

**V.PARTHIBAN.,J.**

Today, the matter is posted under the caption 'for being mentioned'. On behalf of the petitioner, the learned counsel submitted that fixation of Rs.10,00,000/- to be paid as one lump-sum towards backwages to the second respondent / employee and also declaring his entitlement to be paid during the last drawn wages during the pendency of the appeal before the first respondent / Authority was not a consent order.

2. In the said circumstances, a request is made that the observation that the petitioners have agreed to the arrangement may be deleted by making it as a Court order, instead.

3. This Court in consideration of the request made by the learned counsel for the petitioner / management accepts the same as it found that there was no express agreement or consent pleaded on behalf of the petitioner at the time when the order was dictated and delivered.

4. In the above circumstances, the order in paragraph 11 is modified as under;

"11.This Court in consideration of the above narrative, taking into consideration of the opposition of the petitioner / Management and also the huge amount due towards back wages, is of the view that Rs.10 Lakh would be equitable and reasonable to be paid in one lump sum to the second

V.PARTHIBAN.,J.



WEB COPY

mrm

respondent employee. Apart from the payment of the lump sum, the second respondent is also entitled to be paid the last drawn wages, pending disposal of the appeal by the appellate authority on remand by this Court. However, a request is made to this Court to fix a time-limit for early disposal of the appeal by the appellate authority."

5. The Registry is directed to issue corrected / modified order only insofar as paragraph 11 is concerned and all other contents of the document will remain as it is without any change.

mrm

11.03.2022W.P.No.6520 of 2021