



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 23RD DAY OF APRIL, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANANT RAMANATH HEGDE

WRIT PETITION NO. 6457 OF 2024 (L-RES)

C/W

WRIT PETITION NO. 6856 OF 2024 (L-RES)

IN WP No. 6457/2024:

BETWEEN:

THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REPRESENTED BY THE
DEPUTY CONSERVATOR OF FOREST,
DEPARTMENT OF FOREST,
SOCIAL FOREST REGION,
KANAKAPURA,
RAMANAGARA DISTRICT.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. M. RAJAKUMAR, AGA)

AND:

SHIVARAJU S/O. MARAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 50 YEARS,
R/O. MARASANDRA VILLAGE,
HAROHALLI HOBLI AND POST,
KANAKAPURA TALUK,
RAMANAGARA DISTRICT-561 101.

...RESPONDENT

(BY SRI. SOMASHEKARA REDDY K.V., ADVOCATE)

THIS W.P. IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF
THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER PASSED BY THE PRINCIPAL DISTRICT AND SESSIONS
JUDGE, RAMANAGARA DATED 29.02.2020 IN I.D.NO.2/2016
ANNEXURE-A.





NC: 2026:KHC:22180
WP No. 6457 of 2024
C/W WP No. 6856 of 2024

IN WP NO. 6856/2024:

BETWEEN:

THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY THE DEPUTY CONSERVATOR OF FOREST,
DEPARTMENT OF FOREST,
SOCIAL FOREST REGION,
KANAKAPURA,
RAMANAGARA DISTRICT.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. M. RAJAKUMAR, AGA)

AND:

1. M.C. SRINIVASIAH
S/O. LATE CHANNAGIRIYIAIAH,
MAJOR,
R/AT MARASANDRA VILLAGE,
HAROHALLI HOBLI AND POST,
KANAKAPURA TALUK,
RAMANAGARA DISTRICT.

2. CHANNAVEERAPPA D.E.
S/O. LATE VEERAPPA,
R/O. DUNTHURU VILLAGE,
KAADAHALLI POST,
SATHANURU HOBLI,
KANAKAPURA TALUK,
RAMANAGARA DISTRICT.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. SOMASHEKARA REDDY K.V., ADVOCATE
FOR R1 AND R2)

THIS W.P. IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF
THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER DATED 29.2.2020 IN ID NO.4 OF 2016 PASSED BY
THE PRINCIPAL DISTRICT AND SESSIONS JUDGE,
RAMANAGARA, VIDE ANNEXURE-A.



THESE PETITIONS, COMING ON FOR ORDERS, THIS DAY,
ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANANT RAMANATH HEGDE

ORAL ORDER

The petition in W.P.No.6457/2024 is filed assailing the award dated 29.02.2020 in I.D.No.2/2016 and the petition in W.P.No.6856/2024 is filed assailing the award dated 29.02.2020 on the file of Principal District Judge, Ramanagar [for short, '*the Labour Court*'].

2. In terms of the said award, the Labour Court has directed the petitioner - department before this Court to reinstate the first party - workmen to their original position and also directed payment of back wages from 01.04.2007 to 31.03.2008 at the rate of Rs.2,465/- per month along with all the terminal benefits including 50% of back wages from 01.04.2008 till their reinstatement.

3. It is submitted that the award of the Labour Court was stayed by this Court and before they were



reinstated, the respondents - workmen [Sri Sri Shivaraju and Sri.M.C.Srinivasaiah] attained the age of superannuation in 2024 and Sri Channaveerappa D.E. is still working.

4. Learned Additional Government Advocate would submit that, the award challenging reinstatement is not pressed as two of the workmen have attained superannuation and one workman is reinstated. It is further submitted that the amount payable under the award is also paid.

5. Learned counsel for the respondents would submit that, entire amount payable is not yet paid.

6. Learned Government Advocate would submit that, the proceeding under Sections 33C(1) and 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 [for short, '*ID Act*'] is pending consideration before the jurisdictional Court on the premise that the award is not yet complied. Since the respondents - workmen [Sri.Shivaraju and



Sri.M.C.Srinivasaiah] have attained the age of superannuation, there is no question of reinstatement and there is no violation.

7. The question is, "whether the respondents - workmen [Sri Shivaraju and Sri M.C.Srinivasaiah] are entitled to receive any sum in addition what is said to have been paid to these respondents?"

8. Learned Government Advocate would submit that, Rs.1,33,775/- to Sri M.C.Srinivasaiah and Rs.2,66,786/- to Sri Shivaraju is paid.

9. Learned counsel for the respondents would submit that, said payment is not in compliance with the award.

10. Sri Channaveerappa D.E. is reinstated and he is still working. There is no question of initiating prosecution for not reinstating Channaveerappa D.E. However, in case if any amount is due to the respondents, the respondents



are at liberty to initiate proceeding to recover the same under Section 33-C (1) of the ID Act. Under these circumstances, the pending criminal proceedings against the officers of the petitioner shall be dropped.

11. The adjudication under Section 33C(1) of the ID Act can take place on an application filed by the respondents to ascertain as to whether the amount payable pursuant to the award is paid or not.

12. In case it is found on adjudication in a proceeding under Section 33C(1) of the ID Act that the amount is not paid, then there shall be appropriate order to recover the amount and the respondents in such a situation are also entitled to initiate action under Section 29 of the ID Act.

13. On production of the copy of this order the Labour Court shall drop the criminal proceeding against the officers of the petitioner. If the respondents claim that



NC: 2026:KHC:22180
WP No. 6457 of 2024
C/W WP No. 6856 of 2024

the amount is yet to be paid, same shall be adjudicated under Section 33C(1) of the ID Act as indicated above.

14. With these observations, writ petitions are ***disposed of.***

Sd/-
(ANANT RAMANATH HEGDE)
JUDGE

SA
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 20