



W.P.No.25453 of 2010

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 04.02.2025

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M. DHANDAPANI

W.P.No.25453 of 2010

and

M.P.No.1 of 2010

The Superintending Engineer,
Tamil Nadu Electricity Board,
Tiruvannamalai Electricity Distribution Circle,
Tiruvannamalai – 606 604.

... Petitioner

Vs.

- 1.The Government of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by its Secretary to Government,
Energy Department, Chennai – 9.
- 2.The Government of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by its Secretary to Labour and Employment Department,
Chennai – 9.
- 3.The Inspector of Labour,
Thiruvannamalai.
- 4.R.Sekar
- 5.B.Sekar
- 6.S.Munusami
- 7.R.Vijayan
- 8.P.Thanigai Giri Vasan
- 9.N.Manogaran
- 10.S.Rathinavelu
- 11.S.K.kannan
- 12.S.Chandrasekaran



W.P.No.25453 of 2010

WEB COPY

- 13.M.Sivagnanam
- 14.K.Srinivasan
- 15.M.Sivaraj
- 16.R.Sivakumar
- 17.K.Boopalan
- 18.S.Panneerselvam
- 19.S.Balaji
- 20.K.Elumalai
- 21.P.Elumalai
- 22.C.Pachaiyappan
- 23.G.Ramajayam
- 24.M.Ravichandran
- 25.V.Jaysankar
- 26.G.Pachaiyappan
- 27.A.Gajendiran
- 28.G.Gnanasekaran
- 29.N.Venkatesan
- 30.G.Ramajayam
- 31.K.Annamalai
- 32.G.Karthikeyan
- 33.K.Raman
- 34.D.Tamilselvan
- 35.A.Gopi
- 36.P.Ramasami

... Respondents

Prayer : Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a Writ of Certiorari, calling for the records of the third respondent relating to his award dated 19.10.2009 and made in Pa.Mu.E.2602 / 2008 and quash the same as illegal and without jurisdiction.

For Petitioner : Mr.Anand Gopalan
for M/s.Agam Legal Advocate

For Respondents : Mr.E.Sundaram
Government Advocate [R1 & R2]
Mr.S.Elumurugan [R7, R9, R11,



WEB COPY



W.P.No.25453 of 2010

R16, R17, R32 & R35]

No appearance [R3 to R6, R8,
R10, R12 to R15, R18 to R31,
R33, R34 & R6]

ORDER

This Writ Petition has been filed seeking for a Writ of Certiorari, to call for the records of the third respondent relating to his award dated 19.10.2009 and made in Pa.Mu.E.2602 / 2008 and quash the same as illegal and without jurisdiction.

2. The case of the petitioner is that, the private respondents/workmen filed claim petitions under Section 3 of the Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981 (in short 'the Act') before the third respondent/Labour Court. The private respondents are contract labourers under the control of the Superintending Engineer/Thiruvannamalai Electricity Distribution Circle/Tamil Nadu Electricity Board and they had put in a service of 480 days within a continuous period of 24 calendar months and therefore, they are entitled for conferment of permanent status. The third respondent/Labour Court, inadvertently adjudicated the



W.P.No.25453 of 2010

issue and passed award in favour of the private respondents/workmen

that their claim can be entertained in terms of Section 3 of the Act.

Challenging the same, the above writ petition has been filed.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that, the private respondents/workmen are contractor labourers and their claim can be adjudicated either under the Contract Labour (Regulation and Abolition) Act, 1970 or under the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. In the present case, the third respondent/Labour Court, without jurisdiction, adjudicated the issue under the Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981, which is not sustainable. In support of his contention, he relied upon the judgment of this Court in W.A.Nos.273 & 275 of 2020, dated 20.01.2023. Accordingly, he prays for allowing the above writ petition.

4. Learned counsel appearing for the respondents 7, 9, 11, 16, 17, 32 and 35 did not dispute the facts submitted by the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner.



W.P.No.25453 of 2010

5. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner, learned

Government Advocate appearing for the respondents 1 and 2 and the learned counsel appearing for the respondents 7, 9, 11, 16, 17, 32 and 35 and perused the materials available on records.

6. The Division Bench of this Court, in W.A.Nos.273 & 275 of 2020, has passed the following judgment on 20.01.2023 :

“Learned counsel appearing for the appellants-workmen would submit that the issue involved in these appeals is squarely covered by a Division Bench decision of this Court in W.P.No.4061 of 2013 and Batch, dated 07.03.2022.

2. Paragraph 34 of the above said decision reads as under :

“34. We have considered the submission aforesaid and find that the order passed by the Labour Inspector needs to be interfered with remand of the case. It is, however, to be made clear that the Labour Inspector would not cause enquiry beyond the powers given under the Act of 1981 and thereby would not be having jurisdiction to adjudicate the complicated questions of fact and law in reference to any other statute than the Act of 1981. The Labour Inspector may, for the purpose of conducting summary enquiry, allow the parties to produce documents and if any of the workmen has completed 480 days of



WEB COPY



W.P.No.25453 of 2010

continuous service in 24 calendar months, appropriate directions can be issued for granting permanency. However, even if such an order is issued, it should be with a clear finding about each workman and the number of working days by referring to the period of 24 calendar months. The benefit as to the consequences thereupon would be only for the period of employment and if any of the workmen is discontinued or not in service, he would be entitled to the benefit only for the period of service and not beyond that and, that too, after the completion of continuous service of 480 days in 24 calendar months, and not for a prior period. The direction aforesaid is not driven by the settlement for the reason that the workmen herein are those who were not extended the benefit of settlement and, therefore, sought claims by maintaining claim separately. However, it would not preclude both the sides from entering into settlement, if they so choose, during the period of summary enquiry by the Labour Inspector. The issue as to whether the respondents fall within the definition of “workman” is however decided against the petitioner Corporation, as not only a settlement was entered, but adjudication about claim to seek permanency has been decided earlier in reference to similarly placed.”

3. In view of the above said decision of this Court, these Writ Appeals are also disposed of. However, we make it clear that the authority can go into the question as to whether the contract is sham and nominal and, if it is sham and nominal, he has no authority to decide the issue and the matter has got to



WEB COPY



W.P.No.25453 of 2010

be decided either before the Industrial Adjudicator or the authority under the Contract Labour (Regulation and Abolition) Act, 1970. The authority is expected to decide the issue as early as possible on day-to-day basis, without adjourning the matter beyond seven working days at any point of time, as the same is pending for more than 25 years. No costs."

7. In view of the above said decision of this Court, the impugned order passed by the third respondent/Labour Court, dated 19.10.2009 is set aside. The private respondents/workmen are at liberty to raise a dispute either under Section 2(k) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 or under the Contract Labour (Regulation and Abolition) Act, 1970 before the Industrial Tribunal in the manner known to law.

8. Accordingly, the Writ Petition is allowed. No costs. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

04.02.2025

Index : Yes / No
Speaking order / Non-speaking order
Neutral Citation Case : Yes / No
sp



WEB COPY



W.P.No.25453 of 2010

M.DHANDAPANI, J.

sp

To

- 1.The Secretary to Government,
Energy Department, Chennai – 9.
- 2.The Secretary to Labour and Employment Department,
Chennai – 9.
- 3.The Inspector of Labour,
Thiruvannamalai.

W.P.No.25453 of 2010

04.02.2025