CENTRA AUM TELSTRATIVE TRIPUNAL LANGALOGE BENCH

Second Floor, Commercial Complex, Indirenagar, BAHGALORE- 560 038.

Dated: 13 DEC 1994

APPLICATION NO: 997 of 1994.

APPLICANTS:- Sri.A. Jaganuath V/S.

RESPONDENTS:- Secretary, Ministry of Labour, NDellis and others.

 $T \bullet$

- 1. Sri.M.S.Anandaramu, Advocate, No. 27, Chandrashekar Complex, Gandhinagar, First Main Road, First Floor, Bangalore-560 009.
- 2. Sri.M. Vasudeva Rao, Addl.C.G.S.C., High Court Bldg, Bangalore-1.

Subject:- Forwarding of copies of the Order passed by the Central Administrative Tribunal, Rangalere.

Please find enclosed herewith a copy of the ORDER/STAY ORDER/INTERIM ORDER/ passed by this Tribunal in the above mentioned application(s) on 28-11-1994.

Issued on 18/12/94

DEPUTY REGISTRAR
JUDICIAL BRANCHES.

gm*

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, BANGALORE BENCH.

DRIGINAL APPLICATION NO. 997/ 1994

MONDAY, THE 28TH DAY OF NOVEMBER, 1994

SHRI V. RAMAKRISHNAN ... MEMBER (A)

SHRI A.N. VUJJANARADHYA ... MEMBER (J)

Shri A. Jagannath, S/o Shri A. Krishnaiah, aged about 26 years and was working as a Casual Labourer, N.D.R.I., Adugodi, Hosur Road, Bangalore, & residing at C/o Shri Nagraj, No.11, Koramangala Cross Road, Bangalore - 30.

Applicant

(By Advocate Shri M.S. Anandaramu)

Vs.

- 1. The Union of India, represented by its Secretary, Ministry of Labour, New Delhi.
- Management of National Dairy Research Institute, represented by its Head, Adugodi, Bangalore - 30.
- Desk Officer, Covernment of India, Ministry of Labour, Shramantralaya, New Delhi.

Respondents

(By Advocate Shri M. Vasudeva Rao, Addl. Central Govt. Standing Counsel)

DRDER

Shri V. Ramakrishnan, Member (A)

The applicant herein is aggrieved by the order of Ministry of Labour dated 21.4.94 as at Annexure A-1 where the Central Government had rejected the request for reference for adjudication by a labour court on the following ground:



....2/-

- " The Dispute has been raised belatedly, i.e. after a lapse of more than 5 years of the cause of action without giving any reasons justifying the delay".
- We have heard Shri M.S. Anandaramu for the applicant and 2. Shri M.V. Rao for the respondents.
- Shri Anandaramu submits that the Labour Ministry was in 3. error in refusing to refer this dispute to a Labour Court only on the ground of delay. He draws our attention to the decision of Karnataka High Court in a writ petition No. 5401/94 disposed of on 28.2.94 in the case of Smt. J. Sudha vs. State of Karnataka where the High Court had held that rejection on the ground of delay is unsustainable as it is a matter to be decided by the adjudicating authority and not the Grow to Consoler the greated by Government. The High Court had further directed for reference of ${\cal F}$ Mit And. industrial adjudication to be disposed of within one month. Anandaramu submits that it is a clear case of industrial dispute and such refusal to refer it to a labour court only on the ground of delay is unsustainable. He also refers to Section 10 (1) (c) of the Indus-
 - In the facts and circumstances of the case, we quash the endorsement dated 21.4.94 as at Annexure A-1 and direct the respondents to consider the grievances of the applicant and to dispose of the same in accordance with the provisions of law within two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order instead of rejecting it on the sole ground of delay in making the request.

Sd-

(A YHDARANA CEUV . N. A) MEMBER (J)

trial Disputes Act.

(V. RAMAKRISHNAN) MEMBER (A)

Central Administralia Bangalore Ban**ch**

Gangalor

.