



C.M.A(MD)No.235 of 2020

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: **12.06.2023**

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE R.VIJAYAKUMAR

C.M.A(MD)No.235 of 2020

Employee's State Insurance Corporation (SRO),
4th Main Road,
K.K.Nagar, Madurai-20.
Represented by its Deputy Director. ... Appellant/Respondent

Vs.

M/s.Sri Maha Spinning Mills Pvt.Ltd.,
Lakshmananpatti,
Kalanampatti, Dindigul District,
Represented by its Chief General Manager. ... Respondent/Petitioner

PRAYER: Civil Miscellaneous Appeal is filed under Section 82 of the E.S.I Act, to set aside the order, dated 22.04.2019 passed by the E.S.I Court (i.e. Labour Court), Madurai in E.S.I.O.P.No.64 of 2011, permit the appellant to charge interest, as claimed in the communication, dated 08.07.2008 as permissible under law and allow this Civil Miscellaneous Appeal with necessary directions in favour of the appellant.

For Appellant : Mr.P.Ganapathisamy

For Respondent : Mr.K.Hemakarthiskeyan



C.M.A(MD)No.235 of 2020

WEB COPY

JUDGMENT

The present appeal has been filed by the E.S.I corporation challenging the order of the Labour Court, Madurai in E.S.I.O.P.No.64 of 2011.

2. According to the learned counsel appearing for the appellant, the coverage of the E.S.I Act was extended to the respondent employer with effect from 01.08.2000. However, the said coverage was challenged by the employer by filing various proceedings. Ultimately, the writ petition came to be dismissed on 03.10.2007. After the dismissal of the writ petition, the employer had filed M.P.No.1 of 2008 in W.P.No.24871 of 2007 seeking clarification to the effect that the order of the dismissal of the writ petition will have only prospective effect and therefore, the employer will be under a statutory obligation to deposit the contribution amount only from the date of passing of the order in writ petition, namely 03.10.2007. The learned Judge of this Court passed an order on 08.07.2008 to the effect that the contributions have to be paid by the employer only with effect from 03.10.2007. Pursuant to the said orders, the employer had paid the entire due on 28.07.2008.



C.M.A(MD)No.235 of 2020

WEB COPY

3. The E.S.I corporation on 08.07.2011 issued a notice under Form C-18 seeking interest for the period between October 2007 to June 2008 to a sum of Rs.24,957/-. The said C-18 notice was subject matter of challenge by the employer in E.S.I.O.P.No.64 of 2011.

4. The Labour Court after considering the evidence of both the parties, arrived at a finding that the corporation could not attribute any motive or bad intention upon by the employer to evade payment of contribution. Therefore, the payment made by the employer immediately after passing of the order should be treated as a strict compliance with the statutory regulations and thereafter, the demand for interest is not legally sustainable. On the basis of the said findings, the Form C-18 notice was set aside by the Labour Court. Challenging the said order, the present appeal has been filed by the E.S.I corporation raising the following substantial questions of law:

“(1) Whether E.S.I Court has got power to prevent charging of interest as admissible as per the provisions of the E.S.I Act, 1948 and E.S.I (General) Regulations, 1950?

(2) Whether the order of the E.S.I Court will promote the interest of the workers?

(3) Whether the Trial Court has power to go against

the express provisions of statute?

<https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis>



C.M.A(MD)No.235 of 2020

(4) Whether the Trial Court has power to go against the express provisions of law laid down by the Supreme Court and this High Court?

5. According to the learned counsel appearing for the appellant, the learned Judge of this Court has issued an order on 08.07.2008 clarifying that the coverage of the establishment would commence from 03.10.2007. However, the entire contribution amount was made only on 28.07.2008. The interest being statutory and consequential in nature, the same cannot be waived by the authorities or by the Court. The Labour Court ought not to have taken the date of disposal of the writ petition as the crucial date for calculation of interest, when the High Court has specifically clarified that the coverage is from 03.10.2007 onwards.

6. Per contra, the learned counsel appearing for the respondent had contended that though the writ petition was dismissed on 03.10.2007, a clarification petition was pending before the High Court to clarify whether the order would have retrospective effect or prospective effect. An order was passed in the said clarificatory petition only on 08.07.2008. Within 20 days from the date of clarificatory order, the entire amount has been deposited by the employer on 28.07.2008. Therefore, E.S.I Court was right in quashing C-18 notice demand interest.



C.M.A(MD)No.235 of 2020

7. I have carefully considered the submissions made on either side.

WEB COPY

8. A perusal of the order, dated 03.10.2007 indicates that the challenge to the coverage under E.S.I Act was made by the employee's union and it was dismissed on the said date. Thereafter, the employer has chosen to file M.P.No.1 of 2008 to seek clarification whether the order would have a retrospective effect or not. The clarificatory order was issued on 08.07.2008 to the effect that E.S.I Act coverage would start from 03.10.2007. Therefore, it is clear that the coverage of the establishment under the E.S.I Act starts from 03.10.2007. The scope of review is only for the purpose of seeking clarification whether the employer has to pay contribution for the period between August 2001 and September 2007. Therefore, the payment of the contribution from October 2007 onwards was not the subject matter of the review. Hence, the contention of the learned counsel appearing for the employer that they were awaiting for the orders in the review petition till 08.07.2008 is not legally sustainable.

9. The E.S.I Court has taken the date of disposal of the clarificatory petition as crucial date for the calculation of interest. When the High Court has clarified that the Act is applicable from 03.10.2007, the E.S.I Court was not right in holding that interest should be calculated



C.M.A(MD)No.235 of 2020

only from August 2008. The learned counsel appearing for the employer had pointed out that in C-18 notice, dated 08.07.2011, it is recorded that the payments were made by the employer only on 28.07.2008 and accordingly, interest has to be calculated. As per Exhibit P.2 before the E.S.I Court, the entire amount has been paid only on 28.07.2008 and therefore, the calculation relating to interest is as per the provisions of the Act.

10. In view of the above said deliberations, this Court passes the following order:

The appeal stands dismissed and order, dated 08.07.2011 is hereby confirmed.

11. With the above said observations, the Civil Miscellaneous Appeal stands dismissed. No costs.

12.06.2023

NCC : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes / No
gbg



C.M.A(MD)No.235 of 2020

To

WEB COPY

- 1.The E.S.I Court (i.e.Labour Court),
Madurai.
- 2.The Section Officer,
Vernacular Section,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



C.M.A(MD)No.235 of 2020

R.VIJAYAKUMAR,J.

gbg

Judgment made in
C.M.A(MD)No.235 of 2020

12.06.2023