the reasonable or legitimate expectations of the persons likely lo be affected by the decision or else that unfairness in the exercise of the power may amount to an abuse or excess of power apart from affecting the bona fides of the decision in a given case. The decision so made would be exposed to challenge on the ground of arbitrariness. Rule of law does not completely eliminate discretion in the exercise of power, as it is unrealistic, but providers for control of its exercise by judicial review."

In the case of **State Bank of India, R.O., Vijayawada vs. Industrial Tribunal, Hyderabad WP No.193/1997,** therein Hon'ble High Court have held,

"*Sri Krovvidi Narasimham, the learned counsel for the 2nd respondent contends, supporting the award that it was a permanent vacancy and even though the 2nd respondent was appointed on temporary basis, his services were not liable to be terminated and he was to be regularised into service on permanent basis. Shastry award warrants that no temporary appointment can be made to a permanent post. But the matter is now covered by two division bench*

judgements dated 28.11.1986 in W.A. No.791 of 1986 and 25.8.1987 in W.A. No.270 of 1982. The ratio decided in the two judgements is to the effect that there cannot be any mandate to appoint employees on permanent basis when the requirement was for appointment on temporary basis. But it is held in the said judgements that when a temporary appointee is ousted from service and not for misconduct and, if again temporary appointment is to be made, then, the case of such temporary appointee who was ousted, has got to be considered in accordance with Sec. 25-H of the Act."

In the case of **State of Haryana and others vs. Piara Singh and others. 1992 (4) SCC 118,** therein Hon'ble Supreme Court have held:-

" 49. If for any reason an adhoc or temporary employee is continued for a fairly long spell, the authorities must consider his case for regularization provided he is eligible and qualified according to the rules and his service record is satisfactory and his appointment does not run counter to the reservation policy of the state."

In the above cited judgements by the Workman the facts of the case are different hence do not apply to instant case of Workman.

47. On the other hand, in support of his contention Respondent has examined witness MW1 and MW1 in chief examination states that, Settlements i.e., on 17.11.1987, 16.7.1988, 27.10.1988, 9.1.1991 were entered into between the SBI and SBI Staff Federation for filling up of the vacancies that arise up to 1994 for those temporary employees who has worked on scale wages. Further, MW1 states that two different panels for messengers and non-messengers as per the eligibility criteria prescribed by the bank. There are four modules in Andhra Pradesh and they are Hyderabad, Tirupathi, Vijayawada and Visakhapatnam. MW1 states that the temporary employees so empanelled were given permanent absorption depending upon the vacancies so arise strictly in terms of the settlement. MW1 states that on 9.6.1995 conciliation proceeding was held before the RLC(C), Hyderabad and in said proceedings it was decided that the panels will be kept live up to 31.3.1997 and vacancies will be filled from both the lists concurrently. A copy of the said minutes of proceedings is Ex.M5. Further, MW1 states that on 30.7.1996 another settlement was entered between the SBI and All India SBI Staff Federation providing for filling up of the vacancies arising up to December 1994 in respect of subordinate cadre and daily wage /casual wage employees out of panel so prepared were to be considered against vacancies arising from January 1995 to December 1996, thereafter the said panels lapse. MW1 states that it was also agreed that all the non- messenger positions in subordinate cadre including part time attendants specially provided as leave reserve will be filled before 31.3.1997 and as regards to non-messengerial positions it is agreed that all such posts sanctioned and fallen vacant up to 31.3.1997 shall be filled before the empanelled list is allowed to lapse. Thus in both the cases empanelled list were lapsed on 1985. Ex.M6 is the copy of the settlement dated 30.7.1996. Further, witness states that on 27.2.1997 a memorandum of understanding was reached between the SBI and SBI Staff Federation providing that both the panels above mentioned will lapse on 31.3.1997. Ex.M7 is the copy of the memorandum of understanding and Ex.M8 is the copy of the statements giving the particulars of 1989 non-messenger panel, Ex.M9 is the copy of the statement of 1989 non-messenger panel, Ex.M10 is the copy of statement of 1992 panel. Further, witness states that petitioner was included in the 1989 panel. As the existing vacancies at that time were exhausted and his turn did not come he could not be given permanent employment in the bank as per the agreements. All the appointments were made strictly in accordance with the settlements reached from time to time between SBI and SBI staff federation and as per seniority, number of days of temporary service put in by them in the bank in the given period. Further, MW1 states petitioner was not sponsored by any employment exchange he did not undergo the regular process of selection required for appointment as a regular non-messenger the petitioner has not worked for 240 days in any year in his entire temporary service in the bank. The petitioner and other temporary employees were terminated from service by the bank. Further, MW1 states that the vacancies were filled up on regular basis with the temporary employees from the panels and these panels were expired in terms of the settlements so reached and there were no vacancies to absorb such employees. Thus, witness MW1 has proved the documents Ex.M1 to Ex.M12 and also contentions made in the counter. However, MW1 was cross examined by the Petitioner Counsel. But nothing has been elicited in his cross examination so as to discredit the testimony of the witness MW1 as regards the date of lapse of both the panels on 31.3.1997 and reasons assigned for non-absorption of the Petitioner from the panel list to the permanent post. Moreover the witness MW1 was re-examined by the Respondent and the witness MW1 states that panels were expired in terms of the settlement send absorptions to the extent of the available vacancies were made. There was no

termination of any temporary messenger as such but their services were not utilized after the cut off date as the available vacancies were already filled up and most of these Petitioners were not in the service of the bank as on the date of the expiry date of the panels. Therefore, in view of the aforesaid testimony of the MW1 in re-examination in the absence of cross examination remained uncontraverted, the claim of the Workman that he was entitled for absorption in permanent post in the branch of Respondent Management on the basis of panel list is found not established.

This point is answered against the Workman.

48. **Point No.IV**:- In view of the discussion and finding given at Point Nos. I, II and III, the Workman is not entitled for any relief and claim statement of Workman sans merit and liable to be dismissed.

This Point is answered accordingly.

AWARD

In view of the fore gone discussion, it is held that the action of the Respondent bank in terminating the services of Sri M. Chinna Veera Ragavulu, Ex. Messenger by way of oral orders w.e.f. the year 12.9.88 is justified. Hence, the Petitioner is not entitled for any relief as prayed for. The claim statement filed by Workman sans merit, hence, dismissed.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. K. Phani Gowri, Personal Assistant, transcribed by her, corrected and signed by me on this the 15th day of June, 2026.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner	Witnesses examined for the Respondent
WW1: Sri M. Chinna Veera Ragavulu	MW1: Sri I.S. Appa Rao

Documents marked for the Petitioner

Ex.W1:	Photocopy of qualification and conduct certificate
Ex.W2:	Photocopy of service certificate
Ex.W3:	Photocopy of service certificate
Ex.W4:	Photocopy of service certificate
Ex.W5:	Photocopy of service including salary certificate

Documents marked for the Respondent

Ex.M1:	Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.17.11.87
Ex.M2:	Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.16.7.88
Ex.M3:	Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.27.10.1988
Ex.M4:	Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.9.1.1991
Ex.M5:	Photocopy of conciliation proceedings before the Regional Labour Commissioner(C) dt.9.6.1995

Ex.M6:	Photocopy of settlement between Respondent and All India State Bank of India Staff Federation dt.30.7.1996
Ex.M7:	Photocopy of Memorandum of understanding dt. 27.1.1997
Ex.M8:	Photocopy of statements giving the particulars of 1989 messenger panel.
Ex.M9:	Photocopy of statement of 1989 Non-messenger panel
Ex.M10:	Photocopy of statement of 1992 panel
Ex.M11:	Photocopy of order of Hon'ble High Court in WA No.86/98 dt. 1.5.98
Ex.M12:	Photocopy of order in SLP No.11886-11888 of 1998 dated 10.8.98

Uploaded by Dte. of Printing at Government of India Press, Ring Road, Mayapuri, New Delhi-110064
and Published by the Controller of Publications, Delhi-110054.

VINOD KUMAR Digitally signed by VINOD KUMAR Date: 2026.09.07 18:27:56 +05'30'