

# The Orissa Gazette

EXTRAORDINARY  
PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

---

No. 301 CUTTACK, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 2009 / FALGUNA 9, 1930

---

## LABOUR & EMPLOYMENT DEPARTMENT

### NOTIFICATION

The 10th February 2009

No. 1281—li/1(BH)-96/1994(Pt.)-LE.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Award, dated the 28th January 2009 in I. D. Case No. 93 of 2008 of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Bhubaneswar to whom the Industrial Dispute between the Management of M/s. Ipisteel Ltd., Dhenkanal and their workman Shri Sarat Ch. Pradhan was referred to for adjudication is hereby published as in the Schedule below :

### SCHEDULE

IN THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, BHUBANESWAR

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE CASE No. 93 OF 2008

Dated the 28th January 2009

*Present :*

Shri P. C. Mishra, o.s.j.s. (Sr. Branch),  
Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal,  
Bhubaneswar.

*Between :*

The Managing Director, . . . First Party—Management  
M/s. Ipisteel Ltd.,  
At Gundichapada,  
Dhenkanal-759 025.

And

Shri Sarat Chandra Pradhan, . . . Second Party—Workman  
At Housing Board Colony,  
Qr. No. M-42, Bajichauk Chhak,  
P.O./Dist. Dhenkanal.

*Appearances :*

None . . . For both the Parties.

## AWARD

Originally, the Government of Orissa in the Labour & Employment Department had referred the following dispute for adjudication by the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Bhubaneswar vide its Order No. 15030—li/1(BH)-94/1994-LE., dated the 26th October 1995 but subsequently it transferred the dispute to be adjudicated by the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Bhubaneswar vide its Order No. 4138—li/21-32/2007-LE., dated the 4th April 2008.

“Whether dismissal from service with effect from the 18th October 1993 of Shri Sarat Chandra Pradhan, Time Keeper by the management of M/s. Ipisteel Ltd., Dhenkanal is legal and/or justified ? If not , to what relief Shri Pradhan is entitled to ? ”

2. In this case neither the second party workman appeared nor took any steps. The case suffered several adjournments for *ex parte* hearing of the case. But no evidence has yet been tendered by the workman.

From such conduct of the workman, it can be inferred that the workman is no more interested to contest the proceeding. Further more it is felt expedient to dispose of an year old case pending since the year 1995.

In absence of any evidence on record, the reference can not be answered in any manner. Hence a no dispute Award is passed accordingly.

Dictated and corrected by me.

P. C. MISHRA  
28-1-2009  
Presiding Officer  
Industrial Tribunal  
Bhubaneswar

P. C. MISHRA  
28-1-2009  
Presiding Officer  
Industrial Tribunal  
Bhubaneswar

By order of the Governor  
K. C. BASKE  
Under-Secretary to Government