

Government of West Bengal
Labour Department, I. R. Branch
N. S. Building, 12th Floor, 1, K. S. Roy Road, Kolkata – 700001

No. Labr/ 93 / (LC-IR)/ 22015(16)/24/2026

Date : 19-01-2026

ORDER

WHEREAS an industrial dispute existed between M/s. Srimani Silpayan (India) Pvt. Ltd., Zone-1, Plot No. 49, P.O. & P.S. – Kolkata Leather Complex, Dist. – South 24-Parganas, PIN – 743502, West Bengal and its workman Md. Allauddin, S/o. Late Abdul Rouf, 45-BH/7, Canal East Road, P.O. & P.S. – Narkeldanga, Kolkata - 700011, West Bengal, regarding the issues, being a matter specified in the second schedule of the Industrial Dispute Act' 1947 (14 of 1947);

AND WHEREAS the 8th Industrial Tribunal, Kolkata has submitted to the State Government its Award dated 28.08.2025 in Case No. 37/2022 on the said Industrial Dispute Vide e-mail dated 15.01.2026 in compliance of Section 10(2A) of the I.D. Act' 1947.

NOW, THEREFORE, in pursuance of the provisions of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act' 1947 (14 of 1947), the Governor is hereby pleased to publish the said Award in the Labour Department's official website i.e **labour.wb.gov.in**

By order of the Governor,


Assistant Secretary

to the Government of West Bengal

No. Labr/ 93 /1(5)/(LC-IR)/ 22015(16)/24/2026

Date : 19-01-2026

Copy forwarded for information and necessary action to :-

1. M/s. Srimani Silpayan (India) Pvt. Ltd., Zone-1, Plot No. 49, P.O. & P.S. – Kolkata Leather Complex, Dist. – South 24-Parganas, PIN – 743502, West Bengal.
2. Md. Allauddin, S/o. Late Abdul Rouf, 45-BH/7, Canal East Road, P.O. & P.S. – Narkeldanga, Kolkata - 700011, West Bengal.
3. The Asstt. Labour Commissioner, W.B. In-Charge, Labour Gazette.
4. The OSD & EO Labour Commissioner, W.B., New Secretariat Building, 11th Floor, 1, Kiran Sankar Roy Road, Kolkata – 700001.
5. The Deputy Secretary, IT Cell, Labour Department, with request to cast the Award in the Department's website.


Assistant Secretary

to the Government of West Bengal

No. Labr/ 93 /2(3)/(LC-IR)/ 22015(16)/24/2026

Date : 19-01-2026

Copy forwarded for information to :-

1. The Judge, 8th Industrial Tribunal, N. S. Building, 1, K.S. Roy Road, Kolkata - 700001 with reference to e-mail dated 15.01.2026.
2. The Joint Labour Commissioner (Statistics), West Bengal, 6, Church Lane, Kolkata - 700001.
3. Office Copy.


Assistant Secretary

to the Government of West Bengal

In the matter of an industrial dispute filed by applicant Md. Allauddin, S/o. Late Abdul Rouf, 45-BH/7, Canal East Road, P.O. & P.S. – Narkeldanga, Kolkata -700011, West Bengal against M/s. Srimani Silpayan (India) Pvt. Ltd., Zone-1, Plot No. 49, P.O. & P.S. – Kolkata Leather Complex, Dist. – South 24-Parganas, PIN – 743502, West Bengal.

(Case No. 37/2022 U/s. 10(1B)(d))

**Before the Eighth Industrial Tribunal: West Bengal
Present Sri Amit Chattopadhyay
Judge,
Eighth Industrial Tribunal,
West Bengal.**

Md. Allauddin **Applicant / workman**

Vs.

M/s. Srimani Silpayan (India) Pvt. Ltd..... O.P. Company

**A W A R D
Dated : 28.08.2025**

An industrial dispute between M/s. Srimani Silpayan (India) Pvt. Ltd., Zone-1, Plot No. 49, P.O. & P.S. – Kolkata Leather Complex, Dist. – South 24-Parganas, PIN – 743502, West Bengal (the Company Employer/ Opposite Party) and Md. Allauddin, S/o. Late Abdul Rouf, 45-BH/7, Canal East Road, P.O. & P.S. – Narkeldanga, Kolkata -700011, West Bengal (The workman / Applicant) has been initiated due to an application filed by Md. Allauddin U/s. 10(1B)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 against M/s. Srimani Silpayan (India) Pvt. Ltd. as stated above. On the basis of both the written statements this Tribunal has framed the following issues on 01.04.2024 for the purpose of adjudication of the case.

I S S U E (S)

- (1) Whether workman's application is barred by limitation as in Section 2-a(3) of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947?
- (2) Whether the applicant is a workman as per the Industrial Disputes Act 1947?
- (3) Whether industrial dispute seeking reinstatement of service, back wage and incidental benefits by the applicant and relief under Section 10(1B)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is maintainable under law and facts.

As per written notes of argument the case of the applicant workman is that he was appointed by the company as Saving Operator vide letter of appointment dated 02.05.2008 at its factory at Kolkata Leather Complex (Ext.-1) on the terms and conditions mentioned therein. He was diligent, honest and there is no black spot or any allegation against him by the management of the company in his long association with the company till his illegal, unjust and mala fide summary termination of service by way of refusal of employment on and from 24.08.2014. The company used to maintain Attendance Register and Wages/Salary Register for its workers/employees. This fact is unchallenged and uncontroverted. The applicant further states that though the management of the company used to pay the wages on weekly basis but they obtained the signatures of the workers on the Wages Register at the end of every month. This fact is also unchallenged and uncontroverted. The applicant and other workers repeatedly requested the management to provide the weekly pay slip, but the company did not bother to pay the same and as a result of which he and the other workers became the eye shore of the company. He is covered under the provisions of ESIC and Employees' Provident Funds. He was also a member of Bantala Leather & Leathers Goods Workers Union, affiliated to INTTUC.

The company did not pay the minimum wages to its workers. So, the workers and their union raised demands to the company verbally and also in writing for payment of minimum wages. But the company did not bother to pay the minimum wages to its workers. Therefore, finding no other alternative the union raised a dispute with the Labour Directorate, Govt. of West Bengal. As a result of which the management of the company also became very annoyed and tried to get rid of it by hook or crook.

On 24.08.2014 when he went to join his duty the Security Guard of the factory did not allow him to enter into the factory including eight other workers. They raised strong protest for such illegal act of the management and requested the Security Guard to allow him to enter into the factory so that he could know the reason of his refusal of employment from the management. But the security guard did not allow him to enter into the factory and the security guard said that he has an instruction not to allow the applicant to enter into the factory.

The union also raised strong protest for such summary termination of services of 9 workers verbally as well as in writing. When the demands and approached became fell flat because of the most adamant attitude of the management the union sponsored an industrial dispute in this respect before the Labour Directorate, Govt. of West Bengal. But for some unforeseen reason the conciliation proceeding had continued for years together.

When the applicant realized that the dispute could not be settled in tripartite level he made a written demand to the management of the company by his letter dated 10.12.2019 for reinstatement in service with full back wages and other incidental benefits but all are in vain. The applicant was summarily terminated him from the service of the company without showing any reason by way of refusal of employment with effect from 24.08.2014. The applicant raised strong protest for such illegal action of the management and demanded for allow him to resume him duty but the company did not allow him to resume him duty. He was terminated from the service of the company with effect from 24.08.2014 illegally and in violation of the provisions of Section 25 F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and also in violation of principles of natural justice.

The applicant made several calls at the factory of the company but the security guard did not allow him to enter into the factory. Therefore, the applicant went to company's office at Lenin Sarani and however he met Mr. Srimani, one of the Directors of the company and requested him for his reinstatement in service and further demanded to convey the reasons of termination in writing but all are in vain. When he realized that the dispute could not be settled in tripartite level he made a written demand to the management by his letter dated 10.12.2019 with the request for reinstatement in service with full back wages. Though the said demand notice was duly received by the company, but the company did not care to give any reply of the same nor allow him to join his duty and paid back wages. The company threw the applicant into prolonged unemployment and starvation with the members of his family. The company has not issued any charge sheet nor shown any cause to the applicant and no domestic enquiry was held before the said termination and the applicant had not been offered any opportunity of hearing before the termination of service. The applicant further states that he was terminated from service of the company in violation of section 25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. The applicant after wrongful and illegal termination of service is facing tremendous financial stringency due to forceful unemployment by the management of the

company. In spite of sending sincere efforts he could not be gainfully employed elsewhere and for that the concerned applicant along with family members are suffering not only financially but also mentally. When all persuasions, approaches and demands fell flat because of the most unfair and unjust attitude of the management the applicant by his letter dated 09.01.2020 raised an industrial dispute before the Dy. Labour Commissioner, Govt. of West Bengal to intervene into the matter. As there is some mistake in the application he made a fresh application on dated 26.02.2020 to the Dy. Labour Commissioner, West Bengal. The Conciliation Officer convened a number of joint meetings on several dates but due to adamant attitude of the management, the matter could not be settled. The termination of service of the applicant by way of refusal of employment is *ipso facto* bad in law, unfair and mala fide amounting to shocking injustice to the poor applicant. At the material time his salary stood at Rs. 12,000/- per month.

The applicant adduced evidence and marked the documents as exhibits. The company examined two witnesses.

The company filed their written statement on 28.07.2022 wherein the management tried to establish that they did not terminate the service of the workman and he is not a permanent workman. From the Ext-1 your Honour will find that the workman was appointed vide letter of appointment dated 02.05.2028. There is not a single word that he was appointed as casual, temporary worker and even there is no clause of retirement, i.e., so long the workman is physically fit he will work. The company in their written statement stated that the workman abandoned the service of the company from 29.08.2013. The company measurably failed to establish the same. My respectful submission is that abandonment or relinquishment of service is always a question of intention, and normally, such an intention cannot be attributed to an employee without adequate evidence in that behalf. In this case your Honour will not find that the management of the company issued any letter to the workman in this regard stating that you are hereby directed to join his duty within a stipulated period and you have failed to join then it will be presumed that you are not interested to your employment and you have abandoned the service of the company. But there is nothing on behalf of the company. If the workman unauthorisedly absented from his duty it is the duty of the management to issue show cause/charge sheet to him for his unauthorised absenteeism. I want to rely on a judgment reported in **2023 LLR, page 304 (P & H HC), (Anil Kumar Vs. P.O, IT, Gurgaon)**, wherein their Lordship opined that *“If a workman does not resume duty despite letters written to him to join duty, prove that the workman himself abandoned his job”*. But in this case it is totally absent. In the case of the **G.T. Lad & Others Vs. Chemicals and Fibres Of India reported in 1979 (39) FLR, page 95 (S.C.)**, wherein the Hon’ble Apex Court held that *“there must be total or complete giving up of duties so as to indicate an intention not to resume the same”*. In this case the workman and his union repeatedly demanded the management to allow the workman to join his duty, but the company did not allow him to join. Therefore your Honour please hold that this case is not coming under the purview of abandonment of service.

My second leg of argument is whether the applicant workman was lawfully terminated from his service? My answer is that he was not lawfully terminated from his service of the company and on the other hand the company terminated him by way of refusal of employment in violation of

principles of natural justice and provisions of law. This is a case of retrenchment from the service. Section 2 (oo) of the I.D. Act states as follows :

“Retrenchment” means termination by the employer of the service of a workman for any reasons whatsoever, otherwise than as a punishment inflicted by way of disciplinary action”.

The company terminated the service of the workman in violation of section 25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. There is some condition that no workman employed in any industry shall be retrenched by the employer until the workman has been given one month’s notice in writing including the reasons for retrenchment..... and the retrenchment compensation. But in this case nothing has been complied with. In the evidence the workman has clearly stated the same that at the time of his termination he was not offered any retrenchment compensation and notice pay. I further like to submit that it is well settled principle that 3 conditions u/s. 25F are necessary preconditions for retrenchment and non-compliance of the same will render retrenchment invalid ab initio.

Therefore from the above it is clear that the opposite party did not care to give any of opportunity of hearing to the applicant before awarding the capital punishment.

The principle of natural justice is an integral part of the guarantee of equality assured by Article 14. Any law made or action taken by the employer must be fair, just and reasonable. Article 21 of the constitution would include right to livelihood. The order of termination of service of an employee visits with civil consequences of jeopardizing not on his livelihood but also career and livelihood of dependents. Therefore before taking any action putting an end to the tenure of an employee fair play requires. But the company did not care the same. I want to rely on a judgment in this respect reported in **1993 (67) F.L.R. page-111 Supreme Court (D.K. Yadav Vs. M/s. J.M.A. Industries Ltd.)**.

I also want to rely on the judgment reported in 1991 (63) FLR page-679, Bom. H.C. (Riaz Ahmed Vs. Munir Ismail Mohammed of Bombay & ors. (Even if the story of voluntary abandonment of service by workman put by the employer is accepted – It was incumbent upon the employer to hold an enquiry- Before treating the service as terminated on this ground – In absence of such an enquiry by the employer the termination of service cannot be held legal and valid.)

I also rely on the judgment reported in 2003 (97) FLR page-262 (Employers in Management, Kusunda Area of M/s. B.C.C.L. Vs. P.O., Central Govt. and others. (Termination of service because of abandonment by the workers would come within the definition of retrenchment – And section 25F would apply).

With regard to back wages I want rely on the judgment reported in 2013 (10) SCC page 324, Deepali Gundu Surwase Vs. Kranti Junior Adhyapak Mahavidyalaya (D. ED) & Others.

There is a mandatory provision in the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 that at the time of retrenchment the employer has to comply Section 25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. The section postulates three conditions to be fulfilled by an employer for effecting a valid retrenchment i.e., *“(a) one month’s notice in writing indicating the reasons for retrenchment or wages in lieu of such notice; (b) payment of compensation equivalent to fifteen days, average pay for every completed year of continuous service or part thereof in excess of six months; and (c) notice to the appropriate Government in the prescribed manner”*. It is now well settled that considering the

negative language used in section 25F, the Section imposes a mandatory duty on the employer, which is a condition precedent to retrenchment a workman. Therefore, the contravention of the mandatory requirements of Section would invalidate the retrenchment and render it void ab initio. There is catena of decisions in this respect. Admittedly the company did not comply mandatory provisions of the I.D. Act, which will reveals from the evidence of the P.W. 1 as well as from the cross-examination of the company's witnesses. Therefore the termination of service of the applicant was in clear violation of the provisions of law.

My learned friend cited a judgment reported in 1999 (2) LLN, 1050 (P & H) wherein the workman had himself gone away and remained absent. He had not also worked for a period of even six months. But in my case the workman had not himself gone away and on the other hand he was not allowed to join his duties despite several demands by the union as well as by the workman. There is not a single letter from the management to show that he was unauthorizedly absented from his duties and directed him to join his duty. My case is refusal of employment. After West Bengal amendment of Section 2A of the ID Act "refuses employment" inserted in this section. So, this judgment is not applicable in this case.

On the other hand Md. Allauddin was terminated from the service of the company with effect from 24.08.2014 without compliance of Section 25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

The workman raised his protest verbally as well as in writing for his summary termination of service (Ext-4, 5, 6 and 7), but the company did not reply the above letters stating that the workman was not terminated from the service of the company.

In summing up the case I state that the workman Md. Allauddin has been terminated from the service of the company in violation of principles of natural justice, equity and Section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

In view of the above Ld. Advocate for the workman once again submitted that Md. Allauddin has illegally terminated from the service of the company and therefore pray before the learned Tribunal to answer the issues in favour the workman holding thereof that the termination of service of Md. Allauddin by way of refusal of employment with effect from 24.08.2014 by the company is totally illegal, bad, unjust and malafide and grant him the relief of reinstatement with full back wages and other consequential benefits.

As per written notes of argument the brief case of the Company is that the industrial dispute seeking reinstatement of service, back wage and incidental benefits by the applicant workmen and relief under Section 10 (1) (b) of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947 should not be allowed for the following issues:

1. Whether the workmen abandoned service in September 2013?

Submissions: On assailing evidence of the case the following emerges:

- The workmen in his cross examination dated 28.10.2024 admitted the fact that he started to work at Aslam Tannery after one week when he left Srimani Siplayan.
- He admitted that he started to work at Aslam Tannery after one week when he left Srimani Silpayan.
- He also admitted that company lodged police complaint Against him in September 2013 (Ex-C)

- The Provident fund documents filed by the Company indicated that the workmen's wages were deducted till August 2013 and no deduction took place for the month of September.
- He admits that in his cross-examination dated 04.09.2014 that prior to 10.12.2019 he did not write any letter to company or any other office about his illegal termination.

The workman therefore fails to establish any fact of his illegal termination on 24.08.2014. Rather it can be inferred from the said evidence that he abandoned his job and within a week got employment and got his salary from Aslam Tannery in 2013 itself and has been under gain full employment till present date. The workman fails to establish himself as a victim for "retrenchment" by the opposite party/ employer.

2. Whether the workman was allegedly terminated on 24.08.2014? If yes, whether the said termination was illegal? If yes what relief is he entitled to?

Submissions : On assailing evidence of the case the following emerges :

- The workman fails to produce any termination letter effecting termination on 24.08.2014.
- He admits that in his cross-examination dated 04.09.2014 that prior to 10.12.2019 he did not write any letter to company or any other office about his illegal termination.
- In exhibit – 2, the Union lodged a complaint to Asst. Labour Commissioner where no date of termination was mentioned.
- It was only for the first time on 09.01.2020 (Ext-5) the workman mentioned his termination on 24.08.2014 to be illegal.
- The workman in his cross-examination dated 28.10.2024 admitted the fact that he started work in Aslam Tannery in the year 2013 and supports the contention of MW1 as in his evidence in chief.
- He admitted that he started to work at Aslam Tannery after one week when he left Srimani Silpayan.
- He also admitted that Company lodged police complaint against him in September 2013. (Ext. C)
- The Provident Fund documents filed by the Company indicated that the workmen's wages were deducted till August 2013 and no deduction took place for the month of September.

From the aforesaid, it is submitted that the workman had admitted to be in gainful employment with Aslam Tannery within a week after leaving Srimani Silpayan in 2013 and been under gainful employment till present day as construction worker. No case of illegal termination was made out by the workman against the management in 2013. The workman made out a fictitious claim of illegal termination on 24.08.2014 only for the first time in 2019 i.e. after 6 years since he left service of Srimani Silpayan (employer). The management had not passed any order of termination as alleged by the workman on 24.08.2014; if there is no order of termination, passed by the employer, under no

circumstances it is required to hold an enquiry. The workman had himself abandoned the job at Srimani Shilpayan in 2013. He is wanting to take advantage of his own wrong. There is neither equity nor law in his favour. The workmen for aforesaid reasons failed to establish any evidence of retrenchment by non-compliance of Section 25F of the I.D. Act having failed to establish that he was illegally or improperly terminated on 24.08.2014 to seek remedy of back wages / compensation and / or reinstatement. The complaint of the workmen be dismissed.

Judgment relied:

(1999) 1 LLJ 224,

(1999) (2) LLN 1050 Laxmi Kant Vs. Presiding Officer Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Gurgaon another (P&H HC) held in Para 9 that “ the management had not passed any order of termination, if there is no order of termination passed by the employer, it is not understood as to how and why it is required to hold an enquiry. The petitioner had himself abandoned the job. He is wanting to take advantage of his own wrong. There is neither equity nor law in his favour.

Here in this particular case three issues are framed by the Court. These are

- (1) Whether workman's application is barred by limitation as in Section 2-a(3) of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947?
- (2) Whether the applicant is a workman as per the Industrial Disputes Act 1947?
- (3) Whether industrial dispute seeking reinstatement of service, back wage and incidental benefits by the applicant and relief under Section 10(1B)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is maintainable under law and facts.

Now I have taken up all the three issues together for the convenience of discussion. On scrutiny of the record I find that this case is filed by the applicant Md. Allauddin against his illegal termination on and from 24.08.2014. But from the documents filed by the workman which are exhibited in this case I did not find any termination letter issued by the Company against the workman, which the workman in his cross-examination dt. 28.10.2024 admitted that, “he started to work at Aslam Tannery after one week when he left Srimani Silpayan i.e. the O.P. Company herein”. The Provident Fund document filed by the Company indicated that the workman's wages were deducted till August, 2013 and no deduction took place for the month of September, 2013. The workman further admitted in his cross-examination dt. 04.09.2014 that prior to 10.12.2019 he did not write any letter to Company or any other office about his illegal termination. So it is crystal clear from the evidence and documents on record that the workman fails to bring anything before this Tribunal that he was illegally terminated from the service on 24.08.2014. rather it can be inferred from the said evidence that he abandoned his job and within a week got employment and got his salary from Aslam Tannery in 2013 itself and has been under-gain full employment till present day.

It is alleged by the workman that he was illegally terminated on 24.08.2014. But from the evidence it is established that workman fails to produce any termination letter effecting termination on and from 24.08.2014. In Exhibit-2 the Union lodged a complaint to the Assistant Labour

Commissioner where date of termination was not mentioned. From Exhibit-5 it is revealed that it was only for the first time on 09.01.2020 the workman mentioned his termination on 24.08.2014 to be illegal. Now the question is whether the application under Section 10 (1B)(d) of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. Now I have to see the Section 2-A(3) which runs as follows:- “The application referred to in Sub-section 2 shall be made to the Labour Court or to the Tribunal before the expiry of three years from the date of discharge, dismissal, retrenchment or otherwise termination of service as specified in Sub-section 1.” Now I have to see the Section 10(1) which reveals that, “Where the appropriate Government is of opinion that any industrial dispute exists or is apprehended, it may at any time, by order in writing –

- (b) refer any matter appearing to be connected with or relevant to the dispute to a Court for inquiry; or
- (d) refer the dispute or any matter appearing to be connected with, or relevant to, the dispute, whether it relates to any matter specified in the Second Schedule, or the Third Schedule, to a Tribunal for adjudication.

On scrutiny of the record I find that this case under Section 10(1B)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 has been filed before this Tribunal of 27.06.2022 and the date of termination of service alleged by the workman is on 24.08.2014. The Section 2-A(3) clearly indicated that the application referred in Sub-section 2 shall be made to the Labour Court or Tribunal before the expiry of three years from the date of discharge, dismissal, retrenchment or otherwise termination”. But here if I accept the version of workman is true that he was terminated from the service on and from 24.08.2014 and he filed this case before 27.06.2022 in that case it is crystal clear that the case was filed after three years from the date of termination i.e. after the expiry of three years and the case is barred by limitation as in Section 2-A(3) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

In view of the above facts & circumstances all the three issues are decided against the worker Md. Allauddin. Accordingly, it is held that the case filed by the worker is not maintainable and it is barred by limitation under Section 2-A(3) of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Hence, it is

ORDERED

that the case is dismissed on contest without any cost.

Let the copy of this judgment and award be sent to the Secretary, to the Government of West Bengal, Labour Department, New Secretariat Buildings, 12th Floor, 1 No. Kiran Shankar Roy Road, Kolkata – 700 001.

Dictated & Corrected by me

Judge

(Amit Chattopadhyay)
Judge
Eighth Industrial Tribunal,
Kolkata
28.08.2025

GOVERNMENT OF WEST BENGAL
DIRECTORATE OF INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNALS
NEW SECRETARIAT BUILDINGS
BLOCK - 'A', 2ND FLOOR
1, KIRAN SANKAR ROY ROAD
KOLKATA - 700001

Memo No.

Dated Kolkata, the 28.08.2025

-

From: Shri Amit Chattopadhyay,
Judge,
8th Industrial Tribunal,
Kolkata - 1.

To : The Secretary to the
Govt. of West Bengal,
Labour Department,
New Secretariat Buildings, 12th Floor,
1, Kiran Sankar Roy Road,
Kolkata - 700 001.

Sir,

I am sending herewith the Award passed in the matter of an industrial dispute filed by applicant Md. Allauddin, S/o. Late Abdul Rouf, 45-BH/7, Canal East Road, P.O. & P.S. - Narkeldanga, Kolkata -700011, West Bengal against M/s. Srimani Silpayan (India) Pvt. Ltd., Zone-1, Plot No. 49, P.O. & P.S. - Kolkata Leather Complex, Dist. - South 24-Parganas, PIN - 743502, West Bengal being Case No. 37/2022 U/s. 10(1B)(d) for information and necessary action.

Encl: As stated above.

Yours faithfully,

Judge,
Eighth Industrial Tribunal,
Kolkata
04-10-2024