

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE ABHINAND KUMAR SHAVILI

WRIT PETITION Nos.3373, 3375 AND 3412 of 2002

COMMON ORDER:

W.P. No.3373 of 2002 is filed seeking to issue a writ of Certiorari calling for the records relating to P.G. No.3/2000 dated 16.07.2001 as modified in P.G. Appeal No. 6/2001 dated 11.12.2001 and quash the same. W.P. No.3375 of 2002 is filed seeking to issue a writ of Certiorari calling for the records relating to P.G. No.7/2000 dated 16.07.2001 as modified in P.G. Appeal No.9/2001 dated 10.12.2001 and quash the same. W.P. No.3412 of 2002 is filed seeking to issue a writ of Certiorari calling for the records relating to P.G. No.10/2000 dated 16.07.2001 as modified in P.G. Appeal No.1/2001 dated 08.12.2001 and quash the same.

2. Heard Sri T.S. Anand, learned counsel for the petitioners and the learned Government Pleader for Labour.

3. In these three writ petitions the orders passed by the original Authority under Payment of Gratuity Act, 1972 (for short 'the Act') and the Appellate Authority under the Act, are under challenge.

4. As the issue raised in these three writ petitions is one and the same, they are disposed of by way of a common order. For convenience, the facts in W.P. No.3373 of 2002 are discussed herein.

5. It has been contended by the petitioner that the 3rd respondent was employed as home worker in the petitioner establishment and that

both the authorities under the Act failed to appreciate that the petitioner had established its business only from 1982 and both the authorities have directed payment of Gratuity by treating the first entry of the 3rd respondent as 1982 and erroneously passed orders to pay Rs.11,340/- to the 3rd respondent towards gratuity.

6. The Government Pleader for Labour for the respondents had contended that both the authorities had rightly taken into consideration the date of appointment of the workman based upon the documents marked before the authorities and based upon the evidence lead by the respondents and the authorities under the Act had rightly passed orders and therefore, no interference is called for.

7. This Court after considering the rival submissions made by the parties, is of the view that the authorities under the Act had rightly passed orders in favour of the workman. In fact, the first authority under the Act had directed to calculate the wages from 1982 and quantified an amount of Rs.11,340/- to be paid to the workman and the appellate Authority, by agreeing to some of the contentions raised by the petitioner, reduced the amount of gratuity payable to the respondent - workman to Rs.10,374/-.

8. As the contentions raised by the petitioner were rightly taken into account by the Appellate Authority and the Appellate Authority has rightly modified the original Authority's order and directed that an amount of Rs.10,374/- is to be paid to the 3rd respondent workman.

There are no illegalities as pointed out by the petitioner in the orders passed by the authority under Payment of Gratuity Act. Hence, the writ petitions are liable to be dismissed as there are no merits in the writ petitions.

9. Accordingly, all the Writ Petitions are dismissed. As a sequel thereto, miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending shall stand closed. No order as to costs.

ABHINAND KUMAR SHAVILI, J

30th October, 2018
cbs



THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE ABHINAND KUMAR SHAVILI



WRIT PETITION Nos.3373, 3375 AND 3412 of 2002
(dismissed)

30th October, 2018

cbs