



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 16TH DAY OF MARCH, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANANT RAMANATH HEGDE

WRIT PETITION NO. 1394 OF 2026 (L-RES)

BETWEEN:

M/S TRANSYSTEM LOGISTICS INTERNATIONAL
PRIVATE LIMITED, TOYOTA TECHNO PARK
NO.20, BIDADI INDUSTRIAL AREA,
RAMANAGARA,
NOW SHIFTED AND SITUATED AT NO.68,
BIDADI INDUSTRIAL AREA, 2ND PHASE,
SECTOR 2, RAMANAGARA DISTRICT
BENGALURU 562 109.

REPRESENTED BY ITS
ASSISTANT GENERAL MANAGER-HR
SRI A.SHIVAPRASAD
REGISTERED UNDER COMPANIES ACT, 1956

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. S N MURTHY., SENIOR COUNSEL FOR
SRI.SOMASHEKAR., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE PRESIDENT
TRANSYSTEM LOGISTIC INTERNATIONAL
PRIVATE LIMITED, KARMIKARA UNION,
D.RAJANNA BUILDING,
BEHIND ICICI BANK, BYRAVANADODDI,
BIDADI HOBLI, RAMANAGARA.
2. THE GENERAL MANAGER
M/S.GENIUS CONSULTANTS LIMITED
HAVING ITS ADDRESS AT "MANIPAL CENTRE",
NO.S-402, SOUTH BLOCK, 4TH FLOOR,
47, DICKENSON ROAD, BENGALURU 560 042.
NOW SHIFTED AND SITUATED AT
BMS PLADIUM, 19/3, 3RD FLOOR,
CUNNINGHAM ROAD, BENGALURU 560 052.

Digitally signed
by PRAMILA G
V

Location: HIGH
COURT OF
KARNATAKA



3. THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT
SHRAM SHAKTHI BHAVAN, RAFI MARG
NEW DELHI - 110 001.
4. SRI.LAKSHMINARASIAH M
S/O MUDALAGIRIYAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 62 YEARS,
NO.255, AMBEDKAR CIRCLE,
TOTADAGUDDALI NAGASANDRA,
DASANPURA, BENGALURU EAST,
BENGALURU - 73.
5. SRI.MRUTHUNJAYA R,
S/O RUDRAPPA
AGED ABOUT 45 YEARS,
BASAVANAPALYA, TAVAREKERE,
BENGALURU - 562 130.
6. SRI.JAYAGOPAL H,
S/O HANUMANTE GOWDA H P,
AGED ABOUT 50 YEARS,
HALENA HALLI, NARASIPURA,
NELAMANGALA, BENGALURU - 562 111.
7. SRI.RAJESH KUMAR YADAV,
S/O HARI SHANKAR YADAV,
AGED ABOUT 46 YEARS,
HARSINGH PUR, TILTHI MIRJAPUR,
MIRJAPUR, UTTAR PRADESH - 231 312.
8. SRI.AJESH KUMAR YADAV,
S/O DOODHNATH YADAV,
AGED ABOUT 45 YEARS,
PURE MEHARBANKA, PURWA BAIJAPUR,
SADER SULTANPUR, UTTAR PRADESH - 228 001.
9. SRI. KAPOOR CHAND,
S/O MATA PRASAD YADAV,
AGED ABOUT 46 YEARS,
KAK RAHI, GOPIGANG, GYANPUR
BHADOHI, UTTAR PRADESH - 02547.



10. SRI. LAL CHANDRA YADAV,
S/O RATIRAM YADAV,
AGED ABOUT 43 YEARS,
DALAPUR(DHANIPUR),
LAKHIPUR KAPSA PATTI
PRATAP GARH, UTTAR PRADESH - 230 138.
11. SRI. CHAND YADAV,
S/O SRI. MATAPRASAD YADAV,
AGED ABOUT 47 YEARS,
KAKRAHI CHAVBAN GOPIGANG,
GYANPUR BHADOHI,
UTTAR PRADESH - 02547.
12. SRI.BRIJALAL YADAV,
S/O RAM LAKAN YADAV,
AGED ABOUT 47 YEARS,
KAKARAHI PURASAMBUPUR,
GOPI GANJ GYANPUR,
SANT RAVIDAS NAGAR - 221 547.
13. SRI.RAMJEETH YADAV,
S/O RAM BAHADUR YADAV,
AGED ABOUT 50 YEARS,
KOPA GAURAMPHI PATTI, PRATAP GARH,
UTTAR PRADESH - 230 124.
14. SRI.HARISH CHANDRA YADAV,
S/O MATA PRASAD YADAV,
AGED ABOUT 50 YEARS,
KAKRAHI CHAUBAN,
GOPI GANJ GYANPUR BHADOHI,
UTTAR PRADESH - 02547
15. SRI.RAMESH CHAND DUBEY,
S/O SITALAL PRASAD DUBAY,
AGED ABOUT 53 YEARS,
BAISUKHIA NEVIL SADAR, MIRJAPUR,
UTTAR PRADESH - 231 001.
16. SRI. SAHAJAN O.V,
S/O KANNAN,



AGED ABOUT 56 YEARS,
ODAMPARAMPIL, PACHENI THIRUVATOOR,
THALIPARAMBU, KANNUR, KERALA - 670 141.

17. SRI. JAI SINGH YADAV,
S/O RAM CHANDRA YADAV,
AGED ABOUT 48 YEARS,
KOPA GAURAMAPHI PATTI,
PRATAPGARH, UTTAR PRADESH - 230 124.
18. SRI.AWADESH KUMAR YADAV,
S/O GURUCHARAN RAI,
AGED ABOUT 48 YEARS,
CHANDANPUR, RAMPUR KALA (KHAIRA),
NAGRA CHAPRA, (SARAN) BIHAR - 841 414.
19. SRI. RANGASWAMY G,
S/O GIRIYAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 52 YEARS,
MARIKANIVI, HIRIYURU,
CHITRADURGA - 577 599.
20. SRI.VENKATA RATHNAPPA,
S/O TIRUMALPPA,
AGED ABOUT 47 YEARS,
HARLAGUNTE, YELUR,
SRINIVASPURA, KOLAR,
KARNATAKA - 563 138.
21. SRI.AJITH KUBER DEVALPUR,
S/O KUBER JALAPAR,
AGED ABOUT 49 YEARS,
AROBANETH BYLAHONGALA,
BYLAHONGALA, BELGAUM - 591 121.
22. SRI.MOHAMMAD MATEEN,
C/O VIVEK,
AGED ABOUT 47 YEARS,
SILK FARM, OPP SLN PUBLIC SCHOOL,
BIDADI RAMANAGARAM,
RAMANAGARAM- 562 109.



23. SRI.M.N.LOKANA GOWDA,
S/O BOGAPPA M,
AGED ABOUT 48 YEARS,
JHOLADA RASHI, BELLARY,
KARNATAKA - 583 111.
24. SRI. ARMUGAM SHAMY Y,
S/O KARPAHI,
AGED ABOUT 52 YEARS,
#263, GUDWEL VETRANIYAN KULLNGUDI,
KOYAL SIVGANGE - 630 556.
25. SRI. RANGE GOWDA,
AGED ABOUT 48 YEARS,
#08, VENKATAPATI BUILDING,
OPP MUNESHWARA TEMPLE, 1ST MAIN ROAD,
GORAGUNTE PALYA, BENGALURU - 22.
26. SRI.RAVI KUMAR S R,
S/O RAJ SHEKHAR,
AGED ABOUT 45 YEARS,
SAKLESHPUR, HAREHALLI ROAD,
AGRAHAR SAKLESHPUR, HASSAN
KARNATAKA - 573 134.
27. SRI.SRINIVAS REDDY K,
S/O RAMSUBBA REDDY,
AGED ABOUT 44 YEARS,
JOGARDODDI,BIDADI,
RAMANAGARAM, KARNATAKA - 562 109.
28. SRI.VIMELESH KUMAR YADAV,
S/O GORKANATH YADAV,
AGED ABOUT 41 YEARS,
SHAYARA, JAMAANEYA, GEHPUR - 232 327.
29. SRI.SRINIVASULU S,
S/O SHAMANNA M,
AGED ABOUT 56 YEARS,
PEDDABANGARUNANATHAM, KUPPAM,
CHITTOR, ANDRA PRADESH - 514 725.



30. SRI.BHARATHRAM YADAV,
S/O RAM KHELAVAN YADAV,
AGED ABOUT 49 YEARS,
TILTHI, MIRJAPUR, UTTAR PRADESH - 231 312.
...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI.NAGYANATARA B G., ADVOCATE FOR R3;
R2 SERVED;
V.C.O DATED 24/2/2026, NOTICE TO R1 IS HELD SUFFICIENT;
SRI. MURALIDHAR PESHWA.,ADVOCATE FOR R4 TO R30)

THIS WP IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF
THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO QUASH THE
CENTRAL GOVERNMENT NOTIFICATION DATED 08.12.2025 AT
ANNEXURE D TO THIS WRIT PETITION AND QUASH ORDER
DATED 12.12.2025 IN REF.NO.024/2008 PASSED BY THE
PRINCIPAL LABOUR COURT, BENGALURU ON I.A.NO.VI AT
ANNEXURE G.

THIS PETITION, COMING ON FOR ORDERS, THIS DAY,
ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANANT RAMANATH HEGDE

ORAL ORDER

Heard the learned Senior Counsel appearing for the
petitioner and the learned counsel appearing for the
respondents/impleading applicants No.4 to 30 on the merits
of the matter as well as on I.A. No.1/2026.

2. I.A. No.1/2026 is filed by the respondents No.4 to
30, who claim that they have independently filed vakalath
before the Labour Court. It is submitted by the learned
counsel for the proposed respondents No.4 to 30 that the



Union is not presently functioning and the matter is remanded to the Trial Court pursuant to the writ petitions No.13751/2012 to 13916/2012, filed by respondents No.4 to 30, as such, they are also entitled to participate in the proceeding and the impugned order is in their favour and in case they are not heard on the merits of the matter, in case the impugned order is set-aside, it will affect.

3. Learned Senior Counsel appearing for the petitioner would oppose the application on the premise that the dispute is raised by the Union and Union is made a party in the present proceeding and Union is served, as such, the respondent No.4 to 30 cannot come on record to oppose the petition.

4. The Court has considered the contentions raised in this behalf.

5. It is not in dispute that the writ petitions No.13751-13916/2012 were filed by 166 workmen and the matter was remanded to the Labour Court to permit the parties to lead evidence on three additional issues framed by



this Court.

6. Though it is true that the Union is made a party, and the notice is served on the Union, what is required to be noticed is, there is no representation on behalf of the Union.

7. Though the learned senior counsel would urge that Union is still in existence, it is to be noticed that before this Court, there is no representation on behalf of the Union. Considering the fact that the 116 workmen had filed writ petition earlier and the proposed respondents No.4 to 30 are among the said 116 workmen and they have already filed vakalath before the Labour Court, filed by the workmen is allowed by allowing I.A. 1/2026. The petitioner is permitted to amend the cause title and furnish the amended cause title.

8. As far as merits of the case is concerned, it is noticed that the petitioner/establishment has assailed the order dated 12.12.2025 wherein the Labour Court has allowed the application filed by the first party for summoning the attendance register maintained by the second party No.1 pertaining to 104 drivers for the years 2007 to 2012.



9. Learned Senior Counsel appearing for the petitioner would urge that application could not have been allowed given the fact that the petitioner/establishment has taken a firm stand that the documents are not maintained by them and it is his further submission that one of the witnesses examined on behalf of the workmen has categorically made a statement that all of them are working in a Genius Consultant party No.2 of second party since 2008 and that being the position, the records would be maintained only by party No.2 of the second party and the application for summoning the documents from the party No.1 of the first party is not maintainable.

10. Learned counsel appearing for the respondents No.4 to 30 would urge that in the cross-examination it is admitted that the documents are with the party No.1 of the second party, as such, the Labour Court is justified in allowing the application.

11. The Court has considered the contentions raised at the Bar and perused the records.



12. From the impugned order, it is noticed that the Labour Court has extracted the evidence of MW-3 and MW-4 to hold that the documents are to be summoned from the Party No.1 of second party. Those portion of the evidence extracted are as under:-

MW3:-xxxx

"It is true to suggest that since we were recording the trip details of vehicles of second party No.1, we used to provide all logistics support to the said vehicles and drivers of the said vehicles before and after 2007"

MW4:- xxxx

"It is true to suggest that second party No.2 never used to give trip sheets, trip details and check sheets to drivers."

13. The aforementioned statement referred to above, do not indicate that the party No.1 of the second party is the custodian of the attendance register of the workmen.

14. Learned counsel for the respondents would also refer to paragraph No.29 in the cross examination of MW-3. The said paragraph No.29 reads as under:-



"29. It is false to suggest that the company has no system of attendance of each and every driver. I say that currently we have, but I do not know about previous days. We have both biometric and manual attendance. It is false to suggest that we have not maintained any manual attendance register. I can produce the said manual attendance register before this court. I do not know whether in the year 2024 the company had paid Rs.1.2 lakhs as penalty under provisions of Factories Act."

15. Referring to the above statement it is urged by the learned counsel for respondents No.4 to 30 that the MW-3 has admitted that they maintain the attendance register of the workers.

16. Responding to this, learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner would urge that the said statement cannot be construed as an admission relating to the records and attendance register of the workmen of the party No.2 of the second party. It is the contention that there may be the attendance register of the employees of the party No.1 of the second party.



17. The Court has perused the said statement. From the said statement, one cannot authoritatively conclude as to whether the attendance registers of the workmen who have raised the dispute are with the party No.1 of the second party. It is quite possible to urge a contention that the registers are pertaining to the regular employees of the petitioner-establishment. It is also possible to urge the contention that the said registers are pertaining to the workmen who have raised a dispute. In any case, there is ambiguity in the said statement.

18. This being the position, the Court is of the view that at this juncture, it is not possible to record a finding that the records are with the party No.1 of the second party. Hence, the impugned order is set-aside as it purports to take a view that the records are with the petitioner.

19. Whether records are with the petitioner or not may have to be considered with reference to any other evidence that may be led.

20. Under these circumstances, keeping that question



to be decided later, the impugned order is set aside.

21. As far as the prayer to quash Annexure-D, the notification dated 08.12.2025 is concerned, the Court has negated the similar contention raised in W.P. No.3784/2026 pursuant to amendment brought to the Industrial Relations Code, 2020. Hence, the prayer to assail the notification dated 08.12.2025 marked at Annexure-D is not maintainable.

22. The parties are at liberty to lead further evidence on the availability or non availability of the documents sought to be summoned. Hence, the following:-

ORDER

- (i) Petition is ***allowed in part.***
- (ii) The impugned order dated 12.12.2025 (Annexure-G) is set aside.
- (iii) The parties are at liberty to lead fresh evidence on the availability or non availability of the documents sought to be summoned.
- (iv) The time frame fixed by this Court vide earlier



order, to conclude the matter is expiring on 19.03.2026. Considering the controversy involved in this matter, the time frame to dispose of the case is extended by two months from today, excluding the vacation.

**Sd/-
(ANANT RAMANATH HEGDE)
JUDGE**

CHS
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 16