# Misconduct in Employment

**B.R.GHAIYE** 

2nd. Edition

EASTERN BOOK CO.

## MISCONDUCT IN EMPLOYMENT

(in Public and Private Sector)

### B. R. GHAIYE

B.A., LL.B.

Legal Advisor

The Birla Cotton Spg. & Wvg. Mills Ltd.

Author of: Law and Procedure of Departmental Enquiries

Eastern Book Co. (Sales) Kashmere Gate Delhi-6 (Tele. 227616)

Manav Law House Block 8, Flat 2, Hastings Road Entension, Allahabad (Td. 3869)

FIRST EDITION, 1969
SECOND EDITION, 1977
REPRINTED 1981
REPRINTED 1982
(With Revised chapter on latest case law)

Price Rs. 125.00

#### PREFACE TO SECOND EDITION

The first edition was published in the year 1969 and during the span of 8 years there has been considerable addition to the case law. In the present edition the case law upto January, 1977 has been incorporated. Further case law which could not be incorporated has been given at the end so as to bring the case law upto the end of May, 1977.

In writing the second edition opportunity has been taken to re-arrange or sub-divide some chapters for greater facility of reference. A chapter namely "EMPLOYMENT IN GOVERNMENT SERVICE AND CONDUCT RULFS" has been added to provide a commentary on the Government Conduct Rules. The matter was previously scattered in other chapters but it has now been consolidated. It is hoped that now the book will be found to be equally useful for Government as well as Industrial employment.

A misconduct on the part of an employee is basically violation of obligation imposed on the employee by the conditions of service. Such conditions of service may be regulated by law, service rules or contract of service. Where an employee is charged with misconduct it is sometimes necessary to find out the exact scope of service conditions to decide whether a particular obligation was or was not imposed on an employee. The Author has, therefore, tried to discuss the various employment regulations which are imposed on an employee either by common law, statutory provisions, service rules or contract. It is hoped that this will lead to better understanding of the subject.

The book will be found very useful for employees and trade union rights because if on account of misconception of legal position they embark on an authorised action then the consequences for them are very serious. They are not only liable to lose the employment but in certain cases the retirement benefits amounting to considerable amount are liable to be reduced or forfeited and provision for their old age is likely to be jeopardised.

Although the book was out of print for the last 2-3 years and there were persistent demands for the next edition but it was not possible to bring out the second edition of the book on account of preoccupations as well as the fact that re-organisation of the book required considerable efforts and time. The Author has been encouraged by the response of the public to the earlier edition and hopes that this edition will be found still more useful by the readers.

The Author takes the opportunity to thank Shri Gopal Singh, B. A., I.L. B. for checking the case law; Shri R. C. Garg, Senior Stenographer and Shri Ashok Diwakar for assistance in completion of the revised edition. The Author is also thankful to other well wishers and readers who have been making valuable suggestion from time to time.

B. R. Chaire

DLLHI: July 10, 1977

#### PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION

The growth of labour law has highlighted the importance of misconducts in employment. Previously the services of an employee could be terminated at will and it was, therefore, not very important to decide whether or not he was guilty of a misconduct. Since the right of employer to terminate the services was restricted, it became very necessary to find out whether an employee is or is not guilty of misconduct. From the point of view of employee also the decision of misconduct has assumed greater importance When there were little or no retiring benefits and practically no stakes in service, the termination of the services meant little to him. Now-a-days the economic impact of dismissal on the employee is considerable. He may lose thousands of rupees on account of loss of gratuity and other retiring benefits, loss of his due leaves, reduction of employer's contribution to provident fund in case of dismissal alongwith the difficulty of getting a new employment. Thus, the employee has acquired considerable stakes in defending himself against the charge of misconduct. The employer has also a stake in the sense that if the charge of misconduct fails and he is required to pay the back wages, then the amounts are generally considerable. Hence, a proper determination of the commission of misconduct has assumed considerable importance and this importance is still increasing day-by-day. The importance of determination of misconduct in public sector has also increased on account of constitutional protections. During the last 20 years a mass of case law, not only by the High Courts and Supreme Court, but also by the Labour Appellate Tribunals, Industrial Tribunals and Labour Courts etc., has been published, either in the Law Reports or in various State Gazettes. No attempt has, however, been made to collect, analyse and co-relate them for the purpose of evolving the correct concept of misconduct. The correct understanding of the principles is very necessary not only in case of officers of a large organisation but also for every employee and union leader. The Author found difficulties in understanding the subject for the purpose of applying the principles in day-to-day problems of the Personnel Department looked after by him and this necessitated a thorough study of the subject which ultimately culminated in the present book. The Author feels that similar difficulties must be experienced by other officers as well as employees and the Author will be well rewarded if this book helps them in solving their problems.

In writing the book the Author has kept in mind the necessity of expressing various legal propositions in very simple and practical language so that they can easily be understood by the lay-men. At the same time, the requirements of the busy legal practitioners have also been kept in mind and all available cases have been quoted. The book will also be found useful

by the persons who want to make advanced study of the subject. Though the book is mainly based upon the case law as evolved by the courts and industrial adjudication, yet the Author has tried to co-ordinate the different decisions into legal propositions and explain their justification as well as their historical evolution.

The various misconducts were formulated in private employment by the Model Standing Orders mentioned in the Industrial Employment (Standing Orders) Rules, 1946. The Industrial Employment (Standing Orders) Rules, 1946, required all establishments having more than 100 employees to frame Standing Orders on the lines of the Model Standing Orders. The Standing Orders have been framed in all the large industrial establishments on the lines of the Model Standing Orders. The various courts and tribunals had the occasion to interpret, clarify and apply the misconducts as contained in the Standing Orders. Wherever the industrial adjudication had an occasion to frame the misconduct, it has also taken its colour from the Model Standing Orders.

In practically all the Standing Orders, including the Model Standing Orders, wilful insubordination and disobedience of legal and reasonable orders is misconduct. Another misconduct is 'an act subversive of discipline' and 'riotous or disorderly behaviour on the premises'. Thus the Model Standing Orders have classified the misconducts as 'Disobedience', 'Insubordination', 'Subversive of Discipline', 'Riotous and disorderly behaviour on the premises'. The classification is overlaping. The disobedience and insubordination may also be subversive of discipline. The riotous behaviour on the premises is a misconduct, but the riotous behaviour outside the premises may also be misconduct if it is comprised in 'subversive of discipline'. The classification, therefore, does not denote distinct misconducts but it denotes different standpoints for judging whether a particular act falls into misconduct or not. The author has adopted the same classification because if the author would have adopted any other classification then it would have been difficult to apply the same to the facts of a particular case in the existing circumstances. This has led to some duplicacy in as much as a particular misconduct has to be discussed at more than one place from more than one standpoint, but this was unavoidable. If any reader wants to know how a particular act is misconduct from different standpoints, then he may take the assistance of Index for this purpose.

The concept of misconduct in its comprehensive sense includes the concept of rights and obligations of employees. The misconduct can be termed as 'breach of an express or implied obligation on the part of an employee'. It is, therefore, very necessary to understand what are the rights and obligations of employees on a particular point. The author has kept this in mind and has tried to elucidate the rights and obligations of employees in respect of different matters, such as 'strike', 'picketing', 'defamation' etc., which will give a clearer insight into the circumstances in which the act can be said to constitute a misconduct.

PREFACE VII

The Author is conscious of some defects in printing which are inevitable in such a large project. The author would be thankful if the readers will point out any mistake or give any suggestion for improvement of the book. If any reader wants any clarification on any of the points mentioned in this book, he is most welcome to contact the Author.

The Author has avoided the quotation of unnecessary case law of non-Indian origin. In India every branch of law is influenced by the constitutional principles, especially the fundamental rights. The concept of misconduct is also influenced by such statutory law as the Law of Contract, Law of Penal Code and Labour Laws such as Factories Act, Industrial Disputes Act etc. The cases decided outside India generally decided in different set-up and in a number of cases they may not be suitable for India. In the opinion of the Author it is better to rely mainly on Indian cases. In India some of the concepts relating to misconducts such as 'theft', 'criminal breach of trust', 'misappropriation', 'forgery', 'falsification of accounts', 'defamation', 'abuse' etc., have been taken from the Criminal Law of India and the Industrial Tribunals have generally adopted the same concept in deciding whether a particular act falls in the aforesaid misconducts or not. The Author, therefore, has tried to clarify at appropriate places what such concept mean in Criminal Law and how the concept of Criminal Law has been applied in industrial adjudication and, if so, with what restrictions and exceptions.

At the end of each chapter the author has given not only the case law of framing the charge relating to the misconduct discussed in that chapter but also the specimen charge-sheets. The author is conscious of the fact that whenever a misconduct is attributed to an employee, either in private or public employment, that is necessarily followed by a charge-sheet and departmental enquiry. Though the departmental inquiry is not the subject-matter of the present book, still while discussing the individual misconducts case law regarding the framing of the charge and the management or defence evidence in relation to that misconduct is also given at the appropriate place so that the book may be more useful to the persons concerned. The Author hopes that this will be found useful to the persons for whom it is meant.

The Author is thankful to his colleague and friend Mr. K. K. Khullar, Industrial Law Adviser and previously Deputy Secretary to the Punjab and Delhi Chamber of Commerce for valued discussion and advice. The Author is also thankful to his daughter Nirmal Ghaiye, M.A., Mr. Hanuwant Singh, Labour Officer, Birla Cotton Mills, Mr. R. N. Rai, Labour Law consultant and Mr. Ramesh Chandra Garg, Birla Cotton Mills for the assistance rendered by them in preparation of the book. The author also thanks all his friends and colleagues who have inspired and encouraged him to undertake and finish the present project.

#### TABLE OF CASES

A A - D						000
A, A. v. B.  — Chinniah and Others v. Dalmia Cement (Bharat)	Ted	4.4	105 106	200 9	111	328
O Mariana Danama Manininalian			185, 186,			
— Thomas v. Pearless Carbon Compay		419	* *			344 204
— D. Cotton Mills Ltd. v. Workmen		* *	* *			589
Ch. J. Dhanet Containing (D.s.) Tad	* *	* *	*.*			627
- G. v. Goddard	* *	4.4				651
— Patel v. State of Gujarat						79
- I. C. Fox Collison Gilbreath, R. E. Sutton, Orvil	le Hutch	nine Tohn	S Tones	Manhi		19
N. Dustin, Merril C. Hutchins, H. M. Childers, V	Varren S	Morden	Edward	E O		
Neill, Philip Edgar Ferris v. Summit King Mines				1.0.,		204
- K. Jagdish Kumar v. Automative Mfrs. (Pvt.) Ltd			* *	-	20	
Madhawan a Ananda Rhawan	u.				239,	
- Madhawan v. Ananda Bhawan			* *			678
	* *		* *		523,	
- N. D'silva v. Union of India	* *	* *	* *		330,	
- R y v. Lummus Company (India), Dhiwaran		* *	4 4		40,	
<ul> <li>P. Tewari v. Allahabad Bank</li> <li>R. Natraj Aiyer v. Trichy Srirangam Transport C</li> <li>R. D. Deshpande v. Union of India</li> <li>&amp; S. Henry &amp; Co. Ltd. v. Workmen</li> </ul>	o Ted	* *	* *			249
- R. Natraj Alver v. Trichy Strangam Transport C	o. Liu.	* *		592, 8		
- R. D. Desilpande V. Onion of India	4 ( 4)			66, 1		
<ul> <li>&amp; S. Henry &amp; Co. Ltd. v. Workmen</li> <li>Stanley Benjamin (Mrs.) v. The D. S. Central Ra</li> </ul>	* 1	97			* *	27
- Stanley Benjamin (Mrs.) v. The D. S. Central Ka	iiiway,	Jhansi	* *			112
- S. Naidu v. Supdt. of Post Offices	* *	* *				669
- Razoi v. Divisional Engineer, Telegraphs			* *			532
- Shankaranarayana Rao v. State of Mysore	* *	* *				186
- Shiyananda Sarvana v. Divisional Commissioner	* *	16 E	* *			269
- T. Dey Ltd. v. Anil Kumar Basak	* #	* *	(# L.W.	527, 5		
	(0) (0)	n: 4				734
	. * *			5	37,	
Abanibhushan Biswas v. Hindustan Cables Ltd.					* *	46
Abduiali v. Mirza Khan						298
Abdul Azees Rothen Re					* *	862
- Aziz v. State of Mysore		* *				79
— v. Selva Vinaynegar Bus Service		* *	* *		* *	
— v. Steel Structures (Pvt.) Ltd.	* *	* *	* *			725
— Khan v. Union of India	7 . 1 . 4.1			0.11		876
- Gaffar Gulam Kadar v Silver Cotton Mills Co.				341, 3	351,	
- Gani Muzaffar Khan v. Matchwell Electricals (In	ndia) Lt	d.			* *	714
- Hamid v. King Emperor			4.4			390
- Khader v. Consolidated Coffee Estate Ltd.			* *	53,	168,	
- Khalik Rauzu v. State of Jammu & Kashmir		40.8	4.4		* *	82
- Latif v. New Prakash Transport Co	* *	* *	4.4		+ +	307
- Mohinddin v. Narainsinghirji Mfg. Co. Ltd., Sh	olapur	4.9			4.4	340
- Qadar v. Regi nal Dy. Director of Publ c Instru	ictions	* *	* *		260,	262
- Rahim v. A. P. S Road Transport Corporation		* *	+ +		W. W.	289
— — Khan v. Municipal Committee	**	0.0	* *			129
- Rehman v. D. Ramgiah	* 4	4.4			* *	658
Abdullah v. Mohammed	F (F)					344
- Shariff v. Mohammad Ali			* *			337
Abid Ali Danish Ali v. Pehlawi Behary, Bombay	* *		4.8		777,	778
Abraham v. State	* *		90.00			565
Abzal Rehman v. King Emperor					10.116	782
Adair v. U. S.	* *		4.9			478
Adam v. Maison de Lusae Ltd.	* *		* *			329
Wantock & Frank Smith v. Armour & Co.						197
Adambhai Valibhai v. Maheshwari Mills Ltd. Guja	rat	* *				164
Adhir Ghose v. Patna Electric Supply Co.	* *	* *				681
Adikando Satpathi v. State	4.4		* *			782
Aditya Milly Ltd n. Ram Daval			* *			449
Adverd C. Chanein v. Pansalvaina Kelations Board			* 4			167
Advertising Corporation of India Ltd. v. B. C. Nag						568
Advocate Re	* *	* *				816
A PAGE TO THE PAGE						

					P	ages
Acklam v. Sentinel Insurance Co.						321
Aeron Steel Rolling Mills v. Narsappa Bhimappa	b. 4				* *	672
Agarpara Co. Ltd. v. Workmen						283
— Jute Mills Ltd. v. Janardan Singh				541,	552,	553
— — — v. Sukhdeo Roy	40.00	* *			540,	
Agnani v. Badri Das		* *				, 69
Agnihotrau Ananthraschayulu v. Executive Officer						177
Agra Electric Supply Co. Ltd. v. Alldin	* * *	4.4				45
Ahmed Hassan v. Chief Commissioner for Manipur						86
Ahmedabad Commercial Mills Ltd. v. Mohammad	Umar				574,	
- Co.ton Mfg. Co. Ltd. v. Harihar Mahanand		* *	ar out			279
- Electricity Co. Ltd., Ahmedabad v. Dhuli Hira					544,	
- Jayabharat Cotton Mills Ltd. v. Textile Labour	Association					622
- Keser-Hind Mills Ltd. v. Geddalal Chhotelal					2 2	127
- Laxmi Cotton Mills Co. Ltd. v. Abdulla Khan I	Mohammed	Safi Khan				772
— — — — Baburam Gangadin						146
- Mfg. & Calico Printing Co. Ltd. v. Ashashai Ka	driabhai	0.00				687
v. Jagjivandas Vithaldas		7.5			624,	
v. Keshaylal Kanjibhai						
	* *		* 4		* *	596
v. Textile Labour Association			252	240	411	348
————— v Waghjee Shivjee	***	* *	250,	349,	411,	414
— Misc Industrial Workers Union v. Ahmedabad I	Clasterisity C	o Ttd Ahm	33/,	361,	309,	
New Testile Mills Co. I td. v. Dhannahankar M	anilal Trive	o, Ltd. Ann	iedab			25
- New Textile Mills Co. Ltd. v. Bhanushanker M	tannai i rive	:UI		360,	366,	
— Sarangpur Mills Co. v. I. T.	1	11	* *			49
- Spg. & Míg. Co. Ltd., Ahmedabad v. Vrajlal Is	nwaruai		*: *:			121
Ahuja Stores Ltd v. Workmen	* *		× 14		1.0	809
Air Conditioning Corporation (Pvt.) Ltd. v. Works	nen	7. 9	* *		*.*	750
— S. L. Bhatnagar	(4) 8		* *			561
Air India Ltd. v. Lobo	* 10		* *			522
——— v. S. Lobo	* *	4.40	601,	603,	617,	626
— — v. Their Workmen	* *	1.5				604
Airlines Hotels (Pvt.) Ltd. v. Workmen	* *	4.4	6.8			283
Ajanta Art Printers v. Its Workmen	1.7	8.9				411
Ajit Kumar Kunda v. State of West Bengal		**				361
- Mills Ltd., Ahmedabad v. Bhagwant Prasad	(w. K					117
- Singh, Constable v. Kirpal Singh, D I. G.	4.4	4.4				89
Akal Transport Co. (Pvt.) Ltd. v. Workmen	x. x		4.4			759
Akbarali Kasamali Ravajani v. N. G. Pandya	4.7	* *			6.9	66
Akshay Chandra Bose v. Emperor		4.4	2.5			818
Ala Perfection Mattress & Spring Co. v. Dupree						660
Albert Bonnan v. Imperial Tobacco Co.						327
Alderson B. & Bonzorn v. Ottoman Bank		4.4				308
Alembic Chemical Works Co. Ltd. v. Bhiku Ramji						643
———— v. Madhosing Bajobasing					000,	665
Algappa Textiles (Cochin) Ltd. v. Workmen						125
Ali Altaf Hussain v. Gulam Rahman Mallik		* *			* *	727
Aligarh Municipal Board v. Ekka Tonga Mazdoor	Union					299
Alihasan Manula v. Ahmedabad Ramkrishna Mille	Co Ahemo	lahad	* *			
Alindranath Mukherjee v. G. V. Gillot	oo, mining	iavau				544
	* *	* *	* *			687
All India Bank Employees Association v. I. T.		* *	. 0.00	4.40	405	441
— — — v. National Industrial Tribunal	* *	* *		442,	495,	
Union v. National Industrial Tribunal		1000	* *			91
- Railwaymen's Federation v. Union of India	11.47(4)	10.00	* *		6.0	75
— Sugar Mills v. Sundersingh		* *			* *	319
- Orissa Transport Employees Union v. State of C	Jrissa.		4.4			473
———— & the State Transport Employee	s Union v. S	state of Oris	sa	763,	886,	, 887
Allahabad Bank Ltd. v. Chaturvedi	**	4.4	* *		4.4	822
- J. K. Cotton Spg. & Wvg. Mills Co. Ltd. v.	Textile Mil	ls in Kanp	ur &	The	ir	
Workmen		***			w: A	407
Allibhoy Sharafalty & Co., (Pvt.) Ltd. v. Nandlal	Mahabali			191,	192	
Allison v. General Council of Medical Education a	nd Registrat	ion				64
Alopati Swarma Krishnayya v. Alopati Kesivaswar	athan					761
Amalgamated Chemicals Dyestuffs Co. Ltd. v W	orkmen			128.	327	
- Engineering Union v. Minister of Pensions & N	lational Insu	rance				18
- Tea Estate Co. Ltd. v. Union						612
Amamallai Plantation Works Union v. Sholapur G	roup of Esta	ates				490
The state of the s	A					200

				Pages
Amarsingh v. Karansingh				
Amarnath v. Executive Engineer	* *			893
-Mukherjee v. Turner Morrison & Co. (Pvt) Ltd.	* *	* #	711,	727, 753
		*:*		896
A L T I D I L L D L L L L L L L L L L L L L L			**	622
The day Amendaya Con P. Back Co. Tall	**		-	117
A Liber Teste Mills Tad or Their Manhan		* *		4/7
American Arcot Industrial Institute v. Workmen				TO 1 000
-Arcot Industrial Institute v. Workmen	**		296, 171, 173,	314, 675
— — Mission Industrial Institute v. Their Workmen —Brake Shoe Co. v. N.L.R.B.			1/1, 173,	572, 599
and the trace of the state of t			* *	114
1 7 0 0 117 1				344
THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPERTY O	(#/#)			
				813, 833
Amritanjan Ltd., New Delhi v. Workmen	* *			396
Amritdhara Pharmacy (P) Ltd. v. Their Workmen		* *	* *	328
Amritsar Rayon & Silk Mills v. Their Workmen Amir Uddin Saley Bhai Re.			* *	128
1 Transfer Training of India			6.6	880
Amulya Ratan Mukherjee v. Eastern Railway	77			877
Anamallais Timber Trust Ltd. v. Chack (LAT)				48
Anand Bazar Patrika v. Indian Journalists Association	on			539
Amul Kumar Talukdar v. Union of India Amulya Ratan Mukherjee v. Eastern Railway Anamallais Timber Trust Ltd. v. Chack (LAT) Anand Bazar Patrika v. Indian Journalists Associatie — — Ltd. v. Their Employees Ananda Dhondiba Gade v. Manager, Victoria Mills — Prakash & Sons v. Girja Shanker Scientific Co. v. Employees Union	Tid Dami		11.	130, 572
Ananda Dhondiba Gade v. Manager, victoria Milis	Lta., bom	bay	* *	715, 743
Scientific Co. v. Employees Union			**	570
Scientific Co. v. Employees Union Ananthanarayanan v. Southern Railway Andersons v. Mt. Clemens Pottery Co.				671
Andersons v. Mt. Clemens Pottery Co.	**		4040	201
Andheri Marol Kurla Bus Service v. State of Bomba	3.V			432
Andhra Laundry, Madras v. Addl. L.C.  Patrika, Madras v. Their Workers  Pradesh State Road Transport Corporation Emp		w. #	200	434
Andhra Laundry, Madras v. Addl. L.C.			* *	29, 306
Produch State Road Transport Corporation Emp	lovees Unio	n " Corno	ration	417 420
Scientific Co. Employees Union v. Andhra Scient	tific Co.	ii v. oorpo	Tation	417, 436
Ltd. v. A. Seshagiri Roa			312, 356	6, 369, 370
Andrews v. Rainssay & Co.	3.3	* *		655
— Scientific Co. Employees Union v. Andhra Scient — — Ltd. v. A. Seshagiri Roa Andrews v. Rainssay & Co. — Remak v. Electric Aerolite Co		* (*)		513
Anglo-American Direct Tea Trading Co. Ltd. v. La  — French Mills, Pondicherry v. Goulam Cadar	abour Court		* *	330
Angus Engineering Works, Angus, Hooghly v. Hani	f Mohamm	ad and 07	other.	734, 737
Angus Engineering Works, Angus, Hooghly v. Ham Anilchandra Ghose v. Union of India	ii ivionamii	ad and 97	others	
Anilchandra Ghose v. Union of India Anil Hardboards Ltd. v. Shakharam Mahadeo  Kumar v. Union of India  Bose v. State of Bihar	0.1			357
— Kumar v. Union of India — — Bose v. State of Bihar	* *		#1341	297
Bose v. State of Bihar			* *	
- Mitra v. Commissioner for the port of Calcut	ta		* *	74
— — Bose v. State of Binar  — Mitra v. Commissioner for the port of Calcut Anilnath De v Collector of Central Excise Anjuman Tea Company v State of West Bengal		***		72, 78
Annapet Handloom Weavers Cooperative Production	on Sales So	ciety I td	" Kada	621, 647
muthu	on Dares Do	cacty Liu.	v. Kada	776
Annaswami Re				862
Annaswamy Ivenger Re				863
Anthony v. Good Year Tyre & Rubber Co. of Indi	a Ltd.			258
Annaswamy Iyenger Re Anthony v. Good Year Tyre & Rubber Co. of Indi — Saccaviro v. Churchward & Co.		4	**	149
D'enuza r. Mott Chand blik Mills		4.16		4
Araish & Basakhasingh & Co. (Pvt.) Ltd. v. Works	man, Kama	nand Path	ak	866
Argent v. Minister of Social Security Ariandas Brillal & Co. v. Workmen	**	* 4.		11, 13
Arjandas Brijlal & Co. v. Workmen Ark, Hale Hardward Co. v. Pagland			**	676, 724
Armour & Co. v. Adam Wantock of Frank Smith			* *	342, 354 196, 202
Arron Abraham v. India United Mills Ltd.				823
A selver Butler & Co. 7. Union			2.7	47
Arun Motiram v Mafatlal Fine Spinning & Weavin	ig Mills Co.	Ltd.	**	405
Arvind Boards of Paper Products Ltd. v. Gajari La	RGI	* *		465
— n Workmen	8.8	**	* *	417, 741
Asarva Mills, Ahmedabad v. Bai Manni Bhuri	4.9	* *	3.	52, 355, 356

					$P_{\ell}$	ages
Asarva Mills Ltd., Ahmedabad v. Chunnilal Sitaran	n	* *				744
Asharam v. Delhi Cloth Mills		* . *				767
Asher Textiles v. I. T.	4, 0	054	000 000	070	074	244
— — — v. Subbaraman Ashgarali alias Chottakhan a. New Victoria Mills I	td.		263, 268,			
Ashok Kumar Tribhoovandas v. Ahmedabad M	Ifg. and C	alico Prin	ting Co.	Ltd.	* *	033
						160
- Motors Ltd. v. Their Workn en			222, 225,	226,	228,	230
— Textiles Ltd. v. Their Workmen	* *		* *		* *	296
Ashoka Hotel Ltd. v. Ambi Ram		* *			*: +:	
— Mills Ltd. v. Dabyabhai Sethabhai Ashutosh Ray v. State		* *	* *		***	
Asiatic Board Mills v. Badan Pandey	1.					
Asiatic Transport Service (Pvt) Ltd. v. Workmen		* *			* * *	
Asian Rayon Mills Bombay v. Sakharam Ragho Sa	vant					172
Asis Mukherjee (Dr.) v. State of Bihar	* *		* * *			763
Assam Metals Co. Ltd. v. Bijoy Lal Sen — Oil Co. Ltd. v. Appal Swami	2.7		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		202	187
— — — Ltd. v. Mahanti	* *				493,	252
— — — v. Its Workmen	119,	136, 164,	392, 400,	512.	847.	868
- Railway Trading Co. v. S. K. Sen						460
Assistant Education Officer v. Utthu Paramba	ur Union	47.65	* * *			81
Associated Cement Co. v. Cement Workers Kamda	r Union	* *				725
— — Companies Ltd. v. P. N. Sharma	*.*	4.4	4.4	0.47	272,	743
<ul> <li>— — — Shahabad v. Their Workmen</li> <li>— — Staff Union v. Associated Cement Co. and Co.</li> </ul>	Others	* *	* *	247,	420,	100
— — Electrical Industrial Mfg. Co. v. Workme	n			510	570	182
<ul> <li>— — Electrical Industrial Mfg. Co. v. Workme</li> <li>— Indian Enterprises (P) Ltd. v. Workmen</li> <li>— Industries Ltd. v. M. C. Mahajan</li> </ul>	1.			010,	632.	900
- Industries Ltd. v. M. C. Mahajan						
— Traders & Engineers (Pvt) Ltd. v. Amar Singh		X 2:				648
— — — — v. Workman Devraj					* *	
— — — — v. Workmen — Traders (Pvt) Ltd. v. Workman, Charan Singh			* *			183
Association of Plumbing & Heating Contractors of	Greater !	Vew York	Inc n V	Willia	m	904
Mertem	Orcarci I	NOW YORK	LIIC, D. V	VIIIIA	111	439
		4.4				825
Asutosh Ray v. State Aswini Kumar & Co. v. Workmen Atherton West & Co. Ltd., Kanpur v. Regional Co.						826
Atherton West & Co. Ltd., Kanpur v. Regional Co	onsiliation	Officer		173	, 322,	357
v. Their Workmen		132	, 207, 299	, 689	, 740,	742
Athokpan Nombi Singh v. Officer on Special Duty	, Manipur	State Ir	ansport, I	mpha	500	500
Timbers Rombay & Their Workmen	kinen	4 4			529,	421
Atlas Cycle Industries Ltd., Sonepat v. Their Wor — Timbers Bombay v. Their Workmen Aufiero v. E. A. Laboratories Incorporated Autocars Ltd. v. Ambaji Bhikhaji Automobile Mfg. Workers' Association v. Automo — Products of India Ltd. v. S. V. Seshadhri — V.N. S. Sharma — Rhandun v. Workmen	***		**			198
Autocars Ltd. v. Ambaji Bhikhaji			4.4			687
Automobile Mfg. Workers' Association v. Automo	bile Produ	cts of Inc	lia Ltd.		757,	764
- Products of India Ltd. v. S. V. Seshadhri	14.14		(+1)-			120
— — V.N. S. Sharma	414	40.4	4.74		265,	268
bhandup v. Workingh			* *			202
Available Chandra Saniar v. Dul Sundt of Railwa	v	**	* *		568	682
Avinash Chandra Sanjar v. Dvl. Supdt. of Railwa Ayub Yusuf Naikwaeti v. City of Sangli Municipa Azad Coala Shramik Sabha v. Manager, South Jh	lity		**		568,	827
Azad Coala Shramik Sabha v. Manager, South Jh	narkhand (	Colliery		244	, 315	, 412
B. B. Chawan v. Jalgaon District Central Coop. B	lank Ltd.					687
- C. I. Railway v. Rajnagar Spinning Co. Lt.	d.	4.9	* *		* *	61
- C. Dass v. Union of India		* *	* *		* *	80
<ul> <li>D'Souza v. Kohinoor Mills Co. Ltd., Bombay</li> <li>E. S. T. Undertaking v. B. E. S. T. Workers U.</li> </ul>	Inion Bom	hav	26, 142	194	207	683
	· ·		20, 17	-5 6 77	, 407	779
v. Workmen		* *				739
Bombay v. Mustafa Ahmed Khali	il Abbasi S	heikh	460	, 490	, 515	, 590
Workers Union v. B. E. S. T. Undert	taking	25, 161	, 186, 194	1, 217	, 294	, 314
D P C T II dantali - Da	, 442, 467	, 531, 553	6, 628, 63	, 636		
	Undertal	cing Rom	hav			, 741 769
I C Itd " Rambahadur Iamadar	. Olideral	5, 1011	2007		(#,)#c	539

					P	ages
B.I.C. Ltd. v. Workmen				262.	877,	-
Kanpur v. Workmen					726,	
- J. Sajekar v. Colaba Land & Mills Co. Ltd., Bom			* *			379
<ul> <li>K. Burman v. Additional Secretary to Governmen</li> <li>Kar v. Chief Justice</li> </ul>	IL.		* *		4.4	93 322
- Kumankulu v. Distt. Mechanical Engineer	10					786
- Lakshminarayan v. Imperial Bank of India						715
— Lakshminarayana v. Suvari Sanyasi Appa Rao			* *			802
- M. Kastura v. Swadeshi Mills Co. Ltd.	* *				306,	
— S. Motor Service, Coimbatore v. Workmen	* *		*, *			750
<ul> <li>Manmohan v. State of Mysore</li> <li>N. Alias &amp; Co. Ltd. v. G. P. Sarathy</li> </ul>	**	**		260	261,	94
————— v. Their Workmen				200,		262
- C. Co. Ltd. v. Venkatiah						46
— — Nagrajan v. State of Mysore		**			71,	, 73
- Railway Company v. Hukamchand and Hardu	ttrai		* *		* *	61
— Rubber Works v. Om Prakash		* *				281
— Singh v. State of U. P. — O. A. C. v. Workmen					575,	975
- R. Patel v. State of Maharashtra						177
- Venkappayya v. State of Mysore						284
- S. Vadera v. Union of India						78
Baban Madhare Shinde v. Malegaon Sahakari Sakha		a Ltd.	* *			749
Babcock and Willcox of India Ltd. v. Their Working	en				* *	192
Babu Singh v. State of Punjab	**	**	* *		* *	390
Baburao Tatyarao v. Emperor Baburaoji Pandurang Rokade & Bros. v. Employees		* *	* *			830 884
Bacha Pandey v. Partabpur Concern Ltd.			* *			594
Bachan Singh v. Union of India		* *				882
Bachubhai Hassanali Karyani v. State of Maharasht	ra	* *			166,	694
Badanbai v. Bhomsingh	* *					
Badri v. Bally Jute Mills Co. Ltd.			* *		150,	
Badrinarain v. State Badugu Venkateswarlu v. State		* *	* *		491,	891
Badyanath Das v. Angus Co.	**		- **		* *	851
Bagalkot Cement Co. Ltd. v. R. K. Pathan					1	46
Bai Divaresham v. New Swadeshi Mills Co. Ltd.	* *	* *				349
<ul> <li>Kankujivi v. Shri Anand Cotton Mills Ltd.</li> </ul>	3.3.	4.4				241
- Ratan Resham v Maneklal Hiralal Mills Co. Lto	1.	* *			* *	349
Baikunthmath Prathihari v. State of Orissa	alica Print	ing Co	Tid (	Linit		3
<ul> <li>Rukhiben Surajben v. Ahmedabad Mfg. &amp; C</li> <li>Mills)</li> </ul>	anco I int	mg Co.	Lita.	Juon	ce	737
- Sanki Venu v. Manaklal Hiralal Mills Co. Ltd.						768
- Santok Beni v. Fine Knitting Co. Ltd., Ahmedal	oad				223,	235
Baitalpur Chini Mills Mazdoor Sangh v. Shri Sitara	ım Sugar N	Iills Ltd.				321)
Bajaj Electricals Ltd. v. Jaichand Bansal	* *	4.4	* *		528,	
— — v. Workmen	* *	* *				mark.
— Industries (Pvt.) Ltd. v. Workmen	1.0				***	624
Bajendra Singh v. State of U. P. Bajrang Lal v. State of Rajasthan					* *	870
Baker v. Regem	1836				* *	843
Bakery & Pastry Drivers v. Wohl						478
Bakhtawarlal v. Crown	* *	* *				524
Balaiah (D) v Indian Detonators Ltd.		21	~		+ 4	466
Balabhai Vastubhai v. Ahmedabad Mfg. & Calico	rinting Co	. Ltd.	* *	050	000	680
Balan Vadasseri v. District Panchayat Officer, Mala	ppuram	7 0		259	, 260,	
Balasingh Jairamsingh v. Sarangpur Cotton Mills C Balasubramania Mudaliar v. Rajagopalacharier	o. Liu.				* *	389 548
Balayaya Re	4.				ć.	823
Balbahadurmal v. Commissioner						759
Balbir Singh v. I. T.			* *			753
Baldey Sahai Re						785
Baldeva Kar Hansa v. Delhi Admn.	**					673
Baldevji Shivaji v. Arvind Mills Ltd.		* *				683
Bale Bariha v. Kathu						499
Baleshwar Nath Gupta Re — Singh v. Commissioner for the Port of Calcutta					***	866 702
— Drift of Commissions		2.2				104

					P	ages
Balashwar Singh v. District Magistrate						902
— v. District Magistrate Benaras	* *	* *	* *		700,	
— v. District Magistrate & Collector, Benaras Bal Govind Shah Re	4 8		* *		595,	
Balipara Tea Estate v. Workmen	* *	h 9.				803
Bali Rai v. Patna Electric Supply Co. Ltd.				17, 6		636
& Guru Prasad v. Patna Electric Supply Co.			0			
Baliram v. Manager, Express Mills, Nagpur			* *			715
— Prasad v. State of Mysore		* *	* *			000
Baljit Singh Bali v. Chief Commissioner, Union Te	erritory		* *			283
Balkaran Dingar v. G. G. of India in Council	C C	32	* *			
Balkishan Tukaram Jadhav v. Birhau Maharashtra				100	154,	509
Ballarpur Collieries v. Industrial Tribunal — v. Salim Merchant	* *	1.4	427,	130, 4	137,	438
Ballu Govind v. Appollo Mills Ltd.						
Bally Municipality v. Madan Mohan Banerjee			**		324.	873
Bal Mahadeo Danke v. Jam Sri Ranjit Singh Spg.	& Wvg. I	Mills Co. Lte	1		14.13	343
Balra Khanna v. Motiram						
Balrama Verma Tea Ltd. v. Shen Cottah Kamatch	nia Pillai					
- Textiles Ltd. v. Kamatchia Pillai	X 30.	20.4	4.5		451,	461
v. Shencottah Textile Mill Workers Un		nother				169
Balussary Benefit Chit Funds (Pvt.) Ltd. v. Workn	nen		200			319
Balwantraj v. Union of India	ndo Co-	ala	722,	763,	767,	776
Banaras Light & Power Co. Ltd. v. Bijli Ghar Ma	zdoor San	_	::	10	369,	3/9
——— v. Hanuman Singh	0.00			71	45	645
v. Labour Court II	1.5				70,	645
Bandhu Bhairu v. Kamla Mills Ltd.	1.0				578.	590
Bandra Municipality v. Workmen	* *	**	2.4		281.	591
Banga Hadua v. Emperor		9.8				
Bangalore Silk Throwing Factory v. Their Workm			* * *			446
- Woollen Cotton & Silk Mills Co. Ltd. v. B. Da			* *		114	
v. Binny Mills Labour Ass	an.	* *	* *		* *	
v. Their Workmen	* *	5.5				778
Bangoday Cotton Mills Ltd. v. Workmen			1.5			681
Bank of Baroda Ltd. v. Inderjit Mehta — India v. L. A. T. of India	3.3					848
- Jaipur Ltd., v Kishore Lal	* * *		# (#) (#) #			con
v. Kishore Lal & Sadhu Ram						625
Ltd. v. Workmen	0.04			660		699
Madura Ltd. v. Employees Union			A14	660,	745,	786
Madura v. Bank of Madura Employee	es Union		* *			47
— — Employees' Union v. Bank of Madura Lt	d.	**	8.6	711,	745,	787
— Mysore Ltd. v. Workmen						274
- Voor Handelen Scheepvart N. V. v. Slatford	* *	* *				12
Banking Companies v. Workmen	+ +		4.4		576,	713
Bankola Colliery v. Their Workmen	* *	* *			0.0	332
Banks in the State of Madras v. Workmen	* *		* *			378
Bans Lochanlal v Subharama Ayyar Banwarilal v. State	8.8	**	* *			296
Bapuji Bhogji v. Sirpur Mills Co. Ltd.						790 153
— Maluji v. Ahmedabad Mfg. & Calico Ptg. Co.					447	450
						2, 83
Baramati Municipal Council v. Workmen						728
Barari Colliery v. Workmen						833
Barrilly Electric Supply Co. Ltd. v. Serajuddin			* *		2	273
- Imperial Surgico Industries v. Workmen		1.7				317
Barhanpur Tapti Mills Ltd. v. State I. C.			**			766
Barkway v. South Wales Transport Co.	* *	* *	* *			396
Barnes v. Richards						33
Baroda Spg. & Wvg. Co. Ltd. v. Trikamlal Poons	amchand	4.4			* *	854
Mills Co. Ltd. v. Miyabhai Chandabh	ial		4.4		* *	733
Basisthanarain Chaudhary v. Commissioner, I. T.		* *	9.45	950	3	1, 75
Baster v. London & County Printing Works		4.4		359,		
Bata Krishna Burman v. Asstt. Secretary W. B.	3.3		8,4		* * *	551

					I	ages
Bhanuprasad Hari prasad v. State	1904)					781
Bharat Airways Ltd. v. Ram pratap Pandey					4 8	315
— — v. Their Workmen — Bank Ltd. v. Agnihotri	* *	90.0	9.34		0.0	310
— — v. Employees	* *		* *		E4	391
- Barrel & Drum Mfg. Co. (Pvt) Ltd. v. Barsati	Nabhi	* *	* *		34,	328 732
v. Its Workmen		4.5			412,	1000
— Electronics Ltd. v. I. T.	7.4		* *		603,	
- Fire & General Insurance Ltd. v. Parmeshwari	Prasad					29
- Jute Refined (P) Ltd. v. Workmen	90.00	40.00	18.76		* *	746
— Marketing & Advertising Co. v. Its Workmen	* *	00.00	100	000	005	330
— Springs (Pvt) Ltd., Bombay v. Their workmen — Starch & Chemicals Ltd. v. I. T.	14/19/	0.70	168,			
— Sugar Mills Ltd. v. Jai Singh	**		222, 225,	226	233	405
Bharatram v. Union of India	**			4403		OFF
Bharattaji Ghamirji v. Shorock Spg. & Mfg. Co.	Ltd.					161
Bhaskaran Nair v. Management of Premier Tyres	4.4		40.0		* *	259
Bhasker Atmaram Joshi v. State of Maharashtra	* *					767
— Textiles Ltd. v. Industrial Tribunal			* *			895
Bhatia Steel Works v. Workmen Bhattachar Rubber Works v. Their Workmen		* *	* *		* *	576
Bhattacharjee Agency & Co. v. Wood Products M	azdoor Uni	On.			* *	421 783
Bhauji Re			***			825
Bhawan Jivraj & Co. (Pvt) Ltd. v. Workmen	***	**				459
Bhawani Sahai v. Sayed Naqvi Imam		1.00	2.3		***	299
Bhawanidatt Dharmanand v. New Manekchouk S	pg. & Wvg.	Mills	Co. Ltd.			562
Bhavanjee Sardarjee v. Vijay Mills Co. Ltd., Ahn	nedabad	* *		148,		
— v. Vijay Mills Co. Ltd.	4.4	* *	*:*	680,	682,	
Bhawoo Jivaji v. Mulji Dayal	4.5	(e) +	* *		* *	548
Bhimnath Hari v. Behari Mills Ltd.		(8)	* *		* *	212
Bhivadevji and Others v. Taddington Chemical F. Bhoiraj v. Saurashtra Government			. * *		* *	184
Bholanath v. Emperor	* *	* *			556,	
- Mandal v. India Marine Service (P) Ltd.		2.2				677
Bhowra Colliery v. Workmen		4.41				298
Bhrangbhadra Chemical Works v. I. T.		***				596
Bhula Re			* *			823
Bhupendra Singh v. Burrakur oal Co. Ltd.	**	* *				588
Bhutnath Dal Mills v. Tirat Mistry		* * .	**		300,	314
Bhuwneshwar Kuer v. Raghubansmani Prasad Na	irain Singh	* *			* *	875
- Prasad Verma v. State	Fastern Dai	Lucy				717
Bibhuti Bhushan Basu Roy v. General Manager, l Biddle v. Bond	Eastern Nai		6.8		* *	76 656
Bihar Fire Works & Potteries v. Their Workmen	* *	* *	**		403,	
———— Workers' nion v. Bihar Fire Works	& Potteries	Ltd.				
- Journals Ltd. v. Ali Hasan	91411		1.7			46
Bihari Mills Ltd., Ahmedabad v. Pir Sahib Miyar	Ghasi Mi	yan	* *	349,		
Bijal Jelha v. New Rajpur Mills Ltd., Ahmedabar		*1.5	Tea of			120
Bijavnand Patnayak v. K. A. A. Brinand	7.5					880
Bijoy Kumar Dey v. State of West Bengal	1.0		**			286
Bikaner Gypsums Ltd. v. Workmen	1				592,	
Bimal Kanta Mukherjee v. Newmans Printing Wo	orks	4.74	* *		* *	848
— Kumar Pandit v. State	**	4.4			* *	82
Bindeshwari v. Emperor — Singh v. State						810
Binny Beach Engg. Work Ltd. v. Workmen					697	771
- Ltd. v. C. C. Thomas						
— v. Workmen	* *				Aug	765
Binoy Kumar v. State of West Bengal			100			83
Bipen Chandra v. Republic of India	4040	Terrer	**		the of the	820
Bipra Das Giri v. Niradamoni Bewa	* * .		* *			832
Birbal v. Kishori Lal		* *	.00000		* 4	658
Birdhichand Sharma v. 1st Civil Judge, Nagpur		* (*)	4.4			16
Birdo Saunda D. Volliery v. Workmen			**			778
Birendra Kumar Sinha v. State of Bihar	4.8	* *	4.6			719

					P	ages	
Birmingham v. Bartels					404.		
Birpara Tea Co. Ltd. v. Workmen	* *	* *					
	* *	4:4				379	
Bishambherlal Dayachand v. State of Punjab		* *	+ 4				
Bishwanath Das v. Keshab Gandhabanaik Bisra Stone Lime Co. Ltd. v. I. T.			* *				
Bissesardas v. Kasturchand	* *	* *			19,		
Biography Des De	**						
Di la Nati Cara			* *		4.4	799	
Biswanathdas v. Gohonchandra Heyrik Blackwood (India) Ltd. v. R. K. Mukherjee	* *	* *			703,	705	
Blackwood (India) Ltd. v. R. K. Mukherjee	*.*				710,	720	
Blake v. Woolf Blankley Laundry Co. v. Cleaners & Dyers' Union,	7 1 37	10400				13	
Blankley Laundry Co. v. Cleaners & Dyers Union,	Local No.	18422			* *		
Blenkern v. Hodges Distillery Co. Ltd. Blue Star Engg. Co. Ltd. v. Balbir Singh	* *	* *					
Bo Adlerbert, d. b. a. Sunrise Dairy v. Local No.	680. Int	ernational	Brothe	rhood	1	104	
of Teamasters, Chauffeurs, Stablemen & Helpers	of America	3		222000		487	
Board of Education n. Rice						291	
Bobby Lyke v. N. L. R. B. Boddepalli Lakshminarayana v. Survari Sanyasi Boeing Airplane Company v. N.L.R.B. Bombay Calico Printing Mills, Amritsar v. Their W — Cotton Waste Mills Co. Ltd. v. Rashtriya. Mill N — Engg., Madras v. Workmen — Fine Worsted Mfrs. Castle Mills v. Woollen Mill — Gas Co. Ltd., Bombay v. Bhairoo Krishna — Glass Works Ltd. v. Workmen — Life Assurance Co. Ltd. v. Employees — Mills Mazdoor Sabha, Bombay v. Rajkamal Silk — Pencils (Pvt.) Ltd. Bombay v. Their Workmen — Port Trust v. Their Workmen		* *				444	
Boddepalli Lakshminarayana v. Survari Sanyasi		4.4			839,	840	
Boeing Airplane Company v. N.L.R.B.					* *	886	
Bombay Calico Printing Mills, Amritsar v. Their W	orkmen	1.5				122	
— Cotton Waste Mills Co. Ltd. v. Rashtriya. Mill I	viazdoor 5	angn	* *		* *	391	
- Engg., Madras v. Workingh	Kamaar	Linion	* *		* *	576	
- Gas Co Ltd Rombay v Bhairoo Krishna	2 Tramgar	Cinon			444	445	
— Glass Works Ltd. v. Workmen		**			111,	664	
- Life Assurance Co. Ltd. v. Employees				148,	474.	535	
- Mills Mazdoor Sabha, Bombay v. Rajkamal Silk	Mills, Bo	mbay		-		440	)
— Pencils (Pvt.) Ltd. Bombay v. Their Workmen  — Port Trust v. Their Workmen  Boots Pure Drug Co. (India) Ltd. v. John Dulmeda					* *	532	
— Port Trust v. Their Workmen	1	86, 223, 2	31, 268,	318,	414,	415,	,
Boots Pure Drug Co. (India) Ltd. v. John Dulmeda Bose v. Director of Telegraphs Bose Bros. v. Iron & Steel Workmen's Union Boston Deep Sea Fishing & Ice Co. v. Ansell Boultan Bros. & Co. Ltd. (India), Delhi v. New Vie Bouzourou v. Ottoman Bank Bowers et al. v. Remington Rand Inc.		* *				852	
Bose v. Director of Telegraphs	* *	* *	* *		* *	00/	
Bose Bros. v. Iron & Steel Workmen's Union			* *		656	663	
Boultan Bros & Co. Ltd. (India). Delhi v. New Vic	ctoria Mil	s Co. Ltd	* *		000,	658	
Bouzourou v. Ottoman Bank						271	
Bowers et. al. v. Remington Rand Inc.	*1.5						
Bowreah Cotton Mills Co. v. Their Workmen	* *	* *				299	}
Boston Deep Sea Fishing & Ice Co. v. Ansell Boultan Bros. & Co. Ltd. (India), Delhi v. New Vis Bouzourou v. Ottoman Bank Bowers et. al. v. Remington Rand Inc. Bowreah Cotton Mills Co. v. Their Workmen Box-Assemble Contractor, Bombay v. Pandurang An — Trading Co. v. West Bengal Card & Ptg. Mazdo Bradma of India Ltd. v. Workmen Bragenore Estate Kallar & Nedu Mangad v. Taluk I	nante Dan	ge	2.4			126	)
— Trading Co. v. West Bengal Card & Ptg. Mazdo	or Union						
Bradma of India Ltd. v. Workmen	7-4-4- XA7-	Januar T.T. Jan					
						328	
Brake Shoe Company v. N.L.R.B. Bray v. Chandler					296,	656	
Bray v. Chandler Bredma of India Pyt. Ltd., Bombay v. Their Works	nen				200,		
Briggs v. Imperial Chemical Industries Ltd.	9.040	**	* *			244	1
Bredma of India Pvt. Ltd., Bombay v. Their Works Briggs v. Imperial Chemical Industries Ltd. Bright v. Ganas Brihan Maharashtra Sugar Syndicate Ltd. v. Laxma	* *		4.4			678	3
Brihan Maharashtra Sugar Syndicate Ltd. v. Laxma	an Tatuab	a	* #		387,	846	j
Brillal Matabadal v. Eastern Chemicals (India) Ltd	., Bombay	+ +	* *		770,		
Brij Mohan v. Priyabrat Narain Sinha Britannia Biscuit Co. v. Workmen							
Britannia Biscuit Co. v. Workmen			* *				
— — Ltd. v. Amirchand British and Irish Steam Packet Co. v. Seamen's Un	ion					136	1
— Electric & Pump Ltd. v. Workmen	1011					H85	
— India Corporation Ltd. v. Bakshi Sher Singh			4.6		165,		
— — Kanpur v. Their Workmen	* *		4 0	244,	325		
- Institute of Engineering Technology (India) Ltd	. v. J. V.	G. Coelh	0			316	
- Insulated Calendars Cables Ltd. v. Workmen	1476					823	
- Movietonews Ltd. v. London and Distr. Cinema	s Ltd.					33	
- Motor Car Co. v. Their Workmen	4.3		* *		100	47	
Brooke Bond India Pvt. Ltd. v. Chandra Nath Cho	wdhary	* *				, 65	
v. Sudhir Ranjan Bose	* *	A 16	* *		8.8	76 48	100
Brotherhood of Railrood Trainmen v. Jakcon Ville		• •	* *			66	
Brown v. Dupree Brundaban Swarmi v. State of Orissa	* *	4.4				64	
Bryne v Boadle			* *			36	
1.00							