I/627434/2025

Government of West Bengal
Labour Department, I. R. Branch
N. S. Building, 12th Floor, 1, K. S. Roy Road, Kolkata – 700001

No. Labr/ 406 /(LC-IR)/ 22023/7/2019 Date : 09/04/2025

ORDER

WHEREAS an industrial dispute existed between (1) M/s. Sembramky Environmental Management Private Limited, Belgachia "F" Road, Howrah, Pin – 7111105, (2) The Chairman, Mr. Ajodha Rama Reddy of M/s. Sembramky Environmental Management Private Limited, Ramky Group, Ramky Grandiose, Ramky Towers Complex, Gachibowli, Hyderabad, Pin – 500032 & (3) Formerly Known Renamed as M/s Medicare Environmental Management Private Limited, Belgachia "F" Road, Howrah, Pin – 7111105 and their workman Shri Bhaskor Mandal, Paschim Chakpara, Raja Nagar, Dagabagan, P.O. Bhattanagar, P.S. Liluah, Dist. Howrah, Pin - 711214, regarding the issues, being a matter specified in the second schedule of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947);

AND WHEREAS the 2nd Labour Court, Kolkata has submitted to the State Government its Award dated 18.03.2025 in Case No. 9/14 on the said Industrial Dispute Vide e-mail dated 21.03.2025 in compliance of u/s 10(2A) of the I.D. Act, 1947.

NOW, THEREFORE, in pursuance of the provisions of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Governor is pleased hereby to publish the said Award in the Labour Department's official website i.e ***wblabour .gov.in***

By order of the Governor,

Assistant Secretary
to the Government of West Bengal

No. Labr/ 406 /1(7)/(LC-IR)/ 22023/7/2019 Date : 09/04/2025

Copy forwarded for information and necessary action to :-

1. M/s. Sembramky Environmental Management Private Limited, Belgachia "F" Road, Howrah, Pin – 7111105.
2. The Chairman, Mr. Ajodha Rama Reddy of M/s. Sembramky Environmental Management Private Limited, Ramky Group, Ramky Grandiose, Ramky Towers Complex, Gachibowli, Hyderabad, Pin – 500032.
3. Formerly Known Renamed as M/s Medicare Environmental Management Private Limited, Belgachia "F" Road, Howrah, Pin – 7111105.
4. Shri Bhaskor Mandal, Paschim Chakpara, Raja Nagar, Dagabagan, P.O. Bhattanagar, P.S. Liluah, Dist. Howrah, Pin – 711214.
5. The Asstt. Labour Commissioner, W.B. In-Charge, Labour Gazette.
6. The Labour Commissioner, W.B., New Secretariat Building, 11th Floor, 1, Kiran Sankar Roy Road, Kolkata – 700001.
7. The Deputy Secretary, IT Cell, Labour Department, with the request to cast the Award in the Department's website.

Assistant Secretary
to the Government of West Bengal

No. Labr/ 406 /2(3)/(LC-IR)/ 22023/7/2019 Date : 09/04/2025

Copy forwarded for information to :-

1. The Judge, 2nd Labour Court, N. S. Building, 1, K.S. Roy Road, Kolkata - 700001 with respect to her e-mail dated 21.03.2025.
2. The Joint Labour Commissioner (Statistics), West Bengal, 6, Church Lane, Kolkata - 700001.
3. Office Copy.

Assistant Secretary
to the Government of West Bengal

THE SECOND LABOUR COURT, KOLKATA

IN THE MATTER OF

Application No.9/14 Under Section 2A(2) Industrial Dispute Act,1947

ON

REFERENCE OF DISPUTE BY INDIVIDUAL WORKMAN

==========

1. **SHRI BHASKOR MANDAL, PASCHIM CHAKPARA, RAJA NAGAR, DAGABAGAN, P.O. BHATTANAGAR, P.S. LILUAH , DIST; HOWRAH PIN 711214**

VERSUS

01. **M/S. SEMBRAMKY ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PRIVATE LIMITED, BELGACHIA "F" ROAD , HOWRAH , PIN CODE-711105.**
02. **THE CHAIRMAN , MR. AJODHA RAMA REDDY OF M/S SEMBRAMKY ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PRIVATE LIMITED, RAMKY GROUP , RAMKY GRANDIOSE, RAMKY TOWERS COMPLEX, GACHIBOWLI, HYDERABAD, PIN -500032.**
03. **FORMERLY KNOWN RENAMED AS M/S MEDICARE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PRIVATE LIMITED, BELGACHIA "F" ROAD , HOWRAH , PIN CODE-711105.**

==========

==========

Appearance

MR/~~MRS~~ **Asit Banerjee,** , LD Advocate for the Applicant.

MR/~~MRS~~ **Praswan Das, Koushik Bhattacharya,**.LD Advocate for the Opposite party

REFERENCE	Dispute raised by individual workman within the meaning of Section 2A(2) ,as applicable to the State of West Bengal .
POWER OF THIS COURT TO ENTERTAIN THE CAUSE IN HAND	Section 7 of Industrial Dispute Act,1947 Read with Entries under 2nd Schedule to the Industrial Dispute Act AND DEPT Notfno. 101-IR/12L-14/11dated 2nd February 2012 in Partial modification of Dept Notf no1085- IR dated 25-07-1997
PROCEDURE ADOPTED IN DEALING WITH THE CASE	**Karnataka state Road Corporation** **Vs** **SmtLakshidevamma and another (2001)5 SCC 433** *Locus cassisus*on the point that strict rules of evidence and procedure shall not govern the proceedings under the Industrial Dispute Act,1947.
BINDING NATURE OF AWARD	Dispute being raised individually, shall only bind the parties herein**(Section 18 of the Industrial Dispute Act)**
COMPLAINCES	Copies of award be submitted to appropriate government for publication.**(Section 15** of the**Industrial Dispute Act)** .

SECOND LABOUR COURT GOVT. OF WEST BENGAL

PRESENT: MISS SREEJITA CHATTERJEE

JO CODE ; WB0001252

DATE OF AWARD :18 .03.2025

1) The truth of differences that arise in industrial establishments, justify themselves to an attempt to resolve the differences between the partiesand in the process, steps are taken to do away finally with questionings because they are so often declared insoluble by primary attempts of conciliation that they can be only be dissolved by applications to industrial adjudicators.

   This is one such application for resolution of dispute u/s 2A(2) of the Industrial Dispute Act 1947 .

2) The basic precints of legal prudence in industrial differences, in its broadest connotion and it seems, inevitable and ultimate parameters ,manifests itself in the idea that search for truth in such cases must be decided strictly on the anvil of points of differences.

The prayer of the applicant/ workman in his written statement runs as follows;-

"Your petitioner employee, therefore , most humbly prays that your Honour will be graciously pleased to hold that the termination of service by way of refusal of employment of the aforesaid employee applicant , is unjustified , uncalled for illegal as well as violation of principle of labour laws and for which the workman applicant is entitled to reinstatement in his service with full back wages and other consequential benefits and /or relief or reliefs as admissible under the law and your Honour may be graciously pleased to direct the employee opposite party to reinstate the workman in his service with full back wages/ salary and other consequential benefits considering the above averments and pass an order or orders as your Honour may deem fit and proper"

The premise pronounces upon itself decision on the following ; -

a) That the termination of workman from service in the form of refusal was illegal ,
b) Reinstatement of the workman in consequence thereof along with backwages,
c) Decleration of illegal retrenchment and awarding compensation in consequence, as consequential benefits .

3)FACTS OF THE CASE AND EVIDENCES ON BEHALF OF THE PARTIES

The facts of this caseby the applicant germane to this isuuein brief is that applicant is a workmen in the roll of the company (under Companies's Act 1956) continuously and since a long time. He was initially appointed as a *'picker'*. His monthly salary was subsequently enhanced once his service was confirmed .

It is averred that the West Bengal Shop and Establishment Act of 1965 demands mandatory provisions of compliance for hire and fire in such companies .However ,the present applicant was suddenly fired leading to cessation of work, without adherence to such rules. He was not allowed to join his service and he had none to redress the grievance.

Finding no other Alternate, the applicant made written representation to the Opposite Party vide registered letter dated 21/10/14,in the form of" **Demand of Justice"** but it fell in deaf ears.

This prompted him to invoke conciliation machinery by the intervention of LabourDirectorate, Government of West Bengal. On failure of conciliation, in terms of section 2A , the present application was filed on expiry ofperiod of 45 days from such reference.

It is the plea of the applicant that the company has not awarded any opportunity to the applicant to present his case either in the form of domestic enquiry (preceeded by a chargesheet) or otherwise, in form of a show cause notice .The act of refusal of employment has led to determination of his continuous services . The provisions of the retrenchment under Section 25F of the Industrial Disputes Act,1947 ,have not been complied .

Hence he prays for;-

1) *Reinstatement in service with full back wages*
2) *Consequential benefits*

4)PerContraOP NO1 repudiated the above averments on the count that the reference is not maintainable and suffers from infirmity of law.

The OP deny and deprecate all the above averments of applicant .

It is the specific intention that they dispute the status of applicant as a workman .

It is averred that theapplicant was transferred from Howrah to another unit which he declined to comply. Present application in the form of reinstatement is to shield such transfers which is not subject to Section 2A.

It is their further plea that due to the assault by the applicant upon one of the representatives of employer in a process of conciliation ,the company, instituted a criminal action being Sessions case (ST 58 of 2015)(preferred to District and Sessions Judge Howarh) under Sections 144, 307, 325, 341,506,34 IPC.

The illegal activities which are subject of such criminal cases also the subject of the present case against the applicant which prompted a departmental enquiry where they were found guilty and transferred.

Thus the applicant was duly chargesheeted and there was nothing illegalfrom the end of the opposite party. There was no termination but a transfer of applicant which they were reluctant and rest matters are concocted story.

Thus this application deserves dismissal.

5) DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE FOR THE APPLICANT

Sl. No.	Nature Of Documents	Document's Date	EXHIBIT NO.	Date of exhibit
1.	Photocopy of Identity card of Bhaskor Mandal.		01	01.10.2018
2.	Photocopy of E.S.I.Card of Bhaskor Mandal.		02	01.10.2018
3.	Photocopy of Voter 's Card of Bhaskor Mandal.	05.03.2009	03	01.10.2018
4.	Photocopy of PAN Card Bhaskor Mandal.		04	01.10.2018
5.	Photocopy of Salary Certificate of BhaskorMandal.for the month of September,2007.		05	01.10.2018
6.	Photocopy of Pay Slip of Bhaskor Mandal for the month of May, 2008.		06	01.10.2018
7.	Photocopy of Pay Slip of BhaskorMandal.for the month of April, 2013 and May, 2013.		06/1	01.10.2018
8.	Photocopies of Incremental Letters of Bhaskor Mandal.(in eight pages)	11.08.2008 29.09.2009 06.10.2010 01.10.2012	07 (Series)	01.10.2018
9.	Photocopy of P.F. Slip of Bhaskor Mandal. for the year 2009-2010		08	01.10.2018
10.	Photocopy of P.F. Statement of Bhaskor Mandal.in three pages		08/1 (collectively)	01.10.2018
11.	Photocopy of Salary Statement of Bhaskor Mandal for the Period 01-04-2013 to 28-03-2014 in two pages		09	01.10.2018
12.	Photocopy of letter given to Mr.(Dr.) Rana Sinha by Bhaskor Mandal.	20-10-2011	10	01.10.2018
13.	Photocopy of letter of Undertaking in four pages	17.06.2013	11	01.10.2018
14.	Photocopy of letter written to the Deputy General (two pages)	11.06.2013	12	01.10.2018
15.	Photocopy of letter written to Plant Manager (two pages)	17.06.2013	13	01.10.2018
16.	Photocopy of another letter written to the Plant Manager (two pages)	29.06.2013	13/1	01.10.2018
17.	Photocopy of notice issued by the Company .	17.06.2013	14	01.10.2018
18.	Photocopy of letter given to DGM, HRD by the employees.	20.06.2013	14	01.10.2018
19.	Photocopy of letters dated 22-06-2018 and 25-06-2028 given to DGM, HRD (3 pages)	22.06.2013 25.06.2013	15	01.10.2018

ORAL EVIDENCE FORTHEAPPLICANT

1 : P. W. 1 : Shri Bhaskor Mandal ---- APPLICANT

FOR THE OPW-NOT TENDERED

The OP has not tendered any evidence but has substantially cross examined the applicant. Hence the case cannot be strictly said to have proceeded on exparte board.

6)The gist of points of difference framed in the form of issues runs as follows;-

1. Whether this case u/s 2A of Industrial Disputes act is maintainable in its present form and in law?
2. Whether a letter directing the application " Cessation of work " w.e.f. July 06, 2013 was issued by the management of the O.P. company ?
3. Whether the applicant was transferred from Howrah unit to another unit through transfer order issued by the management of the company?
4. Is the applicant entitled to get any relief as prayed for?
5. To what other relief or reliefs the applicant is entitled to get?

This is offered to the court in the form of;-

a) A decision on whether the applicant is workman within the meaning of Industrial Disputes Act 1947.
b) A finding on maintanibility of the present application of non compliance of order of transfer in the garb of alleged " cessation of work "
c) Consequent entitlement and relief.

7) At the outset, Whether the applicant is a workman is subject of decision ?
Exhibit 1,2,3,4,9 suggest that the applicant was under the employment of the company since 2006 till 2013.
It is found from the written statement that it is averred by the opposite party that the applicant is not workman though nothing is suggested as to why he is not so included.

The perusal of exhibits suggest thatapplicant washolding ESI card, PF card, salary slips which reflects his status as'picker' for the company. It is not case of the company that they are not company within the meaning of Companies Actor that they are not covered by the definition of employer within the meaning of this Act,so as to shield them from the applicability of the Industrial Dispute Act 1947. If it is not so, employee is an workman unless invested with supervisory or managerial functions, which appears none in the present case. **The averment appears to be more facile in its appeal, leading to a perilous refusal of the essence for which the benefit to workmen exist. This is not intention of legistlature or the interpretation of statute by Honbl Courts.**

Hence the applicant is a workman within the meaning of the Industrail Disputes Act 1947.

8) Issue no 1,2,3 are taken up for discussion.

Section 2A expiates;-

Dismissal, etc., of an individual workman to be deemed to be an Industrial dispute ---

(I) Where any employer discharges, dismisses, retrenches or otherwise terminates the services of an individual workman, any dispute or difference between that workman and his employer connected with, or arising out of such discharge, dismissal, retrenchment or termination shall be deemed to be an industrial dispute notwithstanding that no otherworkmen nor any union of workmen is a party to the dispute.

(2)Notwithstanding anything contained in section IO any such workman as is specified in sub-section (I) 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 has made the application to the conciliation officer of the appropriate Government for conciliation of the dispute,andon receipt of such application the Labour court or Tribunal shall have powers and jurisdiction to adjudicate upon the dispute, as 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.

3) The application referred to in sub-section (2) shall be made to the Labour Court or Tribunal before the expiryof three years from the date of discharge, dismissal, retrenchment or otherwise termination of service as specified in sub-section (1)."

It appears from the examination of the above that there are following lines of interpretation on this point of applicability of the Section :-

a) Employer discharges, dismisses, retrenches or otherwise terminates the services of an individual workman,
b) There is a dispute or difference between that workman and his employer connected with, or arising out of such discharge, dismissal, retrenchment or termination
c) Such dispute shall be deemed to an industrial dispute in the form of individual dispute and valid even if it is not espoused validly by any union or raised collectively.

It is not therefore correct to say that the reference of an individual dispute seeking to redress refusal in the form of termination is per se not maintainable.

Now whether there is actually any dispute in the form and resulting from illegal refusal or termination is subject of consideration?

At the outset, It appears from the written statement followed by the workmen's affidavit in chief and other documents that he has complied with the basic ingredients of Section 2A in respect of time frames of institution as prescribed under the Section.

Turning to the case, the anvil ofdifference between the party is dismissal from service in the form of refusal of employment.

The burden of proof of facts leading to inference of a case is always upon the applicant even if proved otherwise..

In UP **State Warehousing Corporation and Another VS Presiding officer and Another 2013, ILR 927** , it was observed ;-

> "It **is a settled law that the person who files a claim is required to prove his case.** The industrial dispute was raised at the instance of the union and even though, the provisions of the Evidence Act is not applicable in the industrial proceedings, none the less, the burden of proof is upon the union and its workers to prove their claim before the labour court"
>
> (Emphasis mine)

Whether the burden has been discharged is a subject of the present discussion

It seems from the facts that there were 5 employees who have faced the similar consequence of termination by way of refusal. Each of them have filed separate cases and one of such employee is the applicant of the instanct case.

An act of dismissal or refusal must be shown either by direct evidence or to be inferred from circumstances in absence of such direct evidence. An act of refusal may be direct if supported by letters or inferred from circumstances where it depends upon the facts of the case.

The facts of the present case are peculiar in the sense that there was not a single document in the form of chargesheet, domestic enquiry or otherwise by company against the employee which would suggest a termination or refusal. There is neither any document of refusal of employment by way of letter to the applicant. But interestingly, Exhibits 11 to 15 suggest a dispute between the management and the company and its workman regarding enhancement of salary for a sum of ₹ 1500, which employees have been pressing for since a long time. There are no salary slips and evidence of employment in the OP company after the month of May 2013. So the applicant was not in job thereafter.

The company has not contested the case to the hilt. It has only cross-examined one the witness of applicant and left thereafter. Hence there is no evidence from the end of the company.

These are the matters before this court from which this court is to infer refusal.

Given the present facts, it is difficult to show and suggest refusal by direct evidence. It is because there is not a single document in the record , on the point of such refusal. Hence it is to be inferred from the circumstance.

Exhibits 10 to 15 depicts a discord between the employees and the management, which is an inference of a motive of strained relationship which in general experience prompts the management to takes stern action against employees. This is followed by alleged act of assault upon the member of employer and criminal cases against applicant . In absence of direct evidence, these are the circumstances of the case, which cannot be overlooked to suggest a motive for refusal of employment .

A charge sheet in sessions trial case was filed against the applicant. The charges appear to be assault by the group of employees of one Victor Dasgupta, in a meeting of conciliation summoned by Deputy LabourCommissioner . It has also appeared from the documents on record that they were aquitted from the case

There is no charge sheet preceeding a domestic enquiryby the company apart from a chargesheet before the sessions judge. No alleged order of transfer of the applicant is on record. These facts suggest that there was neither any domestic enquiry nor any alleged transfer has been subject of discord.

Weighed in the balance of the probabilities, it seems that the alleged protest activities undertaken by the applicant's and his associates has been a cause of discomfort which goes without much barren contradictions that such alleged act of alleged assault upon the arepresentative of the employer side is not supposed to be attended with comfort by the employer.

All these can be taken to suggest an inference of refusal of employment by conduct and restraint of the employees to join the service. If at this stage a protest is raised that no independent occular witness has been furthered by the applicant to tender the story of implied refusal, it is not difficult to infer a comparatively weaker position of the employees , in front of the employer .Circumstances of this order leave employees at mercy of employer who has 'dominion' over the employees.Theydonot show guts to appear and depose in favour of fellow colllegues lest they shall invite similar consequences .

These circumstances suggest a motive of the refusal of employment and termination of service.

Conversely,the plea of op in their written statement that the company neither terminated nor refused the applicants to join service and that the service was not terminated by any letter from the end of the company and it is not true that they did not allow them to join their services cannot be countenanced in view of the following. It is found that though the company has submitted that they have neither terminated nor refused,the company did not submit whether the petitioners have been working still now . There is no suggestion or evidence from the OP either that the applicant has voluntarily abandoned their service. As they were neither terminated nor refused ,nor they have abandoned , this suggests the false plea by the OP company.Thus the OP company refused employment to them and stopped their employment. The plea of the applicant goes unrebutted.

Hence the above discussions indubitably rest the above issues in favour of the applicant.

9) <u>Relief</u>

<u>REINSTATEMENT;</u> The inference suggested by the above discussions leads to a conclusion that the plausible course would be the reinstatement of the applicants to the post . The evidence in record suggest that applicant is presently about 45 years old and thus such reinstatment is feasible .

BACK WAGES :In terms of the law on the subject, it seems that the determining factor for such award of back wages are multifarious ranging from the post held by the employee, special qualifications required in the job, the age and qualification possessed by him , the fact that he may not be in position to get another employment, his length of service, nature of employment-temporary or permanent, followed by his wrongful termination. These factors are weighed and balanced in arriving at the just decision of the quantum of back wages.

In terms of the burden of proof of being gainfully employed elsewhere during the course of proceeding, earlier it was insisted that the employer must plead and prove the same.

It is now well settled, though, having regard to Section 109 of Bharatiya Sakshi Adhiniyam 2023 (corresponding to Section 106 of Indian Evidence Act, 1872), such a plea must be raised by the applicant in the written statement at least. This initial burden in upon him.

Upon discharge thereof, the employee can bring materials on record to rebut the claim. **While the employee cannot be asked to prove the negative, he has to at least assert on oath that he was not gainfully employed or engaged in any business or venture and that he didn't have any income.** Further, the misconception of continuity of service and full consequential benefits on reinstatement has been done away with and judicial mind is applied to decide on this aspect.These results are deducible from thedecisions***General Manager, Haryana Roadways VS Rudhan Singh AIR 2005 SUPREME COURT 3966 , Deepali Gundu Surwase VS Kranti Junior Adhyapak ..., Hindustan Tin Works Private Limited VS Employees of Hindustan Tin Works Private Limited AIR 1979, SC 75, UP State Brassware Corporation Ltd VS Udai Narain Pandey 2006 (1) SCC 479 , Kendriya Vidyalaya Sangathan VS S.C Sharma 2005 (2) SCC 363.***

NOW TO THE FACTS. There is nothing in the written statement of the applicant or his evidence to suggest an averment that applicant was not gainfully employed

Nowhere in the written statement he has pleaded that he was out of employment since his termination. Nowhere in his evidence it has appeared that he was unemployed after termination

In view of the fact that it is neither pleaded nor proved that he was out of employment for all these years, this court, having regard to the facts herein and his tenure of employment, this court is inclined to award a back wage of 50 % from the termination.

RETRENCHMENT ; Whether the has been retrenchment is the subject of the present discussion ?

Section 2 (OO) of the Act expands the definition of retrenchment as "termination... for any reason whatsoever " . Retrenchment means the termination by employer service for any reason whatsoever, otherwise than as a punishment in the form of disciplinary action. Thus in terms of above expression, all termination are covered by retrenchment except those covered by the exceptions to **Section 2(OO)**.

Every terminations spells a retrenchment. Retrenchment means to cut down .There cannot be any retrenchment without a trenchment**. Hon'ble Justice Krishna Iyer in State Bank Of India Vs N. Sundaramoney** 1976 SC 933.

Termination takes place where the term expires either by active step of the master or by running out of the stipulated period. It means to conclude and cease.

Some act by the employerisnecesssaryin order to bring about termination is essential to attract section 25 F and automatic extinguishing service is not sufficient.

The applicant has pleaded in the written statement that he is employed for more than 240 days continuously and without any interruption and we have been working for more than 5 years with this company. This fact has not been denied by the opposite party .Hence applicant is not required to prove 240 days of service prior to the termination, in terms of Section 25B of the Act as there is no evidence of interruption . The applicant has been in continuous service for more than 5 yaers without interruption .It appears that they have been working continuously without such interruption for such time .This demands that the OP company should have followed the procedures before termination and refusal of employment which were not done . This attracts provisions of *Unfair Labour Practice* under *Section 25T*. Be it mentioned in this regard that section 25 T is a penal provision carrying a punishment which this present, in seisin of a civil matter, is not empowered to invoke. But this court is free to afford compensation for such unfair labour practice. Hence this court is inclined to award a compensation of Rs 50,000/- .

The cause of the applicant is thus upheld.

IT IS ORDERED

The application under Section 2A(2) of the Industrial Dispute Act 1947 be and the same is

HEREBY ALLOWED On contest against the OP Compny with a cost and compensation of Rs 50,000/-.

The OPPOSITE PARTY was not justified in terminating the applicant. The applicant is hereby entitled to reinstatement at the same status.

The applicant is entitled to receive 50% back wages from date of termination till the actual reinstatement with all consequential benefits.

OP is directed to make payment and comply the award, lest the applicant shall be free to take legal recourse.

Let necessary compliances be made in terms of service of the copies to concerned Government authorities in terms of Section 17AA of the Industrial Dispute Act ,1947.

The case is hereby disposed off.

Note in the relevant register.

TYPED BY

(SREEJITA CHATTERJEE)
JUDGE

Judge
Second Labour Court WB

18/03/25

(SREEJITA CHATTERJEE)
JUDGE
SECOND LABOUR COURT,
KOLKATA
18.03.2025

Judge
Second Labour Court WB

SECOND LABOUR COURT OF WEST BENGAL