Karnataka High Court

The Divisional Controller vs Mahaboobsab R Mudnal on 17 February, 2010

Author: Subhash B.Adi

```
     IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA
     CIRCUIT BENCH AT DHARWAD

     DATED THIS THE 17% DAY OF FESRUA_R'Y*;«':z.G«.:fi§'T'   .
     BEFORE  "    I I'
     THE I-1ON'BLE MRUUSTICE SUBIIASI:I"I1S;;ADI'.'.1'IV  «
     WRIT PETITION NO.6oO62/:2A0.17oILaKSRTC'I[}~,.._'

     BETWEEN:

     THE DIVISIONAL CONTROLLER___  -
     MWKRTC, GADAG DIVISION,  ' .. _
     GADAG, REPRESENTED BY THEQ . '
     CHIEF LAW OFFICER, __ '     »
     CENTRAL OFFICES, GOKUL'--ROAD., ' "
     HUBLI 580 o3o_.f  *

      " ....PETITIONER

     -  SRI. :.RAv.I v.--..IIOvSAMANI, ADV.)

     EL);
     MAHIABOOESAI3.R."«MUDNAL,. j
     AGE MAJOR; OCC':AAIEx..¢DIRIvF.R
     R/O I~I.NO;EwS---1_s5,'IwIU'DCO" COLONY
     MULGUND' ROAD, GA.D'Ag.;I'

     ._ " ._  '- ...RESPONDENT

     'In':-3:-k9:

     ""'TI~:I.S'"wvR1T PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 225 AND

      I  i2T2'7_OE_TI-.IEQONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO QUASI-I THE
      AWARD'-«._DATED 26/6/09 PASSED BY THE INDUSTRIAL
     'TRIBUNAL; HUBLI IN ID 24/06 PRODUCED HEREWITI-I AS

     ANNEX'URE#C AND CONSEQUENTLY DISMISS ID 24 / 2006 FILED
     BY .. TI-TIE RESPONDENT HEREIN BEFORE INDUSTRIAL

      TRIBUNAL, HUBLI AND ETC.

     THIS WRIT PETITION COMING ON FOR PRELIMINARY

     HEARING THIS DAY, THE COURT MADE THE FOLLOWING:
```

ORDER

Respondent-wWorkman raised a dispute in I.D.No.24/ 2006 before the Labour Court, Labour Court Hubli opined that punishmie-nt' ordered against the workman v_Jithoutj,in.quiry___ much without any reason and accordingly set order', of punishment.

2. Learned. "couns'ei" petitioner submits that the labour Court no.t"eon_s_idering the case in the p*rop.erupergspective.' Respondent has not disputed the accident. the contention of the petitioner's coiinysel is coincerned, even in case of minor penalty, the ' authority must assign reasons as to why L'.in'quiry'.1isVjdispensed with. As no such document is produced either in this petition or before the Labour V' , Cotirt, I ☐nd that the award passed by the labour Court does not call for interference. However, While passing the award, the labour Court has issued several other directions which are totally unnecessary. In View of the same, except setting asig1_e:thefoi1*der of punishment and giving consequential the directions are unsustaiIiah1e'.« s_ PTO; .thiatV_Ve§iite'nt, 7 petition is partly aliowed and it kmv