BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 08.03.2023

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE N.SATHISH KUMAR

C.M.A.(MD)No.1115 of 2022

1.Chandrakala
2.Yuvaraj
3.Swarnalatha ... Appellants / Petitioners

Vs.

1.The Branch Manager,
Tamil Nadu State Transport Corporation Ltd.,
(Kumbakonam) Karur Branch – 1,
Thirumanilaiyur,
Karur Town.

2.The General Manager,
Tamil Nadu State Transport Corporation Ltd.,
(Kumbakonam) Tiruchirapalli Division,
Tiruchirapalli.

3.The Managing Director,
Tamil Nadu State Transport Corporation Ltd.,
(Kumbakonam), Head Office,
Kumbakonam,
Thanjavur District.

4.The Manager,
The New India Assurance Company Ltd.,
Tiruchirapalli. ... Respondents / Respondents

PRAYER: This Civil Miscellaneous Appeal is filed under Section 30(1)(A) of Workmen Compensation Act, against the order dated 31.03.2021 made in W.C.No. 107 of 2013 on the file of the Workmen Compensation Commissioner Tribunal, Dindigul.

For Appellants : Mr.S.Rajasekar

For Respondents : Mr.K.Ramaiah for R1 to R3

Mr.R.Sureshkumar for R4

JUDGMENT

Challenging the order passed by the Workmen Compensation Commissioner Tribunal, Dindigul, in W.C.No.107 of 2013, dated 31.03.2021, the appellants have filed this Civil Miscellaneous Appeal.

2. The only question raised in this appeal is that the fixation of amount with respect of monthly income under the provisions of the Employees Compensation Act, is not according to the revised G.O.(2D).No.91, Labour and Employment (J1) Department, dated 12.12.2013 or not.

3. The brief facts, leading to the filing of this Civil Miscellaneous Appeal, are as follows:-

The deceased Subramani @ Subramanian was a driver of the first respondent Corporation and while he was driving a bus, bearing Registration No.TN-45-N-2302 from Karur to Dindigul on 13.01.2013, the deceased fainted and fell down from the bus. As a result, the deceased succumbed to injures, whereby, an application has been filed by the legal heirs of the deceased Subramani @ Subramanian, before the Workmen Compensation Commissioner, Dindigul. Though the Insurance company has made as a party, no relief has been sought as against the 4th respondent.

4. The respondents 1 to 3 – Transport Corporation took a stand before the Tribunal that the since the Transport Corporation has taken a policy under the Group Janatha Personal Accident Policy for their employees, they are not liable to pay any compensation and the Insurance Company is liable to pay compensation.

5. The 4th respondent – Insurance company took a stand before the Tribunal that the Transport Corporation has taken a policy for their employees under the Group Janatha Personal Accident Policy and as per the policy, the amount has already been paid and therefore, they are not liable to pay the compensation.

6. The Workmen Compensation Commissioner, considering the entire evidence adduced before him, has fixed the monthly income of the deceased at Rs.8,000/- as per the Workmen Compensation Act and awarded a total compensation of Rs.6,03,680/- with interest at the rate of 12% p.a. Aggrieved over the same, the appellants have filed this Civil Miscellaneous Appeal for enhancement of the compensation.

7. The only contention raised by the learned counsel appearing for the appellants is that as per the Government order referred to above, the monthly income of the deceased ought to have been fixed at Rs.9,787/-. In support of his submissions, he has relied upon a judgment of this Court in ***C.M.A.No.897 of 2018 [P.Ramesh Vs. Ravi and others], dated 27.01.2021*** and ***C.M.A.No.1982 of 2018 [Selvi and others Vs. Gnanasundari and others], dated 15.03.2021,*** wherein, this Court has enhanced the monthly income of the deceased from Rs.8,000/- to Rs.9,787/-.

8. The learned counsel appearing for the respondents have not disputed the judgments of this Court.

9. I have heard the learned counsel appearing on either side and perused the materials available on record.

10. In G.O.(2D).No.91, Labour and Employment Department (J1), dated 12.12.2013, it is stated that while calculating the compensation, the minimum wages fixed by the State Government has to be adopted. The original notification was issued on 31.05.2010 under Section 4(1B) of the Employees Compensation Act. Relying upon the said notification, the Workmen Compensation Commissioner, has fixed the monthly income of the deceased. It is relevant to note that in the year 2013, the State Government in G.O.2D.No.91, Labour and Employment Department, dated 12.12.2013, has enhanced the minimum wages to the workmen as Rs.9,787/- under the provisions of the Minimum Wages Act. Thus, the beneficial minimum wages under the general law is to be applied for the purpose of grant of compensation. This Court also elaborately considered the enhancement made by the State Government regarding minimum wages to be paid under the Minimum Wages Act in C.M.A.No.897 of 2018, dated 27.01.2021 and the relevant paragraphs are extracted hereunder:

> *"18. Adopting the conventional procedures, the minimum wages are fixed by the State and Union for the purpose of fixing the*

monthly income. Undoubtedly prior to 18.01.2010, the date on which the amendment was issued, the deeming cap was in force and as per the deeming cap, a sum of Rs.4000/- was fixed as a monthly income. However, in the amendment dated 18.01.2010, such a deeming cap was removed and the Supreme Court also interpreted in the case of K.Sivaraman and Ors Vs.Sathish Kumar and Anr, cited supra that such deeming cap on the monthly income of the employee was removed from the amendment. Therefore, the actual monthly wages of the employee is to be taken into account for grant of compensation. Therefore, the employee is at liberty to establish his monthly income by submitting documents and evidences. Once an employee is able to establish his monthly income with an acceptable evidence, then, such monthly income is to be taken into consideration for the purpose of quantifying the compensation. In the cases where there is no proof is available, then, the minimum wages notified by the Central Government under Section 4(1B) is to be taken into account.

19. Thus, the object of fixation of monthly wages by the Central Government, is to ensure that the employees are not discriminated or to avoid discrepancies in quantifying the compensation. The authorities may have their own notions and approaches in the matter of fixation of monthly income. Such fixation cannot be at the discretion of the competent authorities. In the event of granting discretion, there are possibilities of discrepancies and denial of justice to the workmen. That is the reason why the Central Government thought fit to issue a notification regarding the minimum wages to be fixed for grant of *compensation. The fixation of minimum wages under Section 4(1B) has got a definite object. The very object would be to eradicate the discrimination and inconsistencies in the matter of fixation of monthly income. However such fixation would not deprive the workmen from getting higher compensation based on his actual income if he is able to establish the monthly income with acceptable evidence.*

20. For example, the workmen working in Government Transport Corporation is having definite evidence regarding his salary. The workers working in Government factories are having proof for their monthly income. Those workmen cannot be denied compensation on par with their monthly income. Because the compensation must be in commensuration with the status of the workmen and the income of the workmen in order to protect the interest of the family and their livelihood. In every legislation, the common purpose would be to grant compensation in commensuration with the family status and to meet out the livelihood. Another example would be the grant of maintenance in matrimonial cases, the monthly maintenance is paid taking into account the various factors including the family status. Therefore, there cannot be a ceiling for the purpose of grant of maintenance in matrimonial cases or equally grant of compensation in workmen cases. All such welfare provisions are to be interpreted so as to ensure and protect the livelihood of the workmen. While protecting the livelihood of the workmen, the income is to be fixed with reference to the actual income established and if not, the minimum wages notified by the Central Government.

21. The question arises, whether the minimum wages fixed by the Government of Tamil Nadu can be adopted for the purpose of grant of compensation under the Workmen Compensation Act. There is no dispute that the Act is a welfare legislation. The principles to be followed is to grant 'just compensation'. There cannot be any other opinion that the compensation to be granted, must be not only adequate, but in commensuration with the cost index of the relevant point of time. Thus, if there is no revision of minimum wages by the Central Government under the provisions of the Workmen Compensation Act, and if such minimum wages are fixed by the particular State Government, considering the cost index of the relevant point of time under the provisions of the Minimum Wages Act, which is a general law, then for the purpose of calculating the compensation, the minimum wages fixed by the State can be adopted, so as to grant a 'just compensation', which is the basic principle to be adopted. In the interest of justice, and to compensate the victim in commensuration with the disability / suffering or otherwise, the Courts have to adopt a pragmatic approach and once the minimum wages are fixed by the State concerned under the provisions of the Minimum Wages Act, the said minimum wages shall be taken into account for calculating the compensation, provided such minimum wages are higher than that of the minimum wages fixed by the Central Government under Section 4(1) of the Workmen Compensation Act.

22. It is needless to state that the notification issued by the Central Government under Section 4(1B) is to be followed all *over the Nation and that shall be the minimum wages. However, if any enhancement is made by any State by invoking the provisions of the Minimum Wages Act, then such minimum wages, which is more beneficial to the victims shall be followed for the purpose of fixing the monthly income. This happens because there is a long interval in fixing minimum wages under the provisions of the Employees Compensation Act by the Central Government. In between the State Governments are reviewing the minimum wages to be paid under the Minimum Wages Act. The Act being a welfare legislation, the beneficial income fixed under the provisions of the Minimum Wages Act shall be adopted, so as to fix the compensation. In the event of not granting the minimum wages with reference to the price index during the relevant point of time, then the victims are not only deprived, but the principles of 'just compensation' is diluted. Fixing of monthly income with reference to the minimum wages arises only in cases, where the monthly income is unable to be established by the claimants with an acceptable evidence. When a workman is not having adequate evidence to establish the monthly income, then the statute requires that the minimum wages as applicable is to be fixed for quantifying the compensation. The method of calculation is also contemplated under Section 5 of the Workmen Compensation Act. Thus, the principles of 'just compensation' is to be scrupulously followed by the Courts, while calculating the compensation with reference to the Statute.*

23. As far as Sections 4 and 5 of the Workmen Compensation Act is concerned, the method of calculating the *wages are contemplated. However, there is no reference with regard to the monthly wages to be notified by the Central Government. Thus, the cogent reading of theentire scheme of the Act as well as the statement of objects and reasons and taking note of the fact that the claimants are entitled for 'just compensation', the workman should not be deprived of the benefit of enhancement made either by the Central Government or by the State Government under the provisions of the Minimum Wages Act regarding the monthly income. The Courts are bound to ensure the beneficial monthly income fixed under the provisions of the Minimum Wages Act, which is a general Act. Irrespective of the fact, whether such fixation is done by the Central Government by issuing a notification or by the State Government by issuing appropriate orders.*

24. The minimum wages of Rs.8,000/- was fixed by the Central Government with effect from 18.01.2010. If any accident occurred in the year 2013 or 2014, definitely the said amount cannot be adequate to meet out the family expenditures of the legal heirs in the event of death of an employee. In such circumstances, the Courts cannot do the exercise to assess the prevailing cost index during the relevant point of time. However, the Courts are bound to ensure and minimize the inequalities in the matter of grant of compensation.

25. Thus, this Court has no hesitation in holding that the minimum wages notified by the Central Government under Section 4(1B) of the Act, 1923 is applicable all over the Nation in general *and in particular, if any State fixed the minimum wages under the provisions of the Minimum Wages Act, which is higher than that of the minimum wages fixed by the Central Government, then the minimum wages fixed by the State Government, which is more beneficial is to be adopted for the purpose of fixing the monthly income of the employee concerned. This is to be followed, because the employee concerned is working in the particular State and the State has enhanced the minimum wages to be paid to the workman. Therefore, in the event of not adopting the minimum wages notified by the State, which is higher than that of the Central Government Notification, then there will be an inequality of fixing minimum wages, in the matter of fixing monthly income and grant of compensation."*

11. Following the said Judgment, this Court is also inclined to enhance the monthly income of the deceased from a sum of R.8,000/- to Rs.9,787/- and accordingly, the appellants are entitled for the compensation of Rs.7,12,410/- (Rupees Seven Lakhs Twelve Thousand Four Hundred and Ten only) [9787 x 50/100 x 149.67 = 7,32,410 + Rs.5,000 for funeral expenses – Rs.25,000/- already paid for the policy] along with interest at the rate of 12% p.a. from the date of accident till the date of deposit.

12. In the result, this Civil Miscellaneous Appeal is allowed and the respondents 1 to 3 – Transport Corporation is directed to deposit the modified compensation amount of Rs.7,12,410/- (Rupees Seven Lakhs Twelve Thousand Four Hundred and Ten only), along with interest at the rate of 12% p.a. from the date of accident till the date of deposit, less the amount already deposited, if any, within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. No costs.

08.03.2023

NCC : Yes/No

Index : Yes/No
Internet : Yes/No
vsm

To

1.The Workmen Compensation Commissioner Tribunal,
Dindigul.

2.The Section Officer,
Vernacular Records,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

N.SATHISH KUMAR, J.

vsm

C.M.A.(MD)No.1115 of 2022

08.03.2023