



W.P.Nos.33980, 33982, 34384, 34387, 33986, 33988 and 33991 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

ORDER RESERVED ON : 29.10.2025

ORDER PRONOUNCED ON : 21.11.2025

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE N.MALA

W.P.Nos.33980, 33982, 34384, 34387, 33986, 33988 and 33991 of 2025
and WMP.Nos.38134,38548, 38550, 38139, 38141 and 38148 of 2025

The Management of
G.E. Vernova T & D India (P) Ltd.,
Formerly Known as G.E. T&D India Ltd.,
Plot No.46, SIPCOT,
Zuzuvadi,
Hosur- 635 126.
Rep. by its Authorised Signatory

...Petitioner in all WP Nos.

Vs

Prakash S

...Respondent in WP No.33980 of 2025

Rabiraj

...Respondent in WP No.33982 of 2025

C.Prabhakaran

...Respondent in WP No.34384 of 2025

P.Rooban Kumar

...Respondent in WP No.34387 of 2025

C.Chinnasamy

...Respondent in WP No.33986 of 2025



W.P.Nos.33980, 33982, 34384, 34387, 33986, 33988 and 33991 of 2025

G.Vignesh

...Respondent in WP No.33988 of 2025

N.Devaraj

...Respondent in WP No.33991 of 2025

Prayer in WP No.33980 of 2025: Writ petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, pleaded to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus calling for the records of the Labour Court, Hosur in I.A.No.5/2024 in ID No.23/2022, quash its order dated 05.08.2025 and further direct the Labour Court, Hosur to reopen and permit the petitioner to adduce further evidence in ID No.23 of 2022.

Prayer in WP No.33982 of 2025: Writ petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, pleaded to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus calling for the records of the Labour Court, Hosur in I.A.No.5/2024 in ID No.24/2022, quash its order dated 05.08.2025 and further direct the Labour Court, Hosur to reopen and permit the petitioner to adduce further evidence in ID No.24 of 2022.

Prayer in WP No.34384 of 2025: Writ petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, pleaded to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus calling for the records of the Labour Court, Hosur in I.A.No.5/2024 in ID No.26/2022, quash its order dated 05.08.2025 and further direct the Labour Court, Hosur to reopen and permit the petitioner to adduce further evidence in ID No.26 of 2022.

Prayer in WP No.34387 of 2025: Writ petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, pleaded to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus calling for the records of the Labour Court, Hosur in I.A.No.5/2024 in ID No.27/2022, quash its order dated 05.08.2025 and further direct the Labour Court, Hosur to reopen and permit the petitioner to adduce further evidence in ID No.27 of 2022.



W.P.Nos.33980, 33982, 34384, 34387, 33986, 33988 and 33991 of 2025

Prayer in WP No.33986 of 2025: Writ petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, pleaded to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus calling for the records of the Labour Court, Hosur in I.A.No.5/2024 in ID No.25/2022, quash its order dated 05.08.2025 and further direct the Labour Court, Hosur to reopen and permit the petitioner to adduce further evidence in ID No.25 of 2022.

Prayer in WP No.33988 of 2025: Writ petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, pleaded to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus calling for the records of the Labour Court, Hosur in I.A.No.6/2024 in ID No.21/2022, quash its order dated 05.08.2025 and further direct the Labour Court, Hosur to reopen and permit the petitioner to adduce further evidence in ID No.21 of 2022.

Prayer in WP No.33991 of 2025: Writ petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, pleaded to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus calling for the records of the Labour Court, Hosur in I.A.No.5/2024 in ID No.22/2022, quash its order dated 05.08.2025 and further direct the Labour Court, Hosur to reopen and permit the petitioner to adduce further evidence in ID No.22 of 2022.

For Petitioner (s) : Mr.Haroon Al.Rasheed
in all WP Nos. for M/s.Advit Law Chambers

For Respondent (s): Mr.K.V.Shanmuganathan
in all WP Nos.

COMMON ORDER

These writ petitions are filed challenging the orders dated 05.08.2025, of the Labour Court, Hosur in the interlocutory applications, filed to reopen and permit the



W.P.Nos.33980, 33982, 34384, 34387, 33986, 33988 and 33991 of 2025

petitioner to adduce further evidence in I.D's.

WEB COPY

2. As the issues raised in the writ petitions are common, the writ petitions are disposed of by this common order.

WP No.33982 of 2025

3. The petitioner is a limited company engaged in manufacture of highly technical electrical equipment such as High Voltage Instrument Transformers, AIS/GIS Switchgears, CTs, CVTs, EMVTs, Bushings, Capacitors etc. and allied products. The respondents were engaged as technician trainees from 08.04.2019, and their training period was periodically extended till 07.04.2022. The petitioner's case is that due to pandemic induced downturn, the traineeships could not be continued, and therefore the respondents were duly relieved with an ex-gratia amount exceeding statutory retrenchment benefits. The respondent's challenged the said ex-gratia by raising a dispute before the Labour Court, Hosur. After completion of initial



W.P.Nos.33980, 33982, 34384, 34387, 33986, 33988 and 33991 of 2025

evidence, the petitioner sought to adduce additional evidence and for the said purpose

filed the applications. The Labour Court however rejected the applications.

Aggrieved by the rejection of the petitioner's application for reopening the evidence

and for filing additional documents, the petitioner has filed the above writ petition for

the aforesaid relief.

4. The respondents filed detail counter stating *inter alia* that the petitioner was given ample opportunities by the Labour Court to adduce additional evidence, but the petitioner failed to utilise the opportunities. The respondent stated that the petitioner filed the said application with the sole object of protracting the proceedings. The respondent further stated that the Labour Court cannot be faulted, since the affidavit for reopening and adducing additional evidence was bereft of particulars. The respondent submitted that the Labour Court had exercised its discretion in a sound and reasonable manner and therefore, this Court should not interfere with the impugned order passed by the Labour Court.



W.P.Nos.33980, 33982, 34384, 34387, 33986, 33988 and 33991 of 2025

WEB COPY

5. Heard both the learned counsels and perused the materials placed on record.

6. The petitioner's application for reopening the evidence and adducing additional evidence was rejected by the Labour Court on three grounds, that, the adjudication passed by the Court revealed that the petitioner had not utilised earlier opportunities provided to him for producing additional evidence, that the averments stated in the petitioner's affidavit lacked details of witness and documents produced by him, which would obviate the respondent from effectively contesting the petition and that the petitioner had failed to aver how the proposed evidence was material and necessary to decide the controversy between the parties.

7. From the materials placed on record, this Court finds that the ID was filed on 20.10.2022, and the petitioner entered appearance on 14.11.2022 and thereafter, the respondent completed his side evidence on 14.09.2023. Subsequently, the petitioner



W.P.Nos.33980, 33982, 34384, 34387, 33986, 33988 and 33991 of 2025

examined his witness M.W.1, and later, on 30.05.2024, M.W1 was cross-examined.

Thereafter, the Labour Court adjourned the matter to 03.10.2024, for additional evidence of the petitioner. On 03.10.2024, the petitioner did not summon his witness and therefore the Labour Court adjourned the case to 17.10.2024. On 17.10.2024, the petitioner filed adjournment petition, but the same was dismissed by the Labour Court and the petitioner's side evidence was closed. Thereafter, the petitioner filed the I.A on 24.10.2024, seeking to reopen the case for adducing additional evidence and for marking the documents. The said facts clearly reveal that the petitioner was given amply opportunity to adduce additional evidence. Despite the aforesaid opportunities, the petitioner failed to utilise the same and therefore, the reasoning of the Labour Court in this regard cannot be faulted.

8. Upon perusal of the affidavit filed in support of the petition, it is found that the petitioner has not given the particulars of the evidence proposed to be adduced by him, and the relevancy of the same to the issues involved. Therefore, the Labour



W.P.Nos.33980, 33982, 34384, 34387, 33986, 33988 and 33991 of 2025

Court's finding that the petitioner's affidavit was vague and bereft of the relevancy of the said documents to the issue cannot be faulted.

9. Before this Court, for the first time the petitioner stated that it proposed to examine its HR Manager and through him, wanted to file documents like the Government training manual prescribed by the Government for various trades, hand bills and notice issued by various companies regarding the training programs as that of the petitioner company, details of NEEM schemes promoted by the Government prescribing training period for trainees and few other notifications. The petitioner in his writ affidavit has stated that, had the Labour Court, given him an opportunity to specify the details, the petitioner would have certainly provided the same. The petitioner has stated that it wanted to examine the retired Director of technical institute, but since he was unable to accommodate the petitioner owing to his old age, the petitioner proposed to examine its HR manager and through him, mark the aforesaid documents. The petitioner has not whispered, as to when he obtained the



W.P.Nos.33980, 33982, 34384, 34387, 33986, 33988 and 33991 of 2025

documents. Further, the petitioner had examined the HR manager earlier, and hence could have marked the documents through him. Since the documents are public documents relating to Government training manual and Government schemes, apart from the notifications of the Government, nothing prevented the petitioner from producing them earlier. As already stated, the Labour Court had given sufficient opportunity to the petitioner during the enquiry and before closure of evidence to adduce additional evidence. In the affidavit in support of the petition for additional evidence and in the affidavit in support of the writ petition, absolutely no explanation is given for the omission to produce the documents earlier. Therefore, this Court is constrained to view that the petition to re-open and file additional documents is only an attempt to fill up the lacunae in the case, which cannot be permitted under the guise of leading additional evidence.

10. There is no dispute on the legal proposition that the Labour Court has jurisdiction to entertain an application for reopening and adducing additional evidence, for doing complete justice to both the parties. However, this Court finds



W.P.Nos.33980, 33982, 34384, 34387, 33986, 33988 and 33991 of 2025

that the judgment in the case of ***Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Ltd., Madras (by Deputy General Manager) versus Third Additional Labour Court, Madras, and another***, reported in ***1985 (2) LLN 787***, relied on by the learned counsel for the petitioner does not apply to the facts of the case. It is trite that, the interference under Article 226 of the Constitution in interlocutory matters is limited to correcting jurisdictional errors or patent illegality. It is to be noted that the discretionary power to permit further evidence must be used sparingly, and that too to meet the ends of justice. This Court finds that the impugned order is based on sound reasoning and that the Labour Court has exercised its jurisdiction judiciously. Therefore, this Court is of the view that the impugned order calls for no interference.

For all the above reasons, this Court finds no merit in the writ petitions and hence, all the writ petitions are dismissed. No costs. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

21.11.2025

Index:Yes/No

Speaking Order:Yes/No

10/13



W.P.Nos.33980, 33982, 34384, 34387, 33986, 33988 and 33991 of 2025

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

Internet: Yes

dsn

To
The Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, hosur.



WEB COPY



W.P.Nos.33980, 33982, 34384, 34387, 33986, 33988 and 33991 of 2025

N.MALA,J.

dsn

Order in W.P.Nos.33980, 33982, 34384, 34387, 33986, 33988 and 33991 of 2025



WEB COPY



W.P.Nos.33980, 33982, 34384, 34387, 33986, 33988 and 33991 of 2025

Order Pronounced on 21.11.2025