

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Date : 10.12.2020

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R.SURESH KUMAR

W.P.Nos.10141 to 10155 of 2014

Maraimalai Nagar Municipality
Represented by its Commissioner
Maraimalai Nagar, Chengalpet Taluk,
Kancheepuram District.

.. Petitioner in all WPs

Vs.

1.The Presiding Officer
I Additional Labour Court,
Chennai - 600 104.

... 1st Respondents in all WPs

2	G.RAVIKUMAR	... 2nd RESPONDENT	in WP No.10141 of 2014
2	J.SUBBARAYAN	... 2nd RESPONDENT	in WP No.10142 of 2014
2	J.SHANMUGAM	... 2nd RESPONDENT	in WP No.10143 of 2014
2	G.JAMES	... 2nd RESPONDENT	in WP No.10144 of 2014
2	M.SURESHKUMAR	... 2nd RESPONDENT	in WP No.10145 of 2014
2	V.ANDI	... 2nd RESPONDENT	in WP No.10146 of 2014
2	B.ARUMUGAM	... 2nd RESPONDENT	in WP No.10147 of 2014
2	R.THIRUMALAI	... 2nd RESPONDENT	in WP No.10148 of 2014
2	K. ELUMALAI (DIED)	... 2nd RESPONDENT	in WP No.10149 of 2014
3	SMT. LAKSHMI	... 3 rd RESPONDENT	in WP No.10149 of 2014
4	SELVI.TAMILSELVI	... 4 th RESPONDENT	in WP No.10149 of 2014
5	SELVI. ASWINI	... 5 th RESPONDENT	in WP No.10149 of 2014
6	SMT. PACHAIAMMAL	... 6 th RESPONDENT	in WP No.10149 of 2014

R - 3 TO R - 6 ARE SUBSTITUTED
AS LRS OF DECEASED R-2 : K. ELUMALAI
AS PER ORDER DATED:24.03.2017 BY MMSJ IN
WMP.NO.4842/2017 IN WP.NO.10149/2014.

2 M.DILLIBABU ... 2nd RESPONDENT in WP No.10150 of 2014
2 J.ELUMALAI ... 2nd RESPONDENT in WP No.10151 of 2014
2 S.MOHAN ... 2nd RESPONDENT in WP No.10152 of 2014
2 MUTHUKUMAR ... 2nd RESPONDENT in WP No.10153 of 2014
2 R. RAVIKUMAR ... 2nd RESPONDENT in WP No.10154 of 2014
2 S.IYAPPAN ... 2nd RESPONDENT in WP No.10155 of 2014

Prayer in all WPs : Petition filed under Article 226 of Constitution of India praying for issuance of a Writ of Certiorari calling for the records of the first respondent the 1st Additional Labour Court, Chennai order passed in C.P.Nos.79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93 respectively of 2008 dated 29.11.2013 and quash the same.

For Petitioner : Mr.P.Srinivas
all the WPs

For 2nd Respondent : Mr.K.M.Ramesh
in all the WPs

COMMON ORDER

As the issue raised in these cases are one and the same or common, with the consent of the learned counsel appearing for both sides, all these writ petitions were heard together and have been disposed of by this common order.

2.Invariably in all these writ petitions, the respective second respondents are the employees of the petitioner Municipality viz., Maraimalai Nagar Municipality. These employees though were initially engaged by the Municipality even prior to 1996 as Daily wages, subsequently in view of G.O.Ms.198, Municipal Administration and Water Supply Department, dated 26.10.1998, had been appointed afresh by separate appointment orders dated 29.09.2000 as Water Supply Helper, of course on consolidated pay. As per the import of the G.O.(Ms)No.198, the employees like the second respondents, who had been appointed on a consolidated pay in various designations, would be entitled to seek for time scale of pay after successful completion of three years service in consolidated pay.

3.Accordingly, these employees since had been appointed in the year 2000 and claimed to have completed successful period of

three years service in consolidated pay, seems to have requested the Municipality/employer to bring them under time scale of pay on such completion of three years i.e., from the year 2003.

4. In the meanwhile, in the year 2001, the State Government had imposed a ban, due to various reasons, for creating any new posts or making any new appointment in Government service including the service of Municipalities and Town Panchayats, by issuing a separate Government order to that effect.

5. The said ban imposed by the Government had been in force for about five years and only in the year 2006 by issuance of Government Order in G.O.(Ms).No.14 dated 07.02.2006, the said ban imposed was lifted.

6. Simultaneously another Government Order G.O.(Ms).No.21 of the same Municipal Administration and Water Supply (MC3) Department, dated 23.02.2006 was issued by the Government, thereby, those employees who had been in consolidated pay for three years and more can be brought under regular time scale of pay.

7. Accordingly, the services of these employees have been brought under time scale of pay only from the year 2006 i.e. from the date of issuance of G.O.(Ms).No.21 i.e. from 23.02.2006 alone.

8. Therefore, from 23.02.2006 these employees had been brought under time scale of pay and they have been getting the salary calculated under time scale of pay since then.

9. In this context, it was the grievance of these employees that, though had been appointed under consolidated pay in 2000 and had successfully completed three years period, as envisaged under G.O.(Ms).No.198, on completion of such three years period i.e., in the year 2003, these employees should have been brought under time scale of pay, however, by citing the reason of ban imposed by the State Government between 2001 and 2006 and only subsequent to G.O.(Ms).No.21 dated 23.02.2006 since these employees had been brought under time scale of pay, thereby, the benefit accrued on them to get the time scale of pay for three years i.e., between 2003 and 2006 cannot be denied. Therefore, on that score, they wanted pay difference by calculating their scale of pay in this regard for the said three years period and accordingly, in order to quantify and to get the same, these employees had approached the Labour Court by filing separate computation petitions in C.P.Nos.79 to 93 of 2008 on the file of the I Additional Labour Court, Chennai.

10. Those claim petitions i.e., C.P.Nos.79 to 94 of 2008

were heard jointly and after hearing both sides, the Labour Court, by its common Award dated 29.11.2013, had allowed those CPs and thereby directed the employer i.e., the Municipality to pay the following amount to each of the employees.

1.	G.Ravikumar	C.P.No.79/08	Rs.78,494/-
2.	J.Subbarayan	C.P.No.80/08	Rs.78,494/-
3.	J.Shanmugam	C.P.No.81/08	Rs.78,494/-
4.	G.James	C.P.No.82/08	Rs.78,494/-
5.	M.Sureshkumar	C.P.No.83/08	Rs.78,494/-
6.	V.Andi	C.P.No.84/08	Rs.93,587/-
7.	B.Arumugam	C.P.No.85/08	Rs.78,494/-
8.	R.Thirumalai	C.P.No.86/08	Rs.93,587/-
9.	K.Elumalai	C.P.No.87/08	Rs.93,587/-
10.	M.Dillibabu	C.P.No.88/08	Rs.78,494/-
11.	J.Elumalai	C.P.No.89/08	Rs.1,55,952/-
12.	S.Mohan	C.P.No.90/08	Rs.1,55,952/-
13.	S.Muthukumar	C.P.No.91/08	Rs.1,55,952/-
14.	R.Ravikumar	C.P.No.92/08	Rs.1,55,952/-
15.	S.Iyappan	C.P.No.93/08	Rs.1,55,952/-

11. Aggrieved over the said order passed by the Labour Court in the batch of computation petitions filed by these employees, the employer Maraimalai Nagar Municipality filed this batch of writ petitions with the prayer mentioned therein, that is how this batch of cases have come before this Court.

12. Mr. P. Srinivas, learned Standing Counsel appearing for the petitioner Municipality, in all these cases, would raise the following grounds in support of the writ petitions assailing the impugned order passed by the Labour Court.

(i) That first of all the computation petitions filed by these employees under Section 33C(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 ought not to have been entertained, as the amount they wanted to compute through the CPs ought to have been ascertained by orders of the Court at Industrial Tribunal or Labour Court and in absence of the same, these employees are not entitled to seek any computation, therefore, the very basis for seeking computation under Section 33C(2) since was not available in these cases, these CPs should have been dismissed or rejected by the Labour Court.

(ii) It is an admitted fact that, all these employees were appointed on a consolidated pay only in the year 2000, of course, pursuant to the import of G.O.(Ms).No.198 dated 26.10.1998. In this context, by relying upon clause (4) of the said G.O., the learned counsel for the Municipality would urge that, on completion of more than three years in consolidated pay, these employees are not automatically entitled to get the time scale of pay and the satisfactory completion of three years

period under consolidated pay should be accepted and a decision has to be taken in this regard by Government, then only they would be entitled to get such benefit, without which, if they straight away seek for benefit by approaching the Labour Court by way of computation petition, the said request ought to have been rejected by the Labour Court.

(iii) The State Government, after lifting the ban imposed between 2001 and 2006, had come forward to issue a Government Order in G.O.(Ms).No.21 dated 23.02.2006 which is the only enabling G.O. for the Government or authorities or employer like the petitioner Municipality to bring the employees, who had been in consolidated pay, under time scale of pay and therefore, the decision, as has been envisaged at para 4 of G.O.(Ms).No.198, since has been taken by the Government only in the year 2006 under G.O.(Ms).No.21, only on that basis alone, the claim of the employees to bring them under time scale of pay was considered and granted, therefore, prior to 2006, none of these employees are entitled to get time scale of pay. Therefore, the very basis for seeking such difference of pay is not at all available to these employees and this aspect has not been considered by the Labour Court while allowing the computation petitions.

(iv) The learned counsel also, by relying upon a Full Bench decision of this Court in the matter of S.Dhanasekaran and 24 others Vs. Government of Tamil Nadu, rep. by its Secretary, Department of Municipal Administration and Water Supply dated 29.11.2013 reported in 2013 (6) CTC 593, submitted that, in view of the law laid down by the Full Bench in the afore-stated Judgment, the benefits now have been conferred or directed to be given to these employees by the Labour Court is unsustainable; and

(v) The learned counsel for the Municipality would also raise a ground that, though the said Full Bench judgment cited supra, has subsequently been reviewed by another Full Bench of this Court in Secretary to Government, Municipal Administration and Water Supply Department, Fort St. George, Chennai Vs. V.Marisamy and others in Rev.Apln.(MD).No.87 of 2014 etc. batch dated 30.05.2017, the said order passed in the review was appealed by the Department before the Hon'ble Supreme Court, where, stay has been granted on the operation of the said review order thereby the earlier Full Bench order cited supra in 2013 (6) CTC 593 will hold the field or in operation. Therefore, at the import of the said Full Bench judgment, if it is implemented, certainly, these employees would not be entitled to seek any benefit as they have claimed before the Labour Court. Therefore, on that ground also, the impugned orders passed in the computation petitions by the Labour Court are liable to be set aside.

(vi) Raising these grounds, the learned counsel for the Municipality has taken this Court extensively to relevant G.Os. as well as the Judgments referred to above and would contend that, since the similar issue or the issue in pari materia has been dealt with in respect of the same set of employees covered under another G.O. viz., G.O.(Ms).No.101, Municipal Administration and Water Supply Department dated 30.04.1997 where the Full Bench has given the view, which reads thus:

"28.In view of the foregoing discussions, we answer the question referred to us as follows:

(i)The view taken in W.P.(MD)Nos.4170 and 4171 of 2011, dated 02.04.2013, has got nothing to do with the sanitary workers, working in Municipalities and Municipal Corporations, who are governed by G.O.Ms.Nos.101, 71 and 21, Municipal Administration and Water Supply Department, dated 30.04.1997, 05.05.1998 and 23.02.2006, respectively. Therefore, we have not examined the correctness of the views expressed in W.P. (MD)Nos.4170 and 4171 of 2011.

(ii)The view expressed in W.A.(MD)No.729/2013 is not the correct legal position in respect of sanitary workers who are governed by G.O.Ms.Nos.101, 71 and 21, Municipal Administration and Water Supply Department, dated 30.04.1997, 05.05.1998 and 23.02.2006, respectively and accordingly, we, with respect, overrule the same.

(iii)Those sanitary workers, who were appointed as per G.O.Ms.No.101, Municipal Administration and Water Supply Department, dated 30.04.1997 or absorbed as per G.O.Ms.No.71, Municipal Administration and Water Supply Department, dated 05.05.1998, are all governed by G.O.Ms.No.21, Municipal Administration and Water Supply Department, dated 23.02.2006, in respect of their regularisation in service and such regularisation shall take effect only from 23.02.2006 and not from the date on which they had completed three years of service from the date of their initial entry into service."

(vii) By relying upon the said import of the Full Bench decision, the learned counsel for Municipality would contend that, the law declared by the Division Bench of this Court insofar as it relates to similar workers, who were covered under G.O.Ms.No.199, Municipal Administration and Water Supply Department, dated 12.08.1997, was declared to be not a correct law and to that extent, the Full Bench has intervened and stated that, the benefit conferred on them i.e., to the employees who

were appointed under G.O.Ms.No.101 and subsequently claimed or got the benefit of time scale of pay on the completion of three years period of service under consolidated pay either can be withdrawn or cannot be conferred on them and they would be entitled only to get such benefits pursuant to the import of G.O. (Ms)No.21 alone.

(viii) By relying upon heavily the said import of the Full Bench judgment, the learned counsel would contend that, in view of the law having been declared by this Court in the authoritative pronouncement of the Full Bench judgment cited supra, as against which though subsequently the order was reviewed as stated supra, now by virtue of the stay granted by the Hon'ble Supreme Court against the said order of the another Full Bench, where, the orders of the Full Bench having been reviewed, the field is occupied now only with the import of the judgment of the Full Bench cited supra in Dhanasekaran's case alone and therefore, if the principle, as has been laid down by the Full Bench in Dhanasekaran's case, is applied to the facts of the present cases, the learned counsel for Municipality would contend that, the employees herein also would be squarely covered under the said principle. Therefore, they would also not be entitled to get any such benefit i.e., grant of time scale of pay prior to 2006 as they claimed from 2003 and therefore, they are not entitled to get any computation of difference of pay for the said three years period between 2003 and 2006 as well, therefore, the impugned order is liable to be set aside and these writ petitions are to be allowed, he contended.

13.Per contra, Mr.K.M.Ramesh, learned counsel appearing for the employees respondents also has taken this Court to various judgments of the learned Single Judge of this Court, Division Bench of this Court as well as the two Full Bench judgments i.e. in Dhanasekaran's case and review of Dhanasekaran's case and also the relevant Government Orders, including the Government Orders, which have been issued subsequent to all these developments i.e., in the year 2015 and would further contend that, in view of these decisions, the law has been well settled and insofar as the claim of the employees are concerned to get the time scale of pay from 2003 onwards i.e., on completion of three years period successfully under consolidated pay it is justifiable claim and since this has been considered in proper perspective by the Labour Court in the impugned order in computation petitions, it does not require any interference from this Court.

14.The learned counsel for employees would further contend that, even though the Full Bench judgment, referred to above in Dhanasekaran's case, has dealt with a similar issue, but the law declared by the Full Bench, according to him, would not apply to the facts of this case because in the Full Bench judgment,

mainly the issue was, whether the consolidated employees made under G.O.Ms.No.101 would be entitled to get time scale of pay on completion of three years period or they would be entitled to have such benefit only pursuant to G.O.(Ms).No.21 in the year 2006.

15.Only in that context, after having considered those aspect, the Full Bench has held that, the law in respect of the employees who had been covered under G.O.Ms.No.198 or G.O.Ms.No.199 of Municipal Administration and Water Supply Department, which are exactly the issue before this Court, would not apply to the employees covered under G.O.Ms.No.101, thereby, the Full Bench cautiously excluded the employees, whose case or benefit were dealt with by the learned Single Judge, subsequently by Division Bench of this Court, which was appealed to the Hon'ble Supreme Court, where, SLP was dismissed, hence it has not been tinkered with or modified by the Full Bench judgment cited supra in Dhanasekaran's case.

16.By stating the aforesaid, the learned counsel for employees would further contend that, in fact, the said Full Bench judgment in Dhanasekaran's case, though subsequently was reviewed by another Full Bench in Secretary to Government Vs. Marisamy dated 30.05.2017, which was appealed by the Department before the Hon'ble Supreme Court, where, stay has been granted, therefore, such a larger issue can be decided later on by the Hon'ble Apex Court. However, insofar as the present issue raised in this batch of cases are concerned, according to the learned counsel for employees, this has not been dealt with or not covered under the import of the Full Bench judgment in Dhanasekaran's case. Therefore, this can be independently considered in view of the law declared by this Court in various orders passed by the learned Single Judge Benches of this Court in the year 2008 wherein appeal filed before the Division Bench, who also has upheld the view taken by the Writ Court in W.A.Nos.47 and 385 of 2010, by judgment dated 23.06.2010. This was also unsuccessfully appealed to the Hon'ble Supreme Court in SLP (Civil) No.26605 of 2010 dated 27.09.2010, therefore, the quietus has already been given insofar as the employees, who are covered under G.O.Ms.No.198 or under G.O.Ms.No.199 and since these employees admittedly covered under G.O.Ms.No.198, their issue has been given a quietus and that is not covered by the Full Bench judgment. Therefore, under the shadow of Full Bench judgment, the petitioner Management cannot take any shelter to deny the benefit of time scale of pay to these employees for the three years period from 2003 and 2006. Therefore, the learned counsel appearing for the employees would contend that, the employees are entitled to get such benefit and the same since has been quantified in the computation petitions, no interference is called for.

17. Insofar as the objection raised by the petitioner side that, these petitions should not have been entertained by the Labour Court by invoking the provisions of Section 33C(2) of the I.D. Act, the learned counsel appearing for employees would contend that, since the salary payable to these employees has already been recognised by virtue of G.O.Ms.No.198 and the date of appointment is explicit i.e., 29.09.2000 from that date, once these employees have successfully completed three years period of service under consolidated pay and on such completion, certainly, they would be entitled to get the time scale of pay. Therefore, there is every justification on the part of the employees to seek for such computation and therefore, this was rightly considered and decided in favour of the employees by the Labour Court. Hence, according to the learned counsel for employees, the said objection raised by the Municipality that, 33C(2) petition should not have been entertained by the Labour Court, cannot have any legal basis and therefore, the said objection can easily be overruled, he contended.

18. By stating all these submissions, the learned counsel appearing for employees would submit that, the orders which are impugned herein passed by the Labour Court in computation petition filed by each of the employees can very well be upheld and accordingly, the benefits sought for by them can be directed to be paid by this Municipality within a time frame to be fixed, he contended.

19. I have considered the elaborate submissions made by the learned counsel appearing for both sides and perused the materials placed before this Court.

20. The main objection raised on behalf of the Municipality before the Labour Court is that, though these employees were appointed under consolidated pay under G.O.Ms.No.198, they are not automatically entitled to get time scale of pay on completion of three years service and this would be considered and decided by the Government later on and only from such decision is made, they are entitled to get the benefit and such a decision since has been made only in the year 2006, they would be entitled to get the benefit only from that date.

21. To deal with the said objection, let me take the relevant clause stated in G.O.Ms.No.198 dated 26.10.1998.

22. In G.O.Ms.No.198 certain posts are created called, Pipe Inspector, Helper, Electrician, Pipe Operator and Water Supply Helper. Insofar as these employees are concerned, admittedly they had been appointed as Water Supply Helper, which is one of the post created under G.O.Ms.No.198. Even prior to issuance of this G.O.Ms.No.198, all these employees had been engaged as

Daily wagers and even as in 1996 either they had been engaged for five years or less than five years as Daily wagers. By issuance of G.O.Ms.No.198, since a set of posts have been created, these employees who have already been in service by way of daily wages had been considered and appointed, of course in consonance with G.O.Ms.No.198. In this context, the relevant para of G.O.Ms.No.198 reads thus: -

" 4. மேலே (அ) (ஆ) மற்றும் (இ).ல் குறிப்பிடப்பட்டுள்ள பணியிடங்களில் புதியதாக நியமனம் செய்யப்படும் பணியாளர்கள் கீழ்க்கண்டவாறு தொகுப்பூதியத்தில் நியமனம் செய்யப்படவேண்டும்.

1. பொறியியல் பட்டியப்படிப்பினை கல்வித்தகுதியாக வரையறுக்கப்பட்ட இனங்களுக்கு -மாதம் ரூ.2000//

2. ஐ.டி.ஐ போன்ற தொழிற்கல்வியை கல்வித்தகுதியாக வரையறுக்கப்பட்ட இனங்களுக்கு -மாதம் ரூ.2000//

3. பள்ளி இறுதிக்கல்வி அல்லது எட்டாம் வகுப்பினை கல்வித்தகுதியாக வரையறுக்கப்பட்ட இனங்களுக்கு - மாதம் ரூ.1700//
இத்தொகுப்பூதியம் ஒவ்வொரு ஆண்டும் 5 (ஐந்து) சதவீதம் அதிகரிக்கப்படும்.

புதியதாக நியமனம் செய்யப்படும் பணியாளர்கள் முதலில் ஓராண்டு காலத்திற்கு மட்டும் நியமனம் செய்யப்பட வேண்டும் பின்னர் ஒவ்வொரு ஆண்டு காலத்திற்கும் நியமனத்தை புதுப்பிக்க அவர்களின் செயல்திறனைப் பொருத்து தொடர்ந்து மூன்றாண்டுகளுக்கு நியமனம் செய்யப்படவேண்டும். மூன்று ஆண்டுகளுக்குப் பின்னர் பணியாளர்களின் செயல்திறனை மதிப்பீடு செய்து அவர்களை ஊதியம் ஏற்றமுறையில் நியமனம் செய்யப்படவேண்டும் என்பது குறித்து அரசு பரிசீலித்து ஆணையிடும்."

23.On reading of the same, it would be found that, these employees would be first appointed in any of these posts created under the G.O. for a period of one year on a consolidated pay and such one year period would be extended every year, of course, on satisfactory service and once the employee completes three years satisfactory service, they would be considered for bringing them under time scale of pay and in this regard, the Government after considering the same, would pass orders.

24.Only this has been specifically pointed out by the learned counsel appearing for Municipality and he would state that, it is not an automatic benefit conferred on these employees to get time scale of pay on completion of three years period, but only after the Government considering their

satisfactory performance of three years will pass orders and based on that orders only these employees will be brought under time scale of pay.

25. In this context, the learned counsel appearing for the Municipality has heavily relied upon G.O.(Ms).No.21, Municipal Administration and Water Supply Department, dated 23.02.2006.

26. In the said G.O., several earlier G.Os. including G.O.Ms.No.198 have been read and the relevant portion of the order in the G.O. reads thus:

"5. They, accordingly, direct the appointing authorities viz Municipal Commissioners, Grade III Municipal Commissioners and Commissioners of Municipal Corporations (Except Chennai) to appoint the employees on consolidated pay and NMRs on daily wages on their roll as on 01-10-1996 in respect of Municipalities and Municipal Corporations (except chennai) and as on 31-12-1996 in respect of Grade-III Municipalities in the vacant posts and to regularise their services in the regular post, from the date of issue of their order subject to the following conditions:-

i) Sanctioned posts should be available
ii) Persons should fulfill all Educational and other qualifications and
iii) Establishment (Pay and Pension) expenditure of the Urban Local Body should not exceed 49% revenue after filling up of posts.

6. The appointing authorities are strictly advised not to appoint any person on daily wages or on consolidated pay in the Municipalities and in the Municipal corporations in future."

27. Since G.O.(Ms).No.21 provides for regularise their services in the regular post from the date of issue of the order i.e. from 23.02.2006, only from that date, these employees are entitled to get their regularisation and not prior to that, is the contention of the Municipality.

28. However, there is a fine difference between the import of G.O.Ms.No.198 and G.O.(Ms).No.21. Under G.O.Ms.No.198, the language used is "மூன்று ஆண்டுகளுக்குப் பின்னர் பணியாளர்களின் செயல்திறனை மதிப்பீடு செய்து அவர்களை ஊதியம் ஏற்றமுறையில் நியமனம் செய்யப்படவேண்டும் என்பது குறித்து அரசு பரிசீலித்து ஆணையிடும்." Whereas the language used in G.O.(Ms).No.21 is ".... to regularise their services in the regular post, from the date of issue of this order subject to the following conditions".

29. In G.O.Ms.No.198, new posts were created where

appointment were given to these employees. At the time of appointment, instead of giving permanent appointment by way of time scale of pay, only a temporary appointment was given that too for a consolidated pay, the condition imposed was that, on satisfaction of the three years service on consolidated pay, they would be brought under time scale of pay. Whereas the import of G.O.(Ms).No.21, generally states, wherever there are employees who have been working and that consolidated pay NMRs or daily wages on their roll as on 01.10.1996 in respect of Municipalities and Municipal Corporations, those employees shall be regularised with their services in the regular posts from the date of issue of the order i.e., G.O.(Ms).No.21.

30. Pausing for a moment, there is a vast difference between the two set of employees which have been mentioned separately in G.O.Ms.No.198 and G.O.(Ms). No.21. In G.O.Ms.No.198, the employees dealt with are not NMRs or not daily wages, they may be employees with a consolidated pay, but in sanctioned vacancy. Once the vacancy is sanctioned by creating a post on permanent basis, for which, Government issued G.O. i.e., G.O.Ms.No.198 i.e., a permanent post where whoever be the incumbent under the consolidated pay, who can be brought under regular time scale of pay on completion of three years period. Such a contingency has not arisen in respect of other categories viz., NMR or daily wages, who were in fact dealt with by G.O.(Ms).No.21.

31. Insofar as the employees, like the respondents herein, who are fully covered under G.O.Ms.No.198, they are under separate channel and whatever the benefit accrued on them financially by virtue of import of G.O.Ms.No.198 shall be conferred on them, provided, if they completed the satisfactory service, as envisaged under the G.O.

32. Therefore, the Government or the Municipality cannot take a stand that, only under G.O.(Ms).No.21 dated 23.02.2006, these employees who are appointed, are being covered and also would be under time scale of pay. The said benefit emanates not from G.O.(Ms).No.21, but from only G.O.Ms.No.198. The import of G.O.Ms.No.198 has not been changed, modified or the benefit conferred on the consolidated pay employees appointed under G.O.Ms.No.198 has not been taken away so far. Therefore, the very basis of the contention raised by the Municipality by relying upon the import of G.O.(Ms).No.21, in the considered opinion of this Court, would be on wrong assumptions and therefore, based on such assumption, the benefit accrued on these employees under G.O.Ms.No.198 i.e., financial benefit by way of time scale of pay, cannot be denied.

33. On the other objection, as has been raised by the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner Municipality, by

relying upon the Full Bench judgment is concerned, this Court, have gone through the order passed by the Full Bench, where, at para 28, the proposition, which was held by the Full Bench, has been enumerated. It has been made clear that, the view expressed by the Division Bench in W.A.(MD). No.729 of 2013 was not correct as that legal position was in respect of sanitary workers who are covered by G.O.Ms.No.101, G.O.Ms.No.71 and G.O.Ms.No.21 of Municipal Administration and Water Supply Department dated 30.04.1997, 05.05.1998 and 23.02.2006.

34. In the Full Bench judgment, it has considered the relevant Division Bench judgment in W.A.(MD).No.729 of 2013. The judgment of the Division Bench in W.A.(MD).No.729 of 2013 is nothing but following the law declared by this Court in another Division Bench made in W.A.Nos.47 and 385 of 2010. The writ appeals in W.A.Nos.47 and 385 of 2010 arising out of the order passed in W.P.No.25620 of 2006 by order dated 17.09.2008. The learned Single Judge Bench in W.P.No.25620 of 2006 dated 17.09.2008 has passed the following order.

"4. G.O.Ms.No.199, Municipal Administration and Water Supply Department, dated 12.08.1997 could not be given effect due to the policy decision of the Government not to fill up any post except in Police, Medical and Teacher as per the G.O. Ms.212, P & AR Department dated 29.11.2001 with effect from 29.11.2001. Further, there were instructions from the Government vide proceedings dated 29.7.2002, which directed to keep in abeyance the regularizations of sanitary workers due to financial crunch faced by many of the Town Panchayats. The petitioners could not be regularized in service with effect from 2001 mainly due to the ban orders of the Government for filling up of the vacancies. The petitioners have miserably failed to bring notice about G.O.Ms.No.21, Municipal Administration and Water Supply (MC3) Department, dated 23.2.2006, which was issued for regularization of services of workers on consolidated pay and NMRs on daily wages. In view of the policy decision of the Government and in view of the financial constraint the services of the petitioners could not regularized with effect from March 2001.

5. Mr.V.Vijay Shankar, learned counsel appearing for the petitioners and Mr.K.Elango, learned Special Government Pleader appearing for the respondents have made their submissions based on the above pleadings.

6. It is not in dispute that the petitioners were appointed as sanitary works initially on consolidated basis in Palladam Municipality in pursuant to G.O.Ms.No.199, Municipal Administration and Water Supply Department dated 12.8.1997. As per

the said G.O., the sanitary workers shall be regularized on completion of three years of service. The petitioners, who have been appointed on 27.3.1998 as per the said G.O. ought to have been regularized by 27.3.2001. The reason for not regularizing their services as per the counter affidavit of the respondents is that there was a ban for recruitment except in Police, Medical and Teachers service and hence the services of the petitioners could not be regularized. The ban imposed could only be for a new appointment and the petitioners, who have been already appointed prior to the ban imposed by the Government cannot be denied regularization of their services citing the said ban. All the petitioners have already been appointed and it is not as if new posts are being created or new appointments are made. Hence the contention raised by the learned Special Government Pleader appearing for the respondents that the services of the petitioners could not be regularized in view of the ban imposed by the Government cannot be accepted.

7. Yet another reason that has been stated by the respondents is that due to financial crunch, such regularization could not be made. Again this cannot be the reason for refusing the regularization of the petitioners in service. The petitioners have been appointed in pursuant to G.O.Ms.No.199, referred to above, wherein it is specifically provided that after the completion of three years, their services should be regularized. In view of the said fact, the said contention of the learned Special Government Pleader appearing for the respondents cannot also be accepted.

8. Further more as rightly pointed out by the learned counsel appearing for the petitioners G.O.Ms.No.21, Municipal Administration and Water Supply (MC3) Department dated 23.2.2006 referred to by the respondents, does not refer about G.O.Ms.No.199 Municipal Administration and Water Supply (MC3) Department dated 12.8.1997. Thus, the respondents cannot be permitted to say that the services of the petitioners could be regularized only as per G.O.Ms.No.21 Municipal Administration and Water Supply (MC3) Department, dated 23.2.2006 cannot also be accepted.

9. Considering the above facts and circumstances, I am of the considered view that refusal to regularize the services of the petitioners with effect from 27.3.2001 is totally erroneous. In the result, the impugned proceedings

of the third respondent dated 27.2.2006 directing the regularization of the services of the petitioners only with effect from 23.2.2006 is required to be set aside and accordingly set aside and the writ petition stands allowed."

35. The said order of the learned Single Judge Bench was appealed to a Division Bench in W.A.Nos.47 and 385 of 2010, where, a Division Bench of this Court, by order dated 23.06.2010 has held as follows:

"2. The short facts leading to the filing of these appeals are stated hereunder:-

The petitioners in both the writ petitions were appointed as Sweepers / Sanitary Workers by the concerned Town Panchayats, on a consolidated pay of Rs.900/- with effect from 27.3.1998 and 30.4.1998 respectively. They joined duty on different dates in the year 1998. As per the Government Orders, dated 17.8.1999, on completion of three years of service on consolidated pay, they should have been brought under the time scale of pay with effect from the date when they completed three years. But by means of the orders impugned in the writ petitions, they were brought under the time scale of pay only with effect from 23.2.2006 in so far as W.A.No.47 of 2010 is concerned and with effect from 23.6.2006 in so far as W.A.No.385 of 2010 is concerned. The said orders were challenged in the writ petitions.

3. The learned Single Judge, on the basis of the judgment rendered by a Division Bench of this Court in W.A.No.1454 of 2007, dated 19.12.2008 in the case of Director of Town Panchayat, Kuralagam, Chennai and two others -vs- R.Sundaradas, allowed the writ petitions and held that the writ petitioners are entitled to the time scale of pay only from the date when they completed three years on consolidated pay and not from any subsequent date. Aggrieved by the same, the respective Panchayats have filed the above appeals.

4. We have perused the judgment, dated 19.12.2008 rendered by the Division Bench of this Court in the aforementioned appeal. In our view, as rightly held by learned Single Judge, the present cases are squarely covered by the said Division Bench judgment. We do not find any reason to differ with the view taken by the learned Single Judge. There being no merit in the appeals they stand dismissed."

36.As against the Division Bench order, in fact, Special Leave Petition was filed in SLP(Civil) No.26605 of 2010, on 27.09.2010 the same also was dismissed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court. Thus, what was held by the Writ Court in W.P.No.25620 of 2006 dated 17.09.2008, confirmed by the Division Bench in W.A.Nos.47 and 385 of 2010 dated 23.06.2010 has been confirmed by the Hon'ble Apex Court by dismissal of the Special Leave Petition.

37.The issue, which was dealt with in those decisions of the learned Judge as well as the Division Bench, is similar to that of these employees. Those employees were covered by a similar G.O. by the very same Department i.e., G.O.Ms.No.199 dated 12.08.1997, where a set of posts were created and those employees had been dealt with. Pari materia under the similar provision of G.O.Ms.No.198 these employees were appointed on a consolidated pay.

38.Having these facts in the background while dealing with the issue posed before the Full Bench, the learned Full Bench in Dhanasekaran's case, after having considered all these aspects including the decision made in W.A.Nos.47 and 385 of 2010 has found out that, what has been allowed by another Division Bench in W.A.(MD).No.729 of 2013, of course, following the view taken by the Division Bench in W.A.Nos.47 and 385 of 2010 is not the correct legal position. The reason being, according to the Full Bench, those employees, whose subject matter was dealt with by the Division Bench in W.A.(MD).No.729 of 2013 are covered under G.O.Ms.No.101 dated 30.04.1997 and not under G.O.Ms.No.199.

39.Therefore, the Full Bench found some distinction between the G.O.Ms.No.101 employees and G.O.Ms.No.199 employees. Moreover, the Full Bench also taken note of the fact that, the law laid down by the Division Bench in W.A.Nos.47 and 385 of 2010 was appealed to the Hon'ble Supreme Court and SLP which was dismissed. These aspects have been clearly mentioned in the Full Bench judgment and in order to appreciate the same, the relevant portion of the Full Bench judgment are extracted hereunder:

"23.In yet another judgment in W.A.(MD)No.729 of 2013, a Division Bench of this Court considered G.O.Ms.No.199, Municipal Administration and Water Supply Department, dated 12.08.1997, and G.O.Ms.No.22. Personnel and Administrative Reforms (F) Department, dated 28.02.2006, referred to above. The Division Bench had the benefit of another Division Bench judgment in W.A.Nos.47 and 385 of 2010 (referred to above) and finally, the Division Bench held in paragraph 6 as follows:

"6.As the learned counsel for the appellants as well as the respondents agreed that the matter in issue is covered by the said judgment, the writ appeal is allowed in terms of the order made in Writ Appeal Nos.47 and 385 of 2010. Hence, the appellants are directed to grant regularisation of the respondents' services from the date of completion of three years of respective services. No costs. Consequently connected miscellaneous petition is closed."

24.A reading of the above judgment in W.A.(MD) No.729/2013 would reflect that the Division Bench had no occasion to refer to the relevant Government Orders, namely G.O.Ms.Nos.101, 71 and 21, Municipal Administration and Water Supply Department, dated 30.04.1997, 05.05.1998 and 23.02.2006, respectively. These are the relevant Government orders pertaining to sanitary workers who were appointed as against newly created posts as per G.O.Ms.No.101, Municipal Administration and Water Supply Department, dated 30.04.1997.

25.So far as the judgment of the Division Bench in W.A.Nos.47 and 385 of 2010 is concerned, there, the Sweepers/Sanitary Workers, working in Town Panchayats, claimed benefit of G.O.Ms.No.199, Municipal Administration and Water Supply Department, dated 12.08.1997. In that case, the Division Bench had no occasion to consider the scope of G.O.Ms.Nos.101, 71 and 21, Municipal Administration and Water Supply Department, dated 30.04.1997, 05.05.1998 and 23.02.2006, respectively. It needs to be mentioned that the judgment in W.A.No.47 and 385 of 2010 was challenged before the Supreme Court by way of SLP and the SLP was dismissed at its threshold by the Hon'ble Supreme Court. Though the fact remains so, the said judgment in W.A.No.47 and 385 of 2010 has got nothing to do with the issues relating to the regularisation of the sanitary workers working in Municipalities and Municipal Corporations. As we have already pointed out, the above judgment relates to sweepers and sanitary workers working in Panchayats, who were governed by different Government Orders.

26.The judgment in W.A.(MD)No.729 of 2013 relates to the sanitary workers working in Municipalities. But, the Division Bench had considered only G.O.Ms.No.199, Municipal Administration and Water Supply Department, dated 12.08.1997 and not the G.O.Ms.Nos.101, 71 and 21, Municipal Administration and Water Supply Department, dated 30.04.1997, 05.05.1998 and

23.02.2006, respectively. So far as G.O.Ms.No.199, Municipal Administration and Water Supply Department, dated 12.08.1997 is concerned, the said G.O. has got nothing to do with the Sanitary Workers employed on consolidated pay in Municipalities and Municipal Corporations. There were only six categories of employees for whose benefit G.O.Ms.No.199, dated 12.08.1997, was issued. They are Sanitary Inspector, Sanitary Maistry, Sweeper, Coss Pool Cleaner, Compost Mazdoor and Drainage Cleaner. Therefore, in our considered view, the said G.O.Ms.No.199, Municipal Administration and Water Supply Department, dated 12.08.1997, cannot be made applicable to the sanitary workers working in Municipalities/Municipal Corporations. This point was not argued before the Division Bench and further it was not even brought to the notice of the Division Bench about G.O.Ms.Nos.101, 71 and 21, Municipal Administration and Water Supply Department, dated 30.04.1997, 05.05.1998 and 23.02.2006, respectively, referred to above. Therefore, we regret that we are unable to subscribe to the view taken by the Division Bench in W.A.(MD) No.729 of 2013.

27. In our considered view, in the case of sanitary workers, who were appointed against the newly created posts in pursuance of G.O.Ms.No.101, Municipal Administration and Water Supply Department, dated 30.06.1997, their regularisation is governed by G.O.Ms.No.21, Municipal Administration and Water Supply Department, dated 23.02.2006. Such a regularisation, as per the said G.O., should take effect only from the date of G.O. and not from the date on which they had completed three years of service from the date of their initial appointment. Following are the reasons for our conclusion.

(a) As we have already pointed out, appointments of the petitioners and the appellants herein, were not made as per the Tamil Nadu Municipal Corporations Basic Service Rules, 1996. As per the said Rules, sanitary workers can be appointed only by direct recruitment, in time scale of pay. There is no provision in the Rules to appoint sanitary workers on consolidated pay. Therefore, there can be no doubt that the petitioners and the appellants herein, who were all appointed, not as per the Tamil Nadu Municipal Corporations Basic Service Rules, 1996, but, outside the scope of the said Rules, however, governed by the Orders issued by the Government in G.O.Ms.No.101, Municipal

Administration and Water Supply Department, dated 30.04.1997.

(b)As we have already pointed out, as per G.O.Ms.No.101, Municipal Administration and Water Supply Department, dated 30.04.1997, new posts of sanitary workers were all created, on need basis. The said Government Order permitted filling-up of such newly created posts, through Employment Exchanges, on consolidated pay. That is how the petitioners and the appellants herein came to be appointed.

(c)As per Clause 4(6) of G.O.Ms.No.101, Municipal Administration and Water Supply Department, dated 30.04.1997, the said appointment was initially for a period of one year, which could be extended upto three years. As we have already extracted, as per Clause 4 (6), on completion of three years, the Government would decide whether to regularise the services of such employees, so as to bring them into regular time scale of pay. Therefore, as per this Government Order, it is fallacious to contend that on completion of three years from the date of initial appointment, such appointed sanitary workers shall be regularised.

(d)As narrated above, the Government thereafter examined the question of regularisation only in the year 2006 and accordingly issued G.O.Ms.No.21, Municipal Administration and Water Supply Department, dated 23.02.2006. The said Government Order directs that the regularisation shall be from the date of issue of the Government Order, namely 23.02.2006.

(e)Thus, a conjoint reading of G.O.Ms.No.101, Municipal Administration and Water Supply Department, dated 30.04.1997 and G.O.Ms.No.21, Municipal Administration and Water Supply Department, dated 23.02.2005, would go to clearly show that on completion of three years of service from the date of initial appointment, the Government had an option to examine the question of regularisation, which the Government did only in 2006 and it is the wisdom of the Government to give regularisation from any date. (Vide judgment of the Supreme Court in K.Madalaimuthu and another vs. State of T.N. And others - (2006) 6 SCC 558). Unless such date fixed by the Government, giving effect to the regularisation, is proved to be arbitrary and violative of Article 14 of the Constitution of India or any other constitutional provision, it cannot be held, in vacuum, that the said norms prescribed in G.O.Ms.No.21 for the purpose of regularisation is either illegal or unconstitutional.

Therefore, we have no hesitation to hold that regularisation of such sanitary workers, who are governed by G.O.Ms.Nos.101, 71 and 21, Municipal Administration and Water Supply Department, dated 30.04.1997, 05.05.1998 and 23.02.2006, respectively, shall be only from 23.02.2006. The contrary view expressed elsewhere in the judgments referred to above, in our respectful view, are not correct."

40.Subsequently, the very said Full Bench judgment in Dhanasekaran's case was completely reviewed in another Full Bench of this Court by order dated 30.05.2017, where, the following orders have been passed.

" 29.In the result, Rev.Aplc.No.87 of 2014 is dismissed and Rev.Appl.Nos.223 and 254 of 2015 are allowed on the following terms:

a)Persons employed as sanitary workers and covered by G.O.Ms.No.101 dated 30.04.1997 and G.O. Ms.No.71 dated 05.05.98 are entitled to be regularized after the completion of the respective period under consolidated pay as specified in the Government Orders from the date of their initial appointment.

b)Any orders passed by any Municipality regularizing the service based on G.O.Ms.No.21 dated 23.02.2006, Full Bench Judgment dated 29.11.2013 and G.O.Ms.No.166 dated 31.12.2014 shall be recalled and appropriate orders shall be passed as held above.

30.Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petitions are closed. No costs."

41.However, as against the said order passed in the review by subsequent Full Bench, appeal was filed to the Hon'ble Apex Court by the Department/Municipality, where, it has been stated that, stay has been granted which is still in force.

42.However, insofar as the present issue raised in this batch of writ petitions is concerned, that is not at all covered under the import of the Full Bench judgment in Dhanasekaran's case. This has been clearly spelt out by the Full Bench judgment itself in para 28 which has already been quoted herein above. In fact, the issue raised in these writ petitions has been covered by the order of the Division Bench made in W.A.Nos.47 and 385 of 2010 dated 23.06.2010 and the relevant portion of the said Division Bench judgment also has been quoted herein above, which has been upheld by dismissal of the SLP by the Hon'ble Supreme Court on 27.09.2010 whereby the issue insofar as the employees

worked under G.O.Ms.Nos.198 and 199 are concerned, has been given a quietus.

43.It is further to be noted that, yet another decision was made in a batch of writ appeals by this Court in W.A.No.1289 of 2014 etc. batch, by order dated 30.06.2015, pursuant to which, the Government through the Municipal Administration and Water Supply Department has come forward to issue yet another Government Order in G.O.Ms.No.142 dated 23.09.2015 where, the following orders have been passed.

"5.In the meanwhile, the Full Bench of the Madurai Bench of the Madras High Court in its observations, dated 29.11.2013, made in W.P.(MD).No.1083/2012 and W.A.(MD).No.555/2010 filed by Thiru.S.Dhanasekaran and 24 others, Madurai Corporation and Thiru E.Panneerselvam and 24 others, Nagarcoil Municipality has observed that the services of Municipality and Corporation employees worked on consolidated pay shall be regularised with effect from the date of issue order only, i.e. 23.02.2006 and not from the date of completion of 3 years of service on consolidated pay.

6.The Director of Town Panchayats has also stated that based on the above Full Bench observation, several Writ Appeals were filed by the Executive Officers concerned, and they are listed as batch cases by the Hon'ble High Court of Madras and the court after hearing, in its order dated 30.08.2015 has given the following direction:-

"29) Resultantly, for the reasoning and analysis made hereinabove, the appeals are partly allowed to the extent that the respondents are entitled to consideration for grant of time scale on regular basis on the basis of performance assessment to be done on completion of three years and in the event, the performance of the respondents, is found satisfactory, they are entitled to regularisation on completion of three years, with all consequential monetary benefits."

7.The Director of Town Panchayats has also stated that as per the orders of Hon'ble High Court of Madras on the above Writ Appeals, there is no possibilities is to assess the performance of the employees at present, and many employees have filed Writ Petitions before the High Court of Madras for bringing them into the time scale of pay from the date on which they have completed 3 years on consolidated pay.

8. Therefore, the Director of Town Panchayats, has requested the Government to issue orders, permitting the Executive Officers of Town Panchayats to regularise the services of the employees working in sanitation, water supply and street light maintenance in Town Panchayats from the date on which they had completed 3 years of service on consolidated pay and claiming the arrears of pay from the General Fund of the concerned Town Panchayats.

9. The Government have examined the proposal of the Director of Town Panchayats in the light of the orders of the High Court of Madras in the batch of cases of Writ Appeals and decided to accept the proposal of the Director of Town Panchayats to permit the Executive Officers of Town Panchayats concerned to regularise the services of 2923 employees working in sanitation, water supply and street light maintenance in Town Panchayats who were already brought into the time scale of pay as per the G.O. 5th read above with effect from 23.06.2006 excluding the employees who were already brought into time scale of pay from the date on which they have completed 3 years of service on consolidated pay due to Court orders, from the date on which they have completed 3 years of service on consolidated pay for claiming the arrears of pay from the General Fund of the Town Panchayats concerned subject to condition that the salary and establishment cost including this expenditure should not exceed 49% of the total revenue of the concerned Town Panchayats and order accordingly."

44. Therefore, the subsequent orders also have been passed by the Government by taking a conscious view that, what has been stated in G.O.Ms.Nos.198 and 199 in respect of the employees who had been appointed in a newly created posts, of course, initially on a consolidated pay who are subsequently entitled to get time scale of pay on completion of successful three years period, has been recognised. This Court's view in this aspect has further been fortified because in the G.O.Ms.No.142, where G.O.Ms.Nos.199 and 198 had been referred, whereas G.O.Ms.No.101 has not been referred. Therefore, the distinctiveness of G.O.Ms.No.101 and its employees have been separately dealt with of course in the Full Bench judgment which is now ultimately pending before the Hon'ble Apex Court. Therefore, insofar as the employees covered under G.O.Ms.No.101 certainly their cases can be dealt with only subject to or pursuant to the outcome of the decision to be made by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the pending cases.

45.The said situation is not available insofar as the employees who are covered under G.O.Ms.Nos.198 and 199 and they have been independently dealt with right from the beginning till date and this has been evidenced in the recent issuance of G.O.Ms.No.142 dated 23.09.2015 of course pursuant to the orders passed by a Division Bench of this Court dated 30.06.2015.

46.All these aspects would go to show that the employees who are covered under G.O.Ms.No.198 like the respondents employees herein are entitled to get the benefit of time scale of pay on their successful completion of three years period from the date of their initial appointment under consolidated pay. For conferring such a benefit by way of financial benefit, this Court has no hesitation to hold that, the import of the ban imposed by the State Government between 2001 and 2006 shall not stand in the way, reason being, the ban imposed by the State Government is only in respect of creation of new posts and making a new appointment. Whereas, here the post was created well before the ban was imposed i.e. in the year 1998 and the appointment also had been made just one year before the ban imposed i.e., in the year 2000, therefore, the ban will not have any impact on conferring the financial benefit of these employees who are entitled to get the same on their successful completion of three years service.

47.Therefore, this Court do not find any error apparently on the impugned orders passed by the Labour Court in the computation petitions. However, insofar as the plea raised that 33C(2) petition under I.D. Act cannot be straight away filed before the Labour Court to computation of these amounts are concerned, in view of the decisions taken by this Court consistently from the year 2013 insofar as the employees who are covered under G.O.Ms.No.198, such a benefit has already been accrued on these employees, therefore, for which, they are entitled to and in order to get the said amount, it has to be quantified, therefore, the legal forum provided under the provisions of the I.D. Act can very well be utilised by these employees. Therefore, in that context only they approached the Labour Court invoking the provisions under Section 33C(2) of the Act which cannot be found fault with. Therefore, on that ground also, the petitioner Municipality cannot successfully assail the impugned order passed by the Labour Court.

48.For all these reasons discussed above, this Court is of the considered view that, the impugned order is liable to be sustained as it does not require any interference from this Court.

49.It is brought to the notice of this Court that, pursuant to the interim order passed by this Court, during the pendency

of the writ petitions, 50% of the arrears of pay revision for the period in question has already been paid to these respondents employees. In view of the above, the remaining 50% of their salary due, if not already paid, for the relevant period, shall be calculated and be paid to these employees by the petitioner Municipality within a period of two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

50. In the result, all these Writ Petitions fail, therefore, they are liable to be dismissed, accordingly are dismissed. However, there shall be no order as to costs.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (CS-VIII)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

Sgl

To

1. The Presiding Officer
I Additional Labour Court,
Chennai - 600 104.
2. The Commissioner,
Maraimalai Nagar Municipality,
Maraimalai Nagar,
Chengalpet Taluk,
kancheepuram District.

+1cc to Mr.P.Srinivas, Advocate, S.R.No. 40580
+2cc to Mr.K.M.Ramesh, Advocate, S.R.No. 40230

W.P.Nos.10141 to 10155 of 2014

JP (CO)
GN (17/04/2021)

WEB COPY