

BEFORE THE JUDGE, LABOUR COURT-2 AT AURANGABAD

(Presided over by Shri. S. S. Sahasrabudhe)

Complaint (I.T.) No.05/2022
in Ref.IDA NO.113/2017

CNR NO.MHLC200002492022

01. Narayan Wamanrao Ghule,
Age : 50 years, Occ. Nil,
R/o.N-9, K75/6 Pawan Nagar,
Cidco, Aurangabad.

**..Applicants/
Complainants**

**02. Indus Mobile Tower Technical Karmachari
Sanghatana (Through its President),
K-75/6, N-9, Pawan Nagar Cidco, Aurangabad.**

V/s.

**1. M/s. Indus Towers Ltd.,
(Through it's Manager),
E-core, 210, IInd Floor, Marvel Edge,
Viman Nagar, Pune-411 014.**

**02. M/s. Teamlease Services Pvt.Ltd.,
(Through it's Manager),
509, Nucleus Mall, Chourch Road Camp,
Opp.Police Commissioner Office,
Pune 411 001.**

**03. M/s. Magnum Environment Management Pvt. Ltd.,
(Through is Authorized Signatory)
1, Vaishali Nagar, Kotra Sultanabad,
Bhopal 462 003. (M.P.)**

... Respondents

Claim :- Application for interim relief in the matter of Complaint
U/s.33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Appearance :

Shri. B. R. Kawre, Advocate for Complainants
Shri. Y.I. Thole, Advocate for respondent no.1.
Shri. Gadekar, Advocate for respondent no.2.

.....
.....

Order below Exh.U-2

(Passed on this 02nd day of August, 2023)

1. This is an application in the matter of Complaint U/s.33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 against respondents for grant of interim relief. The applicants have prayed for directions to the respondents to pay the monthly wages and continue to pay till final disposal of the complaint. The case of applicants in short is as under :-

2. That the applicant is working since 2008 as a Technician with respondent no.1 but his services were not regularized. The name of applicant was enrolled on the roll of different name lending contractor. Therefore, he raised industrial dispute of regularization of services against respondents before this Court vide Ref.(IDA) No.113/2017. Applicants have submitted that, in the month of January, 2022 the respondent no.1 has introduced new Labour Contractor by terminating earlier Labour Contract unilaterally. The applicant and other employees were forced to sign employment papers of newly appointed contractor. The applicant is President of Union and in that capacity he required to appear on behalf of all workmen before competent authority to put the grievances. On this reason he become eye sour of respondent no.1. On 01.12.2017 the respondent has changed service condition of employees and enrolled the name of employees on the roll of respondent no.3. The Union as well as employees were threatened that they required to sign back dated

agreement with the respondent no.3 otherwise they will constrain to terminate their service. The complainant has objected the entry of respondent no.3 during pendency of dispute. Therefore, respondent no.1 targets the complainants. The Union and workmen were forced to sign the agreement giving retrospective effect. On 20.08.2020 the respondent no.1 has issued charge sheet and suspension order through respondent no.3 making false and frivolous allegation. Further on 02.09.2020 the respondent no.1 realized that they are committed certain blunder, therefore the corrigendum was issued by correcting earlier mistake. On 03.09.2020 detail reply to the said charge sheet was given.

3. Applicant submitted that, the respondent no.3 being agent of respondent no.1 has no authority to issue charge sheet or take action against the complainant, as there is no employer-employee relationship. The respondent no.1 through respondent no.3 conducted the enquiry in violation of principles of natural justice, without giving appropriate opportunity of hearing the enquiry was concluded. On 09.12.2021 the services of complainant are dismissed by respondent no.3 without authority. After issuance of dismissal order dated 09.12.2021 the complainant filed an application before Reg.Labour Commissioner for redressal of his grievance. But respondent no.1 has not co-operated. Therefore, the complainant has no alternative than to file present proceeding before this Court u/s.33 of the I.D.Act, 1947. The respondent no.1 should not change service conditions of the complainant during pendency of the instant industrial dispute, new agency or contractor is introduced at the place of respondent no.2.

Therefore, appropriate order is required to be passed against the respondent no.1 for attempting to interfere in the service conditions of the complainant workman and further criminal prosecution required to be launch against competent authority of respondent no.1. Hence, applicants have prayed for directions to the respondents to pay the monthly wages and continue to pay till final disposal of the complaint.

4. Respondent no.1 has opposed the application by filing say at Exh.C-4. Respondent no.1 contended that, the Central Govt. has referred Order dated 27.12.2017 of the appropriate Government, wherein present respondent no.3 M/s.Magnum Environment Management Pvt.Ltd., has not been shown as a party having industrial dispute. In Ref.IDA No.113/2017 M/s.Magnum Environment Management Pvt.Ltd., is not a party to the dispute. By bringing the present M/s.Magnum Environment Management Pvt.Ltd., as a party as respondent no.3 to the present complaint, the complainant is trying to enlarge the scope of reference, which is legally not permitted. The complaint appears to be filed on 16.07.2022, whereas the complainants alleged in the complaint that, services of complainant no.1 came to be allegedly dismissed w.e.f. 09.12.2021. The complaint is filed after about more than 7 months, therefore, the complaint is not maintainable. The complaint is not verified, which is mandatate under Rule 59(3) of I.D.Act (Central) Rules, 1957. The complaint u/s.33A of I.D.Act shall only be maintainable where it exists employer-employee relationship. In Ref.IDA NO.113/2017 respondent no.1 has denied employer-employee relationship ever exists between the

complainant no.1 and respondent no.1. In their statement of claim complainant no.1 has admitted that, the complainant no.1 was employee of respondent no.2, respondent no.2 used to pay the payment of wages to the complainant no.1. Hence, the respondent no.1 submits that, under the provisions of Section 33A of I.D.Act, the complaint is not maintainable. Respondent no.1 has denied all other averments made against them by complainant. Hence, prayed for dismissal of present application as well as complaint.

5. Respondent no.2 filed their say at Exh.C-6 and contended that, respondent no.2 M/s.Teamlease Services Ltd., is a company engaged in the business of Human Resource Outsourcing and deploying the manpower on fixed term contract to their vendor. Respondent no.2 admitted the relationship of respondent no.2 with complainant and respondent no.1 was contractual and that too for a specific period subject to terms and conditions of the contract, wherein it was specifically expressed that the said relationship was contractual in nature for a certain specific period. Respondent no.2 further submitted that, after respondent no.1 has terminated his services of respondent no.2 vide its letter dated 29.09.2017 from 30.09.2017, further improves/incident happened, mentioned in complaint are not concerned with it and not know to respondent no.2. The respondent no.2 is not in capacity to change any service condition in subject matter, hence could not be held responsible for the allegations. By denying all other averments made in the complaint against respondent no.2, they prayed for dismissal of application against them.

6. In view of rival contentions of the parties following points arises for my consideration, against which I have recorded my findings thereon as follows :-

	<u>Points</u>	<u>Findings</u>
1	Whether the complainant has made out a case for grant of interim relief ?	No
2	Whether the balance of convenience lies in favour of the complainant ?	No
3	Does complainant prove that, if interim relief is not granted he would suffer irreparable loss?	No
4	Whether complainant is entitled for interim relief as prayed for?	No
5	What order?	As per order

REASONS

AS TO POINTS NO.1 to 5 :-

7. Heard Ld.Counsel Shri. Kawre for complainant and Shri. Thole for respondent no.1 and Shri.Gadekar for respondent no.2.
8. The complainant is claiming that he is employee of respondent no.1. In spite of this fact, the respondent no.1 has enrolled his name on the roll of different lending contractors with intention to avoid permanency and regularization. The complainant and union has raised industrial dispute for regularization and same is pending for adjudication. So far as this contention of complainant in respect of pendency of lis is concerned, admittedly, the complainant has initiated proceeding for permanency through his union and same is pending before the Court. As per the complainant, during pendency of said proceeding i.e. Ref.IDA No.113/2017, the respondent no.1 is

trying to change service conditions of complainant. He introduced new Labour Contractor from January, 2022 by terminating his earlier contract. The complainant and other employees were insisted for signing employment papers of newly appointed contractor. As the complainant and other workmen have refused to do so, therefore, the complainant is not allowed to sign muster roll, so also to perform his regular work. Respondent no1 has not paid wages since 2022.

9. All these contentions raised by the complainant are denied by respondent no.1. The respondent no.1 has specifically submitted that, they have filed Written statement in Ref.IDA No.113/2017, wherein they have specifically denied employer-employee relationship. They further submitted that, the complainant has admitted that the respondent no.2 used to pay the payment of wages to the complainant, hence the present complaint is not maintainable in view of provisions of Section 33A of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

10. The complainant has filed this application as per section 33A of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. Section reads as follows :-

Conditions of service,etc. to remain unchanged under certain circumstances during pendency of proceedings.

a) in regard to any matter connected with dispute, alter, to the prejudice of the workmen concerned in such dispute, the conditions of service applicable to them immediately before the commencement of such proceedings;

11. On perusal of above referred provision it is clear that, by the said provision restrictions are imposed on employer from

changing the service conditions of his employee during pendency of the proceeding. It appears from the record that the present complainant has produced documents with list Exh.U-4. Respondent no.1 contended that, in the Written Statement filed by it in Ref.IDA No.113/2017 they have denied employer-employee relationship ever exists between the complainant no.1 and respondent no1. Respondent no.1 has seriously raised dispute in respect of his relationship with the present complainant. Certainly the said issue is yet to be decided by the Court, in which Reference bearing no.113/2017 is pending for adjudication. Considering this fact, as there is dispute in respect of relationship interim relief as sought cannot be granted.

12. So far as the question of change in service conditions are concerned, at least prima-facie there is no material on record from which it can be gathered that the respondent has changed the service conditions as submitted by the complainant. Therefore, considering this fact also interim relief cannot be granted.

13. Besides all these aspects, certainly if at all on merits the complainant succeed in proving that, the respondent no.1 and 2 have illegally changed his service conditions, in that regard the respondents would be punished, so also penalty can be imposed upon them, not only this directions can be issued to the respondents to reinstate the complainant with continuity of service and full back wages, in that event no loss, more particularly, financial loss which cannot be compensated in terms

of money, will be caused to the complainant. Considering this aspect also I came to the conclusion that, interim relief as sought cannot be granted. There is no prima-facie case lies in favour of complainant, so also the balance of convenience also does not lie in favour of complainant. Complainant will not suffer any irreparable loss if interim relief is rejected. Hence, I answer points no.1 to 4 in negative and in answer to point no.5 I proceed to pass following order :-

Order

1. Application stands rejected.

Place: Aurangabad
Date: 02/08/2023

[S. S. Sahasrabudhe]
Judge,
Labour Court-II, Aurangabad.

CERTIFICATE

I affirm that the contents of this PDF file judgment/order are same, word to word, as per the original judgment/order.

Name of Stenographer : G. M. Patil
Court : 2nd Labour Court, Aurangabad.
Date : 02.08.2023
order transcribed on : 02.08.2023
order uploaded on : 02.08.2023
GMP/-