

No. of Printed Pages : 6

MS-28

MANAGEMENT PROGRAMME

(MP)

Term-End Examination

December, 2025

MS-28 : LABOUR LAWS

Time : 3 Hours

Maximum Marks : 100

Weightage : 70%

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

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

Section—A

1. Explain the sources of industrial jurisprudence in India. Discuss the specific objectives of labour legislation in India.

2. Define Industrial Disputes and discuss the powers and duties of authorities under the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.
3. Discuss the provisions regarding responsibility for payment of wage and deduction from wages in the Payment of Wages Act, 1936.
4. Describe the provisions regarding eligibility for bonus and the computation of gross profits in banking and other companies in the Payment of Bonus Act, 1965.
5. Write short notes on any *four* of the following :
 - (a) International Labour Standards
 - (b) Benefits under the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948
 - (c) Contract of apprenticeship
 - (d) Prohibition of employment of contract labour
 - (e) Charge-sheet

Section—B

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

The Standard Textile Printing Works conduct business in high quality printing of superior textiles. It has a good reputation in the market. The company employs about 500 workers and works in three shifts a day. There is no union in the plant. The Chief Executive of the works is the General Manager who is assisted by three Shift Managers, six Supervisors and twelve Assistant Supervisors.

For the past few months, the General Manager had been receiving frequent complaints from Shift Managers that a large number of pieces of customer's cloth were missing from the plant and they could not account for the losses. The General Manager took a serious view of the losses because it meant not only payment of damages to the customers but also the company's reputation in the market. He therefore, ordered a close

search of workers at the time of their leaving the workplace for home. As a result of these searches, a couple of workers were caught with pieces of cloth hidden inside their dresses. They were charge-sheeted for theft and subsequently dismissed after the domestic enquiry.

Some day's back, during lunch interval, Vinayak, a worker in the folding department saw an Assistant Supervisor taking a piece of cloth and putting it in his briefcase. Vinayak immediately reported the matter to the Shift Manager who came to the department and found the said piece of cloth in the briefcase of the Assistant Supervisor. Without any discussion, he asked the Assistant Supervisor to see him in his office. A week passed, and the concerned Assistant Supervisor continued to attend to his work.

During this period, the Assistant Supervisor threatened Vinayak that the latter's days here were numbered. This upset Vinayak. He approached the Shift Manager and

enquired of him as to what action was taken against the Assistant Supervisor. The Shift Manager politely replied, "I am thankful to you for whatever you did; it is none of your business to know what action we are taking against him. Remember that, after all, he is your officer." Vinayak felt irritated, but left the Shift Manager's office without a word.

On the same day, when the watchman was about to search Vinayak while he was leaving the plant, Vinayak shouted at the watchman saying "I will not allow myself to be searched unless the officers are also searched. They are the real thieves." The watchman detained Vinayak at the gate and reported the matter to the General Manager, who called Vinayak to his office. On being questioned by the General Manager, Vinayak told him all about the piece of cloth in the Assistant Supervisor's briefcase and subsequent events and repeated what he had said to the watchman.

The General Manager thereupon asked him angrily, "Do you mean to say that we are thieves?" Vinayak replied, "You can take it that way, if you like." The General Manager recorded the incident along with Vinayak's reply to his question and took Vinayak's signature on it.

Next day Vinayak was served with a suspension order for his "Act of insubordination and indecent behaviour." Thereafter, the General Manager referred the case to the Personnel Manager.

Questions :

- (i) How far is the action of General Manager justified ?
- (ii) As the Personnel Manager, how would you deal with this case ?
- (iii) Give reasons for the way you would handle this case.

× × × × ×