

**BEFORE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL – CUM – LABOUR
COURT-II, NEW DELHI**

I.D. NO. 262/2022

**Sh. Dinesh Kumar, S/o Sh. Meghraj Singh Dagur,
R/o- Chinayata, Karauli, Rajasthan-322236.**

VERSUS

1. The Vice Chancellor,

Jawaharlal Nehru University,
New Mehrauli Road, New Delhi-110067.

2. The Chairman/Director/A.R.,

G4S Secure Solutions (India) Pvt. Ltd.,
Reg. Office: C-16, C-Block, Community Centre,
Janakpuri, New Delhi-110058.

AWARD

01.06.2026

This is an application U/S 2A of the **Industrial Disputes Act (hereinafter referred to as “the Act”)**. Claimant had stated in his claim statement that he was employed as Guard on dated 07.08.2015 by the management no. 1 through contractor i.e. management no. 2 and his last drawn salary was Rs. 14,100/- p.m. He had been performing his duty with utmost care and diligence and there has never been any complaint against him. Management no. 1 released for wages to management no. 2 each and every months amount Rs. 30,000/- per month as per Central Government Minimum Wages Act. He has been suffering mentally, physically and economically due to the non complete payment of salary released by the managements. He had not been provided legal facilities i.e. earns leave,

casual leave, attendance register, overtime, leave book, bonus etc. when he demanded the aforesaid legal facilities, without any rhyme and reason his services have been terminated which is a violation of section 25-F of the I.D. Act. He approached many times to the management's office for his dues, but, management neither paid the payment of workman dues nor taken him back on duty. He had gone to the conciliation which was resulted into failure. Hence, he filed the claim with the prayer that he be reinstated with full back wages.

Management no. 1 has filed its written statement denying the averment made in her claim statement. He submitted that the workman was employed by the management no. 2, who was providing the security services in terms of the contract entered into between the managements and hence there is no employer-employee relationship between the management and the workman. He had stated that claim filed by the claimant is not maintainable and is liable to be dismissed.

Management no. 2 has already been proceeded ex-parte vide order dated 13.03.2023.

Rejoinder has been filed by the claimant denying the averment made in the WS of management no. 1 and affirmed the fact mentioned in his claim statement.

After completion of the pleadings, vide order dated 19.03.2024, following issues have been framed i.e.

1. Whether there exists any employer or employee relationship between M-1 and workman.
2. Whether the service of the workman stand terminated illegally in violation of labour law.
3. Relief, if any.

Now, the matter is listed for workman evidence. Workman has not been appearing since long to substantiate his claim inspite of providing a number of opportunities.

In these circumstances, when the claimant has not been appearing since long to substantiate his claim, it appears that he is not interested in pursuing his case. His claim stands dismissed. Award is passed accordingly. A copy of this award is sent to the appropriate government for notification as required under section 17 of the ID act 1947. File is consigned to record room.

Date: 01.06.2026

ATUL KUMAR GARG
Presiding Officer.
CGIT-cum-Labour Court-II