

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE A.V.RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI

FRIDAY, THE 7TH DAY OF AUGUST 2015/16TH SRAVANA, 1937

OP(LC).No. 18 of 2015 (O)

ID. NO.58/2010 OF INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, IDUKKI.

.....

PETITIONER(S)/^:

**P.K. AMMINI, THADATHIL HOUSE,
MANGANAM, KOTTAYAM.**

BY ADV. SRI.MATHEW PHILIP EDAPPALLIL.

RESPONDENT(S):

- 1. STATE OF KERALA,
REPRESENTED BY SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,
EXCISE DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-695 001.**
- 2. MANAGING DIRECTOR,
KERALA STATE BEVERAGES CORPORATION LTD.,
SASTHAMANGALAM P.O., THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-695 010.**
- 3. MANAGER,
KERALA STATE BEVERAGE (MM) CORPORATION LTD.,
WAREHOUSE, S.H. MOUNT P.O., KOTTAYAM-686 006.**

**R1 BY GOVT. PLEADER SMT.ANITHA RAVINDRAN.
R2 & R3 BY ADV. SRI.C.S.AJITH PRAKASH, SC.**

**THIS OP (LABOUR COURT) HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD
ON 07-08-2015, ALONG WITH OP(LC).NO. 19 OF 2015 AND
CONNECTED CASES, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY
DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:**

rs.

APPENDIX

PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS:-

- EXT.P1 : TRUE COPY OF THE AWARD IN ID. NO.58/10 OF INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, IDUKKI.
- EXT.P2 : TRUE COPY OF THE TERMINATION ORDER DTD. 03-07-2015 OF THE 3RD RESPONDENT.
- EXT.P3 : TRUE COPY OF THE REPRESENTATION TO THE 1ST RESPONDENT DTD. 03-07-2015.
- EXT.P4 : TRUE COPY OF THE REPRESENTATION TO THE 2ND RESPONDENT DTD. 03-07-2015.
- EXT.P5 : TRUE COPY OF THE POSTAL ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF 1ST RESPONDENT.
- EXT.P6 : TRUE COPY OF THE POSTAL ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF 2ND RESPONDENT.

RESPONDENT'S EXHIBITS:- NIL.

//TRUE COPY//

P.A. TO JUDGE

rs.

A.V. RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI, J.

O.P.(LC) Nos. 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24 & 25 of 2015

Dated this the 7th day of August, 2015

J U D G M E N T

Alleging illegal termination of the petitioners on the strength of the awards passed by the Industrial Tribunal, Idukki, the petitioners have come up before this Court.

2. In these writ petitions, the petitioners are challenging the awards passed in different industrial disputes in the Industrial Tribunal.

3. The learned Standing Counsel for the respondent corporation, on instructions, submitted that the petitioners have already been terminated and they were disengaged by the respondent corporation. It was further submitted that as they were provided by a contractor, who is having employees of his own, the request of the petitioners to accommodate them in the respondent corporation cannot be considered at present.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners

..2..

submitted that the petitioners would be satisfied if a direction is given to the 1st respondent corporation to consider and pass orders on Ext.P3 representation.

Therefore, the writ petitions are disposed of directing the 1st respondent to consider Ext.P3 representation submitted by each petitioner within a period of three months after affording the petitioners and the respondent corporation an opportunity of being heard.

Sd/-
A.V. RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI
JUDGE

bka/-