

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

CIVIL APPEAL NO(s). 3951 OF 2002

STATE OF HARYANA & ORS.

Appellant (s)

VERSUS

BIKAR SINGH

Respondent(s)

(With office report)

Date: 22/03/2006 This Appeal was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.K. SEMA

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE AR. LAKSHMANAN

For Appellant(s)

Dr. Gagender S. Chauhan,Adv.

Mr. Harikesh Singh,Adv.

Mr.T.V.George,Adv.

For Respondent(s)

Mr. Naresh Kaushik,Adv.

Mr. Anjani Kumar Jha,Adv.

UPON hearing counsel the Court made the following

O R D E R

The appeal is allowed in terms of the signed order. The order of the Civil Court and the

High Court are hereby quashed and are set aside. The parties are asked to bear their own costs.

(Ganga Thakur)

(Anand Singh)

PS to Registrar

Court Master

Signed reportable order is placed on the file.

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA

CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CRIMINAL APPEAL NO. 3951 OF 2002

STATE OF HARYANA & ORS.
...APPELLANT(S)

Versus

BIKAR SINGH
...RESPONDENT (S)

O R D E R

Pursuant to our order dated 22.02.2006, Mr. Joginder Singh, General Manager,

Haryana Roadways, Sirsa Depot, Sirsa, Haryana has filed a detailed affidavit explaining the

circumstances and tendered an unqualified apology for any omission or commission said to have

been committed by the contemnor. We have gone through the affidavit and apology tendered by

the contemnor which is accepted. The suo motu contempt initiated against the contemnor is

discharged.

This appeal is filed by the State of Haryana against the order of the High Court of

Punjab & Haryana.

We have heard the parties.

In view of the order that we propose to pass, it may not be necessary to recite all facts leading

to the filing of the present appeal. The respondent herein was working as Conductor in the

Haryana Roadways, Sirsa Depot. He was dismissed from service by order dated 25.8.94 by the

General Manager of the Haryana Roadways. The order of dismissal is preceded by an enquiry

in which the charge was found established against him. The charge against the respondent was

that while he was working as Conductor in the Haryana Roadways Depot, he collected Rs .200/-

from the passenger but did not issue ticket and thereby embezzled Rs.200/-. Apart from that,

it is also in evidence on record that the respondent prior to the dismissal of his service, was

placed under suspension on several occasions and his annual increments were stopped.

Aggrieved by the order of dismissal, he preferred an appeal before the Additional Transport

Commissioner which was dismissed on 29.6.1995. Aggrieved thereby, the respondent filed civil

suit, namely, suit No.1361/95 before the Civil Judge, Sr. Division, Sirsa inter alia seeking a

decree of declaration that the respondent may be deemed to be in service and the orders dated

25.8.1994 and 28.6.1995 to be declared as null and void. The Trial Court framed as many as 7

issues. One of the important issue framed was issue No.6, whether the

Civil Court has got

jurisdiction to try the present suit. We are dismayed to note that no finding has been recorded on

this issue by the Trial Court. The Trial Court, however, proceeded to examine the case on

merits, without determining the jurisdiction of the court. It is now well established principle of

law that a decree without the jurisdiction is a nullity. Unfortunately, all the courts below

including the High Court has failed to notice this important question of law.

We repeatedly made query from the learned counsel for the respondent as to

whether the finding has been recorded by the Trial Court regarding the jurisdiction of the Civil

Court. We received no answer.

We have gone through the entire judgment of the trial court and there is no finding

to that effect. In fact, the Trial Court has considered all the 7 issues together and the finding is

recorded as under: -

ISSUE No. 2 to 7

"Onus to prove all these issues was upon the defendants. But

there is no sufficient evidence led by the defendants to prove these issues and

in the lack of sufficient evidence, all these issues are decided against the

defendants."

Learned counsel for the respondent relied upon the judgment of this Court rendered

in Rajasthan State Road Transport Corporation & Anr. Vs. Krishna Kant & Ors. (1995(5)SCC

75) where this Court in paragraph 35(2) has held :

(2) Where, however, the dispute involves recognition, observance or enforcement of any of the rights or obligations created by the Industrial Disputes Act, the only remedy is to approach the forums created by the said Act.

Class 2 of paragraph 35, in fact, is completely against the case of the respondent herein.

In a recent judgment of this Court in the case of Rajasthan State Road Transport Corpn. & Ors. Vs. Zakir Hussain (2005(7)SCC 447) in which my brother Dr. Justice AR.

Lakshmanan was party, this Court after considering the various judgments including the judgment referred above, has come to the conclusion that the Civil Court has no jurisdiction to entertain such suit.

In the view that this Court has been taking consistently, the Civil Court has no jurisdiction to entertain such suit and any decree passed by the Civil Court without jurisdiction, is a nullity. The High Court has failed to notice the position of law enunciated by this Court in catena of decisions.

We may, at this stage, point out that this Court suspended the order of the High Court on 4.2.2004. Despite suspending of the order of the High Court, the respondent herein

was allowed to continue to work on the plea that interim order passed by this Court on 4.2.2004

was not received by the concerned Department. Consequently, the respondent, herein was

allowed to work till 14.12.2005. Since the respondent was allowed to work and he has been paid

salary for the period he has rendered service, we are of the view that so much of the salary paid

to the respondent for the work he has rendered, will not be recovered.

In the premises aforesaid this appeal is allowed. The order of the Civil Court and the

High Court are hereby quashed and are set aside. The parties are asked to bear their own

costs.

.....J.

(H.K. SEMA)

.....J.

(DR. AR. LAKSHMANAN)

New Delhi,

March 22, 2006.