



W.A.No.3396 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 19.11.2025

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S. RAMESH
AND
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE R.SAKTHIVEL

W.A.No.3396 of 2025
and CMP.No.27774 of 2025

The Management of Hypro
Chains Private Limited,
Ranipet

... Appellant

Vs.

1.The Presiding Officer,
Additional Labour Court,
Vellore District, Vellore

2.N.Gunasekaran
3.S.Baskaran
4.G.Kathavarayan
5.P.Dayalan
6.M.Jayavelu
7.P.Jayapal

L.Babu (deceased)

8.M.Karuppaiah
9.V.Desingu

Mani (deceased)

10.V.Mathiazhagan



W.A.No.3396 of 2025

11.P.Ravi
12.K.Munuswamy
13.B.Renuka
14.B.Balaji
15.B.Latha
16.B.Prabhu
(R13 to R16 are LR's of 8th respondent)

17.M.Prema
18.M.Shanmugam
19.M.Nirmala
(R17 to R19 are LR's of 11th respondent)

... Respondents

PRAYER: Appeal is filed under Clause 15 of the Letters Patent, praying to set aside the order to allow the above Writ Appeal by setting aside the order dated 19.03.2025 in W.P.No.41433 of 2016.

For Appellant : Mr.R.Arumugam

For Respondents : R1 – Labour Court

JUDGMENT

(Judgment of this Court was delivered by M.S.RAMESH.J)

This Writ Appeal has been filed to set aside the order dated 19.03.2025 in W.P.No.41433 of 2016.

2. Admittedly, the Management had not challenged the original award of the Labour Court in I.D.No.291 to 304 of 2000, dated 20.11.2003,
Page 2 of 4



W.A.No.3396 of 2025

but had only challenged the consequential order passed in the Computation

WEB COPY Petition filed under Section 33(c)(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Apparently, the award passed by the Labour Court, granting back wages, has become final and the computation has also been made with regard to the workmen's entitlement.

3. The only contention of the learned counsel for the Management before us is that the workmen are not entitled for the entire non employment period. Such a ground is unavailable to the counsel for the Management to raise at this stage, particularly when he has not challenged the award, granting back wages.

4. This apart, the order passed in the Writ Petition also appears to be a consent order, wherein the learned counsel for the Management had represented before the learned Single Judge that they were willing to pay 50% of the compensation amount. Having conceded before the learned Single Judge to pay 50% of back wages, it would not be now open to them to challenge the same before us.



W.A.No.3396 of 2025

M.S.RAMESH, J.
and
R.SAKTHIVEL, J.

Anu

5. In the light of the above findings, we find no merits in the Writ Petition. Accordingly, the Writ Appeal stands dismissed. No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

[M.S.R., J] [R.S.V.,J]
19.11.2025

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

To

The Presiding Officer,
Additional Labour Court,
Vellore District, Vellore

W.A.No.3396 of 2025
and CMP.No.27774 of 2025