

The Superintending Engineer vs the Asst.Commissioner of Labour

The Superintending Engineer vs the Asst.Commissioner of Labour

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/1635585

Court : Chennai

Decided On : Apr-30-2026

Judge : Honourable Mr Justice B.Pugalendhi

Appeal No. : WP(MD)/16609/2020

Appellant : The Superintending Engineer

Respondent : The Asst.Commissioner of Labour

Judgement :

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT
RESERVED ON : 28.11.2025 DELIVERED ON : 30.04.2026

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE B.PUGALENDHI

WP(MD)Nos.16609 of 2020; 20477 of 2021; 4983, 25950 to 25954 of 2022; 29968 of 2023; 28176 of 2024; 28229, 28317, 28326, 28578, 28580, 28603, 28622, 28647, 28670, 28686, 28709, 28821 of 2025 & WMP(MD)Nos.13883 of 2020; 4098, 20096, 20099, 20100, 20102, 20104 of 2022; 25027, 25028, 25029, 25030, 25835 of 2023; 23885, 23887 of 2024; 21944, 22014, 22021, 22167, 22169, 22195, 22215,

22236, 22251, 22292, 22316, 22410, 23305 of 2025;

and

WP(MD)Nos.24657 to 24662, 25234 to 25239, 25391 to 25396, 29089 of 2022; 488 to 493 of 2023; 5030 to 5046 of 2024 & WMP(MD)Nos.18767, 18772, 18774, 18776, 18777, 18782, 19319, 19322, 19324, 19327, 19328, 19331, 19476, 19479, 19481, 19483, 19485, 19487, 23066 of 2022; 452, 453, 455, 457, 460, 461 of 2023; 4816, 4818, 4822, 4824, 4826, 4828, 4830, 4832, 4834, 4838, 4840, 4842, 4846, 4848, 4852, 4854, 4857 of 2024

W.P.(MD)No.16609 of 2020

1. The Superintending Engineer, Madurai Electricity Distribution Circle, Tamil Nadu Electricity Board (TANGEDCO), Madurai.
2. Assistant Engineer, Tamil Nadu Electricity Board, T.Kallupatti, Sindhupatti Min Pirivu, Sindhupatti, Madurai District - 625 529.
3. Assistant Engineer, Thirumangalam West Min Pirivu, Tamil Nadu Electricity Board, Thirumangalam, Madurai District - 625 706.
4. Assistant Engineer, Thirumangalam Nagar Min Pirivu, Tamil Nadu Electricity Board, Thirumangalam, Madurai District - 625 706.
5. Assistant Engineer, RCC Yard Kappalur, Tamil Nadu Electricity Board, Kappalur, Madurai District - 625 706.
6. Assistant Engineer, Thirumangalam North Min Pirivu, Tamil Nadu Electricity Board, Thirumangalam, Madurai District - 625 706.
7. Assistant Engineer, T.Kallupatti Rural Min pirivu, Tamil Nadu Electricity Board, T.Kallupatti, Peraiyur Taluk, Madurai District - 625 532.

8. Assistant Engineer, Usilampatti South Min pirivu, Tamil Nadu Electricity Board, Usilampatti, Madurai district - 625 532.

9. Assistant Engineer, Sengulam Min pirivu, Tamil Nadu Electricity Board, Thirumangalam, Madurai District - 625 706.

10. Assistant Engineer, Saator Min Pirivu, Tamil Nadu Electricity Board, Periyur Taluk, Madurai District - 625 705. ... Petitioners

versus

1. The Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Enforcement) Authority under the Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act 1981, Virudhunagar.

2. S.Pandi

3. P.Sathan

4. M.Ganesan

5. R.Thirupathi

6. R.Thangapandi

7. R.Andisamy

8. P.Saravana Kumar

9. K.Pandi

10. P.Muthu

11. M.Sethuraman

12. C.Chinnaswamy

13. S.Mayee (expired)

14. A.Guruswamy

15. M.Samuthiram

16. P.Thulasimayan

17. A.Murugan

18. C.Annakodi

19. K.Kannan

20. A.Mahalingam

21. P.Jothibasur ... Respondents

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorari, calling for the records of the 1st respondent in Proceedings Na.Ka.No.167/2010 and quash its

order dated 31.01.2019.

For Petitioners : Mr.Anand Gopalan for M/s.T.S.Gopalan and Co. For R1 : Mr.C.Venkatesh Kumar, Special Government Pleader For R2 to R12 R14 to R21 : Mr.John Vincent for M/s.S.Seeni W.P.(MD)No.20477 of 2021 P.Rajasambath ...
Petitioner

versus

1. The Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Enforcement), Theni, Theni District.
2. The Superintending Engineer, Theni Electricity Distribution Circle, TANGEDCO, Theni District.
3. The Assistant Engineer, O&M, Theni Electricity Distribution Circle, TANGEDCO / Thevaram II, Theni District. ... Respondents

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, to call for the records pertaining to the impugned order bearing Na.Ka.No. same as illegal and consequently direct the respondents 2 and 3 to regularize the petitioner employment. . For Petitioner : Mr.I.Sam Jegan For R1 : Mr.C.Venkatesh Kumar, Special Government Pleader For R2 and R3 : Mr.Anand Gopalan for M/s.T.S.Gopalan & Co. W.P.(MD)No.4983 of 2022

1. The Chief Engineer (Personnel), Tamil Nadu Generation and Distribution Corporation Limited (TANGEDCO), 800, Anna Salai, Chennai - 2.

2. The Superintending Engineer, Madurai Electricity Distribution Circle, K.Pudur, Madurai District.

3. Assistant Engineer (Civil), Samayanallur PSC/RCC Yard, Tamil Nadu Generation and Distribution Corporation, Samayanallur, Madurai District. ...
Petitioners

versus

1. Joint Director of Industrial Safety and Health - I, Authority under the Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishments (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981, Madurai.

2. S.Suresh

3. I.Francis

4. P.John Kennedy

5. P.Vaikundanathan

6. P.Sathyanathan

7. B.Veerabhadran ... Respondents

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorari, to call for the records of the 1st respondent in kD.vz;.</1281/2018 and quash its order dated 25.02.2022. For Petitioners : Mr.Anand Gopalan for M/s.T.S.Gopalan & Co. For R1 : Mr.C.Venkatesh Kumar, Special Government Pleader For R2 to R7 : Mr.Srinivasa Raghavan W.P.(MD)No.25950 of 2022

1. The Superintending Engineer, Virudhunagar Electricity Distribution Circle/South, Tamil Nadu Generation and Distribution Corporation, Virudhunagar - 626 001.

2. The Assistant Engineer,

Venganallur North Sub Division, Tamil Nadu Generation and Distribution Corporation, Meenakshi Theatre Road, Rajapalayam, Virudhunagar - 626 142. ...
Petitioners

versus

1. The Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Enforcement), Authority under the Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981, Virudhunagar.

2. S.Nallamuthu ... Respondents

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorari, to call for the records of the 1st respondent in Na.Ka.No.2925-7/2011 and quash its order dated 06.07.2020. For Petitioners : Mr.Anand Gopalan for M/s.T.S.Gopalan and Co. For R1 : Mr.C.Venkatesh Kumar, Special Government Pleader For R2 : Mr.A.S.Krishnan W.P.(MD)No.25951 of 2022

1. The Superintending Engineer, Virudhunagar Electricity Distribution Circle/South, Tamil Nadu Generation and Distribution Corporation, Virudhunagar - 626 001.

2. The Assistant Engineer, Town East Sub Division, Tamil Nadu Generation and Distribution Corporation, Rajapalayam, Virudhunagar - 626 117. ... Petitioners

versus

1. The Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Enforcement), Authority under the Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981, Virudhunagar.

2. P.Chidambaram ... Respondents

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorari, to call for the records of the 1st respondent in Na.Ka.No.2925-8/2011 and quash its order dated 06.07.2020. For Petitioners : Mr.Anand Gopalan for M/s.T.S.Gopalan and Co. For R1 : Mr.C.Venkatesh Kumar, Special Government Pleader For R2 : Mr.A.S.Krishnan W.P.(MD)No.25952 of 2022

1. The Superintending Engineer, Virudhunagar Electricity Distribution Circle/South, Tamil Nadu Generation and Distribution Corporation, Virudhunagar - 626 001.

2. The Assistant Engineer, Alangulam Gramam Sub Division, Tamil Nadu Generation and Distribution Corporation, Alangulam Virudhunagar. ... Petitioners

versus

1. The Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Enforcement), Authority under the Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981, Virudhunagar.

2. N.Paulraj ... Respondents

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorari, to call for the records of the 1st respondent in Na.Ka.No.2925-9/2011 and quash its order dated 06.07.2020. For Petitioners : Mr.Anand Gopalan for M/s.T.S.Gopalan and Co. For R1 : Mr.C.Venkatesh Kumar, Special Government Pleader For R2 : Mr.A.S.Krishnan W.P.(MD)No.25953 of 2022

1. The Superintending Engineer, Virudhunagar Electricity Distribution Circle/South, Tamil Nadu Generation and Distribution Corporation, Virudhunagar - 626 001.

2. The Assistant Engineer, Alangulam Gramam Sub Division, Tamil Nadu Generation and Distribution Corporation, Alangulam Virudhunagar. ... Petitioners

versus

1. The Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Enforcement), Authority under the Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981, Virudhunagar.

2. S.Pothiraj ... Respondents

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorari, to call for the records of the 1st respondent in Na.Ka.No.2925-10/2011 and quash its order dated 06.07.2020. For Petitioners : Mr.Anand Gopalan for M/s.T.S.Gopalan and Co. For R1 : Mr.C.Venkatesh Kumar, Special Government Pleader For R2 : Mr.A.S.Krishnan W.P.(MD)No.25954 of 2022

1. The Superintending Engineer, Virudhunagar Electricity Distribution Circle/South, Tamil Nadu Generation and Distribution Corporation, Virudhunagar - 626 001.

2. The Assistant Engineer, Alangulam Gramam Sub Division, Tamil Nadu Generation and Distribution Corporation, Alangulam Virudhunagar. ... Petitioners

versus

1. The Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Enforcement), Authority under the Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981, Virudhunagar.

2. M.Kallimuthu ... Respondents

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorari, to call for the records of the 1st respondent in

Na.Ka.No.2925-11/2011 and quash its order dated 06.07.2020. For Petitioners : Mr.Anand Gopalan for M/s.T.S.Gopalan and Co. For R1 : Mr.C.Venkatesh Kumar, Special Government Pleader For R2 : Mr.A.S.Krishnan W.P.(MD)No.29968 of 2023

1. The Superintending Engineer, Tamil Nadu Electricity Distribution Circle (TANGEDCO), Theni Distribution Circle, Theni.

2. The Assistant Engineer, Tamil Nadu Electricity Distribution Circle (TANGEDCO), Theni Distribution Circle, Theni. ... Petitioners

versus

1. The Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Enforcement), Authority under the Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981, Theni.

2. S.Kannan

3. J.Kanagaraj

4. V.Sivaperumal

5. V.Vijayakumar

6. C.Chandran

7. M.Prasad

8. E.Balusamy

9. K.Suresh Pandi

10. P.Otchadevan

11. A.Pandi

12. M.Vijayakumar

13. M.Nagarajan

14. A.Thangamuniandi

15. S.Paramasivam

16. S.Selavam

17. M.Easwaran

18. I.Muthuraj

19. M.Sasikumar

20. A.Raja

21. A.Thangaraja ... Respondents

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a Writ of Mandamus forbearing the 1st respondent from proceeding further with regard to the proceedings in Na.Ka.No.2055/2022 dated 05.12.2022. For Petitioners : Mr.Anand Gopalan for M/s.Agam Legal For R1 : Mr.V.Venkatesh Kumar, Special Government Pleader For R2 to R21 : Mr.K.Appadurai W.P.(MD)No.28176 of 2024 The Superintending Engineer, Tamil Nadu Electricity Board, Thoothukudi Electricity Distribution Circle, Ettaiyapuram Road, Thoothukudi - 628 002. ... Petitioner

versus

1. The Assistant Commissioner of Labour

(Enforcement) (In-charge), Authority under the Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981, Thoothukudi - 628 101.

2. V.Karthik ... Respondents

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorari, to call for the records of the 1st respondent in Na.Ka.E/2185/2014 and quash its order dated 27.11.2019. For Petitioner : Mr.Anand Gopalan for M/s.Agam Legal For R1 : Mr.C.Venkatesh Kumar, Special Government Pleader For R2 : No appearance W.P.(MD)No.28229 of 2025

1. The Superintending Engineer, Madurai Metro Electricity Distribution Circle, Tamil Nadu Electricity Board, Madurai - 625 007.

2. The Assistant Engineer, North Arasaradi Electricity Circle, Tamil Nadu Electricity Board, Madurai - 625 016. ... Petitioners

versus

1. The Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Enforcement) Authority under Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, Madurai - 625 016.

2. R.Rajendirakumar ... Respondents

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorari, to call for the records of the 1st respondent in C.P.S.No.54 of 2011 and quash its order dated 30.10.2024. For Petitioners : Mr.Anand Gopalan for M/s.Advit Law Chambers For R1 : Mr.C.Venkatesh Kumar, Special Government Pleader For R2 : Mr.B.Saravanan, Senior Counsel for Mr.S.Louis W.P.(MD)No.28317 of 2025

1. The Superintending Engineer, Madurai Metro Electricity Distribution Circle, Tamil Nadu Electricity Board, Madurai - 625 007.

2. The Assistant Engineer, Tamil Nadu Electricity Board, Munichalai Electricity Circle, Madurai Metro Electricity Distribution Circle, Madurai - 625 009. ... Petitioners

versus

1. The Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Enforcement) Authority under Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, Madurai - 625 016.

2. M.Chinnathambi ... Respondents

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorari, to call for the records of the 1st respondent in C.P.S.No.61 of 2011 and quash its order dated 30.10.2024. For Petitioners : Mr.Anand Gopalan for M/s.Advit Law Chambers For R1 : Mr.C.Venkatesh Kumar, Special Government Pleader For R2 : Mr.B.Saravanan, Senior Counsel for Mr.S.Louis W.P.(MD)No.28326 of 2025

1. The Superintending Engineer, Madurai Metro Electricity Distribution Circle, Tamil Nadu Electricity Board, Madurai - 625 007.

2. The Assistant Engineer, Vilangudi Electricity Circle, Tamil Nadu Electricity Board, Madurai - 625 018. ... Petitioners

versus

1. The Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Enforcement) Authority under Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, Madurai - 625 016.

2. T.Shanmuganathan ... Respondents

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorari, to call for the records of the 1st respondent in C.P.S.No.47 of 2011 and quash its order dated 30.10.2024. For Petitioners : Mr.Anand Gopalan for M/s.Advit Law Chambers For R1 : Mr.C.Venkatesh Kumar, Special Government Pleader For R2 : Mr.B.Saravanan, Senior Counsel for Mr.S.Louis W.P.(MD)No.28578 of 2025

1. The Superintending Engineer, Madurai Metro Electricity Distribution Circle, Tamil Nadu Electricity Board, Madurai - 625 007.

2. The Assistant Engineer, North Arasaradi Electricity Circle, Tamil Nadu Electricity Board, Madurai - 625 016. ... Petitioners

versus

1. The Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Enforcement) Authority under Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, Madurai - 625 016.

2. M.Rajesh Kanna ... Respondents

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorari, to call for the records of the 1st respondent in C.P.S.No.53 of 2011 and quash its order dated 30.10.2024. For Petitioners : Mr.Anand Gopalan for M/s.Advit Law Chambers For R1 : Mr.C.Venkatesh Kumar, Special Government Pleader For R2 : Mr.B.Saravanan, Senior Counsel for Mr.S.Louis W.P.(MD)No.28580 of 2025

1. The Superintending Engineer, Madurai Metro Electricity Distribution Circle, Tamil Nadu Electricity Board, Madurai - 625 007.

2. The Assistant Engineer, Vilangudi Electricity Circle, Tamil Nadu Electricity Board, Madurai - 625 018. ... Petitioners

versus

1. The Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Enforcement) Authority under Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, Madurai - 625 016.

2. V.Manikandan ... Respondents

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorari, to call for the records of the 1st respondent in C.P.S.No.50 of 2011 and quash its order dated 30.10.2024. For Petitioners : Mr.Anand Gopalan for M/s.Advit Law Chambers For R1 : Mr.C.Venkatesh Kumar,

Special Government Pleader For R2 : Mr.B.Saravanan, Senior Counsel for Mr.S.Louis W.P.(MD)No.28603 of 2025

1. The Superintending Engineer, Madurai Metro Electricity Distribution Circle, Tamil Nadu Electricity Board, K.Pudhur, Madurai - 625 007.

2. The Assistant Engineer, Arasamaram Electricity Circle, Tamil Nadu Electricity Board, Madurai - 625 009. ... Petitioners

versus

1. The Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Enforcement) Authority under Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, Madurai - 625 016.

2. P.Lenin Kannan ... Respondents

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorari, to call for the records of the 1st respondent in C.P.S.No.65 of 2011 and quash its order dated 30.10.2024. For Petitioners : Mr.Anand Gopalan for M/s.Advit Law Chambers For R1 : Mr.C.Venkatesh Kumar, Special Government Pleader

For R2 : Mr.B.Saravanan, Senior Counsel for Mr.S.Louis W.P.(MD)No.28622 of 2025

1. The Superintending Engineer, Madurai Metro Electricity Distribution Circle, Tamil Nadu Electricity Board, K.Pudhur, Madurai - 625 007.

2. The Assistant Engineer, Arasamaram Electricity Circle, Tamil Nadu Electricity Board, Madurai - 625 009. ... Petitioners

versus

1. The Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Enforcement) Authority under Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, Madurai - 625 016.

2. B.Murugapandiyan ... Respondents

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorari, to call for the records of the 1st respondent in C.P.S.No.77 of 2011 and quash its order dated 30.10.2024. For Petitioners : Mr.Anand Gopalan for M/s.Advit Law Chambers For R1 : Mr.C.Venkatesh Kumar, Special Government Pleader For R2 : Mr.B.Saravanan, Senior Counsel for Mr.S.Louis W.P.(MD)No.28647 of 2025

1. The Superintending Engineer, Madurai Metro Electricity Distribution Circle, Tamil Nadu Electricity Board, K.Pudhur, Madurai - 625 007.

2. The Assistant Engineer, Tamil Nadu Electricity Board, Munichalai Electricity Circle, Madurai Metro Electricity Distribution Circle, Madurai - 625 009. ...
Petitioners

versus

1. The Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Enforcement) Authority under Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, Madurai - 625 016.

2. V.Mahilampoo Raja ... Respondents

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorari, to call for the records of the 1st respondent in C.P.S.No.58 of 2011 and quash its order dated 30.10.2024. For Petitioners : Mr.Anand Gopalan for M/s.Advit Law Chambers For R1 : Mr.C.Venkatesh Kumar, Special Government Pleader For R2 : Mr.B.Saravanan, Senior Counsel for Mr.S.Louis

W.P.(MD)No.28670 of 2025

1. The Superintending Engineer, Madurai Metro Electricity Distribution Circle, Tamil Nadu Electricity Board, K.Pudhur, Madurai - 625 007.

2. The Assistant Engineer, Arasamaram Electricity Circle, Tamil Nadu Electricity Board, Madurai - 625 009. ... Petitioners

versus

1. The Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Enforcement) Authority under Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, Madurai - 625 016.

2. M.Venkateshwaran ... Respondents

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorari, to call for the records of the 1st respondent in C.P.S.No.68 of 2011 and quash its order dated 30.10.2024. For Petitioners : Mr.Anand Gopalan for M/s.Advit Law Chambers For R1 : Mr.C.Venkatesh Kumar, Special Government Pleader For R2 : Mr.B.Saravanan, Senior Counsel for Mr.S.Louis W.P.(MD)No.28686 of 2025

1. The Superintending Engineer, Madurai Metro Electricity Distribution Circle, Tamil Nadu Electricity Board, K.Pudhur, Madurai - 625 007.

2. The Assistant Engineer, Tamil Nadu Electricity Board, Munichalai Electricity Circle, Madurai Metro Electricity Distribution Circle, Madurai - 625 009. ... Petitioners

versus

1. The Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Enforcement) Authority under Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, Madurai - 625 016.

2. R.Prabakaran ... Respondents

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorari, to call for the records of the 1st respondent in C.P.S.No.59 of 2011 and quash its order dated 30.10.2024. For Petitioners : Mr.Anand Gopalan for M/s.Advit Law Chambers For R1 : Mr.C.Venkatesh Kumar, Special Government Pleader For R2 : Mr.B.Saravanan, Senior Counsel for Mr.S.Louis W.P.(MD)No.28709 of 2025

1. The Superintending Engineer, Madurai Metro Electricity Distribution Circle, Tamil Nadu Electricity Board, Madurai - 625 007.

2. The Assistant Engineer, Arasamaram Electricity Circle, Tamil Nadu Electricity Board, Madurai - 625 009. ... Petitioners

versus

1. The Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Enforcement) Authority under Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, Madurai - 625 016.

2. M.Muthumanickam ... Respondents

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorari, to call for the records of the 1st respondent in C.P.S.No.66 of 2011 and quash its order dated 30.10.2024. For Petitioners : Mr.Anand Gopalan for M/s.Advit Law Chambers For R1 : Mr.C.Venkatesh Kumar, Special Government Pleader For R2 : Mr.B.Saravanan, Senior Counsel for Mr.S.Louis W.P.(MD)No.28821 of 2025

1. The Superintending Engineer, Madurai Metro Electricity Distribution Circle, Tamil Nadu Electricity Board, Madurai - 625 007.

2. The Assistant Engineer, Sellur Electricity Circle, Tamil Nadu Electricity Board, Madurai - 625 002. ... Petitioners

versus

1. The Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Enforcement) Authority under Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, Madurai - 625 016.

2. K.V.Senthilkumar ... Respondents Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorari, to call for the records of the 1st respondent in C.P.S.No.78 of 2011 and quash its order dated 30.10.2024. For Petitioners : Mr.Anand Gopalan for M/s.Advit Law Chambers For R1 : Mr.C.Venkatesh Kumar, Special Government Pleader For R2 : Mr.B.Saravanan, Senior Counsel for Mr.S.Louis ***** W.P.(MD)No.24657 of 2022

The Superintending Engineer, Tamil Nadu Electricity Board, Tuticorin Electricity Distribution Circle, No.131, Ettayapuram Road, Tuticorin - 628 002. ... Petitioner

versus

1. The Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Enforcement), Authority under the Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981, Tuticorin - 628 101.

2. S.Logu Kumaresan ... Respondents Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorari, to call for the records of

the 1st respondent in Na.Ka.No.E/325/2018 and quash its common order

dated 27.11.2019. For Petitioner : Mr.Anand Gopalan for M/s.T.S.Gopalan and Co. For R1 : Mr.C.Venkateshkumar, Special Government Pleader For R2 : Mr.H.Mohammed Imran for M/s.Ajmal Associates W.P.(MD)No.24658 of 2022 The Superintending Engineer, Tamil Nadu Electricity Board, Tuticorin Electricity Distribution Circle, No.131, Ettayapuram Road, Tuticorin - 628 002. ... Petitioner

versus

1. The Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Enforcement), Authority under the Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981, Tuticorin - 628 101.

2. I.Sathyendiran ... Respondents Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorari, to call for the records of

the 1st respondent in Na.Ka.No.E/326/2018 and quash its common order

dated 27.11.2019. For Petitioner : Mr.Anand Gopalan for M/s.T.S.Gopalan and Co. For R1 : Mr.C.Venkateshkumar, Special Government Pleader For R2 : Mr.H.Mohammed Imran for M/s.Ajmal Associates W.P.(MD)No.24659 of 2022 The Superintending Engineer, Tamil Nadu Electricity Board, Tuticorin Electricity Distribution Circle, No.131, Ettayapuram Road, Tuticorin - 628 002. ... Petitioner

versus

1. The Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Enforcement), Authority under the Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981, Tuticorin - 628 101.

2. A.Muthuraja ... Respondents Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorari, to call for the records of

the 1st respondent in Na.Ka.No.E/327/2018 and quash its common order

dated 27.11.2019. For Petitioner : Mr.Anand Gopalan for M/s.T.S.Gopalan and Co. For R1 : Mr.C.Venkateshkumar, Special Government Pleader For R2 : Mr.H.Mohammed Imran for M/s.Ajmal Associates W.P.(MD)No.24660 of 2022 The Superintending Engineer, Tamil Nadu Electricity Board, Tuticorin Electricity Distribution Circle, No.131, Ettayapuram Road, Tuticorin - 628 002. ... Petitioner

versus

1. The Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Enforcement), Authority under the Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981, Tuticorin - 628 101.

2. R.Thirumalaikumar ... Respondents Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorari, to call for the records of

the 1st respondent in Na.Ka.No.E/328/2018 and quash its common order

dated 27.11.2019. For Petitioner : Mr.Anand Gopalan for M/s.T.S.Gopalan and Co. For R1 : Mr.C.Venkateshkumar, Special Government Pleader For R2 : Mr.H.Mohammed Imran for M/s.Ajmal Associates W.P.(MD)No.24661 of 2022 The Superintending Engineer, Tamil Nadu Electricity Board, Tuticorin Electricity Distribution Circle, No.131, Ettayapuram Road, Tuticorin - 628 002. ... Petitioner

versus

1. The Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Enforcement), Authority under the Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981, Tuticorin - 628 101.

2. M.Belwin Packiyyaraj ... Respondents Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorari, to call for the records of

the 1st respondent in Na.Ka.No.E/329/2018 and quash its common order

dated 27.11.2019. For Petitioner : Mr.Anand Gopalan for M/s.T.S.Gopalan and Co. For R1 : Mr.C.Venkateshkumar, Special Government Pleader For R2 : Mr.H.Mohammed Imran for M/s.Ajmal Associates W.P.(MD)No.24662 of 2022 The Superintending Engineer, Tamil Nadu Electricity Board, Tuticorin Electricity

Distribution Circle, No.131, Ettayapuram Road, Tuticorin - 628 002. ... Petitioner

versus

1. The Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Enforcement), Authority under the Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981, Tuticorin - 628 101.

2. P.Suresh ... Respondents Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorari, to call for the records of

the 1st respondent in Na.Ka.No.E/330/2018 and quash its common order

dated 27.11.2019. For Petitioner : Mr.Anand Gopalan for M/s.T.S.Gopalan and Co. For R1 : Mr.C.Venkateshkumar, Special Government Pleader For R2 : Mr.H.Mohammed Imran for M/s.Ajmal Associates W.P.(MD)No.25234 of 2022 The Superintending Engineer, Tamil Nadu Electricity Board, Tuticorin Electricity Distribution Circle, No.131, Ettayapuram Road, Tuticorin - 628 002. ... Petitioner

versus

1. The Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Enforcement), Authority under the Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981, Tuticorin - 628 101.

2. M.Subramaniyan ... Respondents Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorari, to call for the records of

the 1st respondent in Na.Ka.No.E/337/2018 and quash its common order

dated 27.11.2019. For Petitioner : Mr.Anand Gopalan for M/s.T.S.Gopalan and Co. For R1 : Mr.C.Venkateshkumar, Special Government Pleader For R2 : Mr.H.Mohammed Imran for M/s.Ajmal Associates W.P.(MD)No.25235 of 2022 The

Superintending Engineer, Tamil Nadu Electricity Board, Tuticorin Electricity Distribution Circle, No.131, Ettayapuram Road, Tuticorin - 628 002. ... Petitioner

versus

1. The Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Enforcement), Authority under the Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981, Tuticorin - 628 101.

2. F.Antony Michael Nicholas ... Respondents Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorari, to call for the records of

the 1st respondent in Na.Ka.No.E/339/2018 and quash its common order

dated 27.11.2019. For Petitioner : Mr.Anand Gopalan for M/s.T.S.Gopalan and Co. For R1 : Mr.C.Venkateshkumar, Special Government Pleader For R2 : Mr.H.Mohammed Imran for M/s.Ajmal Associates W.P.(MD)No.25236 of 2022 The Superintending Engineer, Tamil Nadu Electricity Board, Tuticorin Electricity Distribution Circle, No.131, Ettayapuram Road, Tuticorin - 628 002. ... Petitioner

versus

1. The Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Enforcement), Authority under the Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981, Tuticorin - 628 101.

2. A.Antony Xavier ... Respondents Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorari, to call for the records of

the 1st respondent in Na.Ka.No.E/338/2018 and quash its common order

dated 27.11.2019. For Petitioner : Mr.Anand Gopalan for M/s.T.S.Gopalan and Co.
For R1 : Mr.C.Venkateshkumar, Special Government Pleader For R2 :
Mr.H.Mohammed Imran for M/s.Ajmal Associates W.P.(MD)No.25237 of 2022 The
Superintending Engineer, Tamil Nadu Electricity Board, Tuticorin Electricity
Distribution Circle, No.131, Ettayapuram Road, Tuticorin - 628 002. ... Petitioner

versus

1. The Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Enforcement), Authority under the
Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to
Workmen) Act, 1981, Tuticorin - 628 101.

2. A.Saravana Kumar ... Respondents Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the
Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorari, to call for the
records of

**the 1st respondent in Na.Ka.No.E/340/2018 and quash its
common order**

dated 27.11.2019. For Petitioner : Mr.Anand Gopalan for M/s.T.S.Gopalan and Co.
For R1 : Mr.C.Venkateshkumar, Special Government Pleader For R2 :
Mr.H.Mohammed Imran for M/s.Ajmal Associates W.P.(MD)No.25238 of 2022 The
Superintending Engineer, Tamil Nadu Electricity Board, Tuticorin Electricity
Distribution Circle, No.131, Ettayapuram Road, Tuticorin - 628 002. ... Petitioner

versus

1. The Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Enforcement), Authority under the
Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to
Workmen) Act, 1981, Tuticorin - 628 101.

2. A.Karuvelmani ... Respondents Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the
Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorari, to call for the
records of

the 1st respondent in Na.Ka.No.E/341/2018 and quash its common order

dated 27.11.2019. For Petitioner : Mr.Anand Gopalan for M/s.T.S.Gopalan and Co. For R1 : Mr.C.Venkateshkumar, Special Government Pleader For R2 : Mr.H.Mohammed Imran for M/s.Ajmal Associates W.P.(MD)No.25239 of 2022 The Superintending Engineer, Tamil Nadu Electricity Board, Tuticorin Electricity Distribution Circle, No.131, Ettayapuram Road, Tuticorin - 628 002. ... Petitioner

versus

1. The Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Enforcement), Authority under the Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981, Tuticorin - 628 101.

2. S.Mari Thangam ... Respondents Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorari, to call for the records of

the 1st respondent in Na.Ka.No.E/342/2018 and quash its common order

dated 27.11.2019. For Petitioner : Mr.Anand Gopalan for M/s.T.S.Gopalan and Co. For R1 : Mr.C.Venkateshkumar, Special Government Pleader For R2 : Mr.H.Mohammed Imran for M/s.Ajmal Associates W.P.(MD)No.25391 of 2022 The Superintending Engineer, Tamil Nadu Electricity Board, Tuticorin Electricity Distribution Circle, No.131, Ettayapuram Road, Tuticorin - 628 002. ... Petitioner

versus

1. The Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Enforcement), Authority under the Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981, Tuticorin - 628 101.

2. E.Ganeshan ... Respondents Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorari, to call for the

records of

the 1st respondent in Na.Ka.No.E/331/2018 and quash its common order

dated 27.11.2019. For Petitioner : Mr.Anand Gopalan for M/s.T.S.Gopalan and Co. For R1 : Mr.S.Vinodh, Government Advocate For R2 : Mr.H.Mohammed Imran for M/s.Ajmal Associates W.P.(MD)No.25392 of 2022 The Superintending Engineer, Tamil Nadu Electricity Board, Tuticorin Electricity Distribution Circle, No.131, Ettayapuram Road, Tuticorin - 628 002. ... Petitioner

versus

1. The Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Enforcement), Authority under the Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981, Tuticorin - 628 101.

2. C.Kombayya Pandiyan ... Respondents Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorari, to call for the records of

the 1st respondent in Na.Ka.No.E/334/2018 and quash its common order

dated 27.11.2019. For Petitioner : Mr.Anand Gopalan for M/s.T.S.Gopalan and Co. For R1 : Mr.S.Vinodh, Government Advocate For R2 : Mr.H.Mohammed Imran for M/s.Ajmal Associates W.P.(MD)No.25393 of 2022 The Superintending Engineer, Tamil Nadu Electricity Board, Tuticorin Electricity Distribution Circle, No.131, Ettayapuram Road, Tuticorin - 628 002. ... Petitioner

versus

1. The Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Enforcement), Authority under the Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981, Tuticorin - 628 101.

2. P.Paramashivan ... Respondents Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorari, to call for the records of

the 1st respondent in Na.Ka.No.E/332/2018 and quash its common order

dated 27.11.2019. For Petitioner : Mr.Anand Gopalan for M/s.T.S.Gopalan and Co. For R1 : Mr.S.Vinodh, Government Advocate For R2 : Mr.H.Mohammed Imran for M/s.Ajmal Associates W.P.(MD)No.25394 of 2022 The Superintending Engineer, Tamil Nadu Electricity Board, Tuticorin Electricity Distribution Circle, No.131, Ettayapuram Road, Tuticorin - 628 002. ... Petitioner

versus

1. The Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Enforcement), Authority under the Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981, Tuticorin - 628 101.

2. S.Thanga Esakkiyaraja ... Respondents Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorari, to call for the records of

the 1st respondent in Na.Ka.No.E/333/2018 and quash its common order

dated 27.11.2019. For Petitioner : Mr.Anand Gopalan for M/s.T.S.Gopalan and Co. For R1 : Mr.S.Vinodh, Government Advocate For R2 : Mr.H.Mohammed Imran for M/s.Ajmal Associates W.P.(MD)No.25395 of 2022 The Superintending Engineer, Tamil Nadu Electricity Board, Tuticorin Electricity Distribution Circle, No.131, Ettayapuram Road, Tuticorin - 628 002. ... Petitioner

versus

1. The Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Enforcement), Authority under the Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to

Workmen) Act, 1981, Tuticorin - 628 101.

2. P.Karpagaraj ... Respondents Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorari, to call for the records of

the 1st respondent in Na.Ka.No.E/335/2018 and quash its common order

dated 27.11.2019. For Petitioner : Mr.Anand Gopalan for M/s.T.S.Gopalan and Co. For R1 : Mr.S.Vinodh, Government Advocate For R2 : Mr.H.Mohammed Imran for M/s.Ajmal Associates W.P.(MD)No.25396 of 2022 The Superintending Engineer, Tamil Nadu Electricity Board, Tuticorin Electricity Distribution Circle, No.131, Ettayapuram Road, Tuticorin - 628 002. ... Petitioner

versus

1. The Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Enforcement), Authority under the Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981, Tuticorin - 628 101.

2. T.Sathaiya ... Respondents Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorari, to call for the records of

the 1st respondent in Na.Ka.No.E/336/2018 and quash its common order

dated 27.11.2019. For Petitioner : Mr.Anand Gopalan for M/s.T.S.Gopalan and Co. For R1 : Mr.S.Vinodh, Government Advocate For R2 : Mr.H.Mohammed Imran for M/s.Ajmal Associates W.P.(MD)No.29089 of 2022

1. The Superintending Engineer, Virudhunagar Electricity Distribution Circle/South, Tamil Nadu Generation and Distribution Corporation, Virudhunagar - 626 001.

2. The Assistant Engineer, East Town Electricity Circle, Tamil Nadu Generation and Distribution Corporation, Rajapalayam, Virudhunagar - 620 127. ... Petitioners

versus

1. The Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Enforcement), Authority under the Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981, Virudhunagar. 2.V.Perumal ... Respondents

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorari, to call for the records of the 1st respondent in Na.Ka.No.2925-12/2011 and quash its order dated 06.07.2020. For Petitioners : Mr.Anand Gopalan for M/s.T.S.Gopalan and Co. For R1 : Mr.C.Venkateshkumar, Special Government Pleader For R2 : No appearance W.P.(MD)No.488 of 2023

1. The Superintending Engineer, Tamil Nadu Electricity Generation and Distribution Corporation, Dindigul Electricity Distribution Circle, Dindigul.

2. The Assistant Engineer, Thandikudi Electricity Division, Tamil Nadu Electricity Generation and Distribution Corporation, Thandikudi. ... Petitioners

versus

1. The Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Enforcement), Authority under the Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981, Dindigul.

2. V.Krishna Kumar ... Respondents

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorari, to call for the records of the 1st respondent in C.P.S.No.62 of 2011 dated 17.05.2022 and quash the same. For Petitioners : Mr.Anand Gopalan for M/s.T.S.Gopalan and Co. For R1 : Mr.C.Venkateshkumar, Special Government Pleader For R2 : No appearance W.P.(MD)No.489 of 2023

1. The Superintending Engineer, Tamil Nadu Electricity Generation and Distribution Corporation, Dindigul Electricity Distribution Circle, Dindigul.

2. The Assistant Engineer, Panchampatti Division, Tamil Nadu Electricity Generation and Distribution Corporation, Pinthanipatti, N.Panchampatti, Dindigul.

... Petitioners

versus

1. The Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Enforcement), Authority under the Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981, Dindigul.

2. V.Eswaran ... Respondents

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorari, to call for the records of the 1st respondent in C.P.S.No.11 of 2013 dated 17.05.2022 and quash the same. For Petitioners : Mr.Anand Gopalan for M/s.T.S.Gopalan and Co. For R1 : Mr.C.Venkateshkumar, Special Government Pleader For R2 : No appearance W.P.(MD)No.490 of 2023

1. The Superintending Engineer, Tamil Nadu Electricity Generation and Distribution Corporation, Dindigul Electricity Distribution Circle, Dindigul.

2. The Assistant Engineer, Panchampatti Division, Tamil Nadu Electricity Generation and Distribution Corporation, Pinthanipatti, N.Panchampatti, Dindigul.

... Petitioners

versus

1. The Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Enforcement), Authority under the Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981, Dindigul.

2. X.Selvam Baskar ... Respondents

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorari, to call for the records of the 1st respondent in C.P.S.No.13 of 2013 dated 17.05.2022 and quash the same. For Petitioners : Mr.Anand Gopalan for M/s.T.S.Gopalan and Co. For R1 : Mr.C.Venkateshkumar, Special Government Pleader For R2 : No appearance W.P.(MD)No.491 of 2023

1. The Superintending Engineer, Tamil Nadu Electricity Generation and Distribution Corporation, Dindigul Electricity Distribution Circle, Dindigul.

2. The Assistant Engineer, Gandhi Village, Division, Tamil Nadu Electricity Generation and Distribution Corporation, Gandhi Village, Dindigul. ... Petitioners

versus

1. The Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Enforcement), Authority under the Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981, Dindigul.

2. J.Asaithambi ... Respondents

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorari, to call for the records of the 1st respondent in C.P.S.No.14 of 2013 dated 17.05.2022 and quash the same. For Petitioners : Mr.Anand Gopalan for M/s.T.S.Gopalan and Co. For R1 : Mr.C.Venkateshkumar, Special Government Pleader For R2 : No appearance W.P.(MD)No.492 of 2023

1. The Superintending Engineer, Tamil Nadu Electricity Generation and Distribution Corporation, Dindigul Electricity Distribution Circle, Dindigul.

2. The Assistant Engineer, Panchampatti Division, Tamil Nadu Electricity Generation and Distribution Corporation, Pinthanipatti, N.Panchampatti, Dindigul. ... Petitioners

versus

1. The Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Enforcement), Authority under the Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981, Dindigul. 2.V.Rajesh Kennedy ... Respondents

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorari, to call for the records of the 1st respondent in C.P.S.No.3 of 2014 dated 17.05.2022 and quash the same. For Petitioners : Mr.Anand Gopalan for M/s.T.S.Gopalan and Co. For R1 : Mr.C.Venkateshkumar, Special Government Pleader For R2 : No appearance

W.P.(MD)No.493 of 2023

1. The Superintending Engineer, Tamil Nadu Electricity Generation and Distribution Corporation, Dindigul Electricity Distribution Circle, Dindigul.

2. The Assistant Engineer, Chinnalampatti Division, Tamil Nadu Electricity Generation and Distribution Corporation, Dindigul. ... Petitioners

versus

1. The Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Enforcement), Authority under the Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981, Dindigul. 2.R.M.Karikalan ... Respondents

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorari, to call for the records of the 1st respondent in C.P.S.No.55 of 2014 dated 17.05.2022 and quash the same. For Petitioners : Mr.Anand Gopalan for M/s.T.S.Gopalan and Co. For R1 : Mr.C.Venkateshkumar, Special Government Pleader For R2 : No appearance

W.P.(MD)No.5030 of 2024

1. The Superintending Engineer, Tamil Nadu Generation and Distribution Corporation, Theni Electricity Distribution Circle, Theni - 625 531.
2. The Assistant Engineer, Surallipatti Division, Surallipatti, Tamil Nadu Electricity Distribution Circle, (TANGEDCO), Theni - 625 516. ... Petitioners

versus

1. The Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Enforcement), Authority under the Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981, Theni.
2. P.Ochadevan ... Respondents

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorari, to call for the records of the 1st respondent in Case No.2055-2/2022 and quash its order dated 13.12.2023. For Petitioners : Mr.Anand Gopalan For R1 : Mr.C.Venkateshkumar, Special Government Pleader For R2 : No appearance

W.P.(MD)No.5031 of 2024

1. The Superintending Engineer, Tamil Nadu Generation and Distribution Corporation, Theni Electricity Distribution Circle, Theni - 625 531.
2. The Assistant Engineer, Erasakanayakanur Electricity Division, Tamil Nadu Electricity Distribution Circle (TANGEDCO), Theni - 625 515. ... Petitioners

versus

1. The Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Enforcement), Authority under the Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981, Theni.
2. S.Kannan ... Respondents

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorari, to call for the records of the 1st respondent in Case No.2055-3/2022 and quash its order dated 13.12.2023. For Petitioners : Mr.Anand Gopalan For R1 : Mr.C.Venkateshkumar, Special Government Pleader For R2 : No appearance W.P.(MD)No.5032 of 2024

1. The Superintending Engineer, Tamil Nadu Generation and Distribution Corporation, Theni Electricity Distribution Circle, Theni - 625 531.

2. The Assistant Engineer, Tamil Nadu Electricity Distribution Circle (TANGEDCO), Rajathani South Pirivu, Andipatti Taluk, Theni - 625 512. ...
Petitioners

versus

1. The Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Enforcement), Authority under the Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981, Theni.

2. J.Kanakaraj ... Respondents

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorari, to call for the records of the 1st respondent in Case No.2055-4/2022 and quash its order dated 13.12.2023. For Petitioners : Mr.Anand Gopalan For R1 : Mr.C.Venkateshkumar, Special Government Pleader For R2 : No appearance W.P.(MD)No.5033 of 2024

1. The Superintending Engineer, Tamil Nadu Generation and Distribution Corporation, Theni Electricity Distribution Circle, Theni - 625 531.

2. The Assistant Engineer, Andipatti Town Electricity Division, Tamil Nadu Electricity Distribution Circle (TANGEDCO), Andipatti, Theni - 625 512. ...
Petitioners

versus

1. The Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Enforcement), Authority under the Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981, Theni.

2. V.Sivaperumal ... Respondents

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorari, to call for the records of the 1st respondent in Case No.2055-5/2022 and quash its order dated 13.12.2023. For Petitioners : Mr.Anand Gopalan For R1 : Mr.C.Venkateshkumar, Special Government Pleader For R2 : No appearance W.P.(MD)No.5034 of 2024

1. The Superintending Engineer, Tamil Nadu Generation and Distribution Corporation, Theni Electricity Distribution Circle, Theni - 625 531.

2. The Assistant Engineer, Kamayagoundenpatti Station, Kamayagoundenpatti, Tamil Nadu Electricity Distribution Circle (TANGEDCO), Theni - 625 521. ...
Petitioners

versus

1. The Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Enforcement), Authority under the Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981, Theni.

2. V.Vijaykumar ... Respondents Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorari, to call for the records of

the 1st respondent in Case No.2055-6/2022 and quash its order dated 13.12.2023. For Petitioners : Mr.Anand Gopalan For R1 : Mr.C.Venkateshkumar, Special Government Pleader For R2 : No appearance W.P.(MD)No.5035 of 2024

1. The Superintending Engineer, Tamil Nadu Generation and Distribution Corporation, Theni Electricity Distribution Circle, Theni - 625 531.

2. The Assistant Engineer, Andipatti West Electricity Division, Tamil Nadu Electricity Distribution Circle (TANGEDCO), Andipatti, Theni - 625 522. ...
Petitioners

versus

1. The Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Enforcement), Authority under the Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981, Theni.

2. C.Chandiran ... Respondents

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorari, to call for the records of the 1st respondent in Case No.2055-7/2022 and quash its order dated 13.12.2023. For Petitioners : Mr.Anand Gopalan For R1 : Mr.C.Venkateshkumar, Special Government Pleader For R2 : No appearance W.P.(MD)No.5036 of 2024

1. The Superintending Engineer, Tamil Nadu Generation and Distribution Corporation, Theni Electricity Distribution Circle, Theni - 625 531.

2. The Assistant Engineer, Gudalur Section, Chinnamanur Division, Tamil Nadu Electricity Distribution Circle (TANGEDCO), Theni - 625 518. ... Petitioners

versus

1. The Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Enforcement), Authority under the Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981, Theni.

2. M.Prasad ... Respondents

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorari, to call for the records of the 1st respondent in Case No.2055-8/2022 and quash its order dated 13.12.2023. For Petitioners : Mr.Anand Gopalan For R1 : Mr.C.Venkateshkumar, Special Government Pleader

For R2 : No appearance W.P.(MD)No.5037 of 2024

1. The Superintending Engineer, Tamil Nadu Generation and Distribution Corporation, Theni Electricity Distribution Circle, Theni - 625 531.

2. The Assistant Engineer, Andipatti West Electricity Division, Tamil Nadu Electricity Distribution Circle (TANGEDCO), Andipatti, Theni - 625 512. ...
Petitioners

versus

1. The Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Enforcement), Authority under the Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981, Theni.

2. K.Sureshpandi ... Respondents

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorari, to call for the records of the 1st respondent in Case No.2055-10/2022 and quash its order dated 13.12.2023. For Petitioners : Mr.Anand Gopalan For R1 : Mr.C.Venkateshkumar, Special Government Pleader For R2 : No appearance W.P.(MD)No.5038 of 2024

1. The Superintending Engineer, Tamil Nadu Generation and Distribution Corporation, Theni Electricity Distribution Circle, Theni - 625 531.

2. The Assistant Engineer, Andipatti Town Electricity Division, Tamil Nadu Electricity Distribution Circle (TANGEDCO), Andipatti, Theni - 625 512. ...
Petitioners

versus

1. The Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Enforcement), Authority under the Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981, Theni.

2. A.Pandi ... Respondents

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorari, to call for the records of the 1st respondent in Case No.2055-11/2022 and quash its order dated 13.12.2023. For Petitioners : Mr.Anand Gopalan For R1 : Mr.C.Venkateshkumar, Special Government Pleader For R2 : No appearance

W.P.(MD)No.5039 of 2024

1. The Superintending Engineer, Tamil Nadu Generation and Distribution Corporation, Theni Electricity Distribution Circle, Theni - 625 531.
2. The Assistant Engineer, Andipatti West Electricity Division, Tamil Nadu Electricity Distribution Circle (TANGEDCO), Andipatti, Theni - 625 512. ...
Petitioners

versus

1. The Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Enforcement), Authority under the Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981, Theni.
2. M.Vijaykumar ... Respondents

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorari, to call for the records of the 1st respondent in Case No.2055-12/2022 and quash its order dated 13.12.2023. For Petitioners : Mr.Anand Gopalan For R1 : Mr.C.Venkateshkumar, Special Government Pleader For R2 : No appearance

W.P.(MD)No.5040 of 2024

1. The Superintending Engineer, Tamil Nadu Generation and Distribution Corporation, Theni Electricity Distribution Circle, Theni - 625 531.

2. The Assistant Engineer, Andipatti West Electricity Division, Tamil Nadu Electricity Distribution Circle (TANGEDCO), Andipatti, Theni - 625 512. ...
Petitioners

versus

1. The Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Enforcement), Authority under the Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981, Theni.

2. M.Nagarajan ... Respondents

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorari, to call for the records of the 1st respondent in Case No.2055-13/2022 and quash its order dated 13.12.2023. For Petitioners : Mr.Anand Gopalan For R1 : Mr.C.Venkateshkumar, Special Government Pleader For R2 : No appearance W.P.(MD)No.5041 of 2024

1. The Superintending Engineer, Tamil Nadu Generation and Distribution Corporation, Theni Electricity Distribution Circle, Theni - 625 531.

2. The Assistant Engineer, Kamayagoundenpatti Section, Kamayagoundenpatti, Tamil Nadu Electricity Distribution Circle (TANGEDCO), Theni - 625 521. ...
Petitioners

versus

1. The Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Enforcement), Authority under the Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981, Theni.

2. A.Thanga Muniyandi ... Respondents

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorari, to call for the records of the 1st respondent in Case No.2055-14/2022 and quash its order dated 13.12.2023. For Petitioners :

Mr.Anand Gopalan For R1 : Mr.C.Venkateshkumar, Special Government Pleader
For R2 : No appearance W.P.(MD)No.5042 of 2024

1. The Superintending Engineer, Tamil Nadu Generation and Distribution Corporation, Theni Electricity Distribution Circle, Theni - 625 531.

2. The Assistant Engineer, Kamayagoundenpatti Section, Kamayagoundenpatti, Tamil Nadu Electricity Distribution Circle (TANGEDCO), Theni - 625 521. ...
Petitioners

versus

1. The Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Enforcement), Authority under the Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981, Theni.

2. I.Muthuraj ... Respondents

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorari, to call for the records of the 1st respondent in Case No.2055-15/2022 and quash its order dated 13.12.2023. For Petitioners : Mr.Anand Gopalan For R1 : Mr.C.Venkateshkumar, Special Government Pleader For R2 : No appearance

W.P.(MD)No.5043 of 2024

1. The Superintending Engineer, Tamil Nadu Generation and Distribution Corporation, Theni Electricity Distribution Circle, Theni - 625 531.

2. The Assistant Engineer, Gudalur Section, Chinnamanur Division, Tamil Nadu Electricity Distribution Circle (TANGEDCO), Theni - 625 518. ... Petitioners

versus

1. The Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Enforcement), Authority under the Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981, Theni.

2. M.Easwaran ... Respondents

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorari, to call for the records of the 1st respondent in Case No.2055-16/2022 and quash its order dated 13.12.2023. For Petitioners : Mr.Anand Gopalan For R1 : Mr.C.Venkateshkumar, Special Government Pleader For R2 : No appearance

W.P.(MD)No.5044 of 2024

1. The Superintending Engineer, Tamil Nadu Generation and Distribution Corporation, Theni Electricity Distribution Circle, Theni - 625 531.

2. The Assistant Engineer, Mathurapuri Section, Mathurapuri, Tamil Nadu Electricity Distribution Circle (TANGEDCO), Theni - 625 531. ... Petitioners

versus

1. The Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Enforcement), Authority under the Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981, Theni.

2. A.Raja ... Respondents

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorari, to call for the records of the 1st respondent in Case No.2055-17/2022 and quash its order dated 13.12.2023. For Petitioners : Mr.Anand Gopalan For R1 : Mr.C.Venkateshkumar, Special Government Pleader For R2 : No appearance W.P.(MD)No.5045 of 2024

1. The Superintending Engineer, Tamil Nadu Generation and Distribution Corporation, Theni Electricity Distribution Circle, Theni - 625 531.
2. The Assistant Engineer, Andipatti East Electricity Division, Tamil Nadu Electricity Distribution Circle (TANGEDCO), Theni - 625 512. ... Petitioners

versus

1. The Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Enforcement), Authority under the Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981, Theni.

2. A.Thangaraja ... Respondents Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorari, to call for the records of

the 1st respondent in Case No.2055-18/2022 and quash its order dated 13.12.2023. For Petitioners : Mr.Anand Gopalan For R1 : Mr.C.Venkateshkumar, Special Government Pleader For R2 : No appearance W.P.(MD)No.5046 of 2024

1. The Superintending Engineer, Tamil Nadu Generation and Distribution Corporation, Theni Electricity Distribution Circle, Theni - 625 531.
2. The Assistant Engineer, Surulipatti Section, Surulipatti, Tamil Nadu Electricity Distribution Circle (TANGEDCO), Theni - 625 512. ... Petitioners

versus

1. The Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Enforcement), Authority under the Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981, Theni.

2. S.Paramasivam ... Respondents

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorari, to call for the records of the 1st respondent in Case No.2055-19/2022 and quash its order dated 13.12.2023. For Petitioners :

Mr.Anand Gopalan For R1 : Mr.C.Venkateshkumar, Special Government Pleader
For R2 : No appearance *****

COMMON ORDER

Since all these writ petitions deal with the proceedings under the Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishments (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981 (hereafter referred to as the Permanent Status Act) as against the Management TNEB/ TANGEDCO, they are taken up together and disposed by way of this common order. 2.For the sake of convenience, the Tamil Nadu Electricity Board shall hereafter be referred to as the Management and the contract labourers shall be referred to as workers. 3.These writ petitions are divided into the following categories: First Category - (i) WP(MD) Nos.25950, 25951, 25952, 25953, 25954 of 2022, 16609 of 2020, WP(MD) No.28176 of 2024 and WP(MD) No.4983 of 2022 have been filed by the Management as against various orders of the Authority under the Permanent Status Act granting permanent status to the respondent labourers.

(ii) WP(MD) Nos. 28821, 28317, 28326, 28229, 28578, 28580, 28603,

28622, 28647, 28670 28686, 28709 of 2025 have been filed by the Management as against the orders of the Authority under the Permanent Status Act granting permanent status to the respondent workers. In fact, in these matters, orders were already passed, assailed before this Court and was remanded back to the Authority under the Permanent Status Act to decide on whether the labourers were engaged for 480 days during the previous 24 calendar months. It was decided by the authority and permanent status has been granted. It is now assailed in these cases. Second category - (i) WP(MD) No.29968 of 2023 is filed by the Management as against the hearing notice issued by the Authority under the 1981 Act. According to the Management, the claim for permanent status of the workmen was already rejected by the Authority under the Permanent Status Act in Na.ka. No.686 of 2010 vide order dated 20.03.2020 and the same was also confirmed by this court vide orders dated 11.04.2022 and 19.04.2022. Despite the same, the impugned hearing notice has been issued.

(ii) WP (MD) No. 20477 of 2021 is filed by the one of the workers as

against the initial order of the Authority dated 20.03.2020 rejecting their claim for permanent status. Third category - WP(MD)Nos.24657 to 24662, 25234 to 25239, 25391 to 25396, 29089 of 2022; 488 to 493 of 2023; 5030 to 5046 of 2024 were filed by the Management challenging the orders of the Authority under the Permanent Status Act granting permanent status to the contract workers. This Court allowed the writ petitions and set aside the

orders of the Authority under the Permanent Status Act by its order

dated 15.09.2025 and provided liberty to the contract employees to approach the Labour Court. These writ petitions are listed before this court under the caption for clarification. 4.The Management herein was constituted under the Electricity (Supply) Act, 1948 (Central Act) on 01.07.1957. It is an industrial establishment as per Section 2(3) of the Permanent Status Act. In order to meet the contingent manpower requirements for the electrification of various parts of the State, the management engaged contract labourers by way of Board Proceedings in between 1978 and 1990. When the Management was about to fill 700 helper posts by way of Direct Recruitment, the contract labourers have claimed preference as they have been engaged by the Management for several years. This matter went up to the Honble Supreme Court of India. In 1991, the Honble Supreme Court appointed Honble Mr.Justice Khalid, a retired judge of the Hon'ble Supreme Court to examine the issue and recommend the criteria to be adopted for the recruitment of helpers. Basis on the recommendations of the Justice Khalid committee, 18,006 contract labourers were absorbed into the services of the Management. Thereafter, 8,500 contract labourers who were engaged from 1993 were identified and paid ex-gratia payment. Again, in 2004 - 2005 and in 2005 - 2006, another 15,600 contract labourers were identified, and ex-gratia payments were made to them. The trade unions representing the contract laborers submitted a demand for the absorption of contract workmen and a settlement under Section 12(3) of the Industrial Disputes Act was reached for the absorption of 21,600 contract labourers as permanent employees in the year 2007. As of the year 2012, contract

labourers who received ex-gratia payments during the years 2011-2012 and continued to provide their services to the management were absorbed into service. A total of 4,037 contract labourers were absorbed into the services of the Management in this process. 5.The Management claims that the engagement of contract labourers was stopped from the year 2012 onwards. However, the Management has maintained the same system and some workers have been engaged as contract labourers by the Management even after 2012. Moreover, some of the contract labourers engaged before 2012 were not absorbed into the services of the Management. The Management has engaged the workers in these writ petitions as contract labourers in essential nature of works such as digging, laying power lines, fixing breakdowns, installing heavy switches and also providing assistance to linemen from 1998 and until the year 2014. Therefore, these workers have made claims under Section 3(1) of the Permanent Status Act that they were employed for more than 480 days during 24 calendar months and are entitled for permanent status. Some of their claims have been allowed by the Authority under the Permanent Status Act and others have been rejected and these writ petitions arise out of these orders of the Authority under the Permanent Status Act. 6.Insofar as the first category of writ petitions is concerned, the common contention of the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the management is that the workers being contract labourers are not entitled to permanency under the Permanent Status Act and hence the impugned orders are liable to be set aside. In support of the same, they have put forth the following submissions: (1)The TNEB/TANGEDCO resorted to the engagement of contract labourers to meet contingent manpower requirements. Agreements known as K2/ Chit agreements were signed for executing works through contractors. These agreements stipulated the amounts payable to the contractors and they in turn paid the contract labourers engaged. The Management has regularised the services of the contract labourers based on the recommendations of the Justice Khalid commission and has entered into a settlement under Section 12(3) of the Industrial Disputes Act on 10.08.2007 for the absorption of leftover contract labourers. Consequently, the engagement of contract labourers by the Management in 2012. Thereafter, the system of engaging contract labourers was regularised and thereafter the contract labourers were engaged as per the Contract Labour

(Regulation and Abolition) Act 1970 (hereafter referred to as Contract Labour Act 1970). (2)The workmen in these writ petitions were admittedly employed as contract labourers and therefore they can make a claim for absorption only before the Labour Court. Hence, the Authority under the Permanent Status Act had no jurisdiction to allow the applications for permanent status filed by the workmen. Further, the Authority under the Permanent Status Act has stepped into the shoes of the Industrial Adjudicator under the Industrial Disputes Act and has addressed complicated questions of law and facts in the impugned orders. (3)There was no employer-employee relationship between the Management and the workmen on the date of filing of the applications and hence there can be no claim for permanency under the Permanent Status Act. As per the decision of the Honble Supreme Court in Umarani vs. Registrar, Cooperative Societies [(2004) 7. SCC 112], the workmen cannot claim backdoor entry into the services. Further, the workmen have been engaged in construction related works and hence they are not entitled for permanency as per Section 7 of the Permanent Status Act.

(4) The workmen failed to establish that they had been engaged for

more than 480 days in 24 calendar months and the certificates issued by the Assistant Engineers do not provide details about the number of days they were engaged as contract labourers. Moreover, some of the workers claim to be employed as contract labourers before 2007. Hence, they can make their claims only with reference to the settlement under Section 12(3) of the Industrial Disputes Act. 7.Insofar as the second category of writ petitions is concerned, it is submitted by the learned counsel appearing for the management that applications filed by the workmen under the Permanent Status Act was

dismissed by the Inspector of Labour in Na.ka. No.686 of 2010 by order

dated 20.03.2020. The workmen have challenged the same by filing WP(MD) No.3775 of 2021, etc Batch and WP(MD) Nos.5972, 5974 and 5975 of 2021 before this court which were dismissed vide orders dated 11.04.2022 and 19.04.2022. However, the workmen have once again filed applications before the Authority under the Permanent Status Act claiming permanent status by incorrectly

representing that their applications had been remanded back for fresh adjudication. On the basis of this wrong representation, the Authority under the Permanent Status Act has sent the impugned notice of hearing dated 05.12.2022 informing that a hearing into the claim of the respondent workmen was to be conducted on 07.12.2022. 8. On the other hand, the common contentions of the learned counsel appearing for the workers in this batch of writ petitions is as follows:

(1) The workmen were engaged by the Management in essential

works such as digging, laying of lines and other works which are perennial in nature and not just in construction related works. (2) The workmen have marked various materials such as their educational qualifications, Petty Cash Book registers and experience certificates issued by the Assistant Engineers of the Management before the Authority under the Permanent Status Act and they have established continuous employment for more than 480 days during 24 calendar months. Further, some of the workmen have also placed materials establishing that payment was directly made to them by the Management. Only after considering the same, the Authority under the Permanent Status Act has allowed the applications filed by the workmen.

(3) The workmen were under the control and supervision of the

Management and they were directly paid wages by the officers of the Management. Hence, there was employer-employee relationship between the Management and the workmen. (4) The Inspector of Labour/ Authority under the Permanent Status Act has been conferred with powers for granting permanent status under Section 5 of the Permanent Status Act. All the workmen were engaged by the Management and hence, it cannot be said that the Inspector of Labour has exceeded his jurisdiction. 9. This court considered the rival submissions and also perused the materials on record. 10. The Permanent Status Act was introduced with the object of curbing the unfair labour practice of continuously engaging workers in industrial establishments on a temporary basis to deny them of the benefits given to the permanent workers. The Act requires that the workmen employed continuously for more than 480 days should be conferred

with permanent status. The Management which is involved in electrification activities is an industrial establishment covered under Section 2(6) of the Permanent Status Act. As per the Act, the term worker includes any person employed in any Industrial establishment to perform work for hire or reward. Therefore, the workers in these writ petitions who were admittedly employed by way of contracts are also included within the definition of workman under the Permanent Status Act and hence they have filed applications under the act claiming permanent status. They have established that they were employed for more than 480 days by marking materials such as Petty Cash Book Register, conduct certificates provided by the officers of the Management and payment receipts before the Inspector of Labour and the Authority under the Permanent Status Act has conferred them with permanent status.

11. The Management has assailed the orders conferring

permanency that the Inspector of Labour cannot entertain the claims of the contract labourers and the workers should approach the Labour Court for the same. However, Section 5 of the Act which deals with the powers and duties of the Inspector of Labour provides that the Inspector of Labour can enter any industrial establishment, examine the registers, records and persons in the industrial establishment and exercise such other powers as may be necessary to carry out the purpose of the Permanent Status Act. Therefore, the Inspector of Labour has the authority to entertain the claims of the workers in these writ petitions. This court also finds that other workers engaged by the Management in essential works which are perennial in nature have approached the Authority under the Permanent Status Act for regularisation and their claims were allowed by the Authority. The Management has filed multiple writ petitions challenging the orders of the Authority under the Permanent Status Act. Such orders of the Authority under the Permanent Status Act has been confirmed by Division Benches of this court and even by the Hon'ble Supreme Court and hence, the Management has implemented the orders of the Authority under the Permanent Status Act granting permanency to contract labourers. Such orders are summarised hereunder for easy reference:

(1) In The Superintending Engineer, Vellore Electricity

Distribution Circle vs. The Labour Inspector, Vellore [2003 SCC Online Mad 810], contract labourers claiming to have worked for more than 480 days under the Management were granted permanency by the Authority under the Permanent Status Act. The Management filed writ petitions against the same claiming that the contract labourers ought to have approached the Labour Court and that the Authority under the Permanent Status Act could not adjudicate on the issues raised by the contract labourers. However, this court rejected such a contention and

held as under:

35. Therefore, I am unable to accept the submission made on

behalf of the Board that the exercise of the power by the Inspector of Labour in conferring permanent status after holding necessary enquiries contemplated under Section 5 read along with Rule 6(4) should be construed as arrogating to himself the powers available to the other adjudicatory forums created under the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947. It will have to be stated that while the exercise of powers vested with the Inspector under the provisions of the Act is summary in nature, the one under the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act may be an elaborate one. Nevertheless the same does not mean that by exercising the power under the provisions of the Act the Inspector of Labour would be trespassing into the adjudication process contemplated under the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act. In this context, if the judgment of the Supreme Court reported in 'Nirchiliya And Others vs. Management Of Safire Theatre, Madras And Another' (1991 (I) L.L.J. 111) is applied, it can be safely held that where there is no prohibition under the provisions of either the Industrial Disputes Act or the Act, exercise of the power in the manner in which it can be done by the Inspector of Labour under the Act cannot be found fault with. It will have to be stated that such an exercise would be well within the statutory

limitations provided under the Act. In fact, in the above referred to judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, the question for consideration was whether the workmen who

initially raised an industrial dispute under the Industrial Disputes Act and who did not pursue it till its logical end when chose to move the authority under the then Madras Shops and Commercial Establishment Act, the Hon'ble Supreme Court

held that in the absence of any prohibition under either of the

enactments, such a course adopted by the workmen cannot be faulted. Therefore, applying the said ratio to the case on hand, it can be safely held that the concerned workmen here were placed in a better footing when they chose to straightaway move the Inspector of Labour under the Act, inasmuch as according to the workmen, having regard to the facts prevailing as on date, they were entitled for the conferment of permanent status as provided under the Act. If such a claim of the workmen was not factually maintainable, it was for the Board to have resisted the said claim with all available materials and could have convinced the Inspector of Labour as the claim ought not to have been countenanced. The Board having miserably failed to perform its duties in the manner expected of it, it cannot be now allowed to contend or complain against the powers exercised by the Inspector of Labour which was within the provisions of the Act. In this context, if the judgment of the Division Bench of this Court reported in Metal Powder Co., Ltd., Thirumangalam and another vs. the state Of Tamil Nadu And Another (1985 II L.L.J. 376) is applied, then also it can be safely held that the Inspector

of Labour was well within his jurisdiction in holding the

proceedings in the manner it was held and in passing the order

by directing the petitioner / Board to confer permanent status on the workmen.

(2) In The Superintending Engineer, Nagapattinam Electricity

Distribution Circle v. the Inspector of Labour and others [2009 [4] MLJ 472], a Division Bench of this court dealt with the issue of enforcement of orders of Inspector of Labour and the claims of the workers who seek for permanent status under the provisions of the Permanent Status Act. The Division Bench held that if the Board as an employer had already conceded to their status as workmen under the Permanent Status Act, then there is no necessity to direct the workers to seek adjudication before the Labour Court. The relevant portions are extracted for easy reference:

23. If this was only a case of adjudication of whether the status of workmen was as directly employed by the Electricity Board or they were employed only as contract labourers, we would have directed that the objection should be considered and an adjudication made in the industrial dispute raised under Section

33(2)(b) of the Industrial Dispute Act. The argument advanced by Shri. Hariparanthaman is that the fate of more than 21,000 workmen was being adjudicated before the Labour Court in I.D. No. 106 of 2003 and that would be the appropriate forum of adjudication. He urged that the petitioner in W.P. No. 27714 of 2007 and connected writ petitions ought to have been directed only to challenge the agreement before the Industrial Tribunal and not by means of writ petition. We have already seen that remedy by writ petition itself is not barred and if the board as an employer has conceded to their status as workmen to whom the provisions of the T.N. Industrial Establishments (Conferment of Permanent Status Act) could be applicable, there is no warrant for directing the parties to seek adjudication before the Industrial Tribunal. We cannot hold that the agreement itself is tainted with any fraud or mala fides. As Shri. P.S. Raman, the learned Additional Advocate General appearing for the Electricity Board says that it is simply a case of the board not allowing itself not to be tied up in knots over a period of time in having adhoc policies of recruitment and feels upstaged when a problem of gigantic proportion has arisen where claims to thousands of men and women were required to be addressed. A public body employing several

thousands of persons could not be blind to realities and engage them in long litigations and if it is found that pragmatism dictated that there ought to be a finality to

litigations and when it had already a judicial decision of a Single Judge directing permanent status to workmen under the Act, the pro-active poser to conclude all litigations by an agreement could not be challenged either as fraudulent or as illegal. Revival of cadre or increase of cadre strength and specifying lesser qualifications commensurate with the nature of work through Board Proceedings could not be faulted, so long as the Regulations provided for creation of such cadre.

(3) In R. Ashok vs. Chairman [2013 SCC OnLine Mad 4063],

contract labourers employed by the Management approached the Inspector of Labour, Karur/ Authority under the Permanent Status Act claiming that they were engaged in essential works such as digging pits, erection of electric poles, construction of transformers and in loading and unloading of line materials for more than 480 days during 24 calendar months. The Inspector of Labour allowed the applications filed by the contract labourers and their services were directed to be regularised. The Management filed a writ petition as against the orders of the Inspector of Labour granting permanent status. Before the Division Bench, the Management specifically raised a legal contention that the workers were contract labourers employed through independent contractors and hence their claims cannot be entertained by the Inspector of Labour and it could only be decided by the Labour Court. A Division Bench of this court specifically rejected such a legal contention by its

order dated 01.02.2013 and the findings of the Division Bench is

summarised as under: (i) The Permanent Status Act is a beneficial enactment introduced with the object of curbing unfair the unfair labour practice of employing workers continuously on a temporary basis to deny them of labour benefits. Hence, the act should be interpreted so as to protect the rights of the workers of

the weaker sections of the society. (ii)The Management is an industrial establishment under Section 2(3) of the Permanent Status Act and the definition of a workmen under Section 2(4) of the Permanent Status Act would include any type of workman including temporary workmen. Hence, the management is governed by the provisions of the act. (iii)The Labour Inspectors appointed under the Permanent Status Act are not paper tigers and have the power to confer permanent status on the workers being employed for more than 480 days during 24 calendar months. (iv)Section 3 of the Act has a non-obstante provision according to which notwithstanding anything contained in any other act, eligible workers can be provided with permanent status. Moreover, there is no bar under the Industrial Disputes Act 1947 for these workers to approach the Authority under the Permanent Status Act. Therefore, it is not mandatory that the workers should approach the Labour Court to seek relief under the Permanent Status Act. (4)The above decision of the Division Bench was challenged by the Management by filing SLP.CC.No.7953 of 2015 and the same was dismissed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court by order dated 30.04.2015.

(5) In The Chairman Tamil Nadu Electricity Board and others vs.

Inspector of Labour, Karur [WA(MD) Nos. 339 and 340 of 2025 dated 24.11.2016], the contract labourers who were engaged by the Management for digging, laying cables, etc raised claims before the Inspector of Labour, Karur/ Authority under the Permanent Status for regularisation. These claims were allowed by the Inspector of Labour and the Management filed writ petitions challenging the order of the Inspector of Labour. Before the Division Bench of this court, the Management raised a contention that the workers were employed as contract labourers and hence the Authority under the Permanent Status Act did not have the jurisdiction to consider their claims. However, the Division Bench rejected such a contention by order dated 24.11.2016 and

held as under:

19.It is a well settled position of law that this Court, in exercise of the jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, cannot re-

appreciate the factual findings rendered by the competent authority unless it is shown that the said findings are perverse or based upon "no evidence". This Court, testing the common order passed by the 1st respondent, is of the considered view that the said official has exercised his statutory power well within the ambit of law and also carefully analysed the documents and other materials placed and rightly reached

the conclusion and thereby ordered conferment of permanent status on the private respondents. Furthermore, since the legal plea raised herein has been settled in the earlier round of litigations, it is not open to the appellants herein to urge the very same point in future litigations and even otherwise, there is no infirmity or perversity attached to the findings rendered by the 1st respondent and therefore, the said order does not warrant interference.

(6) Around 21 claim petitions under the Permanent Status Act were filed by contract labourers employed by the Management between the years 2000 to 2007. It was claimed by them that they were engaged by the Board in various places at the Cuddalore District for more than 480 days. The Inspector of Labour conferred permanency on the contract labourers that the Management is an establishment under section 2(6) of the Permanent Status Act, the workers would be included under the definition of workman under section 2(4) of the Permanent Status Act and the workers were engaged in various works which was prohibited under G.O.Ms.950, Labour and Employment Department dated 08.06.1990. A learned Single Judge of this court directed the Management to implement the above awards in W.P.Nos.7368 -7370, 6626 - 6628, 7066 - 7068 of 2011 dated 31.03.2011, W.P.Nos. 13458 of 2011 etc. dated 15.09.2011 and W.P.Nos.22657 of 2011 etc. dated 10.10.2011. The Management filed W.P.Nos.7368 - 7648, 7654 - 7662, 7666 - 7676, 7680 - 7689, 7693 - 7717, 7740 - 7764, 7781 - 7804 and 7831 - 7841 of 2012, challenging all the awards. A learned Single Judge dismissed the writ petitions by a common order dated 27.03.2012 and held as under: (i) The Standing Counsel for the Management had already agreed to implement the orders of the Inspector of Labour when writ petitions were filed to

implement the awards. (ii)The writ petitions challenging the awards were filed with an inordinate delay of 5 to 7 years and hence was guilty of delay and laches. (iii)The issue was already settled by this court in The Superintending Engineer, Nagapattinam Electricity Distribution Circle v. the Inspector of Labour and others [2009 [4] MLJ 472] wherein it was

held that labourers should not be drawn into long litigations.

As against the above order of the Single Judge, the Management filed W.A.Nos.1340 and 1341 of 2012 which were dismissed by a Division Bench of this court by order dated 10.07.2012. As against the same, the Management filed S.L.P.Nos.24740 to 24741 of 2012. The Hon'ble Supreme Court dismissed the same by order dated 08.04.2013 by observing as under: Heard Mr. L. Nageswara Rao, learned senior counsel for the petitioner.

Special leave petitions are dismissed. However, this will not preclude the petitioner to apply to the High Court for review concerning the matters where the petitioner alleges that awards passed by the Inspector/s of Labour, Cuddalore, Villupuram, Madurai, Erode, Nagappatinam, Theni Division and Salem are forged.

(7) The Management has filed Review Applications in R.A.Nos.89,

103 to 192 of 2015 before this court contending that the awards produced by the workmen were forged. The same was dismissed by a Division Bench of this court by order dated 16.10.2015. As against the dismissal of the Review Applications, the Management filed S.L.P Nos.7222-7312 of 2016 which were also dismissed by the Hon'ble Supreme by order dated 21.08.2018. Thereafter, the Management filed multiple writ petitions once again challenging the orders of the Inspector of Labour in WP. Nos. 21324 of 2011, etc batch and raised a legal contention that the workers who had filed the applications were contract labourers and hence the Inspector of Labour had no jurisdiction to confer permanency on them. However, a Division Bench of this court rejected such a contention and directed the Management to implement the orders of the Inspector of Labour by order dated 02.02.2024. The relevant portion is extracted hereunder for easy reference:

27. Further, the contention of TANGEDCO is that the claim petition is not maintainable before the Inspector of Labour under the Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishments (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981 where contract labours are involved is a legal plea and it is taken up now for the first time. We are unable to agree. We have already extracted their case in the counter in which the said plea is taken. A specific finding is given in respect of said plea in the award. The said award is to be held valid and directed to be implemented. Even in the earliest round decided by the Division Bench in the Superintendent Engineer and Ors. Vs. The Inspector of Labour and Ors., such a plea has been specifically taken and it has been

answered as follows:- 23.If this was only a case of adjudication of whether the status of workmen was as directly employed by the Electricity Board or they were employed only as contract labourers, we would have directed that the objection should be considered and an adjudication made in the industrial dispute raised under Section 33(2)(b) of the Industrial Dispute Act. The argument advanced by Shri. Hariparanthaman is that the fate of more than 21, 000 workmen was being adjudicated before the Labour Court in I.D. No. 106 of 2003 and that would be the appropriate forum of adjudication. He urged that the petitioner in W.P. No. 27714 of 2007 and connected writ petitions ought to have been directed only to challenge the agreement before the Industrial Tribunal and not by means of writ petition. We have already seen that remedy by writ petition itself is not barred and if the board as an employer has conceded to their status as workmen to whom the provisions of the T.N. Industrial Establishments (Conferment of Permanent Status Act) could be applicable, there is no warrant for directing the parties to seek adjudication before the Industrial Tribunal. In any event, the said defence failed in the previous round when

the Writ Petitions were filed to implement the award, cannot now be considered.
12. Therefore, the orders of the Inspector of Labour conferring permanency on

contract labourers has been confirmed by various Division Benches of this court and also by the Hon'ble Supreme Court and the legal contention that the Inspector of Labour cannot entertain the claims of contract labourers has been rejected and hence the management has implemented the orders of the Inspector of Labour conferring permanency on contract labourers. 13. In *Superintending Engineer, Erode vs. Inspector of Labour* [2022 SCC OnLine Mad 1003], the First Bench of this court has approved the

judgment of this court in Superintending Engineer, Vellore Electricity

Distribution Circle (referred supra) and observed as under: 22. In view of the above, while we are of the view that the Labour Inspector has the power to issue appropriate order to grant permanency to the workmen, it cannot be by adjudicating the complicated questions of fact and law. A perusal of the Act of

1981 does not provide power in Labour Inspector of the nature given to the Industrial Adjudicator, i.e., the Industrial Tribunal or Labour Court, as complete framework with procedure for it has been given under the Act of 1947. Certain provisions of the Civil Procedure Code have been made applicable therein for proper adjudication which does not exist under the Act of 1981.

23. If the facts of this case are taken into consideration, we

find that the Labour Inspector has recorded his finding in reference to the Act of 1970 while adjudicating the issue. Such powers have not been conferred on him, rather he can pass appropriate order after summary enquiry

24. The Labour Inspector vested with the power under the Act of 1981 is said to be having a summary power of enquiry, while an elaborate adjudication of questions of fact and law can be only under the Act of 1947.

25. In view of the above, we can safely hold that the Labour Inspector can exercise jurisdiction only in the nature of

summary enquiry, while a case involving complicated question

of fact and law to be left for its adjudication under the Act of

1947. The Labour Inspector can exercise his power under the framework of the Act of 1981. He has no power to adjudicate the issue in reference to other statutes, which includes the Act of 1970.

However, the First Bench after observing as above has only remanded the matters back to the Inspector of Labour for a specific finding regarding whether the workers were engaged for 480 days continuously and not to the Labour Court. Therefore, it is not the case that the claims of the contract labourers for permanency has to be only considered by the Labour Court. Rather, the Inspector of Labour can consider the same and is required to conduct summary enquiry and make a specific finding regarding whether the workers have completed 480 days of continuous employment.

14. However, on the basis of the above observations made by the

First Bench, several Division Benches of this court have taken the view that if a contract labour makes a claim for permanency, the same cannot be entertained by the Inspector of Labour and such claims should only be filed before the Labour Court. In fact, even this court in WP(MD) Nos. 24657 to 24662 of 2022, etc batch dated 15.09.2025 which are listed under the caption for clarification took a stand that the contract labourers cannot raise their claims before the Inspector of Labour and that they can only approach the Labour Court. However, the learned counsels on both sides have brought the above decisions to the attention of this court wherein the legal contention that the Inspector of Labour cannot entertain applications from contract labourers has already been rejected and such workers were conferred with permanency. 15. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in a recent decision in Jaggo vs. Union of India [2024 INSC 1034] held that public employers cannot resort to labour exploitation by using outsourcing to deny various benefits to long serving workmen. It was also clarified by the court that the decision of the court in Umarani (supra) cannot be misinterpreted or misapplied to deny the legitimate claims of long-serving employees. The relevant portions are extracted

as under:

22. The pervasive misuse of temporary employment contracts, as exemplified in this case, reflects a broader systemic issue that adversely affects workers' right and job security. In the private sector, the rise of the gig economy has led to an increase in precarious employment arrangements, often characterized by lack of benefits, job security, and fair treatment. Such practices have been criticized for exploiting workers and

undermining labour standards. Government institutions, entrusted with upholding the principles of fairness and justice, bear an even greater responsibility to avoid such exploitative employment practices. When public sector entities engage in misuse of temporary contracts, it not only mirrors the detrimental trends observed in the gig economy but also sets a concerning precedent that can erode public trust in governmental operations. .

26. While the judgment in Uma Devi (supra) sought to

curtail the practice of backdoor entries and ensure appointments adhered to constitutional principles, it is regrettable that its principles are often misinterpreted or misapplied to deny

legitimate claims of long-serving employees. This judgment

aimed to distinguish between illegal and irregular appointments. It categorically held that employees in irregular appointments, who were engaged in duly sanctioned posts and had served continuously for more than ten years, should be considered for regularization as a one-time measure. However, the laudable intent of the judgment is being subverted when institutions rely on its dicta to indiscriminately reject the claims of employees, even in cases where their appointments are not

illegal, but merely lack adherence to procedural formalities. Government departments often cite the judgment in Uma Devi

(supra) to argue that no vested right to regularization exists for temporary employees, overlooking the judgment's explicit acknowledgment of cases where regularization is appropriate. This selective application distorts the judgment's spirit and purpose, effectively weaponizing it against employees who have rendered indispensable services over decades.

27. In light of these considerations, in our opinion, it is

imperative for government departments to lead by example in providing fair and stable employment. Engaging workers on a temporary basis for extended periods, especially when their roles are integral to the organization's functioning, not only contravenes international labour standards but also exposes the organization to legal challenges and undermines employee morale. By ensuring fair employment practices, government institutions can reduce the burden of unnecessary litigation, promote job security, and uphold the principles of justice and fairness that they are meant to embody. This approach aligns with international standards and sets a positive precedent for the private sector to follow, thereby contributing to the overall betterment of labour practices in the country.

16.As per the above judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, the Management, being a public employer, should also not be allowed to misuse temporary contracts, meant to fulfil short term or seasonal requirements, to defeat its long-term obligations to the workers. 17.Further, the Honble Supreme Court has held in State of Uttar Pradesh vs. Arvind Kumar Srivastava [(2015) 1 SCC 347] that when a particular set of employees are granted relief by the court, all other identically situated persons need to be treated alike by extending that benefit. Not doing so would amount to discrimination and would be violative of Article 14 of the Constitution of India. Therefore, when contract labourers employed with the

Management have previously been conferred with permanent status and the same has also been approved by this court and the Hon'ble Supreme Court in multiple instances, then the workers who are similarly placed contract labourers should also be extended the same benefit of permanent status. 18. Considering the decisions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court and the Division Benches of this court and in light of the above discussion, the writ petitions under each category is disposed in the manner detailed hereunder. 19. Insofar as the first category of writ petitions are concerned, this court finds as under: (1) The Management is an industrial establishment covered under section 2(3) of the Permanent Status Act. (2) The Inspector of Labour is the competent authority under the Permanent Status Act to confer permanent status on the workers who have been engaged by an industrial establishment for more than 480 days. (3) The contract labourers are workers under section 2(4) of the Permanent Status Act and have been engaged in perennial nature of works such as digging, laying power lines, attending breakdowns and also in maintenance works. They have established before the Authority under the Permanent Status Act that they have worked for more than 480 days during a period of 24 calendar months on the basis of materials such as Petty Cash Book Register, conduct certificates provided by the officers of the Management and payment receipts. (4) The Permanent Status Act was enacted in order to curb unfair labour practices wherein the benefits of permanent employees are denied to certain set of workers by engaging them on a temporary basis. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Jaggo vs. Union of India* [2024 INSC 1034] has held that public employers cannot resort to labour exploitation by using outsourcing to deny benefits to long serving workmen. It was also clarified by the Hon'ble Supreme Court that the decision of the court in *Umarani's* case cannot be misinterpreted or misapplied to deny the legitimate claims of long-serving employees. The workers involved in these writ petitions were engaged as contract labourers through K2/ Chit agreements by the officers of the management. They have provided many years of service performing essential tasks such as the digging, laying lines, maintenance works, etc. Therefore, the engagement of the respondent workmen cannot be termed to be an illegal appointment and hence the principles in *Uma Ranis* case (supra) is not applicable to the workers. (5) The main contention of the management is that the workers have been engaged as contract

labourers and that they are not entitled for permanent status. However, the notification issued under Section 10 of the Contract Labour Contract Labour (Regulation and Abolition) Act, 1970 prohibits the nature of works such as transformer maintenance, fuse of call, sick transformers repairing work and maintenance of street lights which is being carried out by the workers in these writ petitions. Therefore, the contention of the management cannot be accepted. (6) By following the recommendations of the Justice Khalid Commission, around 21,000 contract labourers were already regularised and absorbed into service of the management. Further, multiple orders have been passed by this court confirming the order of the Authority under the Permanent Status Act conferring permanent status on contract labourers and these orders have also been confirmed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court and the issue has attained finality.

(7) As per the decision of the Honble Supreme Court in State of

Uttar Pradesh vs. Arvind Kumar Srivastava [(2015) 1 SCC 347], similarly situated persons should be treated similarly with regards to labour benefits. Therefore, when a particular set of workers are granted relief by the court, all other identically situated persons need to be treated alike by extending the same benefit. 20. In light of the orders of multiple Division Benches of this court confirming the permanent status provided to contract labourers which were also affirmed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court and accepted by the management and also the recent decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Jaggo vs. Union of India [2024 INSC 1034], this court is not inclined to interfere in the impugned orders of the Authority under the Permanent Status Act conferring permanency on the workmen. Therefore the writ petitions in the first category in WP(MD) Nos. 25950, 25951, 25952, 25953, 25954 of 2022, 16609 of 2020, WP(MD) No. 28176 of 2024, WP(MD) No. 4983 of 2022, WP(MD) Nos. 28821, 28317, 28326, 28229, 28578, 28580, 28603, 28622, 28647, 28670 28686, 28709 of 2025 filed by the management are dismissed. The management is directed to implement the orders of the Authority under the Permanent Status Act within a period of 3 months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. The workmen shall be provided with continuity of service and attendant benefits. However, they shall not be entitled to any back wages. No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed. 21. Insofar as

the second category of writ petitions is concerned, this court finds as under: (1)The workers involved in this category with a claim that they were engaged by the Management in works such as digging, laying cables, pole erection, replacement of damaged pole and other maintenance works from 2004 to 2008 have approached the Authority under the Permanent Status Act for the conferment of permanent status. The Authority has rejected the claim of the workmen in Na.ka. No. 686 of 2010 vide order dated 20.03.2020 on the ground that they were involved in construction work and not entitled for permanent status under Section 7 of the Permanent Status Act. (2)Some of the workmen have challenged the same by filing WP(MD) No.3775 of 2021, etc Batch and WP(MD) Nos.5972, 5974 and 5975 of 2021 before this court. This court disposed WP(MD) No.3775 of 2021, etc Batch vide order dated 11.04.2022 and held that there was no infirmity with the order of the Inspector of Labour rejecting the applications filed by the respondent workers. The relevant portion is extracted as under:

2. In view of the judgment of the Hon'ble First Bench of this Court, there is no infirmity as such in respect of the orders passed by the Inspector of Labour declining the claim of the writ petitioners for grant of permanent status under the provisions of the Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishments (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981.

3. Accordingly, all the writ petitions are disposed of. No

costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed. (3)Similarly, the writ petitions in WP(MD) Nos. 5972, 5974 and 5975 were also disposed vide order dated 19.04.2022 that there was no infirmity with the order of the Inspector of Labour. (4)No doubt, the court in the above decisions referred to a decision of the First Bench of this court in Superintending Engineer, Erode vs. Inspector of Labour reported [2022 SCC OnLine Mad 1003] wherein the matters were remanded back to the Authority for fresh determination. However, this court has not remanded back the matters involved in this category and has held that there is no infirmity with the orders of the Authority under the Permanent Status Act. It appears that no writ appeal as against the same has been filed by the workmen. (5)In such a circumstance, the workmen have once again approached the Inspector of Labour

claiming that the matters were remanded by this court and the impugned hearing notice was issued on the basis of the same. Since the matter was never remanded back by this court, the Authority under the Permanent Status Act cannot entertain the very same claims once again. (6) From the materials, it also appears that the Authority under the Permanent Status Act has gone ahead with the proceedings and has passed orders in Na.ka. No.2055/2022 granting permanent status to the workmen vide orders dated 13.12.2023. The Management did not take part in the proceedings and the Inspector of Labour has passed the orders on an incorrect basis that the matters were remanded back to the Authority by this court. 22. In light of the above findings, WP(MD) No.29968 of 2023 filed by the management is allowed and the impugned hearing notice is set aside. WP (MD) No. 20477 of 2021 filed by one of the workers is dismissed. Since the issue has already been decided by the Authority under the Permanent Status Act and the same was also confirmed by this court, the workmen cannot raise the very same claim again. Therefore, the consequential orders passed by the Authority under the Permanent Status Act in Na.ka. No. 2055/2022 dated 13.12.2023 are also set aside. It is open to the workmen to work out their remedy as against orders of this court whereby their writ petitions as against the orders of the Authority under the Permanent Status Act was dismissed. No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed. 23. Insofar as WP(MD) Nos.24657 to 24662, 25234 to 25239, 25391 to 25396, 29089 of 2022; 488 to 493 of 2023; 5030 to 5046 of 2024 in the third category listed under the caption for clarification is concerned, since the previous decisions of the Division Benches of this court and the decisions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court confirming the permanent status conferred on the contract labourers has been brought to the attention of this court by the learned counsels on both sides when the other writ petitions are taken up for hearing, this court is inclined to recall the orders passed in WP(MD) Nos.24657 to 24662 of 2022, etc batch dated 15.09.2025 so that the issues involved in those writ petitions can also be considered on the basis of the decisions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court. The Registry is directed to list the same as per roster. Internet : Yes 30.04.2026 gk To

1. The Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Enforcement) Authority under the Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act 1981, Virudhunagar.

2. The Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Enforcement), Theni, Theni District.
3. The Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Enforcement), Authority under the Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981, Thoothukudi - 628 101.
4. The Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Enforcement) Authority under Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, Madurai - 625 016.
5. The Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Enforcement), Authority under the Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981, Dindigul.
6. The Superintending Engineer, Theni Electricity Distribution Circle, TANGEDCO, Theni District.
7. The Assistant Engineer, O&M, Theni Electricity Distribution Circle, TANGEDCO / Thevaram II, Theni District.
8. Joint Director of Industrial Safety and Health - I, Authority under the Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishments (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981, Madurai.

B.PUGALENDHI, J.

gk WP(MD)Nos.16609 of 2020; 20477 of 2021; 4983, 25950 to 25954 of 2022; 29968 of 2023; 28176 of 2024; 28229, 28317, 28326, 28578, 28580, 28603, 28622, 28647, 28670, 28686, 28709, 28821 of 2025 and WP(MD)Nos.24657 to 24662, 25234 to 25239, 25391 to 25396, 29089 of 2022; 488 to 493 of 2023; 5030 to 5046 of 2024 30.04.2026

SooperKanoon - India's Premier Online Legal Search - sooperkanoon.com