BEFORE THE ADDITIONAL LABOUR COURT, COIMBATORE.

Present: **Thiru. K. Lingam, B.Sc., M.L.,**
Presiding officer,
Additional Labour Court,
Coimbatore.

Monday, the 24th of August 2026

COMPUTATION PETITION No. 4 /2025

(CNR No.TNCB04-000015-2025)
C/w.

COMPUTATION PETITION No. 5 /2025

(CNR No.TNCB04-000016-2025)
C/w.

COMPUTATION PETITION No. 6 /2025

(CNR No.TNCB04-000017-2025)
C/w.

COMPUTATION PETITION No. 7 /2025

(CNR No.TNCB04-000018-2025)
C/w.

COMPUTATION PETITION No. 8 /2025

(CNR No.TNCB04-000019-2025)
C/w.

COMPUTATION PETITION No. 10 /2025

(CNR No.TNCB04-000368-2024)
C/w.

COMPUTATION PETITION No. 11 /2025

(CNR No.TNCB04-000013-2025)
C/w.

COMPUTATION PETITION No. 12 /2025

(CNR No.TNCB04-000014-2025)
C/w.

COMPUTATION PETITION No. 13 /2025

(CNR No.TNCB04-000020-2025)
C/w.

COMPUTATION PETITION No. 14 /2025

(CNR No.TNCB04-000021-2025)
C/w.

COMPUTATION PETITION No. 15 /2025

(CNR No.TNCB04-000023-2025)
C/w.

COMPUTATION PETITION No. 16 /2025

(CNR No.TNCB04-000024-2025)
C/w.

COMPUTATION PETITION No. 17 /2025

(CNR No.TNCB04-000025-2025)
C/w.

COMPUTATION PETITION No. 18 /2025

(CNR No.TNCB04-000026-2025)
C/w.

COMPUTATION PETITION No. 19 /2025

(CNR No.TNCB04-000027-2025)
C/w.

COMPUTATION PETITION No. 20 /2025

(CNR No.TNCB04-000028-2025)
C/w.

COMPUTATION PETITION No. 21 /2025

(CNR No.TNCB04-000029-2025)
C/w.

COMPUTATION PETITION No. 22 /2025

(CNR No.TNCB04-000030-2025)
C/w.

COMPUTATION PETITION No. 25 /2025

(CNR No.TNCB04-000306-2024)
C/w.

COMPUTATION PETITION No. 26 /2025

(CNR No.TNCB04-000307-2024)
C/w.

COMPUTATION PETITION No. 27 /2025

(CNR No.TNCB04-000308-2024)
C/w.

COMPUTATION PETITION No. 28 /2025

(CNR No.TNCB04-000309-2024)
C/w.

COMPUTATION PETITION No. 29 /2025

(CNR No.TNCB04-000310-2024)
C/w.

COMPUTATION PETITION No. 30 /2025

(CNR No.TNCB04-000311-2024)
C/w.

COMPUTATION PETITION No. 31 /2025

(CNR No.TNCB04-000312-2024)

C/w.

COMPUTATION PETITION No. 32 /2025

(CNR No.TNCB04-000313-2024)
C/w.

COMPUTATION PETITION No. 33 /2025

(CNR No.TNCB04-000315-2024)
C/w.

COMPUTATION PETITION No. 34 /2025

(CNR No.TNCB04-000316-2024)
C/w.

COMPUTATION PETITION No. 35 /2025

(CNR No.TNCB04-000317-2024)
C/w.

COMPUTATION PETITION No. 36 /2025

(CNR No.TNCB04-000318-2024)
C/w.

COMPUTATION PETITION No. 37 /2025

(CNR No.TNCB04-000319-2024)
C/w.

COMPUTATION PETITION No. 38 /2025

(CNR No.TNCB04-000320-2024)
C/w.

COMPUTATION PETITION No. 39 /2025

(CNR No.TNCB04-000321-2024)
C/w.

COMPUTATION PETITION No. 41 /2025

(CNR No.TNCB04-000363-2024)

C/w.

COMPUTATION PETITION No. 42 /2025

(CNR No.TNCB04-000364-2024)

C/w.

COMPUTATION PETITION No. 43 /2025

(CNR No.TNCB04-000365-2024)

C/w.

COMPUTATION PETITION No. 44 /2025

(CNR No.TNCB04-000366-2024)

C/w.

COMPUTATION PETITION No. 45 /2025

(CNR No.TNCB04-000367-2024)

C/w.

COMPUTATION PETITION No. 51 /2025

(CNR No.TNCB04-000079-2025)

C/w.

COMPUTATION PETITION No. 52 /2025

(CNR No.TNCB04-000080-2025)

C/w.

COMPUTATION PETITION No. 53 /2025

(CNR No.TNCB04-000081-2025)

C/w.

COMPUTATION PETITION No. 54 /2025

(CNR No.TNCB04-000082-2025)

C/w.

COMPUTATION PETITION No. 67 /2025

(CNR No.TNCB04-000095-2025)
C/w.

COMPUTATION PETITION No. 68 /2025

(CNR No.TNCB04-000096-2025)
C/w.

COMPUTATION PETITION No. 82 /2025

(CNR No.TNCB04-000314-2024)
C/w.

COMPUTATION PETITION No. 97 /2025

(CNR No.TNCB04-000124-2025)
C/w.

COMPUTATION PETITION No. 137 /2025

(CNR No.TNCB04-000022-2025)
C/w.

COMPUTATION PETITION No. 34 /2026

(CNR No.TNCB04-000214-2026)
C/w.

COMPUTATION PETITION No. 35 /2026

(CNR No.TNCB04-000216-2026)
C/w.

M. Ponnusamy, S/o. Maranaiker	...	CP. No. 4/2025
M. Prabakaran, S/o. Manickam	...	CP. No. 5/2025
R. Senthilkumar S/o. Ramasamy	...	CP. No. 6/2025
R. Stephen Arokiyadhas, S/o. Rayappan	...	CP. No. 7/2025

A. Eswaran, S/o. Avanashi	...	CP. No. 8/2025
S. Manoharan, S/o. Subbaiah,	...	CP. No. 10/2025
A. Alexander, S/o. Arulsamy	...	CP. No. 11/2025
S. Deivasigamani S/o. Soundappan	...	CP. No. 12/2025
C. Manoharan, S/o. Sokkappan	...	CP. No. 13/2025
P. Shanmugam, S/o. Late. Palanisamy	...	CP. No. 14/2025
R. Chinnasamy, S/o. Rangasamy	...	CP. No. 15/2025
R. Gothandapani, S/o. Late. Rangasamy	...	CP. No. 16/2025
R. Radhakrishnan, S/o. Late. Rangasamy	...	CP. No. 17/2025
K. Parimala W/o. Late. N. Krishnasamy	...	CP. No. 18/2025
P. Natarajan, S/o. Palanisamy	...	CP. No. 19/2025
R. Vijayabarathi, S/o. Late. S. Rajendran	...	CP. No. 20/2025
V.N. Natarajan, S/o. Narayanasamy	...	CP. No. 21/2025
P. Rajagopal S/o. Palanisamy	...	CP. No. 22/2025
A. Arbuthasamy S/o. Anthonisamy	...	CP. No. 25/2025
A. Lakshmanasamy S/o. Arumugam	...	CP. No. 26/2025
P. Mohanbabu		

S/o. Palanisamy	...	CP. No. 27/2025
A. Mani S/o. Anthonimuthu	...	CP. No. 28/2025
R. Balasubramanian, S/o. Ramasamy	...	CP. No. 29/2025
N. Ragavan, S/o. Late. Narayanasamy	...	CP. No. 30/2025
R. Palanisamy, S/o. Raman	...	CP. No. 31/2025
A. Mariyajhon Basko S/o. Anthonisamy	...	CP. No. 32/2025
Viktorea Dominic Mary, W/o. Late A. Yesudhas Paul	...	CP. No. 33/2025
V. Kulanthai Terasa, W/o. Late. A. Vincent	...	CP. No. 34/2025
T. Jothimani W/o. Late. R. Thirumalaisamy	...	CP. No. 35/2025
Vijayalakshmi W/o. Late. K. Muthusamy	...	CP. No. 36/2025
A. Xavier, S/o. Arokiyasamy	...	CP. No. 37/2025
R. Narayanasamy S/o. Rangasamy	...	CP. No. 38/2025
R. Palaniasamy, S/o. Ramasamy	...	CP. No. 39/2025
A. Murugesan, S/o. Arunachalam	...	CP. No. 41/2025
A. Nagarajan S/o. Arunachalam	...	CP. No. 42/2025
P. Chandrasekaran, S/o. Palaniyappan	...	CP. No. 43/2025
G. Kanirajaperumal, S/o. Govindaraj	...	CP. No. 44/2025

V. Kulanthaivelu, S/o. Venkatachalam	...	CP. No. 45/2025
Suganthi, S/o. Late. V. Palanisamy	...	CP. No. 51/2025
A. Anthoniraj, S/o. Arulsamy	...	CP. No. 52/2025
P. Chandrasekaran, S/o. Palaniyappan	...	CP. No. 53/2025
A. Selvaraj, S/o. Arumugam	...	CP. No. 54/2025
S. Narayanan, S/o. Sankaran	...	CP. No. 67/2025
Kaleeswari D/o. P. Vasagan	...	CP. No. 68/2025
T. Jayalakshmi, W/o. Late. K. Thangappan	...	CP. No. 82/2025
A. Joseph Fernat Arokiyaraj, S/o. Anthonisamy	...	CP. No. 97/2025
R. Prabakar, S/o. Ramaraj	...	CP. No. 137/2025
P. Govindaraj S/o. Palanisamy	...	CP. No. 34/2026
Thulasimani W/o. Late. P. Natarajan	...	CP. No. 35/2026

Dhanalakshmi Mills Limited,
C/o. Dhanalakshmi Mills Workers and Staff Union,
B.S. Sundaram Road,
27,E.S. Mahal Compound,
Tirupur – 641 601.

Vs.

The Management,

Dhanalakshmi Mills Limited,

130, B.S. Sundaram Road,
Tirupur – 641 601. … Respondent / Management

*****

The Computation Petitions came up for final hearing before me on 07.08.2026 in the presence of Thiru. J.S. Santharaj, Authorized Representative for the petitioners and Thiru. T. Neelakandan, Advocate for the respondent and upon perusing the petition, counter statement and other documents and upon hearing the arguments of both sides and having stood over for consideration till this date, this Court delivers the following:-

COMMON AWARD

The respective workmen have filed these Computation Petitions separately under Section 33-C(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, claiming monetary benefits towards salary arrears for the period from 26.02.2007 to 31.12.2008, bonus for the years 2005 to 2009, and leave salary for the years 2007 and 2008. The particulars of the respective claims are as follows:

CP. No.	Petitioner Name	Job Nature	Salary (Rs.)	Bonus (Rs.)	Leave Salary (Rs.)	Total (Rs.)
4/2025	M. Ponnusamy	Sider	139948	18475	7966	166389
5/2025	M. Prabhakaran	Cleaner	137693	16276	7783	161752
6/2025	R. Senthilkumar	D. Boy	135150	18225	7677	161052
7/2025	R. Stephen Arokiyadhas	Cleaner	136416	18077	7770	162263
8/2025	A. Eswaran	D. Boy	134160	18154	7635	159950
10/2025	S. Manoharan	Cleaner	133719	17321	7356	158396

11/2025	A. Alexander	Helper	138761	15880	7875	162516
12/2025	S. Deivasigamani	Cleaner	135452	17942	7718	161112
13/2025	C. Manoharan	Cheeper	135119	18193	7677	160989
14/2025	P. Shanmugam	Cleaner	80200	12576	4709	97485
15/2025	R. Chinnasamy	Helper	134440	18403	7875	160718
16/2025	R. Gothandapani	Bobbin Carrier	136370	18128	7784	162282
17/2025	R. Radhakrishnan	Cleaner	139268	18494	7916	165678
18/2025	K. Parimala (Legal Heir) W/o. N. Krishnasamy (Deceased Employee)	Labour	136023	18461	7793	162277
19/2025	P. Natarajan	Teener	135399	18284	7741	161424
20/2025	Vijayabharathi (Legal Heir) S/o. Late. S. Rajendran	Cleaner	91002	15550	5652	112204
21/2025	V. N. Nataraj	Fitter	139181	18638	7910	165729
22/2025	P. Rajagopal	Helper	137325	18463	7791	163579
25/2025	A. Arbuthasamy	Winder	140260	13338	7985	161583
26/2025	A. Lakshmanasamy	Helper	138698	18783	7840	165321
27/2025	P. Mohanbabu	Cleaner	137001	18453	7793	163247
28/2025	A. Mani	Warper	80769	8095	4741	93605
29/2025	R. Balasubramanian	Cleaner	136863	18622	7796	163281
30/2025	N. Ragavan	Cleaner	137411	17788	7916	163115
31/2025	R. Palanisamy	sweeper	138091	18795	7860	164746
32/2025	A. Mariyajohn Basko	Sider	136710	18204	8019	162933
33/2025	Viktoria Domnic Mary (Legal Heir) W/o. Late. A. Yesudahas (Deceased Employee)	Tenter	138473	18443	7899	164816
34/2025	V. Kulanthai Terasa(Legal Heir) W/o. Late. A. Vincent (Deceased Employee)	Sider	136625	18432	7797	162854
35/2025	T. Jothimani (Legal Heir) W/o. Late.R. Thirumalaisamy (Deceased Employee)	Sider	139487	17824	7927	165238
36/2025	Vijayalakshmi (Legal Heir) W/o. Late. K. Muthusamy (Deceased Employee)	Cleaner	138959	18599	7924	165482
37/2025	A. Xavier	Winder	140670	18823	7599	167092
38/2025	R. Narayanasamy	Cleaner	136403	18068	8136	162604
39/2025	R. Palanisamy	D. Boy	139267	18753	7903	165923

41/2025	A. Murugesan	Carpenter	137328	18020	7873	163221
42/2025	A. Nagarajan	Helper	138741	13511	7876	160128
43/2025	P. Chandrasekaran	Sider	141316	18969	8035	168320
44/2025	G. Kanirajaperumal	Cleaner	134181	16271	7635	158087
45/2025	V. Kulanthaivelu	EB Carrier	136726	17753	7793	162272
51/2025	Suganthi (Legal Heir) W/o. V. Palanisamy (Deceased employee)	Cleaner	136670	18222	7785	162677
52/2025	A. Anthoniraj	Cleaner	133924	15914	7587	157425
53/2025	P. Chandrasekaran	Sider	141789	18865	7920	168574
54/2025	A. Selvaraj	Cleaner	133719	17321	7356	158396
67/2025	S. Narayanan	Helper	137311	18038	7796	163145
68/2025	Kaleswari (Legal Hair) D/o. P. Vasagan (Deceased)	Sider	137448	18402	7815	163665
82/2025	T. Jayalakshmi (Legal Heir), W/o. K. Thangappan	Winder	78850	13214	3467	95531
97/2025	A. Joseph Fernard Arokiyaraj	Cleaner	133716	16115	7635	157466
137/2025	R. Prabakar	Bobbin Carrier	136487	16602	7754	160843
34/2026	P. Govindaraj	Labour	136404	16408	7772	160584
35/2026	Thulasimani (Legal Heir) W/o. P. Natarajan (Deceased Employee)	Winder	140333	19120	7889	167342

2. **Gist of the averments in the petitions : :-**

The petitioners state that they were employed under the respondent Management and were subsequently made permanent in service. The petitioners were working in the respondent Management in their respective capacities and were receiving the salary applicable to their respective posts.

3. The petitioners further state that, pursuant to the order dated 17.03.2005

passed by the Hon'ble Madras High Court, the respondent Management resumed the operation of the spinning mill with effect from 28.06.2005 and provided employment to the workers who were in service at that time. Subsequently, the respondent Management stopped the operation of the mill with effect from 26.02.2007 and permanently closed the spinning mill with effect from 31.12.2008. Though the respondent Management paid the closure compensation, notice pay, gratuity and other amounts payable under law, the salary and certain other monetary benefits due to the petitioners for the period of suspension of operation of mill between 26.02.2007 to 31.12.2008 were not paid.

4. The petitioners state that they made repeated requests to the respondent Management for settlement of the outstanding dues. The petitioners, through their Union, also issued a notice dated 04.09.2024 to the Director of the respondent Management, which was received on 05.09.2024, seeking payment of the outstanding amounts. As there was no response from the respondent Management, the petitioners were constrained to approach this Court by filing the respective Computation Petitions. The petitioners therefore seek condonation of the delay in filing the respective petitions, stating that the delay was due to the failure of the respondent Management to settle their legitimate dues.

5. The petitioners further state that, in view of the earlier order passed by the Labour Court dated 21.01.2011 and the amounts were paid by the respondent Management to certain workers, towards the unpaid salary, bonus at the rate of

8.33% and leave salary for the respective periods. The claim particulars of the individual petitioners are set out below:

Sl. No.	Petitioner Name	CP. No.	Nature of work	Salary for 26.02.2007 to 31.12.2008	Bonus for 2005 to 2009	Leave Salary for 2007 & 2008	Total Claim amount
1	M. Ponnusamy	4/2025	Sider	139948	18475	7966	166389
2	M. Prabhakaran	5/2025	Cleaner	137693	16276	7783	161752
3	R. Senthilkumar	6/2025	D. Boy	135150	18225	7677	161052
4	R. Stephen Arokiyadhas	7/2025	Cleaner	136416	18077	7770	162263
5	A. Eswaran	8/2025	D. Boy	134160	18154	7635	159950
6	S. Manoharan	10/2025	Cleaner	133719	17321	7356	158396
7	A. Alexander	11/2025	Helper	138761	15880	7875	162516
8	S. Deivasigamani	12/2025	Cleaner	135452	17942	7718	161112
9	C. Manoharan	13/2025	Cheeper	135119	18193	7677	160989
10	P. Shanmugam	14/2025	Cleaner	80200	12576	4709	97485
11	R. Chinnasamy	15/2025	Helper	134440	18403	7875	160718
12	R. Gothandapani	16/2025	Bobbin Carrier	136370	18128	7784	162282
13	R. Radhakrishnan	17/2025	Cleaner	139268	18494	7916	165678
14	K. Parimala (Legal Heir) W/o. N. Krishnasamy (Deceased Employee)	18/2025	Labour	136023	18461	7793	162277
15	P. Natarajan	19/2025	Teener	135399	18284	7741	161424
16	Vijayabharathi (Legal Heir) D/o. Late. S. Rajendran	20/2025	Cleaner	91002	15550	5652	112204
17	V. N. Nataraj	21/2025	Fitter	139181	18638	7910	165729
18	P. Rajagopal	22/2025	Helper	137325	18463	7791	163579
19	A. Arbuthasamy	25/2025	Winder	140260	13338	7985	161583
20	A. Lakshmanasamy	26/2025	Helper	138698	18783	7840	165321
21	P. Mohanbabu	27/2025	Cleaner	137001	18453	7793	163247
22	A. Mani	28/2025	Warper	80769	8095	4741	93605
23	R. Balasubramanian	29/2025	Cleaner	136863	18622	7796	163281
24	N. Ragavan	30/2025	Cleaner	137411	17788	7916	163115
25	R. Palanisamy	31/2025	sweeper	138091	18795	7860	164746
26	A. Mariyajohn Basko	32/2025	Sider	136710	18204	8019	162933
27	Viktoria Domnic Mary (Legal Heir) W/o. Late. A. Yesudahas (Deceased Employee)	33/2025	Tenter	138473	18443	7899	164816

28	V. Kulanthai Terasa(Legal Heir) W/o. Late. A. Vincent (Deceased Employee)	34/2025	Sider	136625	18432	7797	162854
29	T. Jothimani (Legal Heir) W/o. Late.R. Thirumalaisamy (Deceased Employee)	35/2025	Sider	139487	17824	7927	165238
30	Vijayalakshmi (Legal Heir) W/o. Late. K. Muthusamy (Deceased Employee)	36/2025	Cleaner	138959	18599	7924	165482
31	A. Xavier	37/2025	Winder	140670	18823	7599	167092
32	R. Narayanasamy	38/2025	Cleaner	136403	18068	8136	162604
33	R. Palanisamy	39/2025	D. Boy	139267	18753	7903	165923
34	A. Murugesan	41/2025	Carpenter	137328	18020	7873	163221
35	A. Nagarajan	42/2025	Helper	138741	13511	7876	160128
36	P. Chandrasekaran	43/2025	Sider	141316	18969	8035	168320
37	G. Kanirajaperumal	44/2025	Cleaner	134181	16271	7635	158087
38	V. Kulanthaivelu	45/2025	EB Carrier	136726	17753	7793	162272
39	Suganthi (Legal Heir) W/o. V. Palanisamy (Deceased employee)	51/2025	Cleaner	136670	18222	7785	162677
40	A. Anthoniraj	52/2025	Cleaner	133924	15914	7587	157425
41	P. Chandrasekaran	53/2025	Sider	141789	18865	7920	168574
42	A. Selvaraj	54/2025	Cleaner	133719	17321	7356	158396
43	S. Narayanan	67/2025	Helper	137311	18038	7796	163145
44	Kaleswari (Legal Hair) D/o. P. Vasagan (Deceased)	68/2025	Sider	137448	18402	7815	163665
45	T. Jayalakshmi (Legal Heir), W/o. K. Thangappan	82/2025	Winder	78850	13214	3467	95531
46	A. Joseph Fernard Arokiyaraj	97/2025	Cleaner	133716	16115	7635	157466
47	R. Prabakar	137/2025	Bobbin Carrier	136487	16602	7754	160843
48	P. Govindaraj	34/2026	Labour	136404	16408	7772	160584
49	Thulasimani (Legal Heir) W/o. P. Natarajan (Deceased Employee)	35/2026	Winder	140333	19120	7889	167342

The petitioners therefore pray for a direction to the respondent Management to pay the respective amounts claimed towards unpaid salary, statutory bonus at 8.33% and leave salary, together with interest at 16% per annum.

6. **Common Counter averments in brief : -**

The respondent Management denied the averments made in the respective Computation Petitions except those specifically admitted. It was stated that the respondent company had a spinning mill known as “A” Mills and a weaving unit known as “B” Mills, and that the “B” Mills was closed due to continuous losses. Though alternative employment was offered to the workers of the “B” Mills in the “A” Mills without affecting their service conditions, several workers initially declined to accept the same. The issue relating to the closure of the “B” Mills was adjudicated before the Special Industrial Tribunal, Chennai, and the award dated 28.11.1994 in I.D. No.4/1993 upheld the closure and the offer of alternative employment.

7. The respondent further stated that the “A” Mills had been declared a sick industrial company and its operations had earlier been suspended due to continuous losses. A settlement dated 19.02.2003 was entered into with the workmen, providing for a Voluntary Retirement Scheme and specifically stipulating that no wages would be payable for the period of suspension of operations until reopening. The said settlement was accepted by the Industrial Tribunal and was binding on the workmen. Pursuant to the order of the Hon’ble High Court of Madras, the mill was temporarily

reopened on 28.06.2005 and alternative employment was provided to the workmen in stages. However, due to financial difficulties, power shortage, low production and other circumstances, the operations of the "A" Mills were again suspended with effect from 26.02.2007 and the mill was ultimately closed with effect from 31.12.2008. It was stated that, by then, the strength of the workmen had fallen below 100 and hence no permission under Section 25-O of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 was required for the closure.

8. The respondent Management further stated that the petitioners had already received the closure compensation, notice pay, gratuity and other terminal benefits payable to them. In the earlier proceedings in C.P. Nos.72 to 133 of 2010 and other connected cases, the Labour Court passed a common order dated 27.06.2013, which was challenged by the respondent Management before the Hon'ble Madras High Court in W.P. No.32520 of 2013. Pursuant to the directions of the Hon'ble High Court, the respondent deposited the notice pay and closure compensation, and by order dated 05.10.2015 the writ petition was disposed of with a direction for disbursement of the deposited amount. The petitioners had already received the said amount and, therefore, the present claims for salary for the same period were stated to be untenable.

9. The respondent denied the petitioners' claim for salary for the period from 26.02.2007 to 31.12.2008 and stated that the petitioners were entitled to wages

only for the days on which they actually worked. The principle of "No Work, No Pay" was applicable. It was further stated that the question whether the suspension of operations amounted to lay-off or illegal closure and whether the provisions of Chapter V-B of the Industrial Disputes Act were applicable could be adjudicated only in a reference under Section 10 of the Act and could not be decided in a proceeding under Section 33-C(2).

10. The respondent further denied the claims towards bonus and leave salary. It was stated that the petitioners had not rendered service during the relevant period and, therefore, they were not entitled to claim minimum bonus for the said period. It was also stated that there was no order, award or settlement creating any pre-existing right in favour of the petitioners towards bonus or leave salary for the respective claim periods and that the accumulated leave benefits had already been settled.

11. The respondent Management also raised an objection regarding the maintainability of the Computation Petitions under Section 33-C(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, stating that the said provision could be invoked only for enforcement or computation of a pre-existing right. It was stated that the petitioners had already received their retirement and terminal benefits and, thereafter, there was no subsisting employer-employee relationship so as to enable them to invoke the status of "workman" under Section 2(s) of the Act. The respondent also objected to the long delay in filing the present claims and disputed the correctness of the amounts

mentioned in the respective claim statements.

12. Hence, the respondent Management stated that the petitioners had no existing or pre-existing right to claim the amounts sought for under Section 33-C(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, and prayed for dismissal of the respective Computation Petitions as not maintainable.

13. A joint trial was ordered on the basis of a Joint Memo filed by the parties. During the enquiry, neither side adduced any oral evidence. On the side of the petitioners, Exhibits W1 to W54 were marked by consent in support of their claims, and Exhibits M1 to M5 were marked by consent on the side of the respondent.

14. The court carefully considered the arguments advanced on both sides. The following points were taken up for effective adjudication of the dispute involved in this case.

Points for determination :-

1).Whether the petitioners are entitled for the relief of wages for the period of suspension of operation of mill from 26.02.2007 to 31.12.2008, bonus for the years 2005 to 2009, and leave salary for the period from 2007 & 2008?

2). What other reliefs the parties are entitled to ?

15. **Answer to point no. 1 :-**

The petitioners filed these petitions u/s 33C2 of the Industrial Disputes Act, seeking full wages for the period from 26.02.2007 to 31.12.2008. Further, they claimed bonus at the rate of 8.33% for the said period and leave salary for the said period. The petitioners were the employees of the respondent mill. Some of the petitioners in C.P. Nos. 18/2025, 20/2025, 33/2025 to 36/2025, 51/2025, 68/2025,82/2025 and 35/2026 are the legal heirs of the deceased employees of the respondent mill.

16. In this case, both the parties have filed a joint memo stating that all the Computation Petitions shall be tried jointly. The said memo was recorded by this Court and this Court further ordered that a joint enquiry shall be conducted in all the above cases and the documents marked in C.P. No.4/2025 shall be treated as marked in all other cases. Finally, a joint trial was conducted in all the above cases and, after hearing the arguments of both sides jointly in all the cases, this Court decided to pass a common order in these petitions.

17. In this case, it is not in dispute that all the petitioners were employees of the respondent mill. The respondent company owns a spinning mill called “A” Mills and also owned a weaving unit called “B” Mills. Due to heavy losses, the weaving unit was closed on 20.07.1992 and the workers of the weaving mill were offered alternative work in the spinning mill of the respondent. All the petitioners herein were originally appointed in the weaving unit of the respondent mill and subsequently

given alternative work in the spinning unit of the respondent mill. In this factual background, after various disputes in connection with the previous closure, finally the mill was reopened and manufacturing activity started on 06.08.2005. Thereafter, the respondent Management declared suspension of operation of the spinning mill from 26.02.2007, claiming that it was due to continuous non-supply of power, slow work and low production by the workers. Thereafter, they declared the closure of the mill on 31.12.2008.

18. The employees who were working under the respondent mill, including the petitioners, had filed Computation Petitions in C.P. Nos.72 to 133 of 2010, claiming last drawn wages for the period from 26.02.2007 to 31.12.2009. After contest, all these petitions were allowed by this Court through its common order dated 27.06.2013. In the said order, this Court specifically directed the respondent Management to pay the claim amount as tabulated in the said order to the petitioners. Against the said order, the respondent Management preferred a writ petition in W.P. No.32520/2013 before the Hon'ble Madras High Court. The Hon'ble Madras High Court, through its order dated 05.10.2015, allowed the writ petition and ordered to set aside the common order passed in C.P. Nos.72 to 133/2010 dated 27.06.2013. At the time of admission of the said writ petition, the Hon'ble High Court had imposed a condition that the respondent should deposit the entire notice pay amount and closure compensation amount before this Court. In compliance with the said order, the respondent Management had deposited the notice pay amount and also the closure compensation amount. At the time of disposal of W.P. No.32520/2013, the Hon'ble

Madras High Court directed that it was open to the eligible workmen to withdraw the said amount. As per the said direction, the eligible workmen had withdrawn the notice pay amount and closure compensation deposited by the respondent Management. Thereafter, the petitioners herein filed Execution Petitions in E.P. Nos.5 to 49 of 2017, claiming that the respondent Management had deposited only 50% of the closure compensation and notice pay amount. The said petitions were dismissed by this Court, stating that the entire notice pay amount and closure compensation amount had been deposited by the respondent Management and withdrawn by the respective workmen. Again, challenging the said orders passed in the Execution Petitions, the workmen had filed a writ petition in W.P. No.22133/2013 before the Hon'ble Madras High Court and the same was dismissed by the Hon'ble Madras High Court by order dated 20.11.2020, thereby observing that the entire amount payable to the employees under the slabs of closure compensation, gratuity compensation as well as notice pay in entirety had been deposited and had been withdrawn. Challenging the said order, the employees had preferred a writ appeal in W.A. No.2314/2021 and the same was also dismissed by the Hon'ble Madras High Court on 30.03.2023. After the dismissal of the said writ appeal, the petitioners herein had launched the third round of litigation by way of filing these Computation Petitions.

19. As per the case of the petitioners, the respondent Management had suspended the operation of the respondent mill on 26.02.2007 and finally declared its closure on 31.12.2008. The respondent Management had not paid any wages for the

period from 26.02.2007 to 31.12.2008, i.e., the interregnum period between the date of suspension of operation of the mill till the date of actual closure of the mill. The Authorized Representative appearing on behalf of the petitioners, during the course of his argument, would submit that the respondent Management had calculated closure compensation and gratuity till 31.12.2008, thereby acknowledging that the petitioners were employed under the respondent Management till 31.12.2008. In view of the said admission, the respondent Management is liable to pay salary, statutory bonus and leave salary for the period from 26.02.2007 to 31.12.2008.

20. The said claim made by the petitioners was objected to by the respondent Management mainly on the ground that some petitioners had already filed claim petitions in C.P. Nos.72 to 133/2010 for the same period from 26.02.2007 to 31.12.2009. Though the said petitions were initially allowed by the Labour Court, Coimbatore, they were subsequently set aside by the Hon'ble Madras High Court in W.P. No.32520/2013. The petitioners have not preferred any appeal challenging the said order passed by the Hon'ble Madras High Court in W.P. No.32520/2013 dated 05.10.2015. The said order passed by the Madras High Court in respect of the same claim period has reached finality and hence the petitioners cannot re-agitate the same issue before this Court once again. He further submitted that, even for argument's sake, if the petitioners are entitled to claim wages for the period from 26.02.2007 to 31.12.2008, the petitioners cannot claim such relief in a Computation Petition u/s 33-C(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act,1947. Whether the petitioners are entitled to claim wages for the period of suspension of operation of the mill from 26.02.2007 to

31.12.2007 is a disputed fact and the same could not be decided in these Computation Petitions. He further submitted that the Hon'ble Madras High Court, in its order in W.P. No.32520/2013 dated 05.10.2015, specifically held that the disputed claim of wages for the said period could not be decided in a Computation Petition u/s 33C2 of the Industrial Disputes Act,1947. The Hon'ble Madras High Court further specifically held that the said dispute can be decided by way of raising an industrial dispute either under Section 2K or 2(A)(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act and not by way of a Computation Petition u/s 33C2 of the Industrial Disputes Act. Hence, he submitted that the third round of litigation initiated by the petitioners by way of these Computation Petitions is liable to be dismissed.

21. This Court carefully considered the above-stated rival cases projected by the respective parties and the arguments advanced by the respective counsel. Admittedly, the respondent mill suspended its operation from 26.02.2007 and finally declared its closure on 31.12.2008. Further, it is not in dispute that the petitioners were not provided employment for the period between 26.02.2007 to 31.12.2008. That apart, the respondent Management had not paid any wages under any head, like wages or lay-off compensation, to the petitioners for the said period. In this factual background, during the earlier round of litigation, the same petitioners had filed C.P. Nos.72 to 133/2010 and, the same relief for the same period from 26.02.2007 to 31.12.2008, which was rejected by the Hon'ble Madras High Court by a detailed order in WP. No. 32520 of 2013 dated 05.10.2015. The petitioners had not challenged the said order and it reached finality. In this factual background, only, again the same

petitioners came forward before this Court by way of these Computation Petitions. The Authorized Representative, during the course of his argument, would submit that, though the petitioners filed earlier Computation Petitions for the same period, these petitions were filed on the basis of the admission made by the respondent Management by way of calculating and disbursing gratuity amount and closure compensation till 31.12.2008. It is his argument that when the respondent Management itself admitted and paid closure compensation and gratuity amount by calculating the period of employment till 31.12.2008, they are liable to pay salary for the interregnum period between the date of suspension of operation of the mill till the date of actual closure of the mill. The Court has to see whether the said argument advanced by the learned Authorized Representative has any merit at all. It is true that the respondent Management calculated the period of employment for paying gratuity amount and closure compensation till 31.12.2008. In order to calculate the continuity of service, they have included the period from 26.02.2007 to 31.12.2008. In view of the said calculation made by the respondent Management, the petitioners cannot claim that the respondent Management admitted their eligibility to claim wages for the said period. Further, the said calculation of gratuity amount and closure compensation till 31.12.2008 is not a subsequent cause of action shown by the petitioners. Even at the time of disposal of W.P. No.32520/2013, the Hon'ble Madras High Court took note of the said fact in its order, which can be ascertained from paragraph No.XX of the order dated 05.10.2015. Therefore, this Court is of the view that the petitioners have not come forward with any new cause of action to file these

Computation Petitions to claim wages for the period from 26.02.2007 to 31.12.2008. When the earlier claim made by the very same petitioners was rejected by the Hon'ble Madras High Court for the same period, the petitioners should have challenged the said order before the appellate forum. Admittedly, they have not challenged the said order and the same reached finality. The petitioners cannot again reopen the same dispute which reached its finality by way of the order in W.P. No.32520/2013 dated 05.10.2015. The same petitioners cannot re-agitate the same issue again by way of these fresh Computation Petitions, alleging an illusory cause of action which had already arisen and was taken note of by the Hon'ble Madras High Court at the time of passing the order in W.P. No.32520 dated 05.10.2015.

22. In this case, the learned advocate appearing for the respondent Management, in his incisive argument, would submit that the Hon'ble Madras High Court specifically held that, to decide the dispute as to whether the employees are entitled to claim wages and other monetary benefits for the period of suspension of operation of the mill, they should have raised an industrial dispute. In view of the said order passed by the Hon'ble High Court of Madras, the same petitioners are restrained from filing these Computation Petitions once again for the same relief which was already denied and rejected by the Hon'ble Madras High Court. On careful scrutiny of the order passed by the Madras High Court in W.P. No.32520/2013 dated 05.10.2015, it is disclosed that the Hon'ble Madras High Court has given a finding that the claim made by the employees for the period from 26.02.2007 to 31.12.2008 could not be decided u/s 33C2 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. The

Hon'ble Madras High Court, in its judgment, specifically held as follows: -

> *"xiv). A perusal of the above judgments clearly show that the Labour Court under Section 33C(2) of the Act can compute benefits arising out of a pre-existing right, and cannot exercise the power to adjudicate an industrial dispute. When the admitted fact of the respondent itself is that there was a suspension of operations from 26.02.2007 and that the same would amount to closure, the question as to whether the suspension of operation from the said date would amount to a closure so as to attract section 25(O) of the Act.*
>
> *xv). Proceedings under Section 33C(2) of the Act are in the nature of execution proceedings in which the Labour Court's power is limited to the amount of money due to the workmen from the employer or if the workmen are entitled to any benefit which is capable of being computed in terms of money which is sought to be calculated or the benefit which is sought to be computed. However, such benefits must be real ones, i.e., the award adjudicated upon or provided for must arise in the course of and in relation to the relationship between the workmen and their employer. It is not competent for the Labour Court exercising jurisdiction under Section 33C(2) of the Act to arrogate itself the functions of an Industrial Tribunal and entertain the claim which is not based on a pre-existing right but which may be a subject matter of an industrial dispute under reference under Section 10 of the Act.*
>
> *xvi). Lastly, in the present factual matrix, the first respondent in the impugned Award has virtually set aside the suspension of operation on 26.02.2007 as well as the subsequent closure on 31.12.2008, which cannot be done in proceedings under Section 33C(2) of the Act in which the powers of the Labour Court are limited. When the suspension of operation as well as the subsequent closure have not been challenged by means of any industrial dispute and has*

attained finality, the entire proceedings culminating in the order of the Labour Court would be completely without jurisdiction."

On careful perusal of the above-stated order passed by the Madras High Court, it is clear that the Hon'ble Madras High Court came to a firm conclusion that the dispute relating to the claim for wages and other monetary benefits for the period of suspension of operation of the mill from 26.02.2007 to 31.12.2008 could not be decided in a proceeding u/s 33C2 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. The same can be challenged only by way of raising an industrial dispute. The said order reached finality. In that case, the same petitioners cannot claim the same monetary benefits by way of these Computation Petitions u/s 33(C)2 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

23. In the present case, the petitioners have specifically stated that the respondent Management suspended its operations from 26.02.2007 after issuing notice to the workmen. The petitioners, in their respective petitions, have not stated anything as to whether the said suspension of operations amounted to an illegal lock-out or an illegal lay-off declared by the respondent Management. Admittedly, the respondent Management suspended its operations on 26.02.2007 and thereafter did not resume its operations until the permanent closure of the mill on 31.12.2008. In the normal course, the operations of an industrial establishment may be suspended on account of a lock-out or lay-off. In the present case, the respondent Management had not taken any decision to permanently close the mill until 31.12.2008. Therefore, the suspension of operations from 26.02.2007 until 31.12.2008 has to be treated as a temporary measure adopted by the respondent Management, without any immediate

intention to permanently close the mill. As per Section 2(L) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, even where the suspension of work is ordered by an employer, such suspension may constitute a lock-out, subject to the statutory requirements. The legal position in respect of lock-out has been approved by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***General Labour Union (Red Flag), Bombay v. B.V. Chavan and Others***, reported in **1985 AIR 297**, wherein it was held as follows:

> ***"...Lock-out has been defined in Sec. 2(L) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1974 (ID Act for short) to mean the closing of a place of business, or <u>the suspension of work</u> or the refusal by an employer to continue to employ any number of persons employed by him. In lockout the employer refuses to continue to employ the workmen employed by him even though the business activity was not closed down. The essence of lock-out is the refusal of the employer to continue to employ a workman. There is no intention to close the industrial activity. Even if the suspension of work is ordered it would constitute lock-out. On the other hand closure implies closing of industrial activity as a consequence of which workmen are rendered jobless. Sec. 22(2) of the ID Act prohibits an employer in a public utility service from locking out any of his workmen without giving notice as provided therein. Sec. 23 prohibits an employer from declaring a lock-out in any of the eventualities mentioned therein. Lockout in contravention of Sec.23 is declared illegal. Section 26 of the ID Act provides that any of the practices listed in Schedule 11, III and IV would be an unfair labour practice. Imposing and continuing a lock-out deemed to be illegal under the Act is an unfair labour practice. While examining whether the employer has imposed a lock-out or has closed the industrial establishment, it is not necessary to approach the matter from this angle that the closure has to be irrevocable, final and permanent and that lockout is necessarily temporary or for a period. The employer may close down industrial activity bonafide on such eventualities as suffering continuous loss, no possibility of revival of business or inability for various other***

reasons to continue the industrial activity. There may be a closure for any of these reasons though these reasons are not exhaustive but are merely illustrative. To say that the closure must always be permanent and irrevocable is to ignore the causes which may have necessitated closure. Change of circumstances may encourage an employer to revive the industrial activity which was really intended to be closed. Therefore the true test is that when it is claimed that the employer has resorted to closure of industrial activity, the industrial court in order to determine whether the employer is guilty of unfair labour practice must ascertain on evidence produced before it whether the closure was a device or pretence to terminate services of workmen or whether it is bonafide and for reasons beyond the intention and bonafides of the employer at the time of closure but is not decisive of the matter."

Applying the aforesaid legal principle laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court to the facts of the present case, it is clear that the disputed question regarding the legality of the suspension of operations of the respondent mill is required to be adjudicated upon in an industrial dispute. In the present case, admittedly, the petitioners have not chosen to raise an industrial dispute challenging the legality of the suspension of operations of the respondent mill. In this regard, the Hon'ble Madras High Court, in W.P. No.32520 of 2013, by order dated 05.10.2015, has specifically held that, in the absence of an industrial dispute challenging the legality of the suspension of operations of the mill, the claim for monetary benefits made by the employees on the ground that such suspension of operations was illegal could not be adjudicated upon in a petition filed under Section 33-C(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. In view of the aforesaid legal position, this Court is of the considered view that the petitioners have adopted an improper course by invoking the jurisdiction of this Court under Section 33-C(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, without first raising an industrial dispute about the legality of the suspension of operations of the respondent mill. Therefore, the petitions filed by the petitioners are liable to be dismissed.

24. From the foregoing discussions and findings, this Court is of the view that the present Computation Petitions filed by the petitioners under Section 33C(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, seeking wages and other monetary benefits for the period from 26.02.2007 to 31.12.2008, are not maintainable. The very same claim for the same period had already been raised by the petitioners in the earlier Computation Petitions, which were ultimately denied by the Hon'ble Madras High Court in W.P. No.32520/2013 dated 05.10.2015. The Hon'ble Madras High Court has specifically held that the disputed claim for wages for the period of suspension of operation of the mill cannot be adjudicated in a proceeding under Section 33C(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, and that the petitioners have to seek appropriate remedy by raising an industrial dispute. The said order has reached finality. Therefore, the petitioners cannot reagitate the same claim by filing these fresh Computation Petitions under Section 33C(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. Hence, this Court holds that the present Computation Petitions are liable to be dismissed.

25. **Answer to point no. 2 :-**

The petitioner shall not be entitled to any relief other than the reliefs specifically granted under this Order.

26. **In the result**, all the Computation Petitions stand dismissed. No costs.

(Dictated to Steno Typist, Typed by him, Corrected and Pronounced by me, on this Monday, the 24st day of August 2026)

(Sd/- K. Lingam)

PRESIDING OFFICER,
ADDITIONAL LABOUR COURT,
COIMBATORE.

LIST OF WITNESSES EXAMINED

For Petitioner Side : Nil

For Respondent Side : Nil

LIST OF EXHIBITS MARKED

For Petitioner Side (In Common) :

Exhibits	Description	Date	Remarks
Ex. W1	Affidavit filed by the Management before the Hon'ble High Court in W.P.M.P. No.42148 of 2015 in W.P. No.34935 of 2004.	23.09.2005	Xerox
Ex. W2	Notice issued by the respondent Management regarding the closure of the mill.	31.12.2008	Xerox

Ex. W3	Letter submitted by the respondent management to the Assistant Commissioner of Labour, Gratuity	29.03.2012	Xerox
Ex. W4	Employee Payment Details	-	Xerox
Ex. W5	Letter submitted by Thiru. J.S. Santharaj to the Director of the respondent management requesting bonus, leave salary and salary	04.09.2024	Xerox
Ex. W6	Attendance register	February 2007	Xerox
Ex. W7	Salary slip of Mr. Kothandapani for the month of February 2007.	February 2007	Xerox
Ex. W8	Attendance register	February 2007	Xerox
Ex. W9	Salary slip of Mr. Radhakrishnan for the month of February 2007.	February 2007	Xerox
Ex. W10	Attendance register	February 2007	Xerox
Ex. W11	Salary slip of Mr. Krishnasamy for the month of February 2007.	February 2007	Xerox
Ex. W12	Death Certificate of Mr. Krishnasamy	19.07.2024	Xerox
Ex. W13	Legal heir certificate of Mr. Krishnasamy	06.08.2024	Xerox
Ex. W14	Acknowledgment letter given by Y. Renugadevi acknowledging the filing of the petition by her mother, K. Parimala, against the respondent.	-	Xerox
Ex. W15	Attendance register	February 2007	Xerox
Ex. W16	Salary slip of Mr. Natarajan for the month of February 2007.	February 2007	Xerox
Ex. W17	Attendance register	February 2007	Xerox
Ex. W18	Salary slip of Mr. Rajendran for the month of February 2007.	February 2007	Xerox
Ex. W19	Death Certificate of Mr. Rajendran	23.07.2018	Xerox
Ex. W20	Legal Heir Certificate of Mr. Rajendran	02.08.2018	Xerox
Ex. W21	Death Certificate of Poomalai	07.04.2021	Xerox
Ex. W22	Legal Heir Certificate of Poomalai	18.07.2021	Xerox
Ex. W23	Attendance register	February 2007	Xerox
Ex. W24	Salary slip of Mr. Natarajan for the month of February 2007.	February 2007	Xerox
Ex. W25	Death Certificate of Yesudas Pavul	28.03.2024	Xerox

Ex. W26	Legal Heir Certificate of Yesudas Pavul	02.11.2014	Xerox
Ex. W27	Acknowledgment letter given by other legal heirs acknowledging the filing of the petition by their mother, Viktoria Domnic Mary, against the respondent.	-	Xerox
Ex. W28	Death Certificate of Mr. A. Vincent	27.08.2020	Xerox
Ex. W29	Legal Heir Certificate of Mr. A. Vincent	08.11.2020	Xerox
Ex. W30	Acknowledgment letter given by other legal heirs acknowledging the filing of the petition by their mother against the respondent.	-	Xerox
Ex. W31	Death Certificate of Mr. R. Thirumalaisamy	05.02.2019	Xerox
Ex. W32	Legal Heir Certificate of Mr. R. Thirumalaisamy	19.02.2019	Xerox
Ex. W33	Acknowledgment letter given by other legal heirs acknowledging the filing of the petition by their mother against the respondent.	-	Xerox
Ex. W34	Death Certificate of Mr. A. Muthusamy	09.07.2019	Xerox
Ex. W35	Legal Heir Certificate of Mr. A. Muthusamy	19.08.2019	Xerox
Ex. W36	Death Certificate of Mr. V. Palanisamy	04.10.2024	Xerox
Ex. W37	Legal Heir Certificate of Mr. V. Palanisamy	22.12.2024	Xerox
Ex. W38	Acknowledgment letter given by the legal heir acknowledging the filing of the petition by his mother against the respondent.	-	Xerox
Ex. W39	Death Certificate of Mr. Vasagan	16.05.2024	Xerox
Ex. W40	Legal Heir Certificate of Mr. Vasagan	07.01.2016	Xerox
Ex. W41	Death Certificate of Mr. Vasagan	01.07.2024	Xerox
Ex. W42	Death Certificate of Mr. Thangappan	26.08.2019	Xerox
Ex. W43	Legal Heir Certificate of Mr. Thangappan	25.06.2019	Xerox
Ex. W44	Acknowledgment letter given by other legal heirs acknowledging the filing of the petition by their mother against the respondent.	-	Xerox
Ex. W45	Attendance register	February 2007	Xerox
Ex. W46	Salary slip of Mr. Natarajan for the month of February 2007.	February 2007	Xerox
Ex. W47	Death Certificate of Mr. Natarajan	19.11.2018	Xerox
Ex. W48	Legal Heir Certificate of Mr. Natarajan	07.02.2019	Xerox
Ex. W49	Acknowledgment letter given by other legal heirs acknowledging the filing of the petition by their mother against the respondent.	-	Xerox
Ex. W50	Affidavit filed by the Management before the Hon'ble High Court in W.P.M.P. No.42148 of	23.09.2005	Xerox

	2015 in W.P. No.34935 of 2004.		
Ex. W51	Notice issued by the respondent Management regarding the closure of the mill.	31.12.2008	Xerox
Ex. W52	Letter submitted by the respondent management to the Assistant Commissioner of Labour, Gratuity	29.03.2012	Xerox
Ex. W53	Employee Payment Details	-	Xerox
Ex. W54	Letter submitted by Thiru. J.S. Santharaj to the Director of the respondent management requesting bonus, leave salary and salary	04.09.2024	Xerox

For Respondent Side :

Exhibits	**Description**	**Date**	**Remarks**
Ex. M1	Copy of common award passed in CP. No. 72/2010 to 133/2010	27.06.2013	Xerox
Ex. M2	Copy of order in MP. No. 1/2013 and MP. No. 1/2014 in WP. No. 32520/2013 by the Hon'ble High Court of Madras	21.03.2014	Xerox
Ex. M3	Copy of order in WP. No. 32520/2013 by the Hon'ble High Court of Madras	05.10.2015	Xerox
Ex. M4	Copy of order in WP. No. 22133/2019 by the Hon'ble High Court of Madras	20.11.2020	Xerox
Ex. M5	Copy of order in WA. No. 2314/2021 by the Hon'ble High Court of Madras	30.03.2023	Xerox

(Sd/- K. Lingam)

PRESIDING OFFICER,
ADDITIONAL LABOUR COURT,
COIMBATORE.