

**MANAGEMENT PROGRAMME
(MP)**

Term-End Examination

December, 2024

MS-28 : LABOUR LAWS

Time : 3 Hours

Maximum Marks : 100

Weightage : 70%

Note : (i) Attempt any **three** questions from Section A. Each question carries 20 marks.

(ii) Section B is compulsory and carries 40 marks.

Section—A

1. What is a 'trade union' under the Trade Unions Act, 1926 ? What is the procedure for registration of a trade union under the Act ?
2. Describe the obligations of employers and employees under the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952.

3. Define and discuss the objectives of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. Explain the provisions regarding lay-off, retrenchment and closure under the Act.
4. Discuss the different ILO Conventions adopted by India. Briefly explain the writs and appeals under the Indian Constitution.
5. Explain the scope and coverage of the Mines Act, 1952. Describe the provisions for health and safety under the Act.

Section—B

6. Read the case given below and answer the questions given at the end :

Mr. Nandkishore is a workman employed in the despatch department of a cement factory. The factory is located in one of the towns of a politically sensitive state. It employs about 1,500 employees besides the managerial staff. The annual turnover of the company is around ₹ 150 crores and its capacity utilization is 75 per cent.

The factory has three unions besides a Security Staff Association and a Management Association. For eight years, only one union has been recognized, on the basis of its 'claim' that it has the largest following of workmen.

Continued recognition of a single union led to strained relations between the two unrecognized unions and the Management, and also among the unions themselves.

Mr. Nandkishore is an office bearer of one of the unrecognized unions. The industrial relations situation in the factory has been fluctuating from periods of harmony to periods of disturbances.

On December 10, 1988, Mr. Nandkishore fell down from the ladder, while working during the second shift. This accident resulted in serious injury to his right arm. He was admitted in a Government hospital for treatment. An accident report was sent to the Commissioner under Workmen's Compensation Act, to determine the amount of compensation, if any, to be paid to Mr. Nandkishore for the loss of any earning capacity. Meanwhile, the union in which he is an office bearer requested the Management to pay a sum of ₹ 5,000 as advance to the injured workman for covering medical expenses. It also stated that the above amount may be deducted from the compensation which Mr. Nandkishore may get, according to the Commissioner's decision. The Management paid ₹ 3,000 as advance, after

obtaining a written undertaking from the union that this amount will be deducted from the compensation payable. The union also agreed to this condition. It also arranged for the release of ₹ 2,000 from the Labour Welfare Fund.

The Medical Officer treating the workman submitted a report in February 1989. The Medical Report did not mention any kind of disablement (Full/Partial, Temporary/Permanent) to the workman. The Commissioner, after processing the case and studying the report, ruled that the workman, Mr. Nandkishore shall be paid only half-monthly wages for these two months against his request for compensation as there was no permanent or partial disablement.

On receipt of this report from the Commissioner, the Management asked the workman to repay ₹ 3,000 given as an advance and requested the union to do the needful in this regard. The union, however, contended that since the accident occurred during and in the course of employment, the Management must treat it as ex-gratia payment and that it should not demand its repayment as the money was used for treatment. The Management, however, pointed out that at the time of taking

advance, both the union and workman had agreed that this amount will be recovered from the compensation payable and since no compensation is payable, the workman should payback the advance. The Management, further pointed out that it cannot waive the recovery of the above advance as it is bound by the rules.

The union however insisted that Management should not proceed on the recovery of advance from the workman. The Management also heard rumours that the said union may stage a 'show down' over this issue.

Questions :

- (a) Identify the issues in the case.
- (b) Discuss the Act under which this case can be dealt.

x x x x x x x