

**BEFORE THE PRINCIPAL LABOUR COURT, VELLORE,
VELLORE DISTRICT.**

**PRESENT : Tmt.S.Uma Maheswari, M.L.,
Presiding Officer**

Wednesday, the 23rd day of July, 2025

**I.D. No.51 of 2016
(CNR No.TNVL02-000114-2016)**

C.Radhakrishnan, aged 33,
S/o. Chakkarai Naicker,
No.618, Bajanai Koil Street,
Vaagai Nathakkollai Village,
Doosi Post,
Cheyyar Taluk – 631 701.

. . . Petitioner

Versus

The Managing Director,
Lotus Footwear Enterprises Limited,
Via Akkur,
Cheyyar Taluk,
Thiruvannamalai District.
Tamil Nadu – 631 701.

. . . Respondent

This Petition came up for hearing on 02.07.2025 in the presence of Thiru.J.Prathaban, Advocate for the Petitioner and M.Kandasamy, Advocate for the Respondent, and upon hearing the arguments of both side, upon perusing the material case records and having stood over for consideration till this date, this Court delivered the following:-

PRELIMINARY AWARD

The preliminary issue to be decided in this petition is with regard to the Domestic Enquiry conducted by the respondent as against this workman was a fair and proper one by following the principles of natural justice.

1. Petition averments in brief:-

The petitioner states that he joined in the service of the respondent company on 04.04.2010 as a Cutting Machine Operator Gr-III. The petitioner rendered unblemished record of service and based on that, his job was made permanent. Lastly the petitioner was working as an Injection Mould Operator and his last drawn salary was Rs.12,500/-.

The petitioner states that the respondent company situated at SIPCOT Industrial Estate, and it is a multinational company. The respondent company was not in the habit of following any fixed targets on production and the same was not recognized by any independent third party. The company fixed the targets that any human being cannot do in their capacity. Due to the above said such targets the employees were forced to suffer mentally and will also be forced to commit suicide. Therefore, the petitioner and other affected workers joined together and formed a union in the name and style of Footwear Workers Union, which is a branch of registered labour union. The petitioner being the executive member of the union, questioned the unfair labour practice followed by the respondent. Therefore, to retaliate, the respondent company developed inimical terms against the petitioner.

The petitioner further states that the respondent management issued a charge memo on 18.07.2014 for his involvement in the labour union activities. The petitioner alleges that, the management has no authority to issue a charge memo and an order of suspension, even after the petitioner submitted his explanation. The management not satisfied with the explanation conducted an unfair domestic enquiry. The Enquiry Officer not conducted the proceedings in a fair manner and he involved himself in the facts which were not mentioned in the charge memo and thereby he recorded his wrongful and one-sided opinion about the petitioner. The charges mentioned in the charge memo were far from the truth and against the law. The Enquiry Officer did not permit him to cross examine the management witnesses, and the petitioner alleges that the proceedings of the domestic enquiry and the enquiry report dated 09.02.2015 will clearly prove the same.

The petitioner further states that the report submitted by the Enquiry Officer was totally against the Industrial Dispute pending before the Assistant Commissioner of Labour as I.D. No.94/2014. The management did not obtain any permission under Section-33. All the enquiry proceedings initiated against the petitioner are liable to be rejected. The petitioner requested the management to withdraw their show cause notice, but the management without considering the same terminated the petitioner from service on 07.05.2015. Further the respondent did not obtain any approval for his termination order. Therefore the termination order becomes infructuous. Thus, the petitioner approached the Assistant Commissioner of Labour and raised an Industrial Dispute, but the

management did not co-operate for an amicable settlement. Therefore, the Assistant Commissioner of Labour recorded a failure report.

The petitioner further alleges that, the management conducted the domestic enquiry without following the due process of law and without providing sufficient opportunity to the petitioner. Therefore he requests this court to decide the fairness of the domestic enquiry as a preliminary issue and requests this court to decide the preliminary issue in his favour.

3. The Gist of averments in the Written Statement:-

The respondent filed his written statement and stated that the respondent company was registered under the provisions of Companies Act 1956, and having their factory at SIPCOT Industrial Park and engaged in manufacturing of footwear. The products manufactured by the respondent are largely exported to various countries and their products are highly reputed in the market.

The respondent further states that the petitioner was employed as a worker in TP Department and his last drawn wages were Rs.10,005/-. When he was employed in the company, during the working hours he was distributing union pamphlets which contained derogatory statements about the respondent company. Since this act amounts to a misconduct as per the standing orders of the respondent's management, the management issued a charge memo to the petitioner on 18.07.2014. Further considering the seriousness of the charges the petitioner was placed under suspension.

The petitioner submitted his explanation on 21.07.2014, but the management not satisfied with the explanation decided to conduct a domestic enquiry and accordingly appointed one Mr.Venkatesan as an Enquiry Officer. The Enquiry Officer commenced the enquiry proceedings on 29.07.2014, the petitioner also participated in the enquiry proceedings and denied the charges leveled against him. The petitioner also sought the assistance of one Mr.N.Venkatesan to assist him during the enquiry proceedings. The said Mr.N.Venkatesan was employed as supervisor of the company, therefore the management raised objection regarding his requirement for assistance and the same was accepted by the Enquiry Officer but at the same time the Enquiry Officer advised the petitioner to bring any other co-worker for his assistance in the enquiry.

The respondent further states that during the enquiry proceedings the petitioner deliberately refused to receive the documents and insisted the management to send all the documents by post. The petitioner in spite of sufficient opportunity granted to him, failed to cross examine the management witness, and he made several remarks against the Enquiry Officer to divert the enquiry proceedings. The petitioner though participated in the enquiry proceedings, failed to sign in the proceedings and further on one hearing, i.e., 27.12.2014, he blocked the exit of vehicles in front of the gate of Cheyyar Special Economy Developers. Thereby caused hardship to the companies situated inside the premises and he left the premises on the advise of security guards.

The respondent further states that the petitioner deliberately and intentionally failed to avail several opportunities granted to him, therefore the Enquiry Officer concluded his proceedings on 09.01.2015 and submitted his report on 09.02.2015 holding that the petitioner is guilty of the charges leveled against him. The management after receipt of the report sent a show cause notice to the petitioner along with the copy of the report. The petitioner submitted his reply on 26.04.2015 but the management not satisfied with his reply and taking into account of his past records came to a conclusion that there were no extenuating circumstances to show any leniency to the petitioner, and consequently issued an order of termination. The petitioner later raised an Industrial Dispute before the Labour Officer, Vellore and the respondent filed a counter statement narrating the facts, but no amicable settlement was arrived. Hence, the conciliation proceedings ended in a failure. Now the petitioner has come forward with this present petition by making false allegations and averments. The respondent specifically denies each and every averments mentioned by the petitioner. The respondent states that they conducted the domestic enquiry in a fair and proper manner on the basis of principles of natural justice and therefore requests this court to decide the domestic enquiry proceedings as a fair and proper one.

4. Both side no witnesses were examined. On the side of petitioner Ex-W1 and Ex-W2 were marked. On the side of the respondent Ex-M1 to Ex-M63 were marked.

5. Point for consideration;

Whether the Domestic Enquiry conducted by the respondent was a free and fair one by following the principles of natural justice or not?

After hearing both the counsels and after perusing the claim and written statement averments, this court comes to know that the petitioner initially had been employed as a Cutting Machine Operator Gr-III in the respondent management. At the time of his termination he had worked as an Injunction Mould Operator and the respondent did not deny his employment with them.

It is averred by the petitioner that he had been issued with a charge memo on 18.07.2014 for his union activities. On the other hand, the management stated that the petitioner during his working hours had been issuing union pamphlets under Ex.M2 which contains derogatory remarks about the respondent's management. Further the respondent management had received a complaint about his activities from the employees, one Mr.Vasanth and Mr.V.Mohanraj under Ex.M1 and M3. The above said act of the petitioner has been against the Certified Standing Orders of the respondent management. Therefore, the management considering the serious nature of the complaint, immediately has issued a suspension order to the petitioner under Ex.M4. Subsequently the petitioner has been issued with a charge memo under Ex.M5 and the same was acknowledged by him.

The petitioner has submitted his explanation on 21.07.2014 under Ex.M7. The management has issued the charge memo through registered post on 18.07.2014 and on the next day itself the management decided to conduct a domestic enquiry, and accordingly issued an enquiry notice to the petitioner under Ex.M6. The management has issued the charge memo on 18.07.2014 through registered post to the petitioner and granted 3 days' time to submit his explanation. Admittedly the said charge memo has been received by the petitioner on 19.07.2014. The petitioner has been given 3 days' time to submit his explanation from the date of receipt of the notice. The period to submit his explanation ends on 22.07.2014 and the petitioner has submitted his explanation on 21.07.2014. Unfortunately the management without waiting for his explanation, immediately after the next day of issuance of charge memo, i.e., on 19.07.2014 itself, has decided to conduct a domestic enquiry. The order under Ex.M6 shows about the intention of the management to conduct a domestic enquiry. This clearly exhibits that the management had a pre - determined motive against the petitioner.

The petitioner under Ex.M8 has requested the management to submit certain documents to participate in the enquiry proceedings. The management has appointed one Mr.Ramamoorthy, an Advocate as an Enquiry Officer under Ex.M9, and consequently they appointed one Mr.G.Sankar, as the Management Representative under Ex.M10. The said fact has been intimated to the Enquiry Officer under Ex.M11. The management has appointed Enquiry Officer only on 29.07.2014 under Ex.M9 and the said order was communicated to the Enquiry Officer in person. How the management

served the appointment order to the Enquiry Officer in person? is not explained to this court properly. Further in this Ex.M9, dated 29.07.2014, the management has directed the Enquiry Officer to conduct the enquiry on same day at 10.00 a.m. Subsequently the Enquiry Officer on that day itself at 11.15 a.m. has commenced the proceedings. The above said instant activities of the management clearly show that the Enquiry Officer was readily available in the factory. The above documents Ex.M9 to M11 clearly shows that the management in a hurried manner has decided to conduct the enquiry proceedings without providing breathing time. The petitioner has requested the Enquiry Officer to appoint one Mr.Venkatesan on 23.07.2014 to assist him during the enquiry proceedings under Ex.W1, but prior to this requisition letter itself, the petitioner submitted requisition under Ex.M12 to permit him to engage one Mr.Venkatesan to assist him during the enquiry proceedings. The management has refused his requisition under Ex.M13. In the meantime, the petitioner has also submitted a requisition to produce the copies of Certified Standing Orders under Ex.M12 itself.

Further it is alleged by the management that the petitioner has refused to sign in the enquiry proceedings and therefore they sent the enquiry proceedings and documents through registered post to him. The letter and the copy of the acknowledgment card have been marked as Ex.M14. Later the Enquiry Officer due to his personal reasons had not been able to conduct the enquiry on 12.08.2014, 19.08.2014, 22.08.2014 & 02.09.2014, and the management intimated the same to the petitioner about the adjournments of enquiry proceeding through registered post under Ex.M15 to M18. The management had also affixed the postal receipts of

the registered posts. On perusal of the postal receipts, this court come to know that, the intimation letter about the adjournment on 12.08.2014 had been posted to the petitioner only on 13.08.2014 at 15.22 hours. Likewise the adjournment on 19.08.2014 had been intimated to the petitioner through post on 20.08.2014 at 11.11 hours and the adjournment on 22.08.2014 had been intimated to the petitioner through post on 26.08.2014 at 10.29 hours. The adjournment on 02.09.2014 had been intimated to the petitioner through post on 03.09.2014 at 11.05 hours.

This court perused the above intimation letters and postal receipts. On its perusal, this court comes to know that, the management has failed to intimate the adjournments to the petitioner well in advance, instead the communications were sent belatedly. The above documents have been filed by the management, only with an intention to show as if they have followed the due procedure. But these exhibits clearly show that they have not followed the due procedure and they caused hardships to the petitioner who was already under suspension.

The enquiry proceedings dated 06.09.2014, 13.09.2014, 20.09.2014, 18.10.214 have been marked as Ex.M19, M23, M28 and M33 respectively. The petitioner under Ex.M20 has requested the management to produce the documents, further under Ex.M21 he again addressed the management that they are causing hardship to him. The management has sent the enquiry proceedings conducted on 06.09.2014, 13.09.2014, 20.09.2014 and 18.10.2014 to the petitioner under Ex.M22, M27, M29 and M35 respectively. The management has furnished the part of Certified copies of Standing Order to the petitioner under Ex.M24. But the petitioner has

insisted the management to furnish every document that they have mentioned in the charge sheet under Ex.M25 and M26. The management has issued the notice of enquiry under Ex.M30 to petitioner. Again the proceedings on 09.10.2014 have been adjourned due to the absence of the Enquiry Officer and the same was intimated to the petitioner under Ex.M31. Again the management has issued the notice of enquiry under Ex.M32. The petitioner has requested the management to inform the adjournments well in advance under Ex.M34. The management has again adjourned the enquiry proceedings dated 25.10.2014 due to the absence of the Enquiry Officer and the same was also intimated to the petitioner under Ex.M36 through registered post on 30.10.2014. Again the petitioner has requested the management to inform the adjournment well in advance under Ex.M37.

The management has changed the Enquiry Officer and appointed one Mr.Venkatesan as an Enquiry Officer under Ex.M38. The said new Enquiry Officer has commenced the proceedings on dates such as 26.11.2014, 29.11.2014 & 06.12.2014, and the enquiry proceedings have been marked as Ex.M39 and M41. The said proceedings have been sent to the petitioner under Ex.M40 and M42. The petitioner's leave particulars have been marked as Ex.M43. The petitioner has attended the enquiry proceedings on 06.12.2014 but failed to attend the proceedings on 15.12.2014. The said proceedings have been marked as Ex.M44. Since the petitioner has failed to attend the proceeding on 15.12.2014, the management sent the proceedings through registered post under Ex.M45. Again the enquiry proceeding on 20.12.2014 has been adjourned to 27.12.2014, but as usual the management has intimated the same to the

petitioner only on 23.12.2014 under Ex.M46. The proceedings on 27.12.2014 have been marked as Ex.M47 and the same was sent to the petitioner under Ex.M48.

In the meantime the petitioner found that the Enquiry Officer has acted in support of the management, therefore he informed about his behaviour and hence taken a stand not to participate in the enquiry proceedings under Ex.W2.

The proceeding dated 03.01.2015 has been marked as Ex.M49 but on that date the petitioner was not present. The Enquiry Officer without the presence of the petitioner has marked the documents produced by him and adjourned the case to 09.01.2015. The petitioner under Ex.M50 has requested the management to conduct the domestic enquiry in a common place. The management has filed a letter dated 04.03.2013 supposed to be sent by the petitioner, where the signature of the petitioner was not found. Therefore, this court is not considering this document and hence Ex.M51 is rejected by this court. The management has sent the enquiry proceedings held 03.01.2015 to the petitioner under Ex.M52. The proceedings held on 09.01.2015 have been marked as Ex.M53 but the petitioner failed to appear on that date, therefore the Enquiry Officer concluded the proceedings on 09.01.2015. The petitioner under Ex.M54 has sent a letter to the management about the conduct of the Enquiry Officer. The management on 09.01.2015 has sent a letter to the petitioner and mentioned the list of documents submitted by them to the petitioner under Ex.M55. In the meantime, the Enquiry Officer submitted his report on 09.02.2015 and the management has issued a show cause notice to the petitioner under Ex.M56 along with the enquiry report under

Ex.M57. The petitioner by letter dated 13.04.2015 under Ex.M58 has requested the management to grant time to submit his explanation. The petitioner on 23.04.2015 submitted his explanation under Ex.M59. Again the management has issued show cause notice under Ex.M60 for which the petitioner submitted his explanation under Ex.M61. The management not satisfied with his explanation had issued an order of termination under Ex.M62, along with the termination order the management also settled the final dues to the petitioner, and the calculation sheet regarding his final dues has been marked as Ex.M63.

The learned respondent counsel has argued that the management has conducted the domestic enquiry proceedings in a fair and proper manner by providing full opportunities to the petitioner. Further he argued that the Enquiry Officer has also marked the workman documents as Ex.W1 to W13 during the domestic enquiry proceedings, this further strengthens the fact that the Enquiry Officer has followed the principles of natural justice. Thus he requests the court to decide the preliminary issue in their favour.

This court perused the documents filed on the side of the respondent. This court already found that the management without waiting for his explanation, immediately after serving the charge sheet has proceeded to appoint a domestic enquiry. This first act on the part of the respondent clearly shows that the management had a pre-determined view about the petitioner, for that reason alone without getting his explanation they have decided to conduct a domestic enquiry as per Ex.M6. After getting his explanation in a routine manner and as a formality they have conducted the domestic enquiry.

Further during the domestic enquiry proceedings also the respondent had shown to project themselves as if they were following the principles of natural justice. But the notice of enquiry sent to the petitioner clearly shows that most of the enquiry notices have been posted belatedly. This act of the respondent could have definitely caused hardship to the petitioner, for the reason that for every hearing the petitioner would have presented himself to attend the hearing, but belatedly through post he was informed that the enquiry had been adjourned. The documents filed by the management clearly prove the same.

Further in this case, initially one Mr.Ramamoorthy, an Advocate had been appointed as an Enquiry Officer. He conducted the proceedings for some hearings and later one Mr.Venkatesan was appointed in his place and he continued the enquiry proceedings. Earlier the management has provided several adjournments at the request of the 1st Enquiry Officer. But the subsequently appointed Enquiry Officer has not provided sufficient adjournments to the petitioner. The petitioner has failed to attend the domestic enquiry proceedings on 5.12.2014 alone. The next hearing had been on 27.12.2014, on that date the petitioner has participated in the enquiry proceedings and the next hearing date was on 03.01.2015, and on that date the petitioner failed to appear. The Enquiry Officer without providing one more adjournment immediately has proceeded to mark the documents filed on the side of the petitioner in his absence. This act of the Enquiry Officer clearly exhibits that he has not followed the principles of natural justice. After marking the documents the Enquiry Officer had adjourned the case to 09.01.2015, on that date the petitioner failed to appear but in his absence the Enquiry Officer has

marked the management documents. Further he has concluded the proceedings at the request of the management. The petitioner has not been cross examined the management witnesses. After concluding the proceedings the Enquiry Officer has granted 10 days' time to submit his defence and the same was clearly recorded in Ex.M53. Instead of providing sufficient opportunity to the petitioner during the domestic enquiry proceedings, the enquiry officer has granted 10 days' time only after the conclusion of the proceedings is not acceptable. The behaviour of the Enquiry Officer clearly reveals that he had acted in support of the management and failed to provide fair and sufficient opportunities to the petitioner. Therefore, this court holds that the domestic enquiry was not conducted in a fair and proper manner by following the principles of natural justice.

Point is answered accordingly.

In the result, the preliminary issue is answered by holding that the domestic enquiry was not conducted in a fair and proper manner by following the principles of natural justice.

For the production of management witnesses call on 11.08.2025.

Dictated to the Steno-Typist, typed directly in the Computer, corrected and pronounced by me in the Open Court, on this the 23rd day of July, 2025.

**Sd/- S.Uma Maheswari,
Presiding Officer,
Principal Labour Court, Vellore.**

Annexure:-**1. List of Witnesses examined on the side of the Petitioner:-**

- Nil -

2. List of Exhibits marked on the side of the Petitioner:-

Ex-W1 – 23.07.2014 – Copy of letter addressed by the petitioner

Ex-W2 – 02.01.2015 – Copy of Petitioner's Letter

3. List of Witnesses examined on the side of the Respondent:-

- Nil -

4. List of Exhibits marked on the side of the Respondent:-

Ex-M1 – 08.07.2014 – Copy of Complaint Letter of Mr. Vasanth

Ex-M2 – ---- – Copy of Pamphlet Issued by the Petitioner

Ex-M3 – 10.07.2014 – Copy of Complaint Letter of Mr. Mohanraj

Ex-M4 – 10.07.2014 – Copy of Temporary Suspension Order with pending enquiry

Ex-M5 – 18.07.2014 – Copy of Charge Sheet and Acknowledgment Card issued to Petitioner

Ex-M6 – 19.07.2014 – Copy of Notice of Enquiry Letter and Acknowledgment Card

Ex-M7 – 21.07.2014 – Copy of Letter of the Petitioner

Ex-M8 – 23.07.2014 – Copy of Standing Order Request Letter

Ex-M9 – 29.07.2014 – Copy of Enquiry Officer Appointment

Ex-M10 – 29.07.2014 – Copy of Management Representative Appointment Letter issued to G.Sankar

Ex-M11 – 29.07.2014 – Copy of Management Representative Appointment Letter issued to Ramamurthi

Ex-M12 – 29.07.2014 – Copy of Domestic Enquiry Proceedings
and
05.08.2014

Ex-M13	–	05.08.2014	–	Copy of Management reply Letter
Ex-M14	–	06.08.2014	–	Copy of Enquiry Documents with postal covering Letter and Acknowledgment Card
Ex-M15	–	12.08.2014	–	Copy of Enquiry Postponed Letter
Ex-M16	–	19.08.2014	–	Copy of Enquiry Postponed Letter
Ex-M17	–	25.08.2014	–	Copy of Enquiry Postponed Letter
Ex-M18	–	02.09.2014	–	Copy of Enquiry Postponed Letter and Acknowledgment Letter
Ex-M19	–	06.09.2014	–	Copy of Domestic Enquiry Proceedings
Ex-M20	–	19.08.2014	–	Copy of Explanation Letter of Petitioner
Ex-M21	–	03.09.2014	–	Copy of Explanation Letter of Petitioner
Ex-M22	–	08.09.2014	–	Copy of Enquiry Documents with postal covering Letter and Acknowledgment Card
Ex-M23	–	13.09.2014	–	Copy of Domestic Enquiry Proceedings
Ex-M24	–	13.09.2014	–	Copy of Standing Order submission Letter and Acknowledgment Card
Ex-M25	–	13.09.2014	–	Copy of Letter of the Petitioner
Ex-M26	–	15.09.2014	–	Copy of Letter of the Petitioner
Ex-M27	–	15.09.2014	–	Copy of Enquiry Documents and postal covering Letter
Ex-M28	–	20.09.2014	–	Copy of Domestic Enquiry Proceedings
Ex-M29	–	22.09.2014	–	Copy of Enquiry Documents with postal covering Letter and Acknowledgment Card
Ex-M30	–	06.10.2014	–	Copy of Enquiry postponed Letter and Acknowledgment Card
Ex-M31	–	09.10.2014	–	Copy of Letter of the Petitioner
Ex-M32	–	15.10.2014	–	Copy of Enquiry postponed Letter and Acknowledgment Card
Ex-M33	–	18.10.2014	–	Copy of Domestic Enquiry Proceedings
Ex-M34	–	09.10.2014	–	Copy of Letter by the Petitioner

Ex-M35	– 20.10.2014	– Copy of Enquiry Documents with postal covering Letter and Acknowledgment Card
Ex-M36	– 28.10.2014	– Copy of Enquiry postponed Letter and Acknowledgment Card
Ex-M37	– 07.11.2014	– Copy of Letter of the Petitioner
Ex-M38	– 19.11.2014	– Copy of Enquiry Officer changing Letter and Acknowledgment Card
Ex-M39	– 26.11.2014	– Copy of Domestic Enquiry Proceedings
Ex-M40	– 02.12.2014	– Copy of Enquiry Documents with postal covering Letter and Acknowledgment Card
Ex-M41	– 29.11.2014	– Copy of Domestic Enquiry Proceedings
Ex-M42	– 06.12.2014	– Copy of Letter of Enquiry Officer
Ex-M43	– -----	– Copy of Leave Cards
Ex-M44	– 06.12.2014 and 15.12.2014	– Copy of Domestic Enquiry Proceedings
Ex-M45	– 18.12.2014	– Copy of Enquiry Documents with postal covering Letter and Acknowledgment Card
Ex-M46	– 22.12.2014	– Copy of Enquiry Postponed Letter
Ex-M47	– 27.12.2014	– Copy of Domestic Enquiry Proceedings
Ex-M48	– 29.12.2014	– Copy of Enquiry Documents with postal covering Letter and Acknowledgment Card
Ex-M49	– 03.01.2015	– Copy of Domestic Enquiry Proceedings
Ex-M50	– 15.12.2014	– Copy of Letter of the Petitioner
Ex-M51	– 04.03.2013	– Copy of Letter of the Petitioner
Ex-M52	– 06.01.2015	– Copy of Enquiry Documents with postal covering Letter and Acknowledgment Card
Ex-M53	– 09.01.2015	– Copy of Domestic Enquiry Proceedings
Ex-M54	– 19.12.2014	– Copy of Letter of the Petitioner
Ex-M55	– 09.01.2015	– Copy of Reply Letter to Petitioner by the Management

Ex-M56 – 10.04.2015 – Copy of Show Cause Notice - 1
Ex-M57 – 09.02.2015 – Copy of Enquiry Findings
Ex-M58 – 13.04.2015 – Copy of Petitioner's Request Letter for time extension for his explanation
Ex-M59 – 23.04.2014 – Copy of Petitioner's Explanation Letter - 1
Ex-M60 – 24.04.2015 – Copy of Show Cause Notice - 2
Ex-M61 – 26.04.2015 – Copy of Petitioner's Explanation Letter - 2
Ex-M62 – 07.05.2015 – Copy of Termination Order and Acknowledgment Card
Ex-M63 – 09.05.2015 – Copy of Full and Final Settlement

**Sd/- S.Uma Maheswari,
Presiding Officer,
Principal Labour Court, Vellore.**