

PETITIONER:
ANIL BAPURAO KANASE

Vs.

RESPONDENT:
KRISHNA SAHAKARI SAKHAR KARKHANA LTD & ANR.

DATE OF JUDGMENT: 07/05/1997

BENCH:
K. RAMASWAMY, S. SAGHIRAHMAD, G.B. PATTANAIK

ACT:

HEADNOTE:

JUDGMENT:

O R D E R

Leave granted.

The appellant-employee was engaged in the seasonal work in the Chemistry Section of the sugar factory by the respondent No.1. Since the work was over, the services of the appellant and others were terminated. He sought a reference under the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (for short, 'the Act') contending that the termination being in the nature of retrenchment is in violation of Section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act. The Industrial Tribunal and the High Court negatived the contention.

Learned counsel for the appellant contends that the judgment of the High Court of Bombay relied on in the impugned order March 28, 1995 in Writ Petition No.488 of 1994 is perhaps not applicable. Since the appellant has worked for more than 180 days, since the appellant as retrenched employee and if the procedure contemplated under Section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is applied to, this retrenchment is illegal. We find no force in this contention. In *Morinda Co-op. Sugar Mills Ltd. vs. Ram Kishan & Ors.* [(1995) 5 SCC 653] in paragraph 3, this Court has dealt with engagement of the seasonal workman in sugarcane crushing; in paragraph 4, it is stated that it was not a case of retrenchment of the workman, but of closure of the factory after crushing season was over. Accordingly, in paragraph 5, it was held that it is not 'retrenchment' within the meaning of Section 2(oo) of the Act. Since the present work is seasonal business, the principles of the Act have no application. However, this Court has directed that the respondent-Management should maintain a register and engage the workman when the season starts in the succeeding years in the order of seniority. Until all the employees whose names appear in the list are engaged in addition to the employees who are already working, the management should not go in for fresh engagement of new workmen. It would be incumbent upon the respondent management to adopt such procedure as is enumerated above.

The appeal is accordingly dismissed. No costs.

JUDIS