

Karnataka High Court

The Management Of Bhel vs Sri H N Chikkaiah on 10 February, 2009

Author: Subhash B.Adh

all§V'iSV--.-91:<;quifl:,id and if thfire are no charges by the

rm:~Aalf2agé&m\$%::; t;,M -}'41:e"*---is: szltitisd for the wages for the saié pfiffifi. Fs

_\$.eg:iffifi'ate He submitteé that the managment has fiat

IZfiISC€}}3\$'fiCi 1101' there is any charge against the

;;f\$é:;\$G:1%i%::li ané even the suspension was has-szé on the criminal

:\$1f;0.€:%e€diI2gs; ané if the criminal procéedings having bfififl endétd in

«écquittal, it is unraa\$o::lat;f5 on \$16 part 0f the management to

293.1996 and rfispndmat was resin-statad on '?''.5.20C>1. Wages

fat)! ' said pmioid is paid, however, the resyoildent is not enijifgd for

Wages upto the date sf 293.1996, as the Big:

force tin that date.

5. S1"i.Subramanya, learmcd

workman filed statement of objéffifiéxg fijfadzzcfid L'

amendment t9 the staudgag e; %;€:I1 (llamas

3719} of {ha Staniiing payment of wages

tiurirzg the SuSp8I}SiQ}1 oh of acquittal in

cximinal casaf \$1':j\$itted that, even in

mo-dei pfgasvésion for denial of wages

during the slls_piéli.:.\$iQ5:1"\$}exé;\$\$. ,___ . '

6, If t}ir:.._4eVt:..piVVt\$3,rc\$€';:1?gaç':i;\$1\$t whom thrs criminal proceedings

35 'eijlployee, he should not be Eififiifd of the

deny the legitixnate claim cf the respondent. ; gigs;