



had come to the conclusion that these petitioners had voluntarily tendered their resignation under the Scheme and have also received the compensation and therefore, are not entitled to raise the dispute.

WEB COPY

3. According to the learned counsel for the petitioners, the petitioners herein were coerced to sign the 18(1) Settlement and to receive the full and final dues.

4. Per contra, the learned counsel for the respondent would submit that under the Voluntary Retirement Scheme, 430 employees had opted for the same, out of which, only 63 of them had raised disputes before the Labour Court and even among that 63, only 24 have filed Writ Petitions before this Court. The learned counsel would submit that since the Labour Court has rendered factual findings based on the evidences available on record, this Court should not interfere with the Award.

5. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in Man Singh Vs. Maruti Suzuki India Limited and another reported in (2011) 14 Supreme Court Cases 662, had dealt with a similar situation, where an industrial dispute was raised by a worker after having received the compensation under a Voluntary Retirement Scheme. While rejecting the claim made by the workman, the Hon'ble Supreme Court placed reliance on its earlier judgment in Ramesh Chandra Sankla Vs. Vikram Cement reported in (2008) 14 SCC 58 : (2009) 1 SCC (L & S) 706. The relevant portion of the judgment in Man Singh Vs. Maruti Suzuki India Limited and another reported in (2011) 14 Supreme Court Cases 662, reads as follows:

"...

7. The workmen challenged the order of the Division Bench before this Court inter alia on the ground that having held that the management's appeals were not maintainable, the Division Bench had no jurisdiction to make the impugned direction. This Court repelled the workmen's contention and in paras 100 and 101 of the decision held and observed as follows:- (Ramesh Chandra Sankla Case, (2008) 14 SCC 58 :

(2009) 1 SCC (L & S) 706)

"100. Even otherwise, according to the workmen, they were compelled to accept the amount and they received such amount under coercion and duress. In our considered opinion, they cannot retain the benefit if they want to prosecute claim petitions instituted by them with the Labour Court. Hence, the order passed by the Division Bench of the High Court as to refund of amount cannot be termed unjust, inequitable or improper. Hence, even if it is held



WEB COPY

that a 'technical' contention raised by the workmen has some force, this Court which again exercises discretionary and equitable jurisdiction under Article 136 of the Constitution, will not interfere with a direction which is in consonance with the doctrine of equity. It has been rightly said that a person 'who seeks equity must do equity'. Here the workmen claim benefits as workmen of the Company, but they do not want to part with the benefit they have received towards retirement and severance of relationship of master and servant. It simply cannot be permitted. In our judgment, therefore, the final direction issued by the Division Bench needs no interference, particularly when the Company has also approached this Court under Article 136 of the Constitution.

101. For the foregoing reasons, in our opinion, the order passed by the Division Bench of the High Court deserves to be confirmed and is hereby confirmed. The payment which is required to be made as per the said order should be made by the applicants intending to prosecute their claims before the Labour Court, Mandsour. In view of the fact, however, that the said period is by now over, ends of justice would be served if we extend the time so as to enable the applicants to refund the amount. We, therefore, extend the time up to 31-12-2008 to make such payment. We may, however, clarify that the claim petitions will not be proceeded with till such payment is made. If the payment is not made within the period stipulated above, the claim petitions of those applicants will automatically stand dismissed. The Labour Court will take up the claim petitions after 31-12-2008."

8. The present case is squarely covered by the decision of this Court in Ramesh Chandra Sankla [(2008) 14 SCC 58 : (2009) 1 SCC (L & S) 706]. We, thus, find no merit in the submission made on behalf of the appellant that the High Court had no jurisdiction to make a direction for refund of the entire amount received by the appellant as a condition precedent for the reference to proceed."

6. Likewise, a Division Bench of this Court in the case of V. Ramalingam Vs. Presiding Officer, II Additional Labour Court, Chennai and another and R. Sekar Vs. Presiding Officer, Principal Labour Court, Chennai reported in 2007 (1) L.L.N. 265, had held



that when the Labour Court comes to a conclusion based on the evidences that there was no coercion on the part of the employers and that the employees had voluntarily opted for the Voluntary Retirement Scheme, the High Court would not ordinarily interfere with such factual findings.

7. The ratio laid down in the aforesaid decision are precisely the ground raised by the petitioners, which has been negated. If the petitioners were of the view that the Management had coerced them to receive the compensation, they ought to have refunded the compensation before raising a dispute, as held by Hon'ble Supreme Court in Man Singh's case (supra). Likewise, when the Labour Court had found that there was no coercion on the part of the Management in permitting the petitioners herein to go on voluntary retirement, I do not find any reason to interfere into such findings, which is the ratio laid down in V.Ramalingam (supra) and R.Sekar (supra).

8. In the result, there are no merits in these Writ Petitions. Accordingly, all the Writ Petitions stand dismissed. No costs. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar(CS III)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

Jvm

The Judge,
The Additional Labour Court,
Coimbatore.

+3cc to M/s.S.Sasikala, Advocate Sr.55669

W.P.Nos.33720, 33611 and 34946 of 2019

rld[co]
srg 16/11/2021