HC-KAR
NC: 2026:KHC:61624
WP No. 19249 of 2022
CNR: KAHC010438522022

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 5TH DAY OF NOVEMBER, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.T. NARENDRA PRASAD

WRIT PETITION NO. 19249 OF 2022 (L-KSRTC)

BETWEEN:

THE DIVISION CONTROLLER BMTC
NORTH DIVISION
YASHAVANTHAPURA
BANGALORE-560 022
NOW REP. BY ITS CHIEF ALW OFFICER BMTC
CENTRAL OFFICE, K.H.ROAD
SHANTHINAGAR, BANGALORE-560 027.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. HAREESH BHANDARY T., ADVOCATE)

AND:

SRI. K. H. RAVI
S/O HUTCHAPPA
AGED ABOUT 60 YEARS
CONDUCTOR, BADGE NO.4641
REP. BY THE GENERAL SECRETARY
KSRTC AND BMTC UNITED EMPLOYEES UNION
NO.23, 4TH MAIN ROAD
MATHIKERE EXTENSION
BENGLAURU-54
AND ALSO AT
SRI K.H.RAVI
S/O HUTCHAPPA
AGED ABOUT 60 YEARS
CONDUCTOR, BADGE NO4641
BMTC DEPOT NO.9

Digitally Signed by NARENDRA PRASAD
HAREKOPPA THIMMANNA GOWDA

NORTH DIVISION
BENGLAURU.

…RESPONDENT

(RESPONDENT SERVED AND UNREPRESENTED)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO QUASH THE AWARD DATED: 28.07.2021 PASSED BY THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, BENGALURU IN I.D.NO.173/2013 VIDE ANNEXURE-A AND ETC.

THIS PETITION, COMING ON FOR PRELIMINARY HEARING IN 'B' GROUP, THIS DAY, ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.T. NARENDRA PRASAD

ORAL ORDER

This writ petition is filed by the Bangalore Metropolitan Transport Corporation (for short, 'BMTC'), challenging the award dated 28.07.2021 passed by the Industrial Tribunal, Bengaluru (for short, 'the Tribunal'), in I.D. No.173/2013, whereby the dispute raised by the first party – Workman was allowed and the punishment imposed by the second party – BMTC was set aside.

2. For the sake of convenience, the parties are referred to as per their ranking before the Tribunal.

Digitally Signed by NARENDRA PRASAD
HAREKOPPA THIMMANNA GOWDA

3. The brief facts of the case are that the first party – Workman was working as a Conductor in the second party – BMTC. On 27.10.2008, while he was discharging his duties as a Conductor, in a bus operating on Route No.257/2 was inspected at Makali. During the inspection, it was found that 18 passengers were travelling in the bus and that the first party – Workman had failed to issue five tickets of Rs.3/- denomination to five passengers travelling from Heggadadevanapura to Makali, despite having collected the fare of Rs.15/- from each of them at their boarding point. Based on the report submitted by the checking officials, a domestic enquiry was conducted. The Enquiry Officer submitted a report holding that the charges levelled against the first party – Workman were proved. Based on the said report, the Disciplinary Authority, by order dated 31.08.2012, imposed the penalty of reduction of basic pay by two annual incremental stages with cumulative effect and further

Digitally Signed by NARENDRA PRASAD
HAREKOPPA THIMMANNA GOWDA

ordered that the suspension period be treated as a period of suspension.

4. Being aggrieved by the said order, the first party – Workman raised an industrial dispute before the Tribunal in I.D.No.173/2013. The Tribunal, by award dated 28.07.2021, allowed the dispute and set aside the order of punishment. Aggrieved by the said award, the second party – BMTC has approached this Court by filing the present writ petition.

5. The learned counsel appearing for the second party – BMTC contended that the Tribunal had held that the domestic enquiry conducted by the second party was fair and proper. However, while adjudicating the dispute, the Tribunal proceeded to set aside the punishment on the ground that the second party – BMTC had failed to examine witnesses before the Tribunal. He further contended that, once the domestic enquiry is held to be fair and proper, the Tribunal is required to consider the

Digitally Signed by NARENDRA PRASAD
HAREKOPPA THIMMANNA GOWDA

evidence adduced in the domestic enquiry proceedings and examine whether the findings recorded by the Enquiry Officer are perverse. According to him, the parties are not required to adduce any additional evidence before the Tribunal in such circumstances. In support of his contention, he placed reliance on the judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of ***The Workmen of M/s. Firestone Tyre and Rubber Co. of India (Pvt.) Ltd. v. The Management and Others*****,** reported in **(1973) 1 SCC 813.**

6. The respondent has been served but remains unrepresented.

7. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and perused the writ petition papers.

8. It is not in dispute that the first party – Workman was working as a Conductor in the second party – BMTC. On 27.10.2008, while he was discharging his duties as a Conductor, in a bus operating on Route No.257/2, the said

Digitally Signed by NARENDRA PRASAD
HAREKOPPA THIMMANNA GOWDA

bus was inspected at Makali. During the inspection, it was found that 12+6 passengers were travelling in the bus. It was further alleged that the first party – Workman had failed to issue five tickets of the denomination of Rs.3/- each to five passengers. Based on the report submitted by the Checking Inspector, a charge memo dated 16.12.2008 was issued to the first party – Workman. The relevant charge is extracted below:

> *"ನೀವು ಹೆಗ್ಗಡದೇವನಪುರದಿಂದ ಮಾಕಳಿಗೆ ಪ್ರಯಾಣಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದ ಐದು ಜನ ಪ್ರಯಾಣಿಕರಿಂದ ತಲಾ ರೂ.3.00 ರಂತೆ ಒಟ್ಟು ರೂ.15.00 ಪ್ರಯಾಣದ ದರವನ್ನು ಪಡೆದಿದ್ದರೂ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಅಧಿಕೃತ ಚೀಟಿಗಳನ್ನು ವಿತರಿಸಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ".*

9. The first party – Workman submitted his explanation to the charge memo. As the explanation offered by him was non-satisfactory, a domestic enquiry was conducted. Thereafter, the Enquiry Officer submitted a report holding that the charges levelled against the first party – Workman were proved. Subsequently, the Disciplinary Authority, by order dated 31.08.2012, imposed the penalty of reduction of basic pay by two

Digitally Signed by NARENDRA PRASAD
HAREKOPPA THIMMANNA GOWDA

annual incremental stages with cumulative effect and further ordered that the suspension period be treated as a period of suspension.

10. Being aggrieved by the said order, the first party – Workman raised an industrial dispute before the Tribunal in I.D. No.173/2013. The Tribunal answered issue No.1 in the affirmative and set aside the punishment order imposed by the second party – BMTC.

11. The Tribunal during the trial had passed an order holding that the domestic enquiry conducted by the second party – BMTC was fair and proper. Once the domestic enquiry is held to be fair and proper, the Tribunal is required to examine whether the second party – BMTC had victimised the first party – Workman, whether the second party had resorted to any unfair labour practice in imposing the punishment, whether the order of punishment was not passed in a good faith and whether the findings recorded by the Enquiry Officer were

Digitally Signed by NARENDRA PRASAD
HAREKOPPA THIMMANNA GOWDA

perverse. These aspects are required to be considered on the basis of the evidence adduced by the parties during the domestic enquiry proceedings. Once the domestic enquiry is held to be fair and proper, the parties are not required to adduce additional evidence before the Tribunal for examining the findings recorded in the domestic enquiry.

12. In the present case, the punishment imposed by the second party – BMTC is neither discharge nor dismissal of the first party – Workman from service. The penalty imposed is only that of reduction of pay by two incremental stages with cumulative effect.

13. The Apex Court, in the case of ***The Workmen of M/s. Firestone Tyre and Rubber Co. of India (Pvt.) Ltd. (supra)***, has held that once the preliminary issue relating to the fairness and propriety of the domestic enquiry is decided in favour of the employer, the Tribunal has to adjudicate the dispute on the basis of the evidence

Digitally Signed by NARENDRA PRASAD
HAREKOPPA THIMMANNA GOWDA

adduced by the parties before the Enquiry Officer and the materials available on record. In such circumstances, the parties are not required to adduce any additional evidence before the Tribunal. The relevant paragraphs of the judgment are extracted below:

> *"36. We will first consider cases where an employer has held a proper and valid domestic enquiry before passing the order of punishment. Previously the Tribunal had no power to interfere with its finding of misconduct recorded in the domestic enquiry unless one or other infirmities pointed out by this Court in Indian Iron & Steel Co. Ltd. case existed. The conduct of disciplinary proceedings and the punishment to be imposed were all considered to be a managerial function with which the Tribunal had no power to interfere unless the finding was perverse or the punishment was so harsh as to lead to an inference of victimisation of unfair labour practice. This position, in our view, has now been changed by Section 11-A. The words "in the course of the adjudication proceeding, the Tribunal is satisfied that the order of discharge or dismissal was not justified" clearly indicate that the Tribunal is now clothed with the*

Digitally Signed by NARENDRA PRASAD
HAREKOPPA THIMMANNA GOWDA

power to reappraise the evidence in the domestic enquiry and satisfy itself whether the said evidence relied on by an employer establishes the misconduct alleged against a workman. What was originally a plausible conclusion that could be drawn by an employer from the evidence, has now given place to a satisfaction being arrived at by the Tribunal that the finding of misconduct is correct. The limitations imposed on the powers of the Tribunal by the decision in Indian Iron & Steel Co. Ltd. case, can no longer be invoked by an employer. The Tribunal is now at liberty to consider not only whether the finding of misconduct recorded by an employer is correct; but also to differ from the said finding if a proper case is made out. What was once largely in the realm of the satisfaction of the employer, has ceased to be so; and now it is the satisfaction of the Tribunal that finally decides the matter.

37. If there has been no enquiry held by the employer or if the enquiry is held to be defective, it is open to the employer even now to adduce evidence for the first time before the Tribunal justifying the order of discharge or dismissal. We are not inclined to accept the contention on behalf of the workmen that the right of the employer to adduce evidence before the Tribunal for the first

Digitally Signed by NARENDRA PRASAD
HAREKOPPA THIMMANNA GOWDA

time recognised by this Court in its various decisions, has been taken away. There is no indication in the section that the said right has been abrogated. If the intention of the legislature was to do away with such a right, which has been recognised over a long period of years, as will be noticed by the decisions referred to earlier, the section would have been differently worded. Admittedly, there are no express words to that effect, and there is no indication that the section has impliedly changed the law in that respect. Therefore, the position is that even now the employer is entitled to adduce evidence for the first time before the Tribunal even if he had held no enquiry or the enquiry held by him is found to be defective. Of course, an opportunity will have to be given to the workman to lead evidence contra. The stage at which the employer has to ask for such an opportunity, has been pointed out by this Court in Delhi Cloth and General Mills Co. Ltd. case. No doubt, this procedure may be time consuming, elaborate and cumbersome. As pointed out by this Court in the decision just referred to above, it is open to the Tribunal to deal with the validity of the domestic enquiry, if one has been held as a preliminary issue. If its finding on the subject is in favour of the management, then there will be no

Digitally Signed by NARENDRA PRASAD
HAREKOPPA THIMMANNA GOWDA

occasion for additional evidence being cited by the management. But if the finding on this issue is against the management, the Tribunal will have to give the employer an opportunity to cite additional evidence justifying his action. This right in the management to sustain its order by adducing independent evidence before the Tribunal, if no enquiry has been held or if the enquiry is held to be defective, has been given judicial recognition over a long period of years."

14. In the case on hand, the Tribunal has allowed the dispute on the ground that the second party – BMTC had not adduced any evidence on the merits of the case. Accordingly, it arrived at the conclusion that the penalty imposed by the second party – BMTC was liable to be set aside.

15. The aforesaid finding recorded by the Tribunal is contrary to the law laid down by the Apex Court in ***The Workmen of M/s. Firestone Tyre and Rubber Co. of India (Pvt.) Ltd. (supra).*** On this ground alone, the

Digitally Signed by NARENDRA PRASAD
HAREKOPPA THIMMANNA GOWDA

impugned award is liable to be set aside and the writ petition deserves to be allowed.

16. Accordingly, the following order is passed:

(i) The writ petition is allowed.

(ii) The award dated 28.07.2021 passed by the Tribunal in I.D.No.173/2013, vide Annexure-A, is hereby set aside.

(iii) The matter is remitted back to the Tribunal for fresh consideration, keeping in view the principles laid down by the Apex Court in the judgment referred to supra and in accordance with law.

Digitally Signed by NARENDRA PRASAD HAREKOPPA THIMMANNA GOWDA

(H.T. NARENDRA PRASAD)
JUDGE

CM
LIST NO.: 1 SL NO.: 80