



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 09-03-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE M.DHANDAPANI

WP No. 8922 of 2026

The State President
Nethaji Transport Workers Union,
Reg. No. 3552/ CNI,
No. 478 Thanga Salai,
Siva Complex, Chennai 01

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

The Managing Director
Tamil Nadu State Metropolitan Transport
corporation,
Pallavan Salai, Pallavan Illam, Chennai 02

..Respondent(s)

Prayer: Writ Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of writ of Certiorarified Mandamus calling for the records pertaining to the order of the Principal Labour court, Chennai dated 8.06.2022 passed in O.P.No. 95 of 2019 quash the same and consequently hold that the demands of the petitioner union referred under GO(D) No. 404 dated 5.07.2019 are justified and pass

For Petitioner(s): Mr.C.D.Sugumar

For Respondent(s): Mr.R.Balaji

Order

The writ petition is filed against the order of the Principal Labour Court, Chennai, dated 08.06.2022, wherein the punishment of the petitioner was confirmed.



2. Case of the petitioner is that he is the member of the petitioner Union and was given appointment on 01.02.1995 as permanent employee by the respondent / management. When the delinquent was working as Senior Grade Ticket Seller at Tondiarpet Depot I, she was suspended from service on 17.06.2015 and a Charge Memo was given, stating that when she was working in MST Counter at Vallalar Nagar Depot, she had issued Rs.1000/- season ticket without mentioning the name of the passenger, which resulted in revenue loss and loss of the reputation to the respondent. Based on the explanation of the delinquent, the respondent revoked the order of suspension and provided the regular duty, however conducted a domestic enquiry. In the enquiry, the charges against the delinquent has been proved. Hence the respondent has issued a show cause notice dated 26.09.2016, wherein she also gave explanation. However, the respondent without considering the explanation, had passed an order dated 31.03.2017, imposed a punishment of withholding increment for one year. Against the punishment order, the petitioner Union raised a dispute before the Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Conciliation)-I, Kuralagam, Chennai 600 108. The said authority has issued a failure report on 09.10.2018, against which, the petitioner Union has preferred O.P.No.95 of 2019 before the Principal Labour Court, Chennai. The Labour Court after elaborate enquiry, had dismissed the said O.P. Aggrieved by the order of the Labour Court, the petitioner Union has preferred this writ petition.



3. Learned counsel for the petitioner Union submitted that the Labour Court failed to properly appreciate and consider the material facts and evidence placed on record. It is contended that without adverting to the relevant aspects of the matter, the Labour Court mechanically confirmed the order of punishment imposed by the respondent. Therefore, the impugned order suffers from non-application of mind and is therefore liable to be interfered with.

4. Per contra, learned standing counsel for the respondent Management contended that the delinquent has caused monetary loss to the respondent Management and the charges have been proved through oral and documentary evidence. The Enquiry Officer after conducting a fair and proper domestic enquiry and after verifying all the relevant records and evidences had rightly hold the charges proved against the petitioner. Therefore, the impugned order of the Labour Court need not be interfered with.

5. Heard both sides and also perused the materials available on record.

6. It is seen that the Enquiry Officer, after verifying all the relevant records and evidences, submitted his report holding the charges proved. Based on the said report, the disciplinary authority issued a show cause notice to the delinquent and after considering the explanation submitted by her, the authority ha imposed the punishment in accordance with law. This Court does not find



any procedural irregularity or perversity in the conduct of the enquiry or in the decision-making process. In exercise of the jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, this Court cannot re-appreciate the evidence. Therefore, this Court finds no ground to interfere with the impugned order.

7. Accordingly, the Writ Petition stands dismissed. No costs.

09-03-2026

Index: Yes/No
Speaking/Non-speaking order
Neutral Citation: Yes/No

SK

To
The Managing Director
Tamil Nadu State Metropolitan Transport
corporation,
Pallavan Salai, Pallavan Illam, Chennai 02



WEB COPY

WP No. 8922 of 2



M.DHANDAPANI J.

sk

WP No. 8922 of 2026

09-03-2026