



WEB COPY

W.P.No.12462 of 2023

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 31.01.2025

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE **D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY**

W.P.No.12462 of 2023

1. J.DEVARAJ
2. M. GOPALRAJ
3. C. DHARMAR
4. Y.K. DEVARAJ
5. S.L. RAJAMANI
6. K. ARAVINDAN
7. V. GANESAN
8. R. SEKAR
9. A.ALPHONSE
10. S. HANEEFA
11. S. GANGADHARAN
12. D. SEBASTIAN
13. N. CHANDRAN
14. V. RADHAKRISHNAN
15. V.SOUNDARARAJAN
16. C. JEGANNATHAN
17. V. SIVALINGAM
18. K.P. LAWRENCE
19. M. VISHNU
20. G. SEKAR
21. P.KALIAN
22. R. SHANMUGAM
23. T. MANAKKANNU
24. P.K.VIJAYAKUMARI
25. N. DELHIKUMAR
26. R. GANDHI
27. A.CHANDRASEKARAN
28. R. SRINIVASAN
29. MUTHUVEERAN
30. M. SUNDARAM
31. CHINNATHAMBI
32. RADHA



W.P.No.12462 of 2023

33. R. SHAJAHAN
34. I. PALANISAMY
35. A.K.ASHOK KUMAR
36. R. GOVINDARAJAN
37. A. RAMAN
38. A.K.RAMALINGAM
39. N. SHANMUGAN
40. R. DEVADOSS
41. N. RAJAMANI
42. B. VIKRAMAN
43. R.VASANTHA KUMARI
44. R.RADHAKRISHNAN
45. K.A.NANJAN
46. T.GAYATHRI
47. M. RAJU
48. M.RANGASWAMY
49. R. ALLIMUTHU
50. S. KALU
51. K.R.SAGADEVAN
52. C. ILANGO VAN
53. A.R.KOLLARI
54. J. STANLEY PETER
55. G. SHANTHA
56. A.ANTONY
57. S.B. MOHANKUMAR
58. R. VISWANATHAN
59. N. DEVARAJ
60. J. FRANCIS
61. M. PALANISWAMY
62. L. KRISHNAN
63. R. KRISHNARAJ
64. R. NAGARAJAN
65. J. MANIE
66. B. SRINIVASAN
67. S. NANJAN
68. S. PONMANI
69. T. JAYARAMAN
70. R. MAGENDRAN
71. A. GLADIS MARIA JOSEPH
72. K. MADHAVAN
73. R. PARAMASIVAM
74. SAVITHIRI
75. O.BALAN



W.P.No.12462 of 2023

76. J. STEPHENRAJ
77. T. BALAKRISHNAN
78. S. HALAN
79. S. VIJAYAKUMAR
80. M. JOHN DAVID
81. J. LEONARD
82. R. DHAMODHARAN
83. K. HALDORAI
84. B. SIVAPRAKASAM
85. G. RAGHUNATHAN
86. L. SEVANAN
87. N. YOGESHWARA RAO
88. C. PARAMASIVAM
89. M. PARAMESHWARAN
90. M. CHANDRAN
91. A. MOHAMED YAKUB
92. DOREEN D'SOUZA
93. LAKSHMI
94. A.M.APPUSWAMY
95. S. GANAPATHY
96. J. KANNAN
97. J. BENJAMIN JAYARAJ
98. I. TAJUDDIN
99. V. VEERAMANI
100. V. MOHAN
101. M. PALANISAMY
102. MAIALAGAN
103. C. ARJUNAN
104. S. GEORGE
105. N.P.B. JAGANNATHAN
106. S.A.D.THIRUNAVUKKARASU
107. K. JEEVAN
108. R.MADAN MOHAN
109. C. CHITRAKALA
110. S. ILANGO VAN
111. K. SOORIYAN
112. G.L.NARASIMHAN
113. M. BOJAN
114. M. PRABHU
115. S. KAMALA
116. R. JANAKI
117. R. AZHWAR
118. CHINNADURAI



W.P.No.12462 of 2023

119. A. THANGAPPAN
120. K. SELVARAJ
121. A.DAVID MANOHARAN
122. D. GUNASEKARAN
123. R. BHEEMARAJ
124. K. PRABAKARAN
125. B. HALDORAI
126. B. BHEEMAN
127. K.SELVARANI
128. K.KALAISELVI

(P127 & P128 – IMPEADED AS PER ORDER DATED 06.02.2025
IN W.M.P.NO. 696/2025 IN W.P.NO. 12462 of 2023 BY DBCJ)

... Petitioners

Vs.

1. Hindustan Photo Films Manufacturing Co., Limited.,
Indu Nagar, Ootacamund, The Nilgiris,
Tamilnadu 643 005.
2. The Government of India,
Rep. by its Joint Secretary,
Department of Heavy Industries,
Ministry of Heavy Industries and Public enterprises
Udyog Bhavan, New Delhi
3. The Official Liquidator,
Hindustan Photo Films Manufacturing Co., Limited,
M/s.SPP and Co., Chartered Accountants,
No. 27/9, Nivedh Vikas,
Pankaja Mill Road, Puliyakulam,
Coimbatore - 641 045.

(R3-Impleaded as per order dated 31.01.2025
in W.M.P.No. 33686/2023 in W.P.No. 12462 of 2023 by DBCJ)

... Respondents

Prayer: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of Constitution of India for the issuance of Writ of Mandamus, directing the second respondent to refund the



W.P.No.12462 of 2023

RMA (Recoverable/Refundable Monthly Advance)/SPA (Specific Performance Allowance) /AA (Adjustable Advance) deducted from the petitioners/Workers/employees from their respective VRS benefits within the time stipulated by this Court.

For Petitioners : Mr.S.Mukunth, Senior Counsel
Assisted by Mr.V.Sivakumar

For R1 & R3 : Mr.A.G.Sathyanarayana
For R2 : Mr.Prasad Vijayakumar

ORDER

This writ petition has been filed for a writ of Mandamus directing the second respondent to refund the RMA (Recoverable/Refundable Monthly Advance)/SPA (Specific Performance Allowance) /AA (Adjustable Advance) deducted from the petitioners/Workers/employees from their respective VRS benefits.

2. *Mr.S.Mukunth*, the learned Senior Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners would submit that these 123 workmen voluntarily retired from service and are therefore directly covered by paragraph No.24.3 of the order in W.P.No. 24460 of 2013. The said order was also confirmed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India and the SLP was dismissed by an order dated



W.P.No.12462 of 2023

05.05.2022. Subsequently, when the company went into liquidation and a resolution professional was appointed, the Government of India was still willing to settle the amount and sought clarification from the Supreme Court of India. The premises on which the clarification was sought is recorded by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in its order dated 05.08.2022. The following are the clarification that were sought for:-

“Miscellaneous Application Nos. 1273-1275/2022 have now been preferred by Union of India seeking following directions:

(i) pass an order/direction that the payment which is required to be given as loan to the management of HPF in terms of judgment dated 29.11.2016 passed by Hon'ble High Court of Judicature at Madras be deposited with the Registrar of Hon'ble High Court of Judicature at Madras and the same be released to the persons entitled to receive the same.

(ii) Pass an order/direction to the Resolution Professional who is presently in-charge of the company, to obtain claims from the 633 ex-employees and after due verification from the records of the company and independent verification by a Chartered Accountant, submit actual requirement of funds to GoI accordingly.

(iii) Pass an order/direction to the Resolution Professional to admit claim of GoI to this effect and treat the amount as the first charge over the assets of the company to the Central Government since they step into the shoes of the workmen by taking over to discharge the burden of the company by way of the VRS Scheme.”

3. On the said prayer made by the Government of India, the following was the clarification issued by the Honourable Supreme Court of India:-



WEB COPY



W.P.No.12462 of 2023

“a. The money in terms of the order passed by the High Court as confirmed by this Court, be deposited with the Labour Commissioner, Chennai.

b. The Labour Commissioner shall thereafter issue notice to the concerned workmen and after being satisfied about the identity of the claimants, shall disburse the same to the concerned workmen.

c. The Union of India shall, while making the deposit, give all the details in a Tabular Chart to assist the Labour Commissioner in disbursing the sums.

d. Let the needful be done with six weeks from today

e. All the other issues are kept open”

4. In that view of the matter, the learned Senior Counsel for the petitioners prays that the Government should be directed to release the fund so that they can also approach the Labour Commissioner and receive their benefit.

5. Per contra, *Mr.Prasad Vijayakumar*, the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the second respondent would submit that the workmen have to approach the liquidator and their claims can only be decided as per the mechanism provided under the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016.

6. The learned liquidator would submit that as on date, there is no money that is readily available to be paid to the workman. Even if some



W.P.No.12462 of 2023

9. From the clarification order, it can be seen that merely because the company went into liquidation, the Union of India did not change its stand. By paragraph (ii) which is extracted above, it is clear that after the appointment of the resolution professional, the Union of India was taking such a stand that the claims of 633 employees, pending as on that date should be verified by an Independent Chartered Accountant. The Hon'ble Supreme Court has ordered that instead of Chartered Accountant, the workmen may approach before the Labour Commissioner. Therefore, since the claimants are similarly situated to the aforementioned workmen, nothing prevented these workmen from approaching the Labour Commissioner. They have not approached the Labour Commissioner.

10. When this Court made a suggestion to the learned counsel that these workmen can also approach the Labour Commissioner, *Mr.Prasad Vijayakumar*, the learned counsel appearing for the second respondent raised two specific objections. Firstly, he pointed out that when the Government made its concession at that relevant time, the CIRP was not there. Secondly, he stated that even when the clarification was sought, it was specifically sought with reference to the 633 workmen only.



W.P.No.12462 of 2023

WEB COPY

11. I am of the view that, while it may be true that the company subsequently went into liquidation and the liquidator was there in picture, it was not an obligation on the part of the Government of India. However, considering the plight of the workmen, the Government of India voluntarily stepped in to settle the matter for the workmen. This was rightly done, because if the workmen had gone through the waterfall mechanism, they might have missed out entirely. The liquidator has to strictly go by Section 54 of the IBC. Therefore, it is for the Union of India to take such a stand before the Labour Commissioner. Suffice it to conclude that when the workmen are claiming rights under the order passed by the Court in W.P.No.24460 of 2013, as confirmed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India and clarified by the order dated 05.08.2022, then they should have made their claim before the Labour Commissioner and should not have approached this Court. I do not see any record that is filed before this Court indicating that they have approached the Labour Commissioner. Therefore, it remains open for these 123 workmen to make such claims before the Labour Commissioner. The Labour Commissioner shall act strictly as directed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, issuing notice to all concerned, including the liquidator and the Union



W.P.No.12462 of 2023

of India and decide the matter in accordance with law. The application shall be filed within a period of two weeks from the date of production of the website uploaded order copy of this Court without waiting for the certified copy. Upon the filing of such an application, the Labour Commissioner shall decide the matter in the manner known to law within 16 weeks from that date.

12. Accordingly, this writ petition is disposed of. No costs.

31.01.2025

4/4

Neutral Citation: Yes
nsl

D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY, J.

nsl

To
The Joint Secretary,
Department of Heavy Industries,
Ministry of Heavy Industries and Public enterprises
Udyog Bhavan, New Delhi

11/12



WEB COPY



W.P.No.12462 of 2023

W.P.No.12462 of 2023

31.01.2025
4/4