

In the Court of Labour Court, Kancheepuram

**Present: Tmt.S.Sujatha, M.A., M.L.,
Presiding Officer, Labour Court,
Kancheepuram.**

Monday, the 18th day of May 2026

I.D.No.310/2019

CNR No.TNKP18-000607-2019

(In the matter of the Industrial dispute for adjudication under section 10(1)(c) & Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, between Perfetti Van Melle India Private Limited and Perfetti Van Melle Thozhilalar Maiyam)

General Secretary,
Perfetti Van Melle Thozhilalar Maiyam,
No.18/51, EWS, NH-1, Parimelalagar Street,
Maraimalai Nagar,
Kancheepuram District -603 209.

--- Petitioner / Workman union

//vs//

The Management,
Perfetti Van Melle India Private Limited,
No.7, Karanaipuducherry Village and Post,
Urapakkam,
Kancheepuram District- 603 210.

--- Respondent / Management

This Industrial Dispute came up on 24.04.2026 for final hearing before this court in the presence of M/s.J.Prathaban, S.Rudranath and N.Ponnurangam Advocates for petitioner and M/s.M.Kandasamy, P.Ashokkumar and P.Krishnamurthy Advocates for respondent and upon perusal of records and hearing the both side arguments and having stood over for consideration till this day, this court delivered the following

AWARD

1. This dispute has been referred by the Government of Tamil Nadu vide G.O.(D) No.702 dated 02.12.2019 to adjudicate the following issues :

இணைப்பு

எழுவினா

"நிர்வாகத்தால் பணி நீக்கம் செய்யப்பட்ட தொழிலாளர் திரு.R.மரிய ஆரோக்கிய பிராங்கிலின் என்பவருக்கு மீண்டும் தொடர் சர்வீஸுடன் வேலையும், வேலையிழந்த நாட்களுக்கு முழு ஊதியமும் கிடைக்க ஆவண செய்ய கோரும் தொழிற்சங்கத்தின் கோரிக்கை நியாயம் தானா? ஆம் எனில் உரிய உத்தரவுகள் பிறப்பிக்க."

2. On receipt of this reference, this court issued notice for appearance of both parties before court. Parties on receiving the notice had appeared before court, and had filed the claim statement and counter statement.

3. The contents in the claim statement filed by the claimant union is as follows :

Respondent company is international Italian company involved in production of confectioneries. They have good reputation globally. Respondent company is earning huge profit with the cooperation of its workers. The state government and central Government has provided complete facilities and infrastructures to the respondent company. Respondent company is not

providing lawful benefits entitled to the workers. Respondent/company indirectly obstructs formation of trade union.

During the year 2010 petitioner and all other workers joined Chengai Anna General workers union. Thereafter on the guidelines given by Chengai Pudhu Thozhilalar Sangam, Perfetti Van Melle Thozhilalar Maiyam was established on 18.01.2013. In the respondent company there are 287 permanent workers, 400 contract labourer's, 150 trainees and in the trade union nearly 220 permanent workers are members.

After formation of the trade union, Charter of demands was placed before respondent /management, the respondent /management has not come forward for bilateral talks and started taking vindictive action against the workers. Hence, industrial dispute was raised before labour officer. After that five settlements were entered into between the respondent /management and trade union. The respondent /management acted in a biased manner, thereby providing promotion to certain sector of workers and denied promotion to certain sector of workers. Action was taken on behalf of aggrieved employees by the trade union during 2012. The respondent decided to take action against the workers who were active in trade union. One such person is the petitioner herein. Petitioner had joined service of respondent on 20.08.2007 and worked without any complaint. Petitioner has unblemished records. Petitioner was one of the reason for formation of trade union in the year 2010. Petitioner's last drawn monthly salary is Rs.12,800/-. In such circumstances, a charge sheet

dated 17.09.2013 was issued to the petitioner herein stating on 01.08.2013 at the third shift, during his working hours at 3 a.m. in the early morning, when senior executive Thiru.Ajith Singh came for check rounds, the petitioner was not present in the Mentos coating 2 section area, where he was to be present and he was seen sleeping near Mentos coating 2 Timer panel and petitioner was negligent in his work and was sleeping during his working hours without doing any work. In the said charge memo, it was not stated on who's complaint the same was issued to him. Petitioner sought for the complaint given against him on 21.09.2013, thereafter as an after thought, the respondent/management obtained a written complaint from said Ajith Singh and said complaint was not given immediately and had been created by the respondent/management.

If the alleged incident were true complaint might have been given on the next day itself but the same had been given only on 06.08.2013. It reveals that the said complaint is a created one. For the charge sheet issued to the petitioner, Petitioner gave his explanations dated 26.09.2013 denying the charges levelled against him. Further the petitioner had stated that he sought for leave, the same was refused and he had taken his father to hospital who had sustained accident and on 31.07.2013 he was allotted work at night shift and after completing the same on 01.08.2013 he had gone to hospital taking his father and attended the duty for third shift as there was no sufficient rest and he was feeling tired, he in spite of that was doing his work and in Mentos coating two chocolate manufacturing Pan there are three sections, In each section there will be two

operators, totally six operators, the first batch production will end at 3 am and in continuation of the same for the second batch production raw materials should be taken, machines should be cleaned at that time. Petitioner suffered vomiting sensation and intimating the same to co-worker namely Gopu went to restroom, vomitted there, was feeling, nausea, and unconsciousness and stating his condition to the operator he had gone to take rest for 10 minutes but had not fallen asleep.

On receiving the explanations given by the petitioner herein, the respondent without analyzing the reasons stated by the petitioner, ordered for the domestic enquiry thereby appointing one Manoharan as enquiry officer. Petitioner was under belief that he can disprove the allegations levelled against him by the respondent/management. But the enquiry officer acted in a biased manner in favour of the respondent/management and sufficient opportunity was not given to the petitioner during domestic enquiry. On the side of the respondent management, well trained person was their representative. But the said equal opportunity was not given to the petitioner to take part in the domestic enquiry. On the side of the respondent/ management, production department senior executive Mr.Ajith singh, one Suresh line coordinator, one Muthu kumar were examined. Petitioner had also examined on his side the co-workers namely Seril, Gopu and himself as witness. The documents on the side of the respondent/ management were not marked through witnesses. It was stated by the respondent/management that Ajith singh alone had given

complaint against petitioner. But in order to add value to the complaint of Ajith singh, other two witnesses were examined on the side of the respondent/management during domestic enquiry which is against principles of natural justice and standing orders. The evidence on the side of the petitioner was not recorded properly by the enquiry officer and the evidence during cross examination was not properly recorded. The enquiry officer conducted the domestic enquiry against the principles of natural justice and standing order and acted in favour of the respondent /management and had come to the conclusion that the charges levelled against the petitioner are proved against him.

Based on the findings of the enquiry officer show cause notice dated 26.04.2014 was issued to the petitioner. Petitioner gave his explanation dated 12.05.2014, without accepting the explanations of the petitioner herein, Petitioner was issued second show cause notice dated 17.05.2014 regarding the proposed punishment. The petitioner has given his explanations dated 24.05.2014, without accepting the same, petitioner was terminated from service on 01.10.2014 as an act of vindiction, the respondent filed an application before industrial tribunal for approval of petitioners dismissal, the same was allowed on 20.04.2018. The said findings is against supreme Court's citations. The trade union convened on 05.08.2018 to seek reinstatement of the petitioner's herein and it was decided to raise the industrial dispute by the trade union.

On consultation with the trade union, petitioner gave an application to the respondent on 06.08.2018 and had filed the application before the Assistant

Commissioner, conciliation-I Sriperumbudur on 23.08.2018 under section 2K of the Act. Respondent filed their reply dated 17.12.2018 and rejoinder was filed on behalf of the trade union on 21.02.2019. As no conciliation arrived, conciliation failure report was issued on 21.05.2019 and thereby the Government of TamilNadu has passed this G.O. referring the matter to this court. Hence, this Industrial dispute is before this court. There is no proof that there was production loss due to the act of petitioner. The petitioner was taking rest for few minutes only due to his tiredness and due to the health condition of his father. Respondent/ management has not taken into consideration the past records of the petitioner. The termination of petitioner is against law and justice. As the termination of the petitioner is illegal and he is suffering with family due to non-employment, the court has to interfere under section 11A regarding the punishment imposed on the petitioner. The reference in the government order has to be decided in favour of the petitioner herein.

4. The averments in the counter statement filed by Respondent is as follows:

The respondent denies all the allegations and averments made in the claim petition except those that are specifically admitted herein.

The respondent company is engaged in manufacture of Confectioneries (food product) and their products have high repute in the market. Petitioner joined the services as Company Apprentice with effect from 20.08.2007. At the time of issuing charge sheet dated 17.09.2013 was employed as Shop Floor

Member Level -I and his last drawn wages were Rs.12,800/-. Petitioner was employed in the third shift on 01.08.2013 from 11.00p.m. to 7.00a.m in the Mentos coating -2section, Mr.Ajith Singh(Senior Executive-production) found Petitioner missing from the work spot at around early morning 3.00 a.m. and inspite of searching him in the entire shop floor and later in the canteen and locker room, he could not be found. Any absence by an employee would result in serious risk on safety for the men and Machine resulting in delivering defective quality products, will have a serious issue to consumer safety, would bring down the brand value of the product in the market which will lead to business loss. As per the Certified standing orders sleeping while on duty and not doing the assigned job is a misconduct. The respondent /management issued a charge sheet dated 17.09.2013 for violation of clauses 21(14),21(19) and 21(20) of the certified standing orders of the company. Petitioner submitted a reply dated 21.09.2013 requesting for a copy of the complaint, in the reply had not denied the misconduct alleged in the charge sheet. Vide letter dated 23.09.2013, the copy of the complaint was furnished. Petitioner submitted his explanation dated 26.09.2013 admitting certain aspects of the charges. The enquiry officer after giving due notice commenced the enquiry proceedings on 15.10.2013. On completion of the enquiry proceedings on 03.12.2014, the enquiry officer submitted the enquiry report dated 01.04.2014 holding guilty of the charges. The management issued a second show cause notice dated 17.05.2014 seeking explanation for the proposed punishment of dismissal in

view of the seriousness of the proven misconduct. Petitioner submitted his explanation to show leniency on the proposed punishment of dismissal from the services. Having found no extenuating circumstances to show leniency, decided to dismiss from the services, Vide dismissal order dated 01.10.2014. The respondent/management filed an approval petition seeking approval after complying with the provisions of section 33(2) (b) of I.D.Act. The statement made by the petitioner union that institutions like the respondent are exploiting the workers and curtailing the legal rights of the workers are false, made with malafide intention. The respondent management never curtailed the lawful activities of the members of the union from its inception in the respondent company. The management never compromised or hesitated to initiate disciplinary action to maintain discipline in the factory. The claim statement projecting the management as though it is acting against the union activities is false and misconceived. The long term settlement is signed before the conciliation officer with the consent of both the parties. The allegation made therein that one portion of employees working in the factory were discriminated and given promotion and salary hike are vague. The office bearers worked along with the dismissed employees in the year 2011 are still in the employment of the company and that would prove the relationship nurtured by the respondent/management over the years with the union. On the proven charges all the 4 employees involved in the present dispute were dismissed, that too after conducting an enquiry. Since the charges are grave in nature, any

interference by this Honble court while exercising power under sec.11A of the Act, the respondent/management would be put in to enormous hardship in maintaining the discipline and the presence of such workmen would seriously affect the morale of other workmen and discipline of the entire factory. The allegation of unfair labour practice, perversity, victimisation are unfounded. The respondent is in the business of manufacturing human consumable food products and therefore discipline of employees is most important and cannot be compromised. Considering the grave nature of proven charges the terminated employees does not deserve any relief as prayed for, petition is liable to be dismissed.

5. Fairness of domestic enquiry has been taken as preliminary issue and it had been decided by this court by order dated 24.09.2024 that domestic enquiry was conducted in a fair and proper manner. thereafter following issues were framed

- 1) Whether the findings of the enquiry officer is perverse or opposed to the evidence?
- 2) Whether the management is guilty of victimisation ?

Answer to the Issues Nos. 1&2

6. Regarding the above points for consideration petitioner examined himself as WW1 and has marked 9 documents. On the side the respondent no further oral and documentary evidence had been produced.

7. The learned counsel for the petitioner argued that complaint dated 02.08.2013 was handed over to petitioner belatedly only on 06.08.2013, thereafter one month later charge sheet was issued, co-worker was not permitted by granting shift change, second shift is from 3.30 to 6.20p.m. at about 6.15 p.m. cleaning work had been completed, petitioner only after informing the senior operator has left the work place for 15minutes, there is no proof filed by respondent/management to show that due to absence of petitioner in work spot for 15minutes there was production loss, and in fact machines will be operated by group of 6 operators with 2 operators in each machine, in such circumstances if petitioner was absent for 15minutes the production process will not be affected, respondent/management has not stated or pleaded, loss of confidence and prays the same, at this stage is unsustainable and further argued that dispute regarding promotion was pending before Tribunal in such circumstances, respondent/management has not obtained any approval as required u/s. 33(2)(b) of the ID Act and further argued that dismissal from service for absence from work place for 10minutes is highly disproportionate and hence considering all these defects, reference to be answered in favour of the petitioner.

8. On the other side it was argued by the respondent counsel that petitioner was earlier charged for similar nature of misconduct and as such this respondent/management is not ready to reinstate the petitioner into service, and if he is permitted, it will be a bad precedent among workers and workers will be under impression that they can leave the work-place as per their wish, and the

respondent/management is willing to compensate the workman in lieu of all his claim.

9. In such circumstances, this court analyses the pleadings and evidences. It is the case of the petitioner that due to formation of trade union, as an act of victimization respondent/management has created a false complaint against him and had subsequently issued charge sheet and had terminated him from service.

10. From Ex.W1 it comes to know that petitioner trade union had been registered on 18.01.2013. Petitioner had been issued with charge sheet on 17.09.2013. In para 8 of the claim statement it is stated demand for hike in wages was made during the year 2012. In para 9 of the claim statement it is stated that petitioner was root cause for formation of trade union in the year 2010. But from Ex.W1 it comes to know that trade union had been registered only in the year 2013.

11. Petitioner has not pleaded or adduced any evidence, regarding when formation of trade union was informed to respondent/management, regarding the same pleadings and evidence are silent. Petitioner has not filed any proof to show that he became member or office bearer of the petitioner trade union. Petitioner in his cross examination had adduced as follows:-

நான் மனுதாரர் தொழிற்சங்கத்தின் உறுப்பினர் என காட்ட அடையாள

அட்டை மற்றும் சந்தா ரசீது தாக்கல் செய்யவில்லை என்றால் ஆமாம். நான்

என்னுடைய சாட்சியத்தில் நிர்வாகம் சங்கம் அமைத்து செயல்படுவதை தடை

செய்வதாக சொல்லி உள்ளேன் என்றால் ஆமாம். மனுதாரர் தொழிற்சங்கம் தற்சமயம் வரை எதிர்மனுதாரர் நிறுவனத்தில் செயல்பட்டு வருகிறது என்றால் ஆமாம். சங்க உறுப்பினர்களின் பட்டியல் தாக்கல் செய்யவில்லை என்றால் ஆமாம். ஒவ்வொரு ஆண்டும் சங்க செயற்குழு, பொதுக்குழு கூட்டப்படும் என்றால் ஆமாம். செயற்குழு பொதுக்குழு நடவடிக்கைக்காண ஆதாரம் தொழிலாளர் ஆணையம் முன் தாக்கல் செய்யப்பட்டதா என்றால் இல்லை. இந்த நீதிமன்றத்திலும் தாக்கல் செய்யப்படவில்லை என்றால் ஆமாம்.

பொதுவாக எங்கள் தொழிற்சங்க உறுப்பினர்கள் மீது நிர்வாகம் நடவடிக்கை எதுவும் எடுக்க வேண்டும் என்றால் அதற்கு முன்னர் அழைத்து பேசுவார்கள் என்றால் ஆமாம். தொழிற்சங்கம் ஆரம்பிக்கப்பட்ட பின்னர் நிர்வாகத்திடம் பொது கோரிக்கை சம்பந்தமாக மனு அளிக்கப்பட்டதாக சொல்லும் பொழுது என்ன பொது கோரிக்கை, எந்த தேதியில் அந்த மனு அளிக்கப்பட்டது என்ற விவரம் சொல்லப்பட்டுள்ளதா என்றால் இல்லை. அதற்கான ஆதாரம் தாக்கல் செய்யவில்லை. சம்பள உயர்வு கேட்டு வழக்கு தாக்கல் செய்யப்பட்டதா என்றால் கோரிக்கை மட்டும் வைக்கப்பட்டது. சம்பள உயர்வு கேட்டு எந்த

தேதியில் கோரிக்கை வைக்கப்பட்டது என்பதற்கான ஆதாரம் தாக்கல் செய்யவில்லை. குறைந்தபட்ச ஊதிய சட்டம் முன்னிலைக்கு ஊதியம் வழங்க வேண்டும் என கேட்டு தொழிலாளர் ஆணையர் முன்பு மனு எதுவும் கொடுக்கப்பட்டதா என்றால் இல்லை.

நிர்வாகம் ஒழுங்கீன செய்கையில் ஈடுபடும் தொழிலாளர்களுக்கு எதிராக எந்தவித பாகுபாடும் இன்றி தான் நடவடிக்கையில் ஈடுபடும் என்றால் ஆமாம்.

From the above evidence it can be concluded that, petitioner has not produced any reliable evidence to show that he had been victimized for active participation in trade union activities.

12. Further petitioner has not produced any documents to show that only after raising a dispute before conciliation Officer, respondent/management has come forward to enter into 5 settlements. For the said pleading no proof is filed by petitioner to show during which period 5 settlements were entered into between respondent/management and the petitioner trade union.

13. From Ex.W1, petitioner's trade union had been registered only on 18.01.2023, petitioner has been terminated from service on 01.10.2014. In the between period, it is pleaded 5 settlements were entered into. In such circumstances the pleading of the petitioner that he was root cause for formation of trade union under respondent/management and he was victimised for the

same is untenable. Further when 5 settlements had been entered into between respondent/management and trade union, the question of victimisation is untenable.

14. Regarding perversity in the findings of the Enquiry Officer. Petitioner had stated that on the side of the respondent/management production Senior Executive Ajithsigh, Senior Producer other Suresh, Line Co-ordinator Muthu kumar had been examined, documents were not marked through witnesses, only Ajithsigh has given a complaint, other two had not given, in order to add strength to their complaint, two witnesses had been examined.

15. The argument of the petitioner that regarding his absence from work place only one of the officials have given a complaint, other two officials have not given hence the said complaint is not reliable is unacceptable.

16. Petitioner himself has admitted in his evidence that due to lack of sleep and tiredness he was vomiting and had left the workplace to rest room and was taking rest for 10 minutes. When charge itself is that petitioner was absent from work place for 10minutes and the same has been admitted by petitioner himself than the question of delay in giving complaint and issuance of charge sheet is not agreeable and acceptable. Hence this court concludes that there is no perversity in the findings of the enquiry officer.

17. Petitioner has claimed that at the time of termination of service of petitioner, Industrial dispute was pending and hence there is violation of sec.33(2)(b) of ID Act. Petitioner in his cross examination had adduced as follows:-

நான் என்னுடைய சாட்சியத்தில் நிர்வாகம் வேலை நீக்கம் சம்பந்தமாக உரிய அனுமதி வாங்கவில்லை என சொல்லி உள்ளேன் என்றால் ஆமாம். ஆனால் அனுமதி மனு தாக்கல் செய்தது என்றால் தெரியும். அனுமதி மனுவில் பிறப்பிக்கப்பட்ட உத்தரவிற்கு எதிராக மேல்முறையீடு தாக்கல் செய்யவில்லை என்றால் ஆமாம். அப்புவல் மனு சென்னை தொழிலாளர் தீர்ப்பாயத்தில் அனுமதிக்கப்பட்ட பின்னர் தான் நாங்கள் வேலை நிறுத்தத்தில் ஈடுபட்டோம் என்றால் ஆமாம். வேலை நிறுத்த போராட்டம் என்ன கோரிக்கை அடிப்படையில் நடத்தப்பட்டது என்ற விவரம் தெரியும். சம்பள உயர்வு கேட்டு நடத்தப்பட்டது. நான் உள்பட ஐந்து தொழிலாளர்கள் வேலை நீக்கம் செய்யப்பட்டது சம்பந்தமாகவும் வேலை நிறுத்த போராட்டம் நடைபெற்றது என்றால் ஆமாம். கோரிக்கைகளில் அதுவும் ஒன்றாக இருந்தது. வேலை நிறுத்த போராட்டம் சங்கம் சார்பாக எந்த வித முன் அறிவிப்பும் இன்றி நடத்தப்பட்டது என்றால் மறுக்கிறேன். எந்த தேதியில் முன் அறிவிப்பு கொடுக்கப்பட்டது என்றால் தெரியவில்லை. அந்த முன் அறிவிப்பு நகல் நீதிமன்றத்தில் தாக்கல் செய்யப்பட்டுள்ளதா என்றால் இல்லை.

18. Petitioner has not stated the details of Industrial dispute that was pending before any forum at the time of termination of service. When respondent/management claims that Approval for dismissal had been granted by competent authority, it is not denied by petitioner. From Ex.W9 it comes to know that at the time of termination of service of petitioner a dispute had been pending for adjudication. Hence there is violation of sec.33(2)(b) of ID Act is proved by petitioner herein.

19. The respondent/management during cross examination of petitioner has stated that it had entered into long term settlement with the Petitioner's Trade Union to the period from 2011 to 2014. The said settlement also not produced. When Petitioner's Trade Union has been registered only on 18.01.2013 how they have entered into agreement even in the year 2011 is not clarified by either parties.

20. Petitioner is aged 38 years. Petitioner has been terminated from service for being absent from workplace for 15 minutes. Whether punishment is proportionate or disproportionate to be decided.

21. Petitioner has joined service of respondent/management on 20.08.2007. He had been terminated from service in the year 2014. Petitioner has been terminated from service for had slept for 15 minutes during working hours and further it is alleged that earlier also petitioner had involved in similar misconduct and hence not entitled for reinstatement.

22. Petitioner had not produced any proof to show for formation of trade union and for active participation in trade union activities, he had been terminated on false charges. Further petitioner had not produced any proof to show that his father met with an accident, he had taken care of him in the hospital, he was denied leave, but he himself has admitted that due to tiredness and nausea he left the work place for 15 minutes and was taking rest but had not fallen asleep.

23. Petitioner had rendered nearly 7 years of service under respondent/management. Petitioner is not terminated for any serious misconduct as theft, misappropriation etc. He had left the work place for 15 minutes. For the said absence, respondent/management ought have given written warning, or ought have debited in his leave account if any. But as a grave punishment had terminated his service. The act of respondent/management terminating an employee from service for being absent in work place for 15 minutes is highly disproportionate. The same is liable to be set aside.

24. The respondent/management has not produced any proof to show that petitioner was gainfully employed during his period of non-employment. Petitioner is therefore entitled to 50% of backwages during the period of his non-employment from the date of termination of service till date of reinstatement. Accordingly the issues are answered.

In the result, this Industrial Dispute is allowed. Award is passed directing respondent to reinstate the petitioner into service, with continuity of service, with 50% of back wages during the period of his non-employment from the date of termination of service till the date of reinstatement. Petitioner is not entitled for other attendant benefits. Parties to bear their own cost.

Dictated to the steno typist, directly typed by her, corrected and pronounced by me in the open court, this the 18th day of May 2026.

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court,
Kancheepuram.

List of witnesses examined

For the Petitioner/Workman union :

W.W.1 Maria Arokia Franklin

For the Respondent / Management: Nil

List of exhibits marked

For the Petitioner/Workman union:

Ex.W.1	18.01.2013	Copy of Registration Certificate of Trade Union.
Ex.W.2	26.04.2014	Copy of notice of respondent/management
Ex.W.3	12.05.2014	Copy of Explanation given by Maria Arokia Franklin.
Ex.W.4	06.08.2018	Copy of letter given to the respondent by trade union.
Ex.W.5	23.08.2018	Copy of 2k petition raised before Deputy Commissioner of Labour by trade union.

Ex.W.6	21.02.2019	Copy of rejoinder of petitioner trade union.
Ex.W.7	21.05.2016	Copy of conciliation failure report.
Ex.W.8	02.12.2019	Copy of G.O.702
Ex.W.9	13.06.2024	Copy of Award in ID.18/2014

For the Respondent/ Management: (Ex.1 to 23 marked in Preliminary issue)

Ex.M.1	17.09.2013	Copy of Charge Sheet issued to the petitioner
Ex.M.2	21.09.2013	Copy of reply by the petitioner
Ex.M.3	02.08.2013	Copy of complaint of Ajith Singh
Ex.M.4		Copy of Photograph of petitioner
Ex.M.5	23.09.2013	Copy of letter from the respondent to the petitioner
Ex.M.6	26.09.2013	Copy of explanation of the petitioner
Ex.M.7	11.10.2013	Copy of enquiry notice
Ex.M.8	15.10.2013	Copy of Corrigendum enquiry notice letter
Ex.M.9		Copy of Ex.M10 series filed in the enquiry
Ex.M.10	04.09.2013	email report
Ex.M.11		Copy of coating Log book
Ex.M.12	01.08.2013	Day plan
Ex.M.13	01.08.2013	Copy of shift wise day plan
Ex.M.14		Copy of Photograph

Ex.M.15	16.09.2013	Copy of complaint regarding petitioner
Ex.M.16	26.09.2013	Complaint of G.Seril
Ex.M.17		Copy of Photographs
Ex.M.18	15.10.2013 to 03.02.2014	Copy of enquiry proceedings
Ex.M.19	01.04.2014	Copy of findings of the enquiry officer
Ex.M.20	17.05.2014	Copy of letter with findings of the enquiry officer.
Ex.M.21	24.05.2014	Copy of reply by the petitioner
Ex.M.22	01.10.2014	Copy of the dismissal order along with one month wages with postal receipt
Ex.M.23		Copy of Standing orders.

P.O.
LC,Kpm.