

TNVL020000632024



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

**PRESENT : Tmt.A.PACKIA JOTHI, M.L.,
Presiding Officer.**

Wednesday, the 19th day of August, 2026.

**I.D. No.18 of 2024
(CNR No.TNVL02-000063-2024)**

S.Murugan,
S/o. C.Subramani,
No.28, Indira Nagar,
Idayansathu Post,
Vellore Corporation,
Vellore District – 632 002.

... Petitioner

Versus

The Management,
Susee Polimers Private Limited,
Pillaiyar Kuppam,
Perumugai,
Vellore – 632 009.

... Respondent

This Petition came up for hearing on 17.08.2026 regarding preliminary issue, in the presence of Thiru.D.Christopher, the Advocate for the Petitioner and M.R.Ramanan and Associates for the Respondent, and upon hearing the arguments of both sides, 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 whether the Domestic Enquiry conducted by the respondent against the petitioner is fair and proper by following the principles of natural justice or not?

1. Petition averments in-brief:-

The case of the petitioner is that the respondent concern is producing plastic bags by using the raw material of polymers, selling the same in India and other countries and earning good profits. Apart from this concern they are purchasing car spare parts and assembling the same in the name of Susee Motors. Further having wholesale business in silver jewels and running the CBSC school in the name of Vani Vidhyalaya. In the respondent concern approximately 120 workers are working, for the above workers the respondent deducted PF subscription amount for 71 workers including this petitioner.

The petitioner further states that he joined duty on 18.05.2012 in the respondent's company, but in his termination order his joining date has been wrongly mentioned as 01.01.2013. The petitioner was allotted with electrician work at the time of his joining and the respondent has not issued any proper written appointment order to the petitioner and other workers.



In the respondent concern they followed 12 hours shift and not followed 8 hours shift. The petitioner was doing his first shift from 07.00 a.m. to 07.00 p.m. Some times he is continuously working in the second shift from 07.00 p.m. to 07.00 a.m. If he works for 4 hours in additional shift he has not been paid with excess pay. From the day of joining the petitioner worked efficiently without any fault. The respondent management with vengeance framed charges against the petitioner and conducted domestic enquiry.

The petitioner further states that including this petitioner and other workers they have worked for 6 years to 13 years continuously but the respondent management sundaed by without issuing permanent job, without issuing the fixed minimum wages by the Government. Hence, 36 workers including this petitioner have joined together and formed a union in the name of “United Workers Federation”, a General Body Meeting was conducted on 14.02.2021 and resolution was passed for joining in the union. On 24.02.2021 workers joined in the union and the union informed the above facts to the respondent through letter dated 27.02.2021. By knowing this the respondent management with an intention to thwart the action of union without issuing any charge memo or any orders restricted from entering into the company premises the 9 workers including this petitioner on 24.02.2021. The above act of the respondent is against the



labour act, hence the union sent a letter dated 27.02.2021 by mentioning the same and requested to allow the workers to enter into the company.

The petitioner further states that on 29.03.2021 the union raised an industrial dispute before the Conciliation Officer to reinstate the said 10 employees without any condition with continuity of service and full back wages. The respondent management sent letter dated 27.04.2021 through post to 5 workers including the petitioner stating that the petitioner was absent from January 2020 to February 2021 without any intimation and the same has been against the standing orders of the respondent management. The petitioner denied the charges and sent an explanation letter dated 08.05.2021 to the respondent. On receipt of explanation letter the respondent management again sent the same charge memo to the petitioner on 18.05.2021 and the petitioner again sent his explanation on 27.05.2021 by denying the charges levelled against him.

The petitioner further states that the respondent management decided and ordered to conduct an enquiry on 20.07.2021 and one Mr.D.Pushparaj has been appointed as Enquiry Officer and informed that the enquiry shall commence on 28.07.2021. The petitioner participated in the enquiry and requested to permit him to appoint an advocate on behalf of him, but the Enquiry Officer denied the same and acted in a biased manner and refused



to cross-examine the petitioner and posted to 11.08.2021 for filing management side documents. On 11.08.2021 the respondent side documents were not marked with respondent witnesses and marked by the representative of respondent. While the petitioner objected the same, the Enquiry Officer has not recorded it and reported that his decision only was final. Then the enquiry was posted to 25.08.2021, but on the day of enquiry, enquiry was not conducted and on the same day the petitioner sent his objection letter through registered post to the Enquiry Officer and the respondent management.

The petitioner further states that the respondent management without considering the objection of the petitioner posted the enquiry on 25.08.2021, 01.09.2021, 15.09.2021, 29.09.2021, 13.10.2021 and 13.10.2021 without appearance of the petitioner. The petitioner requested to pay subsistence allowance to him and also to permit him to attend the enquiry for that he sent many letters through registered post and on receipt of the above letters the Enquiry Officer completed the enquiry as exparte. Then the respondent management issued second show cause notice along with enquiry report to the petitioner on 13.12.2021 and asked the petitioner to submit his explanation in respect of why he should not be terminated from service. The petitioner requested to give reply for show cause notice and submitted his explanation letter on 20.01.2022 and after receipt of the



same the respondent management without perusing the explanation of the petitioner, on 17.02.2022 issued the termination order to the petitioner.

The petitioner further states that the respondent management filed an Approval Petition before the Assistant Commissioner of Labour, Vellore for issuing approval of termination of the petitioner, the petitioner filed his counter on 26.04.2022 and finally the Assistant Commissioner of Labour, Vellore issued approval order on 17.02.2022.

Therefore, this petitioner against the order of termination raised an Industrial Dispute before the Assistant Commissioner of Labour, Vellore and the respondent management filed their counter on 11.10.2022. Since no settlement was arrived he recorded a failure report on 15.11.2022. Later this petitioner to set aside the order of termination and to reinstate him along with continuity of service, back wages and all other benefits has filed this Industrial Dispute petition before this court. Pending the petition he requests this court to decide the fairness of the domestic enquiry as a preliminary issue.

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

The respondent denied each and every averment stated in the petition. The respondent states that



the petitioner has joined duty as Electrician on 01.01.2013 and he was paid with all statutory benefits. The petitioner was ordered to attend duty in third shift on 16.05.2021, but not he has attended the duty and he also informed to one Mr.Palani who is the next person in his cadre not to attend duty, thereby the respondent concern was not able to start the production and incurred loss in production and finance. Hence, the petitioner was issued with memo dated 18.05.2021. The petitioner submitted his explanation on 27.05.2021. The explanation is not acceptable one and to give another one option to the petitioner for the intimated dated 20.07.2021 domestic enquiry was initiated. In the domestic enquiry on 18.05.2021 the act of the petitioner was considered as mistake and domestic enquiry was commenced on 28.07.2021. On 28.07.2021 the petitioner attended the enquiry and submitted his letter before the Enquiry Officer by stating that he has to be paid with full wages from 18.05.2021 and requested to appoint an advocate on behalf of him and the Enquiry Officer adjourned the enquiry on 11.08.2021. The respondent sent reply dated 09.08.2021 in which it is stated that on 31.07.2021 the legally entitled amount has been paid to the petitioner as subsistence allowance through cheque. Then the enquiry was posted to 11.08.2021, 25.08.2021, 01.09.2021, 15.09.2021 and 27.09.2021. On 27.09.2021 the respondent management sent a letter to the petitioner stating that his termination was set aside and informed to attend duty. The Enquiry Officer posted for management witnesses on



29.09.2021. On that day 14 documents were filed by management and copies of the same were issued to the petitioner. Then the enquiry was posted to 13.10.2021. As per the order of the respondent, the petitioner has not attended the duty on 27.09.2021. Then the respondent sent another letter stating that he was transferred to M/s. Susee Motors (India) Private Limited and informed to join duty at the new place on 07.10.2021 and posted the enquiry to 13.10.2021. But the petitioner has not joined duty at new place also not attend the enquiry on 13.10.2021. On 13.10.2021 and 20.10.2021, the management side witnesses were examined and posted for cross-examination of the above witnesses on 27.10.2021. On 27.10.2021 and 10.11.2021 the petitioner has not appeared for enquiry also. There was no response from the petitioner and thereby the Enquiry Officer closed the management side witness. Again on 10.11.2021 and 17.11.2021 the petitioner has not appeared for enquiry also. There was no response from the petitioner and the Enquiry Officer concluded the enquiry proceedings. The Enquiry Officer sent enquiry proceedings for all the dates to the petitioner. Then the respondent sent a letter dated 02.11.2021 stating that subsistence allowance for the months from June 2021 to October 2021 sent to the petitioner in his bank account. Then on 17.11.2021 the petitioner has not appeared for enquiry and decided as the enquiry has been closed. On 03.12.2021 the Enquiry Officer submitted his report by stating that the charges against the petitioner has been proved. The petitioner was served



with the enquiry report and second show cause notice dated 10.12.2021 was issued. The petitioner requested time as per letters dated 13.12.2021 and 29.12.2021 and time has been given as per the respondent's letter dated 04.01.2022 and time has been granted till 15.01.2022. The petitioner has not submitted his explanation. The enquiry was adjourned for so many hearings as per request of the petitioner. Further during the conciliation proceedings the petitioner has not stated any objection, so the conciliation officer issued approval to terminate the petitioner.

The Enquiry Officer commenced the proceedings in an impartial manner and provided opportunities to both sides. After conclusion of the enquiry he submitted the report mentioning that all the charges against him were proved. The Enquiry Officer provided fair and sufficient opportunities to the petitioner. Thus the domestic enquiry was conducted in a fair and proper manner and therefore the respondent requests to decide the preliminary issue in their favour.

3. Both side examined no witnesses. On the side of petitioner Ex-W1 to Ex-W42 were marked with consent. On the side of the respondent Ex.M1 and M2 were marked with consent.



4. Now the point for consideration is **‘Whether the Domestic Enquiry was conducted in a free and fair manner by following the principles of natural justice or not?’**

5. **Point:-**

The petitioner **Murugan** has been working as Electrician and Susee Polimers Private Limited who is the employer has issued notice to Thiru.Murugan stating that he had to been work in the 3rd shift on 16.05.2021 and without previous permission he had contacted the Manager half an hour before the work and informed that he is not able to come for work further he has asked Thiru.Palani who had to work with him not to come for work and no electrician was on duty, there was power trip and no one knew to operate the diesel generator and so manufacturing process could not be completed and so there was loss to the management and his act has been pre-determined and he has been placed under suspension on 18.05.2021. On 20.07.2021 domestic enquiry has been ordered and on 27.05.2021 the petitioner Murugan has replied to the Manager stating that he has joined the United Labourers Federation and the management had come to know about the same and as a vindictive measure lockout has been ordered of 10 employees. The reply is marked as Ex.W3. The petitioner Murugan has participated in the enquiry on 28.05.2021. Subsequently on 28.07.2021 he has claimed subsistence allowance stating that he has to



come from Idayansathu Village which is 18 Km. from the venue and he is not able to meet out the day to day expenses of the family, because he is without work. He has claimed full wages and right to be represented by an advocate. This representation dated 28.07.2021 is marked as Ex.W5. On 09.08.2021 the respondent has replied to Murugan and the respondent has stated that there is no necessity to issue charge memo because he has been placed on suspension on 18.05.2021 and the misconduct committed by him has been mentioned in the suspension order and it has been stated that subsistence allowance has been paid to him on 31.07.2021. The respondent has enclosed the cheque for Rs.5.235/- dated 31.07.2021. After he has sent the notice Ex.W5 on 28.07.2021 subsistence allowance has been paid to him. He has appeared for enquiry on 11.08.2021 at 09.15 a.m. and on 25.08.2021 he has sent a letter stating that he does not have sufficient income and so he is not able to attend the enquiry. He has claimed full wages and the right to be represented by an advocate. For the enquiry on 25.08.2021 Murugan has not appeared. On 01.09.2021 also he has sent a notice to the respondent stating that he is not able to appear for the enquiry because of the financial constraint and he has claimed his right to be represented by an advocate. This representation is marked as Ex.W10. The petitioner has not appeared for the enquiry on 15.09.2021 as revealed from the enquiry proceedings Ex.W12. On 15.09.2021 Murugan has sent a letter to the respondent stating that he is not in good health and so he is not able



to appear for enquiry. This letter is marked as Ex.W13. On 27.09.2021 he has sent a representation stating that he does not have sufficient income he has been granted two months salary alone, he has claimed salary for the remaining months and he has stated that he is not able to appear for the enquiry on 29.09.2021. He has claimed full wages and right to be represented by an advocate. On 27.09.2021 the suspension has been revoked without prejudice to the right of disciplinary action and the petitioner has been asked to return for job through Ex.W15. On 29.09.2021 also Murugan has not appeared for enquiry. In order to prove that Murugan has not appeared for work on 16.05.2021, the respondent has produced the attendance which reveal that Murugan and Palani have not come for work in the E.B.Department and workers of the Plant have come for work and shift has been closed because electrician was absent. On 16.05.2021 the loom has not been running as reveled from Ex.W21. Now on 06.10.2021 Murugan was transferred to M/s. Susee Motors India Private Limited from 07.10.2021 and he has been requested to come and join the duty immediately. Murugan has sent a reply on 09.10.2021 stating that two months salary has been given, the remaining salary has to be given and so he has not been able to appear for enquiry on 13.10.2021. He has claimed full wages from 18.05.2021 and he has claimed his right to be represented by an advocate through Ex.W23. He has not appeared for the enquiry on 13.10.2021, 21.10.2021. On 21.10.2021 he has sent a letter stating that he



has received the letter with delay and so was not able to appear on 20.10.2021. This letter is marked as Ex.W26. Again on 23.10.2021 he has sent a letter stating that he has received subsistence allowance for three months and for the remaining months he has not received the subsistence allowance, he has claimed full wages and his right to be represented by an advocate through Ex.W27. Even though he has stated in his letter dated 23.10.2021 that he would appear for enquiry on 27.10.2021 he has not appeared for enquiry. On 02.11.2021 letter has been addressed by the respondent to the petitioner stating that the subsistence allowance for May 2021 to October 2021 has been paid and he has not co-operated for domestic enquiry and there is no rule to permit an advocate to appear on behalf of him. This letter is marked as Ex.W29. On 05.11.2021 the petitioner has replied that he has received the subsistence allowance from 18.05.2021 to 05.11.2021 and he has stated that if he is given subsistence allowance for the remaining period he would appear for domestic enquiry. He has not appeared for the enquiry on 10.11.2021 and he has been set exparte. The petitioner has been placed on suspension from 18.05.2021 and the petitioner addressed that he has received subsistence allowance for the period from 18.05.2021 to 05.11.2021. So he has received the entire subsistence allowance till the enquiry on 10.11.2021. Subsequently Murugan has been set exparte and on 17.11.2021 the domestic enquiry has been completed. Again on 18.11.2021 through Ex.W33 Murugan has given



a representation stating that he was not able to appear for the enquiry because of his ill health. The domestic enquiry report dated 03.12.2021 is marked as Ex.W34. The charges has been proved and the respondent on 10.12.2021 has sent a second show cause notice asking why he should not be terminated from services through Ex.W35. The petitioner has sent a reply requesting time to furnish reply. On 29.12.2021 also he has sent a representation requesting extension of time, the respondent has stated that extension is given till 15.01.2022 and further extension will not be granted. Murugan has given reply on 20.01.2022. Final order has been passed on 17.02.2022. He has been terminated from service and he has been paid the pending wages of Rs.72,761/- by way of cheque. The petitioner has received the same as revealed from Ex.W42.

The contention of the petitioner is that 16.05.2021 is lockdown period and so he was not able to come for work. Attendance register of respondent reveals that on 16.05.2021 Murugan and Palani have not come for work and the workers Rajavel, Plant workers Saravanan, Prakash, Tamilselvan and Arun have come for work on 16.05.2021 and E.B. Worker Murali, Plant Worker N.Venkatesan, B.Yogesh, G.Venkatesan, G.Manimaran, Asish have come for work and their in and out time has been mentioned and the shift has been closed because the electrician was absent. So even though it has been a lock down the workers have come for work



and the manufacturing unit was closed because the electrician has not come for work.

It is the contention of the petitioner that the suspension order becomes unsustainable if a formal memorandum of charges is not served within 90 days. **The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in AIR 2015 SC 2389 in Ajay Kumar Choudhry Vs. Union of India through the Secretary and Another has held in para 14** is as follows:

"14. We, therefore, direct that the currency of a Suspension Order should not extend beyond three months if within this period the Memorandum of Charges / Charge sheet is not served on the delinquent officer / employee; if the Memorandum of Charges / Charge sheet is served a reasoned order must be passed for the extension of the suspension."

The above decision squarely applies to the case on hand.

The petitioner has been suspended on 18.05.2021 by a letter and it has been mentioned in the letter that separate charge memo will be served, but the charge memo has not been served. The domestic enquiry has been held without serving charge memo. The enquiry conducted by the employer is found to be defective. Even though the petitioner has been



given sufficient opportunity to conduct the departmental proceedings, the very purpose is to be decide the fairness of the domestic enquiry as a preliminary issue. Each and every ground cannot be decided as preliminary issue. The mid enquiry transfer order is generally an administrative action to prevent interference with witnesses or evidence rather than a punishment. **The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in 2025 Supreme Online Central Administrative Tribunal 14788 in Vijay Sharma Vs. Rail Bhawan** has held in para 14 and 15 are as follows:

"14. The next issue that arises is whether the impugned transfer is punitive or malafide. The transfer order does not contain any stigma or punitive language. It simply records an administrative posting. As held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Janardhan Debanath (supra), a transfer during vigilance inquiry is not punitive unless the order itself reflects punishment, which is not the case here.

15. It would be pertinent to note that although the applicant has alleged malafides against the Vigilance Officer, he has not been impleaded as a respondent in the present OA. It is a well-settled principle that unless the person against whom malafide is alleged is arrayed as a party and afforded an opportunity of hearing, such allegations cannot be examined. In absence of his impleadment, no finding on malafides can be recorded. Further, the allegation of malafide against the Vigilance



Inspector is devoid of merit. Malafide is a serious charge which must be supported by specific and cogent material. The applicant has not shown that the competent authority issuing the transfer order acted under personal bias or with any ulterior motive. No evidence beyond bare assertion and suspicion has been placed on record. Accordingly, the plea of malafide is also not acceptable."

This decision squarely applies to the case on hand and the transfer order has been issued due to administrative exigencies and the validity of the transfer to the sister company can be decided only after evidence is let in. So the decision relied by the learned counsel for the petitioner in **1989 Supp(1) Supreme Court Cases 679 in Jawaharlal Nehru Univerisity Vs. Dr.K.S.Jawatkar and others** does not apply in deciding the preliminary issue.

The next contention of the petitioner is that he has been denied the right to be represented by an advocate. With regard to this claim for right to be represented by an advocate the **Hon'ble High Court of Madras in CDJ 2009 MHC 2477 - D.Mohamed Shereef Vs. The Enquiry Officer in para 12** held is as follows:



"12. Even in the letter dated 03.02.2009, addressed to the respondent, the petitioner has only stated that within a short space of time, it may not be possible for him to engage a co-employee for assistance in the proposed enquiry and therefore, has sought permission to engage an Advocate, Therefore, it is evident that it is not the case of the petitioner that he was unable to get assistance from a co-employee to assist him in the enquiry proceedings. Further, courts have held that in the absence of any service rule providing engagement of a legal practitioner, the employee cannot seek assistance as a matter of right. Law is well settled that an employee has no legal right to insist for engagement of a legal practitioner in domestic / departmental enquiries, unless there are provisions in the rules/ standing orders / regulations, as the case may be."

This decision squarely applies to the case on hand and this court can only conclude that there has been violation of principles of natural justice. The petitioner has not been served with the charge memo from the date of suspension till the date of completing the enquiry. The respondent has pleaded to let in evidence if this court decides that the domestic enquiry was against the principles of natural justice. So, the respondent is permitted to produce independent evidence to prove the unauthorized absence of the petitioner. The domestic enquiry has not been conducted in a fair manner according to the principles of natural justice and the findings



given by the Domestic Enquiry Officer is not sustainable in law and hence is set aside.

Preliminary issue is answered accordingly.

For management side evidence call on 24.08.2026.

Dictated to the Steno-Typist, typed directly in the Computer, corrected and pronounced by me in the Open Court, on this the 19th day of August, 2026.

**Presiding Officer,
Principal Labour Court,
Vellore.**

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

-NIL-

2. List of Exhibits marked on the side of the Petitioner (With consent):-

- Ex-W1 – 18.05.2021 – Copy of Temporary Suspension Order issued to the petitioner by the respondent
- Ex-W2 – 20.07.2021 – Copy of Internal Enquiry Intimation
- Ex-W3 – 27.05.2021 – Copy of Charge Memo issued to the petitioner by the respondent
- Ex-W4 – 28.07.2021 – Copy of Internal Enquiry Proceedings



Ex-W5	– 28.07.2021	– Copy of Letter submitted by the petitioner to the respondent management and the Enquiry Officer
Ex-W6	– 09.08.2021	– Copy of Reply Letter issued by the respondent to the petitioner
Ex-W7	– 11.08.2021	– Copy of Internal Enquiry Proceedings
Ex-W8	– 25.08.2021	– Copy of Letter submitted by the petitioner to the respondent management and the Enquiry Officer
Ex-W9	– 25.08.2021	Copy of Internal Enquiry Proceedings
Ex-W10	– 01.09.2021	– Copy of Letter submitted by the petitioner to the respondent management and the Enquiry Officer
Ex-W11	– 11.09.2021	– Copy of Internal Enquiry Proceedings
Ex-W12	– 15.09.2021	– Copy of Internal Enquiry Proceedings
Ex-W13	– 15.09.2021	– Copy of Letter submitted by the petitioner to the respondent management and the Enquiry Officer
Ex-W14	– 27.09.2021	– Copy of Letter submitted by the petitioner to the respondent management and the Enquiry Officer
Ex-W15	– 27.09.2021	– Copy of Letter sent to the petitioner by the respondent management
Ex-W16	– 29.09.2021	– Copy of Internal Enquiry Proceedings
Ex-W17	– -----	Copy of Workers In and Out Record
Ex-W18	– -----	Copy of Plant Log Shift closed
Ex-W19	– -----	Copy of Machine Temperature Record, Plant Off Chilers Off



Ex-W20	–	-----	Copy of Night Shift Log
Ex-W21	–	-----	Copy of Plant Activities Log
Ex-W22	–	06.10.2021	– Copy of Transfer letter issued to the petitioner by the respondent management
Ex-W23	–	09.10.2021	– Copy of letter submitted by the petitioner to the respondent management through registered post
Ex-W24	–	13.10.2021	– Copy of Internal Enquiry Proceedings
Ex-W25	–	20.10.2021	– Copy of Internal Enquiry Proceedings
Ex-W26	–	21.10.2021	Copy of letter submitted by the petitioner to the respondent management through registered post
Ex-W27	–	23.10.2021	– Copy of letter submitted by the petitioner to the respondent management through registered post
Ex-W28	–	27.10.2021	– Copy of Internal Enquiry Proceedings
Ex-W29	–	02.11.2021	– Copy of reply letter issued to the petitioner
Ex-W30	–	05.11.2021	– Copy of letter submitted by the petitioner to the respondent management and Enquiry Officer through registered post
Ex-W31	–	10.11.2021	– Copy of Internal Enquiry Proceedings
Ex-W32	–	17.11.2021	– Copy of Internal Enquiry Proceedings
Ex-W33	–	18.11.2021	– Copy of letter submitted by the petitioner to the respondent management and Enquiry Officer through registered post
Ex-W34	–	03.12.2021	– Copy of Enquiry Report



Ex-W35	10.12.2021	Copy of Second Show Cause Notice issued by the respondent to the petitioner
Ex-W36	13.12.2021	Copy of letter requesting time to submit explanation for the charge memo submitted by the petitioner through registered post
Ex-W37	29.12.2021	Copy of letter requesting time to submit explanation for the charge memo submitted by the petitioner through registered post
Ex-W38	04.01.2022	Copy of letter issued by the respondent to the petitioner by extending time to submit explanation for the charge memo
Ex-W39	20.01.2022	Copy of explanation letter for Second Show Cause Notice submitted by the petitioner through registered post
Ex-W40	17.02.2022	Copy of Termination Order issued to the petitioner by the respondent
Ex-W41	17.02.2022	Copy of Cheque for Rs.72,761/- and statement of calculation issued by the respondent management to the petitioner
Ex-W42	25.04.2022	Copy of letter submitted by the petitioner to the respondent management through registered post

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

-NIL-



4. List of Exhibits marked on the side of the Respondent (With consent):-

- Ex-M1 – 17.02.2022 – Copy of Termination Order issued to the Claimant along with cheque, calculation statement and postal receipt
- Ex-M2 – 23.05.2022 – Copy of Order passed in Approval Petition by the Assistant Commissioner of Labour, Vellore in Na.Ka.No.141/2022

**Presiding Officer,
Principal Labour Court,
Vellore.**