

The Odisha Gazette



EXTRAORDINARY
PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

No. 322 CUTTACK, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 2024/MAGHA 24, 1945

LABOUR & E.S.I. DEPARTMENT

NOTIFICATION

The 7th February 2024

S.R.O. No. 79/2024—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Award, dated the 30th December 2023 passed in the ID Case No. 30 of 2017 [u/s 2-A(2)] by the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Bhubaneswar on the industrial dispute between the Management of AMRI Hospital, Bhubaneswar, a Unit of Amri Hospital Ltd., Plot No. 1, beside Satya Sai Enclave, Khandagiri, Bhubaneswar - 751030, Dist. Khurda, represented through its Vice President, 2. AMRI Hospitals Ltd., having its Regd. Office, At P-4 & 5, C.I.T. Scheme LXXII, Block-A, Gariahat Road, Kolkata-700029, Represented through its Chief Executive Officer Mr. Rupak Barua and Suman Chhualsingh, S/o. Umakanta Chhualsingh, Permanent resident of At/P.O. Aiginia, P.S. Khandagiri, Bhubaneswar, Dist. Khurda is hereby published as in the schedule below :—

SCHEDULE

IN THE LABOUR COURT, BHUBANESWAR
INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE CASE No. 30 of 2017 [u/s 2-A(2)]
Dated the 30th December 2023

Present :

Smt. Aparna Mohapatra,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Bhubaneswar.
(JO Code- OD-0408)

Between :

- | | |
|---|-------------------------------|
| 1. The Management of AMRI Hospital,
Bhubaneswar, a Unit of Amri Hospital Ltd.,
Plot No. 1, beside Satya Sai Enclave,
Khandagiri, Bhubaneswar-751030,
Dist. Khurda, represented through its
Vice President. | . . . First Party—Managements |
|---|-------------------------------|

2. AMRI Hospitals Ltd.,
 having its Regd. Office,
 At P-4 & 5, C.I.T. Scheme LXXII,
 Block-A, Gariahat Road, Kolkata-700029,
 Represented through its
 Chief Executive Officer Mr. Rupak Barua.

And
 Suman Chhualsingh,
 S/o. Umakanta Chhualsingh,
 Permanent resident of
 At/P.O. Aiginia, P.S. Khandagiri,
 Bhubaneswar, Dist. Khurda.

Appearances :

Shri S. K. Mohanty & Associates, . . . For the First Party—Managements

Shri Susanta Dash, Advocate . . . For the Second Party—Workman

AWARD

The above named second party has preferred the present application resorting to the provisions of Section 2-A(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (for short 'the Act' or 'the I.D. Act') with a prayer to declare the termination of his service by way of discharge with effect from the 25th July 2016 by the managements as illegal and to direct the managements for his reinstatement with continuity of service, so also to pay him full back wages from the date of his termination till the date of his reinstatement coupled with all consequential benefits.

2. The case of the second party as involved in the present proceeding, in short, is that :— on being selected through an interview he was appointed as Maintenance-Technician by the management and to that effect he was also issued with an offer letter advising him to join in his duty on the 3rd February 2014. Thus, the second party joined as such on the 3rd February 2014 and thereafter, a detail appointment letter was accordingly issued in his favour by the Vice President of Amri Hospitals for a period of six months starting from the date of his joining. Upon completion of such successful probation period, the second party was confirmed in the said post with effect from the 2nd August 2014. Subsequently, the management by taking into consideration his hard & sincere work, so also passion & commitment towards duty, re-designated the post of the second party to the position (Band: OP-3) of Junior Executive Maintenance effective from the 1st April 2013 and also revised his monthly salary from Rs. 8,000 to Rs. 8,467 from the date of his re-designation. It is alleged, although the employees/workmen of the management work for more than 08 hours a day, but they were neither paid their actual salary nor paid anything towards overtime work, for which to ventilate the grievances of the workmen with regard to various service conditions in a democratic way, the workers of the said establishment formed a Union in the name of Amri Hospital Employees Union and got it registered under the Trade Unions Act, 1926. Intimation thereof was also given to the management by the Union, so also its office bearers. The present second party

was the Treasurer of the said Union. Specifically, it is contended that as he was doing the lead role for formation and registration of the said Union, he along with other workmen became eyesore of the management. It is also stated that on the complaint of the Nursing Staffs of the management regarding non-payment of overtime, so also non-allotment of uniforms to them, the second party after obtaining permission from his superior and other office bearers of the Union i.e., General Secretary, Secretary, so also the Maintenance Executive Mr. Kumud Chandra Jena had been to the office of the Nursing Superintendent, namely Mrs. Premala Sharma on the 8th February 2016 and a discussion to that effect was accordingly held. During discussion, Mrs. Sharma had assured to the General Secretary of the Union not only for discussion with the higher authority, but also for resolving the said issue at the earliest. Not only that, she had also advised that they may contact her on the next day morning i.e., on the 9th February 2016 to know about the decision of the higher management on the said issues. Accordingly, the complainant along with other office bearers of the Union had been to the office of Mrs. Sharma on the 9th February 2016 morning and discussed with her on the said issue. But, after her assurance to resolve the said issue shortly by discussing with the top management, they left the said place. But, to his utter surprise, he had received a letter dated the 10th February 2016 along with Charge Sheet-*cum*-Suspension Order dated the 9th February 2016 wherein it has been alleged that since the disputant refused to accept the said letter when the same was delivered to him, the above letter was sent on him through post. Against such action of the management, the General Secretary of the Union wrote a letter to the DLO, Bhubaneswar with a request to give justice to the second party being a protected workman. However, the second party vehemently challenged the charge sheet 9th February 2016-*cum*-Suspension order as false, ambiguous, baseless and concocted in order to victimise him only for his Union activities on various grounds. But, the management thereafter, decided to conduct domestic enquiry against him and as a result of which the services of the disputant were brought to an end with effect from the 25th July 2016 by way of discharge vide notice published in the daily Odia Newspaper 'The Sambad' dated the 2nd August 2016. Feeling aggrieved with such action of the management, on the 3rd August 2016 the General Secretary of the Union raised an industrial dispute before the DLO-*cum*-Conciliation Officer, Khurda at Bhubaneswar. But, as the dispute could not be resolved by the labour machinery within the stipulated period for forty five days, he filed the present application under Section 2-A(2) of the ID Act before this Court directly for adjudication with the aforesaid prayer.

3. After receipt of the notices, the first party managements No. 1 & 2 not only entered their appearance, but also filed a joint Written Statement. At the outset, the first party managements in their WS has challenged the maintainability of the application filed under Section 2-A(2) of the Act on the ground that the same has been filed without complying stipulations of the statutory provision. For better clarification, it is specifically contended that there is no corresponding provision in the existing Orissa Industrial Disputes Rules regarding the fact of amendment of Section 2-A(2) of the I.D. Act in the year, 2010 and accordingly the unilateral & concocted action taken by the second party to approach this Court individually is not legal and valid. It is also averred in the WS that the second party himself admitted that his complaint was never admitted into conciliation except being called upon for joint enquiry. But, such joint enquiry does not confer the right on the workman to

approach this Court by resorting the provision of Section 2-A(2) of the Act when the Asst. Labour Officer, who conducted the same, being not the Conciliation Officer. The second party neither approached the management No. 2 nor made it a party to the purported conciliation proceeding.

Though the managements admitted the claim of the second party regarding his appointment as Technician-Maintenance with effect from the 3rd February 2014 by virtue of his appointment letter dated the 12th February 2014; confirmation of his service after completion of probationary period and revision of his salary from time to time, at the same time they emphasise that owing to his involvement in certain acts of misconducts in employment, he was issued with Charge Sheet-*cum*-Suspension Order dated the 9th February 2016 and consequently, he was dismissed from service followed by an *ex parte* domestic enquiry when his reply was found to be dissatisfactory. The management while taking action against the workman has adhered to the principles of natural justice. The management being a Hospital does not come within the definition of 'industrial establishment' provided under the Industrial Employment (Standing Orders) Act, 1946 and the payment of Wages Act, 1936. Whatever may be, the services of the workman were governed strictly under the service conditions stipulated in his appointment letter. The managements, with the aforesaid background, have prayed for the dismissal of the case.

4. A rejoinder to the Written Statement has been filed by the Second Party thereby while denying almost all the averments made in the WS categorically stated that even though there is no such provision under the State Rules specifying the procedure to be followed for lodging a complaint before the Conciliation Officer so also approaching the Industrial Adjudication for inaction of the Conciliation Officer, but the Central Act i.e., Section 2-A(2) is clear and unambiguous stipulating therein to approach the Labour Court or Tribunal after expiry of 45 days from the date when an application submitted before the Conciliation Officer. The further contention of the second party is that he did his job sincerely & honestly to the best of the ability and satisfaction of the management, but he was intentionally victimised for his union activities.

5. On the rival claims of the parties, the following issues emerge for consideration :—

ISSUES

- (i) Whether the domestic enquiry conducted by the 1st party management against the 2nd party is just and fair ?
- (ii) Whether the application filed by the 2nd party workman under Section 2-A(2) of the ID Act, 1947 is maintainable ?
- (iii) Whether the action of the 1st party management of M/s. AMRI Hospital, Bhubaneswar, a Unit of AMRI Hospital Limited in terminating the services of the 2nd party workman with effect from the 25th July 2016 by way of discharge is legal and/or justified ?
- (iv) If not, what relief the workman is entitled to ?

6. To substantiate their respective stands, the parties have adduced oral as well as documentary evidence. While the second party has examined himself as WW No.1 and filed a bunch of documents which are marked as Exts.1 to 23, the managements have examined three numbers of witnesses as MW Nos. 1 to 3 and exhibited the enquiry preceding file as Ext. A.

FINDINGS

7. *Issue No. (i)*—In the present issue, this Court has to find out as to whether the domestic enquiry conducted by the 1st party management against the 2nd party is just & fair. But, needless to say, this Court has already passed its order on this issue on the 26th September 2023 thereby holding the domestic enquiry conducted against the workman as was not at all in accordance with the principles of natural justice, the same is neither fair nor proper. Hence, this Court will not put unnecessary effort further to pass any order taking the fairness of domestic enquiry.

8. *Issue No. (ii)*—This issue has been framed as the managements while filing its pleadings (WS) came out with a plea that the case is not maintainable. But, the same has not yet been substantiated by the managements through adequate evidence. Admittedly, the second party has filed the present case by resorting to the provisions as envisaged under Section 2-A(2) of the ID Act. So, it needs to discuss as to whether the second party has complied the pre-conditions of the provisions as embodied in Section 2-A(2) of the Act. For better appreciation the contents of the provisions of Section 2-A(2) of the Act are reproduced below :

“(2)Notwithstanding anything contained in Section 10, any such workman as is specified in sub-section (1) may, make an application direct to the Labour Court or Tribunal for adjudication of the dispute referred to therein after the expiry of forty-five days from the date he has made the application to the Conciliation Officer of the appropriate Government for conciliation of the dispute, and in receipt of such application the Labour Court or Tribunal shall have powers & jurisdiction to adjudicate upon the dispute, as if it were a dispute referred to it by the appropriate Government in accordance with the provisions of this Act and all the provisions of this Act shall apply in relation to such adjudication as they apply in relation to an industrial dispute referred to it by the appropriate Government”.

The second party through-out stated with vehemence that being aggrieved with his dismissal from service with effect from the 25th July 2016 he submitted a complaint petition on the 28th March 2017 before the District Labour Officer, Khurda at Bhubaneswar and when his dispute could not be resolved in the stipulated period of time, he directly approached this Court by taking recourse to the provisions of Section 2-A(2) of the ID Act. Such fact also finds due corroboration from the contents of Exts.16 (the Xerox copy of complaint petition of the second party submitted before the concerned DLO). Ext.16 also bears the seal & signature of the office of the DLO, Khurda at Bhubaneswar in token of receipt of the same on the 28th March 2017. Ext.17 also indicates that upon Ext.16 the ALO, Bhubaneswar issued notice to the parties. Although Ext.16 is marked with objection, but nowhere the managements have disputed that prior to filing of the present case the second party had not moved the concerned labour authorities, rather admitted such fact in its WS. But, the management taken a plea that there is no corresponding provision in the Orissa Industrial Disputes Rules to approach this Court directly. Needless to say that, Section 2-A(2) the ID Act clearly stipulates the provision whereby workman can directly approach the Labour Court and Industrial Tribunal after expiry of 45 days of filing his complaint before the concerned Conciliation Officer of the area. Admittedly, the DLO, Khurda at Bhubaneswar, before whom the second party has submitted his complaint vide Ext.16 as well as ALO, Bhubaneswar,

who issued notice to the parties vide Ext.17 are declared as the Conciliation Officers by the Government of Orissa in Labour & Employment Department vide its Notification No.SRO No.91 of 94. It is forthcoming from the case record that the second party has filed the present case before this Court on the 15th September 2017.

Hence, from the above discussions, it emerges that the instant application has been filed in time as prescribed under Section 2-A(2) of the Act and accordingly, it is clearly inferred that the second party has complied the pre-conditions of the provisions of Section 2-(2) of I.D. Act. So, the present case is adequately maintainable.

9. *Issue No. (iii)*—The present case relates to dismissal/discharge of the disputant-workman preceded by a domestic enquiry. Accordingly, keeping in view the principles of law relating to domestic inquiry, the issue of validity of domestic inquiry was taken up as a preliminary issue and answered accordingly vide Ext. 1 (as stated *supra*). Thereafter, keeping in view the averments of the first party managements in its WS at Para. 16, so also the settled principle of law as laid down by Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of Karnataka State Road Transport Vs. Smt. Lakshmidewamma (AIR 2001 SC 2090), the managements were given opportunity to substantiate its impugned action of discharge/dismissal by adducing evidence, to prove the charges on the merit first. Accordingly, the parties have laid their respective evidences in this Court as mentioned in Para. 6 of this Award.

There is no controversy between the parties that the second party is a 'workman' and the management is an 'industry' as per the provisions of the I.D. Act. It is also the common case of the parties that the workman was appointed as Technician-Maintenance by the management as evident from Exts.1 & 2 (which are stated to be the Xerox copies of offer letter and appointment letter respectively issued in favour of the second party) and while working as such, he was dismissed from service with effect from the 25th July 2016 on the allegations of misconduct as mentioned in the charge sheet marked vide Ext. 5. On perusal of the same, it is found that the second party was charge sheeted as per the alleged incidents dated the 8th February 2016 and the 9th February 2016.

The allegation relates to the 8th February 2016 is as follows :

"On the 8th February 2016 at around 16-30 Hrs, the workman with another employee during duty hours lead a group of four employees barged into the office of the Nursing Superintendent and started shouting at the top of their voice accusing her for not allowing nursing staff to join the union.

The Nursing Superintendent when told him (disputant) and other intruders that she was no way involved in the matter union and it was an independent decision of the nurses over which she had no control, he (disputant) having heard such version got enraged and started behaving with her in a most insolent and rude manner and abused her in filthy language which are unprintable. She was also threatened with dire consequences".

Similarly, the allegation relates to the 9th February 2016 is as hereunder :—

"Again, on, the 9th February 2016 at around 11-45 Hrs, the workman along with another employee leading a group of eight to nine employees rushed to the office of Nursing Superintendent and misbehaved with her at the top of their voice and again threatened the Nursing Superintendent

with dire consequences in presence of other employees and when she tried to pacify, he (disputant) became more violent and instigated other associates to shout at her”.

The second party while rendering his evidence as AW No. 1 set up a claim during his evidence that the allegations levelled against him vide Ext.5 are false. So, now the materials on record and evidence of the parties are to be looked into in order to find out whether the managements have substantiated these charges through its witnesses or not.

MW No.1, who is none other than the Deputy Manager of the managements in his affidavit evidence at Para. 5 stated about the alleged incidents dated the 8th February 2016 and dated the 9th February 2016 as happened in the Nursing Office and that Premalatha Sharma was the then Nursing Superintendent. But during his cross-examination at Para. 19, he categorically stated that he joined under the management in the month of June 2016 and he has no direct knowledge regarding the alleged incident, so also the inquiry conducted against the delinquent as he was not in service under the management during that period. He also stated that he had no direct knowledge regarding Ext.A as he was not in service under the Management during that period. He also admits during his cross-examination at Para-21 that he has no direct knowledge regarding the averments made in Paras. 5 to 7 of his affidavit evidence as he was not in service under the management during the period of incident and he had not seen the alleged incident.

Similarly, MW No. 2 (the Deputy Nursing Superintendent) in her evidence while mentioning the alleged incidents dates the 8th February 2016 and the 9th February 2016 stated that she along with Premalatha Sharma were allotted workstation/desk in a single room; she had seen the occurrence when it occurred; a mob of 5-6 men including Suman Chhualsingh and Mr. Kumud Chandra Jena entered inside the nursing station; went to the chamber of the Nursing Superintendent (NS) Ms. Premalatha Sharma; she heard the shout and accuse of the mob members upon Ms. Premalatha Sharma. She also stated that on the following day i.e., on the 9th February 2016, another mob of 9-10 men including Mr. Suman Chhualsingh entered the Nursing station and shouted at Ms. Premalatha Sharma by creating a chaotic environment; she was present in that place and has seen the incident. But, during her cross-examination she admitted in Para. 13 that she cannot say if the management has filed any document that in the year, 2016 she being the Deputy Nursing Superintendent (DNS) and the then Nursing Superintendent (NS), Ms. Premalatha Sharma were allotted desks in a single room. Further, she also admitted that she had not stated before the Enquiry Officer (EO) during her evidence as a witness during inquiry on behalf of the management that she and Nursing Superintendent Premalatha Sharma were allotted two desks in one room. She further stated at Para. 14 of her cross-examination that the outside part of the room/corridor of Nursing Superintendent was under the CCTV surveillance during the relevant time. But, she cannot say if the management has filed the CCTV footage of the relevant period before this Court in this case or not. She further stated in her cross-examination that she does not know if any complaint was lodged in the concerned police station as to the alleged incident dated the 8th February 2016 and the 9th February 2016 by the management or not. She stated that she also exactly cannot say in detail who were present during the time of the alleged incident at the spot on the 8th February 2016 and the 9th February 2016.

Likewise, MW No. 3 has filed his affidavit evidence relating to the alleged incident dated the 9th February 2016 thereby stating that on the 9th February 2016 at about 11-30 A.M. Mr. Suman Chhualsingh along with 6 other employees namely Bidyut Mohanty, Ksushna Mohanty, Pragyan Baliarsingh, Tinku Parida, Siba Pani and Panchanan forcibly entered his office and scolded him, so also threatened him to lift him from office, if he supports the management of AMRI and did not support their union team members. In his evidence, he further deposed that the behaviour of Suman Chhualsingh was very aggressive and he intimated such incident to the Vice President through E-mail on the same day which was filed under Ext.A. But during his cross-examination, he admitted to have no knowledge if any charge sheet was submitted against the delinquent-second party or not. He further admitted that he cannot say if the copy of E-mail dated the 9th February 2016 was supplied to the second party-delinquent or not in the list of documents along with the charge sheet or during enquiry. He cannot say if any FIR was lodged against the second party-delinquent as to the alleged incident dated the 9th February 2016 or not. He further admitted that out of the six numbers of employees (apart from the second party), who were named in the E-mail dated the 9th February 2016 are still working under the management except Siba Pani. He also cannot say if one Panchanan whose name found place in the E-mail dated the 9th February 2016, is still working under the management or not. He also cannot say if any disciplinary proceeding was initiated or not against any of the six numbers of employees (apart from the second party-delinquent) as named in the E-mail dated the 9th February 2016. He further testified that no written notice was issued to him by the Enquiry Officer to adduce evidence on behalf of the management during inquiry; he adduced evidence during enquiry being called by the HR Head through telephonic call and he adduced evidence during enquiry as per the instruction of the HR Head of the management.

After close scrutiny of the evidence as adduced above by the witnesses of the managements, it is forthcoming that the MW No.1 has no direct knowledge of the alleged incident and he has not seen the alleged occurrences as he joined the organisation of the management in the month of June 2016 i.e., after the alleged date of incident and after the domestic inquiry into the allegations was completed. It is also forming that the MW No. 2 though stated that she was sharing workstation with the Nursing Superintendent, but the same is not substantiated through any other evidence. She (MW No. 2) is unable to say in details who were present during the time of the alleged incident at the spot on the 8th February 2016 and the 9th February 2016. Surprisingly enough, when MW No. 2 stated that the outside part of the room/corridor of Nursing Superintendent was under the CCTV surveillance during the relevant time, then the reason best known to the management for not producing the CCTV footage before this Court from which it could have ascertained the alleged occurrences. It is also emerged from the evidence on record that no complaint/FIR was stated to be lodged by the management before the concerned police station for the alleged incident dated the 8th February 2016 and the 9th February 2016. Similarly, it is elicited from the mouth of the MW No. 3 during his cross-examination that he was not aware about the charge sheet issued against the delinquent and he adduced evidence during enquiry being called by the HR Head through telephonic call and adduced evidence as such during enquiry as per the instruction of the HR Head of the management. So, no reliance can be attached to his evidence as he himself admitted to

have given evidence as per the instruction of the HR Head of the management. It is also highlighted from his evidence that when he in his affidavit evidence emphatically mentioned the time and names of six other employees relating to the alleged incident dated the 9th February 2016, but the same do not find place in the charge marked vide Ext.5. So, it clearly establishes the fact of ambiguity in the charge sheet. Further, it is came to light from the cross-examination of MW No.3 that the persons so went to his office along with second party as named in E-mail dated the 9th February 2016 are still working under the management except the second party and one Siba Pani and he failed to say if disciplinary proceeding was initiated against them except the second party or not. So, while taking into consideration the evidence as dvanced by the MW No.3, it is clear that only against the second party disciplinary proceeding was conducted. In addition to the above, admittedly, there is no material before the Court to see whether the management has ever lodged any complaint with the local police station against the workman for such alleged incidents and the evidence as adduced on behalf of the management give a clear picture that some of the employees who were claimed to be involved in the alleged incidents are still in service.

It is the settled principle of law that the charges in a departmental proceeding must be established by such evidence acting upon which a prudent person acting reasonably and with objectivity may arrive at a finding upholding the gravity of the charge against the delinquent. Mere conjecture or surmises cannot sustain the finding of guilt in departmental enquiry proceedings.

But, in view of such vital contradictions in statement of the witnesses and in view of the fact that no FIR was lodged in the concerned police station although it is consistently claimed that the delinquent misbehaved a lady officer and threatened to lift a higher official of the management, a reasonable suspicion can be safely drawn with regard to the alleged incidents on the 8th February 2016 and the 9th February 2016 and there is absolutely no convincing material before this Court to sustain the alleged charges against the second party.

At this stage, it is worthwhile to place reliance in the decision of the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of *Union of India v. H.C. Goel* (AIR 1964 SC 364 = 1964 [4] SCR 718 = 1964-I-LLJ-38 {SC}) wherein it is held that in punishing the guilty, scrupulous care must be taken to see that the innocent is not punished, applies as much as to regular criminal trials as to disciplinary enquiries. It may be held that the technical rules which govern criminal trials in Courts may not necessarily apply to disciplinary proceedings, but nevertheless, the principle that in punishing the guilty scrupulous, care must be taken to see that the innocent are not punished.

On a close scrutiny of the evidence led in the present case, it is found that there is no solid & material evidence to hold the charges as sustainable against the second party. In the result, the action of management in dismissing/discharging the second party workman from service is found to be illegal and unjustified.

10. *Issue No. (iv)*—In view of the findings on issue No. (III), the next question that falls for determination is as to what relief the workman is entitled to ? Since the action of the management as has been already held to be illegal and unjustified, then an order of reinstatement with full back wages in favour of the second party should be the proper relief. But, the second party during his evidence at Para. 4 categorically submitted after sitting idle for almost two years after his termination

on the hoping for his reinstatement in service, he had to do some work intermittently only to sustain his livelihood, so also his family. In alternatively, it may be stated here that the management has failed to prove that the workman is now doing a better job than his previous job. The learned counsel for the second party has submitted during argument that the second party is now doing a temporary job only to maintain his livelihood. In the present premises, this Court after considering the present age of the second party, the prayer made in his claim for his reinstatement so also the sporadic nature of work now performed by him as presumed, this Court is of the humble opinion that the relief of reinstatement would be just & appropriate to be awarded in favour of the second party and instead of full back wages, a lump sum compensation would be the just & proper relief in the present proceeding. Accordingly, the second party is entitled to be reinstated in service with lump sum amount of Rs. 2,00,000 (Rupees Two Lakh) only in lieu of back wages.

The managements are directed to reinstate the second party in service and to pay a lump sum amount of Rs. 2,00,000 (Rupees Two Lakh) only within a period of three months of the date of publication of the Award in the Official Gazette, failing which the second party is entitled to interest of 6% per annum till it is actually paid to him.

The application is disposed of accordingly.

Dictated and corrected by me.

APARNA MOHAPATRA
30-12-2023
Presiding Officer
Labour Court, Bhubaneswar

APARNA MOHAPATRA
30-12-2023
Presiding Officer
Labour Court, Bhubaneswar

[No. 1051—LESI-IR-ID-0012/2024-LESI.]

By order of the Governor
NITIRANJAN SEN
Additional Secretary to Government