



WEB COPY



W.P.No.12777 of 2013

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 07.06.2023

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE V.LAKSHMINARAYANAN

W.P.No.12777 of 2013
and MP No.1 of 2013

Hindustan Unilever Limited
Detergent Factory,
Puducherry
Rep by its Senior Legal Executive

..Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Presiding Officer,
Labour Court,
Pondicherry.

2. N. Krishnan

..Respondents

Prayer: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking issuance of Writ of Certiorari calling for the records of the first respondent in I.D.No.3 of 2012 and quash its award dated 30.11.2012.

For Petitioner : Mr.Anand Gopalan
for M/s.T.S.Gopalan and Co.

For Respondents : R1 – Court
No appearance – for R2



W.P.No.12777 of 2013

WEB COPY

4. The Management took a stand that the workman was a chronic absentee. It is admitted that he was working for more than a decade with the Management. A detailed charge sheet has been given on 19.02.2010, but no reply was given by the employee. The Enquiry Officer submitted a report on 19.07.2010, finding the workman guilty of charges. The second show cause notice was issued and on 17.03.2011, the workman was dismissed from service.

5. Challenging the same, an Industrial Dispute was raised in ID No.3 of 2012. By the said award, the Labour Court found that the enquiry was proper and the dismissal was fair. Therefore, it refused to reinstate the workman in service, but took a view that in lieu of the same the sum of Rs.2,00,000/- be paid as a lump sum compensation. Challenging the same, the present Writ Petition has been filed.



W.P.No.12777 of 2013

WEB COPY

6. I have heard Mr.Anand Gopalan, learned counsel for M/s.T.S.Gopalan and Co. appearing for the petitioner and the second respondent, though served had not entered appearance.

7. I have carefully gone through the records and the award of the Labour Court. The Labour Court had correctly come to the conclusion that the workman having kept away from work without any authority, action has to be taken against him. Dismissal from service is disproportionate and excessive. Discretion has to be exercised taking into consideration the social status of the petitioner. While sitting under Article 226 of the Constitution, unless the discretion exercised is perverse, this Court should not interfere with the order of the Labour Court. This is a case where more than a decade of service put in by the writ petitioner, he had absented himself only for a short period of time. Therefore, dismissing him without any compensation would not be in the interest of justice. The labour court has correctly exercised its jurisdiction and discretion.



W.P.No.12777 of 2013

WEB COPY

8. Therefore, I am dismissing the Writ Petition. The respondent is directed to comply with the directions of the Labour Court within 12 weeks from the date of receipt of the orders. No costs. Consequently the connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

07.06.2023

jv
Index: Yes/No
Internet: Yes/No
Speaking order/Non-Speaking order

To:-

The Presiding Officer,
Labour Court,
Pondicherry.



WEB COPY



W.P.No.12777 of 2013

V.LAKSHMINARAYANAN, J.

jv

W.P.No.12777 of 2013
and MP No.1 of 2013

07.06.2023
1/2