

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

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

Wednesday, the 29th day of January, 2025

**I.A.No.1/2023
IN
I.D. No.105 of 2022
(CNR No.TNVL02-000252-2022)**

S.Karthikeyan, aged 42,
S/o. Sampath Vasagam,
Srirangapatti Village,
Selanthampalli Post,
Tirupattur Taluk,
Tirupattur District – 635 653.

. . . Petitioner

Versus

The Management,
Tamil Nadu State Corporation of Commerce,
District Manager Office (TASMAC Ltd.),
No.1, Katpadi Road,
Vellore District – 632 004.

. . . Respondent

This Petition came up for hearing on 18.12.2024 in the presence of Thiru.C.Arunkumar, Thiru.P.Senthamizhselvan and Thiru.P.Balachander, Advocates for the Petitioner and Thiru.P.K.Sivaji Rao, 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 whether the Domestic Enquiry conducted by the respondent against this workman was fair and proper followed by the principles of natural justice or not?

1. Petition averments in brief:-

The case of the petitioner is that he was working as a Salesman in the respondent's management in the year 2004 employed through employment exchange and his last drawn wages was Rs.6,993/-.

The petitioner further states that initially he was posted in TASMACH Shop No.11293 at Pallipattu. Later on he was transferred to the TASMACH Shop No.11507 at Chinnamookkanur. He worked there till the date of termination. In the said shop Mr.Umapathy and Mr.Shivakumar were working as a Supervisor and Salesman respectively. The above two persons were also terminated from their service for their misconduct.

The petitioner states that in the said shop he was allotted to sell the liquor bottles to the public by receiving the cash. He will make entries in the respective cash receipts and registers which is his specific nature of work. The total number of sales, denomination of amounts received and opening and closing balance of stocks should be verified and entered in the respective registers maintained by the Supervisor of the shop on daily basis. The Supervisor has to specifically maintain the above registers. The above particulars should be informed to the District Manager of the TASMACH by sending message via Whatsapp Messenger on daily basis.

The petitioner further states that in the year 2019 during the Pongal Festival the above said shop was opened only for 3 days, i.e., on 14.01.2019, 15.01.2019 and 17.01.2019. Further 16.01.2019 was declared as Holiday for all the TASMACH shops across the state.

For the above three days the total sale amount was Rs.4,30,960, 5,17,590 and Rs.4,07,680/- respectively. The said amount was handed over to the Supervisor Umapathy by the petitioner, but he did not deposit the sale amount into the bank account of the TASMACH Shop, since it was a holiday declared by the Government to all the banks.

Thereafter, the Supervisor Umapathy deposited a sum of Rs.4,03,680/- which was collected on 17.01.2019 into the bank on 18.01.2019. However, he failed to deposit rest of the sale amounts which were collected on 14.01.2019 and 15.01.2019 and the same was misappropriated by him for his own purposes.

The petitioner when questioned the Supervisor to give the triplicate challan for the deposited amount to make the entries in the respective register, he replied that he utilized the amount for his personal debt and also requested him not to reveal to anyone. The petitioner immediately went to the office of the District Manager for lodging a complaint against the Supervisor. Since she was not available, he made a complaint on 19.01.2019 regarding misappropriation of funds committed by the said Supervisor and sent it through RPAD and the same was received by the respective officials. The Supervisor who came to know about the said fact deliberately prevented the petitioner from doing work and entered absent in the attendance register.

Based on the complaint of the petitioner the respondent's management conducted inspection on 24.01.2019 and found that the Supervisor has indulged in misappropriation and subsequently issued a charge memo on 12.02.2019 to this petitioner also and sought for explanation regarding alleged misconducts. The petitioner submitted his detailed explanation on 25.03.2019 by denying the charges framed against him and also relied upon his earlier complaint lodged by him against the Supervisor. However, the District Manager rejected his explanation on 23.04.2019, subsequently the petitioner sent another explanation on 11.05.2019 and the same was also rejected by the D.M. on 27.05.2019.

The petitioner thereafter preferred a W.P.No.19521/2019 before the Hon'ble Madras High Court and the same was allowed on 08.07.2019. Subsequently, based on the High Court's order the respondent's management issued an Enquiry Notice on 03.07.2019 without providing list of documents and list of witnesses. The petitioner was furnished with enquiry notice and charge memo alone. Therefore the petitioner sent a representation on 16.07.2019 to the District Manager requesting him to furnish the copies of the documents in connection with the charges and he requested him to adjourn the enquiry proceedings till the day of furnishing the documents. The enquiry officer did not accept his request and commenced the proceedings without providing copies of documents and list of witnesses.

The enquiry officer without examining the management witnesses acted as a presenting Officer and examined the other delinquent employees in his absence and the enquiry officer also marked documents without examining the management witnesses. The delinquent employees

during their deposition admitted their guilt and this proves that there is a violation of principles of natural justice. The enquiry officer behaved in a biased manner. Therefore the enquiry report dated 30.12.2019 is totally a biased, one-sided and arbitrary one. But based on the enquiry report the petitioner was terminated from service on 02.02.2020 by the District Manager. Aggrieved against the order, the petitioner preferred the 1st appeal before the Senior Regional Manager, Salem and his appeal was dismissed. Against the said order again he preferred a revision before the II Appellate Authority, the M.D. of the TASMAC. The second appeal was also dismissed on 06.05.2022.

Therefore, this petitioner raised an industrial dispute before the Conciliation Officer, Vellore and the respondent also appeared before the Conciliation Officer. Since, no settlement was arrived the Conciliation Officer recorded a Failure Report on 18.04.2022. Based on the said report the petitioner raised this I.D. before this court and now intended to raise the fairness of the domestic enquiry as a preliminary issue.

Hence, he has filed this present application to call for the entire records in connection with the domestic enquiry proceedings held against him and to decide the fairness of the domestic enquiry conducted by the respondent's management as a preliminary issue.

The respondent submitted the copies of the documents connected with the domestic enquiry proceedings and endorsed 'No Counter' in the application under the impression that this petition was filed only for production of documents.

When this court was about to hear the arguments of the petitioner's counsel, he represented that inadvertently he endorsed 'No Counter' in the petition and

intends to argue in this application. However, he has not chosen to file his counter in this application.

3. Now the point for consideration:

Whether the Domestic Enquiry conducted by the respondent/management against the petitioner was fair and proper and followed by the principles of natural justice or not?

4. Both sides did not let in any oral evidence and on the side of petitioner Ex.W1 to Ex.W54 were marked with consent. On the side of the respondent Ex.M1 to Ex.M22 were marked with consent. In which Ex.M2 and M14 marked with objections by the petitioner's counsel.

5. Point:-

After hearing both the counsels and after perusing the relevant materials on record, this court comes to know that the petitioner was initially appointed as a Salesman at Pallipattu in the respondent's corporation. Subsequently he was transferred to TASMACH Shop No.11507 at Chinnamookkanur and he worked there continuously till the date of termination.

It is the case of the petitioner that he was allowed to sell the liquor bottles to the public on every working day by receiving the cash. Thereafter he has to make entries in the respective cash receipts and registers. The Supervisor of the said shop every day has to verify the total number of sales denomination of amounts received, opening and closing balance of the stock. These particulars should be entered in the respective registers which are maintained in the said shop. After entering the registers

the same have to be informed to the District Manager of the TASMACH by sending message by Whatsapp Messenger on daily basis.

The petitioner further states that in the year 2019 during the Pongal festival the said shop was opened only for 3 days i.e., 14.01.2019, 15.01.2019 and 17.01.2019. On 16.01.2019 it was declared as holiday to the TASMACH Shops across the state. The Supervisor Mr.Umapathy did not deposit the sale amounts collected on 14.01.2019, 15.01.2019 and 17.01.2019 on account of holiday declared by the Government to all the banks. Later he deposited a sale amount of Rs.4,07,680/- on 18.01.2019 which was collected on 17.01.2019. The said Supervisor failed to deposit the entire amount of Rs.4,30,960/- which was collected on 17.09.2019. Further he also failed to deposit the amounts of Rs.5,17,590/- and Rs.4,07,680/- which were collected on 14.01.2019 and 15.01.2019 respectively and the said Supervisor misappropriated the amounts. When the petitioner Karthikeyan asked the Supervisor to give the triplicate challan of the deposited amount to make relevant entries in the registers, he replied that the amounts were utilized by him and he also requested him not to reveal this fact to anyone.

The petitioner immediately gave a complaint to the M.D. by RPAD, by knowing this fact the said Supervisor prevented the petitioner from entering into the shop and he entered absent for the petitioner in the attendance register. The petitioner also sent the complaint to the District Manager, Senior Regional Manager and M.D. of the TASMACH regarding misappropriation committed by the Supervisor through RPAD on 19.01.2019.

It is the contention of the petitioner that subsequently inspection was conducted by the respondent's

management on 24.01.2019 and they found that Supervisor has indulged in misappropriation of funds and the respondent management also issued a suspension cum charge memo to the petitioner on 12.02.2019. Before issuance of charge memo to the petitioner, the Supervisor and another salesman by name Shivakumar were suspended temporarily by the respondent corporation. This suspension order has been issued for not depositing the sales amount of Rs.4,99,010/- and Rs.6,33,700/- totaling to Rs.11,21,710/- which were collected on 19.01.2019 and 20.01.2019. The Supervisor of the said shop alone sent the details of the sale amount through Whatsapp Message to the District Manager of the TASMACH Corporation but when the inspection authorities cross checked the on-line bank statement with the amount mentioned via Whatsapp Message by the Supervisor they found that a sum of Rs.11,21,710/- was not deposited in the bank and further the Supervisor failed to send Whatsapp Message regarding sales particulars. Therefore, the Supervisor and the two salesmen were suspended from 23.01.2019 onwards under Ex.M1. Ex.M1 clearly reveals that the petitioner along with Supervisor and salesmen were suspended for not depositing the collection amount collected on 19.01.2019 and 20.01.2019.

The respondent management marked the inspection report Ex.M2 conducted by the Inspecting Authority on 24.01.2019. The petitioner counsel raised his objection to mark this document. On verification by the inspection authorities they found that the staffs of the shop had indulged in misappropriation. Hence they were suspended under Ex.M1 and were issued with the Charge Memo Ex.M3. For this charge memo this petitioner submitted his explanation under Ex.M4. However the same was not considered and consequently rejected by the M.D. and he

directed the petitioner to deposit the deficit amount into the bank and to produce the challan to the office under Ex.M5.

This petitioner instead of complying the conditions imposed under Ex.M5 chosen to submit his explanation again and requested the M.D. not to collect the deficit amount and to cancel the suspension order, consequently prayed for reinstatement under Ex.M6. Subsequently, the respondent corporation decided to conduct domestic enquiry by appointing one Mr.S.Rajkumar, retired Tahsildar as an Enquiry Officer under Ex.M7.

The Enquiry Officer decided to commence the proceedings and sent notice of appearance to the delinquents under Ex.M8. On receipt of the notice this petitioner and another salesman by name Shivakumar appeared before the Enquiry Officer and requested him to produce the documents related to the domestic enquiry proceedings, the sale particulars and the deposit details to him under Ex.M9. On the request made by the petitioner the Enquiry Officer adjourned the proceedings under Ex.M10.

Again he sent a notice of appearance on 20.07.2019 under Ex.M11. In the meantime, the request of the petitioner to produce the documents related to the domestic enquiry proceedings, the sale particulars and the deposit details were rejected by the District Manager under Ex.M12. Further they have furnished the daily sales details from 01.01.2019 till 23.01.2019 along with Ex.M12. The petitioner who appeared on the second hearing date again requested the respondent corporation to produce the basic documents in respect of his suspension order under Ex.M13. The Enquiry Officer commenced his proceedings by examining this petitioner on 07.08.2019 under Ex.M14. This document was objected by the

petitioner counsel. The petitioner subsequently requested the Enquiry Officer to allow him to represent his case through one A.Babu, Vice President of CITU and also requested the respondent to produce the documents under Ex.M15.

The petitioner under Ex.M16 requested the respondent management to pay his subsistence allowance. The petitioner was directed to appear for the enquiry under Ex.M17. Subsequently the statement of the petitioner was recorded on 17.09.2019 under Ex.M18. Again notice of appearance was sent on 21.11.2019 under EX.M19. On 30.12.2019 the Enquiry Officer submitted his report under Ex.M20.

On a perusal of the enquiry report this court comes to know that the Enquiry Officer recorded the statement of the Supervisor - Umapathy, Salesman - Shivakumar and this petitioner. Based on their statements he came to a conclusion that the charges against the delinquents were proved and submitted his report accordingly.

Based on the report, a show cause notice was issued to this petitioner under Ex.M21 but he did not send any explanation. Therefore the respondent corporation terminated the petitioner from service under Ex.M22.

The petitioner challenged the domestic enquiry on the three grounds:

1. List of witnesses was not furnished
2. List of documents was not furnished.
3. Independent witnesses were not examined.

Based on the arguments of the learned counsel for the petitioner and on a perusal of enquiry report Ex.M20, this court comes to know that the Enquiry Officer has not furnished the list of witnesses whom the management is intended to examine and the list of documents were also not furnished to the delinquents. Without examining the independent witnesses and marking the documents which formed the basis of this allegation the Enquiry Officer has chosen to record the statement of the delinquents. This act of the Enquiry Officer is against the principles of natural justice. Only based on the statements of the three delinquents and without providing opportunity to them to prove their innocence, the Enquiry Officer has come to a conclusion that the charges were proved against the three delinquents.

On a perusal of the enquiry proceedings this court comes to know that the enquiry was not conducted in a fair and proper manner. The enquiry office did not examine the independent witnesses to prove the charges against the delinquents. He also has not provided the opportunity to the delinquents to prove their innocence. Whether the delinquents were indulged in misappropriation of funds or not? has to be decided by the Enquiry Officer in a fair manner by following the principles of natural justice. This case is concerned the Enquiry Officer has not followed the procedure and he has followed his own procedure which is unknown to law. Further he has come to a conclusion based on his own procedure which is not acceptable. Therefore, this court without going into the merits of the case comes to a conclusion that the domestic enquiry was not conducted in a fair and proper manner by following the principles of natural justice.

Preliminary Issue is answered accordingly.

For production of the management witnesses; Call on 13.02.2025.

Dictated to the Steno-Typist, typed by him directly in the Computer, corrected and pronounced by me in the Open Court, on this the 29th day of January, 2025.

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

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

- Nil -

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

- Nil -

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

Ex-W1	-	----	- Xerox Copy of the Petitioner's Aadhaar Card
Ex-W2	-	----	- Xerox Copy of the Appointment Order of the petitioner
Ex-W3	-	26.07.2004	- Xerox Copy of the Security Deposit made through cheque
Ex-W4	-	----	- Xerox Copy of the Identity Card of the petitioner
Ex-W5	-	----	- Xerox Copy of the Bank Pass Book of the petitioner
Ex-W6	-	11.07.2018	- Xerox Copy of the Transfer Order of the petitioner
Ex-W7	-	19.01.2019	- Xerox Copy of the Complaint sent to the District Manager, Vellore and Appellate Authorities by the petitioner along with postal receipt

- Ex-W8 – 12.02.2019 – Xerox Copy of the Charge Memo issue to the petitioner by the District Manager, Vellore.
- Ex-W9 – 25.03.2019 – Xerox Copy of the Explanation submitted by the petitioner to the District Manager, Vellore by registered post along with postal receipt
- Ex-W10 – 23.04.2019 – Xerox Copy of the Reply Letter sent by the District Manager, Vellore to the petitioner
- Ex-W11 – 11.05.2019 – Xerox Copy of the Additional Explanation submitted by the petitioner to the District Manager, Vellore by RPAD
- Ex-W12 – 27.05.2019 – Xerox Copy of the Reply Letter sent by the District Manager, Vellore to the petitioner regarding refusal of the additional explanation of the petitioner
- Ex-W13 – 03.07.2019 – Xerox Copy of the Enquiry Notice issued by the Enquiry Officer
- Ex-W14 – 28.07.2019 – Xerox Copy of the Order of the Hon'ble High Court of Madras in W.P.No. 19521/2019 & W.M.P.Nos. 19008 & 19013/2019
- Ex-W15 – 16.07.2019 – Xerox Copy of the Letter sent by the petitioner to the Enquiry Officer by RPAD requesting him to furnish the documents in connection with the alleged charges levelled against him
- Ex-W16 – 01.08.2019 – Xerox Copy of the Letter sent by the petitioner to the District Manager, Vellore by RPAD requesting her to furnish the documents in connection with the alleged charges levelled against him
- Ex-W17 – 01.08.2019 – Xerox Copy of the Letter sent by the petitioner to the District Manager, Vellore requesting to reinstate him in service as per order of the Hon'ble High Court of Madras

- Ex-W18 – 20.07.2019 – Xerox Copy of the Enquiry Notice issued by the Enquiry Officer to the Petitioner
- Ex-W19 – 13.08.2019 – Xerox Copy of the representation made by the petitioner to the District Manager, Vellore requesting her to pay the subsistence allowance, recording his objections about the biased enquiry, requesting him to change the Enquiry Officer
- Ex-W20 – 30.08.2019 – Xerox Copy of the Enquiry Notice issued by
23.09.2019 the Officer to the petitioner
21.11.2019
- Ex-W21 – 17.09.2019 – Xerox Copy of the Enquiry Proceedings
- Ex-W22 – 05.12.2019 – Xerox Copy of the Requisition letter sent by the Petitioner to the District Manager, Vellore requesting her to pay the subsistence allowance
- Ex-W23 – 27.12.2019 – Xerox Copy of the Representation letter sent by the petitioner to the District Manager, Vellore requesting her to furnish the copy of the enquiry report and to pay the subsistence allowance along with postal receipt
- Ex-W24 – 30.12.2019 – Xerox Copy of the Enquiry Report of the Enquiry Officer
- Ex-W25 – 19.02.2020 – Xerox Copy of the Explanation submitted by the petitioner to the District Manager, Vellore regarding to the show cause notice
- Ex-W26 – 20.02.2020 – Xerox Copy of the Termination Order issued by the District Manager, Vellore
- Ex-W27 – 10.03.2020 – Xerox Copy of the Appeal sent by the petitioner to the Senior Regional Manager, Salem against the termination order
- Ex-W28 – 21.09.2020 – Xerox Copy of the Notice issued by the 1st Appellate Authority to the petitioner
- Ex-W29 – 30.09.2020 – Xerox Copy of the Letter sent by the petitioner to the 1st Appellate Authority

- Ex-W30 – 04.02.2021 – Xerox Copy of the Notice issued by the 1st Appellate Authority to the petitioner
- Ex-W31 – 15.02.2021 – Xerox Copy of the Requisition made by the petitioner to the 1st Appellate Authority requesting him to reinstate him in service and to pay subsistence allowance and other monetary benefits
- Ex-W32 – 05.07.2021 – Xerox Copy of the Representation made by the petitioner to the 1st Appellate Authority requesting him to reinstate him in service and to pay subsistence allowance and other monetary benefits
- Ex-W33 – 05.07.2021 – Xerox Copy of the Order passed by the 1st Appellate Authority in the 1st Appeal
- Ex-W34 – 26.08.2021 – Xerox Copy of the Revision petition sent by the petitioner to the 2nd Appellate Authority, i.e., Managing Director of the TASMAL Limited against his termination order and dismissal order of the 1st appeal
- Ex-W35 – 02.09.2021 – Xerox Copy of the Enquiry Notice issued by the 2nd Appellate Authority to the petitioner in Revision Petition
- Ex-W36 – 14.09.2021 – Xerox Copy of the Requisition Letter sent by the Petitioner to the 2nd Appellate Authority requesting him to reinstate him in service, back wages and other attendant benefits
- Ex-W37 – 18.02.2022 – Xerox Copy of the Petition filed by the petitioner under Section 2(A)(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act before the Labour Officer, Vellore
- Ex-W38 – 12.03.2022 – Xerox Copy of the Letter sent by the Petitioner to the Chief Minister Special Cell, Chennai requesting to reinstate him in service, back wages and other attendant benefits

- Ex-W39 – 07.03.2022 – Xerox Copy of the Conciliation Notice issued by the ACL-1, Vellore to the petitioner
- Ex-W40 – 17.03.2022 – Xerox Copy of the Letter sent by the petitioner to the ACL-1, Vellore requesting to reinstate him in service, back wages and other attendant benefits
- Ex-W41 – 31.03.2022 – Xerox Copy of the Counter filed by the respondent management before the Conciliation Officer, Vellore
- Ex-W42 – 05.04.2022 – Xerox Copy of the Letter sent by the petitioner to the ACL, Vellore regarding raising his objections against the management representative and others
- Ex-W43 – 26.03.2022 – Xerox Copy of the RTI Applications sent by the Petitioner to the 1. PIO, Managing Director TASMACH, Chennai and 2. PIO, District Manager, Vellore
- Ex-W44 – 26.04.2022 – Xerox Copy of the Reply sent by the PIO of the Managing Director, TASMACH, Chennai to the petitioner
- Ex-W45 – 27.04.2022 – Xerox Copy of the Reply letters sent by the PIO of the District Manager, TASMACH, Chennai to the petitioner
- Ex-W46 – 18.04.2022 – Xerox Copy of the Failure Report given by the Conciliation Officer, Vellore vide Proceedings in Na.Ka.No.146/2022
- Ex-W47 – 16.08.2022 – Xerox Copy of the Summons issued by the District Manager, Vellore to the petitioner for calling upon him to submit his explanation before the Assistant Manager regarding repayment of misappropriated amount
- Ex-W48 – 06.05.2022 – Xerox Copy of the Dismissal Order of the Revision Petition issued by the 2nd Appellate Authority

- Ex-W49 – 14.01.2019 – Xerox Copy of the Counterfoil of the
15.01.2019 triplicate challan
18.01.2019
23.01.2019
25.01.2019
- Ex-W50 – ---- – Xerox Copy of the register maintained in
the TASMACH Shop No.11057 regarding
sales entry
- Ex-W51 – ---- – Xerox Copy of the Calculation sheet of the
sales amount in TASMACH Shop No.11057
and detailed statement of the transaction list
- Ex-W52 – Dec. 2018 – Xerox Copy of the Extract of the
– Jan. 2019 Attendance Register of the petitioner along
with calculation memo of sale from
14.01.2019 to 22.01.2019
- Ex-W53 – 24.01.2019 – Xerox Copy of the Inspection Report given
by the Inspection Officer in TASMACH Sho
No.11057
- Ex-W54 – 31.01.2019 – Xerox Copy of the Summary Statement of
Accounts of the M/s. TASMACH retail
collection account from 01.01.2019 to
31.01.2019

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

- Ex-M1 – 23.01.2019 – Xerox Copy of the Suspension Order issued
to the Petitioner
- Ex-M2 – 24.01.2019 – Xerox Copy of the Physical Verification
Report
- Ex-M3 – 12.02.2019 – Xerox Copy of the Charge Memo
- Ex-M4 – 25.03.2019 – Xerox Copy of the Explanation received
from the Petitioner
- Ex-M5 – 23.04.2019 – Xerox Copy of the District Manager
Rejection Letter
- Ex-M6 – 11.05.2019 – Xerox Copy of the Reply from Petitioner

Ex-M7 – 26.06.2019 – Xerox Copy of the Enquiry Officer Appointment by District Manager

Ex-M8 – 03.07.2019 – Xerox Copy of the Call Letter from Enquiry Officer

Ex-M9 – 16.07.2019 – Xerox Copy of the Explanation from the Petitioner

Ex-M10 – 16.07.2019 – Xerox Copy of the Adjourning the Enquiry

Ex-M11 – 20.07.2019 – Xerox Copy of the Call Letter from Enquiry Officer

Ex-M12 – 24.07.2019 – Xerox Copy of the Letter from District Manager to the Petitioner

Ex-M13 – 01.08.2019 – Xerox Copy of the Letter from Petitioner

Ex-M14 – 07.08.2019 – Xerox Copy of the Enquiry Details

Ex-M15 – 07.08.2019 – Xerox Copy of the Letter from Petitioner

Ex-M16 – 13.08.2019 – Xerox Copy of the Letter from Petitioner

Ex-M17 – 30.08.2019 – Xerox Copy of the Call Letter to Petitioner

Ex-M18 – 17.09.2019 – Xerox Copy of the Enquiry Details

Ex-M19 – 21.11.2019 – Xerox Copy of the Call Letter to Petitioner

Ex-M20 – 30.12.2019 – Xerox Copy of the Enquiry Officer Letter

Ex-M21 – 21.01.2020 – Xerox Copy of the Show Cause Notice to the Petitioner

Ex-M22 – 20.02.2020 – Xerox Copy of the Dismissed Order issued to petitioner

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