



WEB COPY



W.P.No.12736 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 09.04.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE **M.DHANDAPANI**

W.P.No.12736 of 2025
and
WMP.No.14312 of 2025

The Management,
Tamilnadu State Transport Corporation (Coimbatore) Limited,
37, Mettupalayam Salai, Coimbatore – 43. ...Petitioner

Vs.

1. The Special Joint Commissioner of Labour,
Authority under Industrial Disputes Act,
DMS Compound, Teynampet,
Chennai – 600 006.
2. M.Balasubramanian ...Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus calling for the records of the 1st respondent pertaining to his proceedings in A.P.No.48 of 2023 dated 24.04.2024 and quash the same and consequently allow the approval petition filed by the petitioner management in A.P.No.48 of 2023.



WEB COPY



W.P.No.12736 of 2025

For Petitioner : Mr.A.Vinothraj

For Respondents : Mr.K.Surendran, AGP, for R1


ORDER

This Writ petition has been filed seeking quashment of the order of the 1st respondent dated 24.04.2024 made in A.P.No.48 of 2023 and to consequently allow the approval petition filed by the petitioner management in A.P.No.48 of 2023.

2. Mr.K.Surendran, learned Additional Government Pleader takes notice on behalf of the 1st respondent. In view of the consent expressed by the learned counsel on either side, this Writ petition is taken up for final disposal at the admission stage itself.

3. Since no adverse order is being passed against the 2nd respondent, notice to the 2nd respondent is dispensed with.

4. The case of the petitioner is that the 2nd respondent was working as a Helper attached to Head office branch at Coimbatore. While so, since the




W.P.No.12736 of 2025

WEB COPY

2nd respondent was unauthorizedly absent from 18.09.2019 duty for more than 10 days, a charge memo dated 08.10.2019 was issued by the petitioner corporation as against the 2nd respondent, for which, as no explanation was submitted by the 2nd respondent, the petitioner corporation proceeded with the domestic enquiry was initiated and though a notice of hearing was served, the 2nd respondent/workman did not participate in the enquiry, thereby, he was set exparte. The Enquiry Officer submitted his findings on 30.11.2022. Thereafter, a second show cause notice was issued on 10.02.2023, even for which, as no explanation was provided, the 2nd respondent was dismissed from service on 27.04.2023. Thereafter, an Approval Petition was filed before the 1st respondent, however, the same was rejected by the 1st respondent, vide impugned order dated 24.04.2024. Challenging the same, the petitioner has filed the present writ petition.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner corporation submitted that, the 1st respondent had rejected the approval petition on the ground that there was a delay of seven days, which is not sustainable, since mere delay of 7 days in filing the approval petition will not vitiate the entire proceedings, While so, rejecting the approval petition filed by the petitioner on the ground that, the



W.P.No.12736 of 2025

same was not filed simultaneously before the authority is not sustainable, as the word simultaneous mentioned is not explained either in the Act or in the rules. Hence, the order of the 1st respondent is liable to be set aside and accordingly, prayed for appropriate orders.

6. Per contra, the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the 1st respondent submitted that, though the 2nd respondent was dismissed from service on 27.04.2023, however, the petitioner corporation had filed the approval petition only on 04.05.2023 with a delay of 7 days, which is an incurable defect as per the decision of the Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court in the case of ***The Management, Tamil Nadu State Transport Corporation (Salem) Limited Vs. C.Iyandhurai and anr.*** (W.A. No.1555 of 2022) dated 01.08.2022. For better appreciation, the relevant portion of the said order is extracted hereunder:

“The Writ Appeal has been filed against the order passed by the learned Single Judge refusing to interfere with the order passed by the second respondent-Authority in dismissing the appellant-Management's approval petition under Section 33(2)(b) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. The rejection of the approval petition was on the ground that



WEB COPY



W.P.No.12736 of 2025

there was shortfall in payment of one month salary to the first respondent-employee and there was eight days delay in filing the approval petition. The learned Single Judge, while advertng to Section 33(2)(b) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, read with Rule 64(2) of the Industrial Disputes Rules, 1958, observed that an application seeking approval of dismissal of an employee needs to be served with the order of punishment and simultaneously, approval application has to be filed before the Authority, and otherwise, the approval petition cannot be entertained and hence, the learned Single Judge observed that the second respondent-authority rightly rejected the approval petition. In view of the above, the learned Single Judge, while not interfering with the order passed by the second respondent-authority in dismissing the approval petition, made it clear that the first respondent-employee would be entitled to all monetary benefits due to him and the appellant-Management was expected to extend the same and the period for compliance was also given by the learned Single Judge. Looking into the order passed by the learned Single Judge, we find no ground made out to entertain the Writ Appeal, which is accordingly dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs. Consequently, the miscellaneous petition is closed.”



W.P.No.12736 of 2025

7. Heard learned counsel on either side and perused the materials available on record.

8. The ingredients which should be satisfied by the employer while filing the approval petition have been spelt out in the decision of the Apex Court in ***Lalla Ram Vs. D.C.M. Chemical Works Ltd. and Ors.***, reported in ***AIR 1978 SC 1004***, wherein the Supreme Court held thus :-

"(i) whether a proper domestic enquiry in accordance with the relevant rules/Standing Orders and principles of natural justice has been held;

(ii) whether a prima facie case for dismissal based on legal evidence adduced before the domestic tribunal is made out;

(iii) whether the employer had come to a bona fide conclusion that the employee was guilty and the dismissal did not amount to unfair labour practice and was not intended to victimise the employee;

(iv) whether the employer has paid or offered to pay Wages for one month to the employee; and

(v) whether the employer has simultaneously or within such reasonably short time as to form part of the same transaction applied to the authority before which the main industrial dispute is pending for approval of the action taken by



W.P.No.12736 of 2025

him."

WEB COPY 9. From the materials available on record it is evident that the approval petition was not filed simultaneously when the order of dismissal had come to be passed. It is even the admitted case of the petitioner that there is a delay of seven days. It is the consistent view of the courts that there should be proper explanation for the delay and in the absence of the same, even a single day's delay is fatal. Though in *Lalla Ram's* case, it has been held that reasonable delay, even then the reasonableness should be explained. However, in the case on hand, there is no explanation for the delay, much less any explanation, which is reasonable and in such a circumstances, the requirement of Section 33(2)(b) has not been fulfilled and, therefore, the same does not merit acceptance. Appreciating the materials in proper perspective, the Labour Court has rejected the approval petition, which cannot be said to be erroneous. Further, the decision of the Division Bench of this Court in *C.Iyandhurai* case (*supra*) is also in line with the decision of this Court.

10. For the reasons aforesaid, this Writ petition stands dismissed. No



W.P.No.12736 of 2025

costs. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

WEB COPY

09.04.2025

skt

NCC : Yes / No
Speaking Order : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No

To

1. The Special Joint Commissioner of Labour,
Authority under Industrial Disputes Act,
DMS Compound, Teynampet,
Chennai – 600 006.
2. The Management,
Tamilnadu State Transport Corporation (Coimbatore) Limited,
37, Mettupalayam Salai, Coimbatore – 43

M.DHANDAPANI, J.

skt



WEB COPY



W.P.No.12736 of 2025

W.P.No.12736 of 2025
and
WMP.No.14312 of 2025

09.04.2025