

A V Kiran vs the Divisional Controller

A V Kiran vs the Divisional Controller

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/1724776

Court : Karnataka

Decided On : Sep-13-2025

Judge : Lok Adalath

Appeal No. : WP/22554/2019

Appellant : A V Kiran

Respondent : The Divisional Controller

Judgement :

HIGH COURT LEGAL SERVICES COMMITTEE, BENGALURU
BEFORE THE LOK ADALAT

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 13TH DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 2025 CONCILIATORS
PRESENT: THE HONBLE MR.JUSTICE ANANT RAMANATH HEGDE &
SRI. P.D. SUBRAMANYA, MEMBER W.P.No.22554/2019 (L-KSRTC)
(Lok Adalath No.6535/2025) BETWEEN 1 . A V KIRAN, S/O
VENKATESH, AGED ABOUT 38 YEARS, R/A C/O RAMESH A, DOOR
NO.8, A-1 BLOCK, NEW POLICE QUARTERS, VALAGERA HALLI,
KENGARI SATELLITE TOWN, BANGALORE-560 060. ...PETITIONER
(BY SRI M C BASAVARAJU, ADVOCATE) AND 1 . THE DIVISIONAL
CONTROLLER, AND APPOINTING AUTHORITY KSRTC,

CHIKKAMAGALURU DIVISION, CHIKKAMAGALUR-577 101.
...RESPONDENT (BY SRI S B SRIKANTH, ADVOCATE) THIS WRIT
PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE
CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO QUASH THE IMPUGNED
ORDER PASSED BY THE LABOUR COURT, CHIKKAMAGALUR IN
I.D.R. NO.08/2018 DT20.3.2019 VIDE ANNEXURE-A TO THIS W.P
AND ETC. THE PETITION COMING ON FOR CONCILIATION BEFORE
LOK ADALAT, THE FOLLOWING CONCILIATION ORDER IS PASSED:

CONCILIATION ORDER

The writ petition is filed assailing the award dated Chikkamagaluru. The award is questioned by the workman.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner and respondent are present.

3. Learned counsel for the workman and the learned counsel for the respondent-Corporation jointly submit that the dispute is settled and the parties have reduced the terms of the settlement in the joint memo.

4. The joint memo reads as under:-

"JOINT MEMO The WP filed against the award in IDR No.08/2018 dated 20.3.2019 on the file of the Labour Court, Chikkamagalur has been settled between the parties on the following terms and the award may kindly be modified as under:

6. The Respondent Corporation has agreed to take the petitioner into service as a fresh trainee for a period of 1 year.

7. The petitioner to be placed on probation for a period of 2 years on successful completion of 1 year of training.

8. The period of service rendered by the employee/trainee prior to the order of removal would not be considered for any purpose.

9. The settlement is arrived without prejudice to the contentions taken by the corporation that the trainee is not a workman under the provisions of I D Act and the said issue is kept open to be decided in appropriate cases.

10. The parties to the proceedings have agreed for the above terms.

5. The joint memo is taken on record.

6. This Court has perused the terms of the settlement.

This Court does not find any impediment to accept the terms of the settlement. Accordingly, the impugned award dated Chikkamagaluru is modified in terms of the joint memo. JUDGE MEMBER CHS

SooperKanoon - India's Premier Online Legal Search - sooperkanoon.com