

# THE WORKFORCE CHRONICLES

INDIPRISE PROFESSIONAL PARTNERS LLP ( A LABOUR LAW EDITION )



## Here's what has happened in the last month and what's to come!

### LATEST FROM THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA

- Supreme Court rejects PSU's plea against order to include HRA & other allowances in overtime wage calculation

### LATEST FROM THE HIGH COURTS

- Maternity Leave can be granted for third pregnancy if claimed for first time: Madras HC.
- If something isn't received well, inappropriate & felt as unwelcome behaviour affecting women, it would be 'Sexual Harassment': Madras HC .

### LATEST FROM THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT

- Circular regarding simplification of joint declaration process in EPS – EPFO.

### LATEST FROM THE STATE GOVERNMENTS .

- List of Holidays for the year 2025.
- Order under Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act, 2013.

### Piece- rated Worker/ employee

A piece rated employee is an employee who is paid based on the number of units they produce or services they provide, rather than the amount of time they spend working.

Piece rate pay is a compensation system where employees are paid based on the number of units or pieces they complete, rather than through a fixed hourly wage or pay. The pay is directly tied to the employee's productivity, meaning the more units produced or tasks completed, the more employee earns.



## LATEST FROM THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA

Supreme Court rejects PSU's plea against order to include HRA & other allowances in overtime wage calculation.

The Supreme Court has dismissed an SLP filed by PSU Munitions India Limited against an interim order of the Bombay High Court directing the implementation of a Central Administrative Tribunal (CAT) decision that mandated including certain compensatory allowances in the calculation of overtime wages under the Factories Act, 1948. [Munitions India Limited & Anr. v. The Ammunition Factory Workers Union & Ors.]

**[Click here to read Judgment.](#)**

## LATEST FROM THE HIGH COURTS

Govt. Company Scheme denying pensionary benefits to employee who resigned before retirement is discriminatory: Bombay HC.

The Bombay High Court has granted relief to an employee of a central public sector enterprise who was denied pensionary benefits after he resigned soon before official retirement and consequent superannuation, declaring the scheme to be discriminatory.

The Court was hearing a Writ Petition challenging the validity of a scheme by MOIL Ltd., a state-owned manganese-ore mining company, which provided that no amount or benefit would be given to the member in case of resignation and the amount accumulated under the name of such member of the scheme shall be transferred and credited to the company's account or adjusted against annual contribution payable by the company to a trust or the Life Insurance Corporation of India.

Upon further perusal of the conditions of the scheme, Court noticed that the scheme creates a distinction between simplicitor resignation and resignation for the purpose of joining another Central Public Sector Enterprise (CPSE). If an employee resigned for joining CPSE after completing 15 years of service, they would get the benefit. The Petitioner in the case had completed 15 years of service, but had not resigned to join another CPSE.

"Such inter se discrimination between resignation simplicitor (on health grounds) and resignation for joining another CPSE, even though a similar Scheme is not available, in fact is clearly discriminatory, and has no nexus with the object sought to be achieved, as indicated above." the Court said. [Chandrabhan Atulkar v. MOIL Limited And Anr.] [\*\*Click here to read Judgement.\*\*](#)

### Withholding gratuity after retirement merely on allegations of misappropriation without conducting inquiry is impermissible under Law: Chhattisgarh HC.

The Respondent (employee) retired as a Revenue Sub Inspector. During an audit, allegations of misappropriation were raised against the employee. Despite these allegations, no departmental inquiry or show-cause notice was initiated against the employee before his retirement. In response to the employee's application for retiral dues, the State withheld a certain amount from his gratuity. The employee filed a Petition seeking quashing of the impugned Order withholding gratuity and the release of the full amount. The Single Judge relied on the Supreme Court's judgment in Punjab v. Rafiq Masih (White Washer) (2015), which prohibits recovery from retired employees or those belonging to Class III and IV services.

Observing that no inquiry or judicial proceedings under the Pension Rules, 1976, had been initiated before the employee's retirement, the Single Bench ordered the release of the withheld gratuity with interest. The Division Bench referred to the decision in Rafiq Masih and held, "It clearly reflects that the matter of the respondent No. 1/writ petitioner is attracted and covered by the above-mentioned judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court. Therefore, on this ground alone, the order of withholding of the gratuity of the respondent No. 1/writ petitioner after his retirement is impermissible under law. "

Accordingly, the High Court dismissed the Appeal. [State of Chhattisgarh & Ors. v. B.P. Tiwari & Ors. ]

[\*\*Click here to read Judgment.\*\*](#)

### Maternity Leave can be granted for third pregnancy if claimed for first time: Madras HC.

The Petitioner, a staff nurse working in Government Rajaji Hospital, Madurai challenged the order passed wherein her request for maternity leave spent was rejected. The petitioner **had** also challenged the report of the Medical Board wherein she was found fit to resume duty and the request for maternity certificate was rejected on the ground that it is her third pregnancy.

While the petitioner was working on a contract basis, out of wedlock through the first marriage, she gave birth to two female children and for both the deliveries, didn't claim any benefit of maternity leave in view of the fact that she was a contract staff. Later, the Petitioner divorced her first husband and re-married. Out of the said wedlock through the second marriage, the petitioner got conceived and she applied for maternity leave. The said application, however was rejected on the ground that the petitioner is not entitled to seek maternity leave for the third child. The Court at the outset noted that the Petitioner has not availed maternity leave for her first two children born through the first wedlock and had sought maternity leave for the first time while she was on the family way through the second wedlock. The Court looked into the Rules and observed that legislative intent of the said Fundamental Rule is to discourage having more children considering the health condition of the woman and financial constraints involved in bringing up the said children.

"It is also based upon the population control policy of the concerned Government. Limiting the maternity leave to two children is also based upon the fact that the State exchequer may not be burdened with more financial stress by extending maternity leave for many children. Therefore, a purposive interpretation has to be given to achieve the object of the above said rules. That apart, limiting the maternity leave to two children is intended to suppress the mischief of having more children, " the Court further observed. [\*\*Click here to read Judgement\*\*](#)



## If something isn't received well, inappropriate & felt as unwelcome behaviour affecting women, it would be 'Sexual Harassment': Madras HC .

The Madras High Court while allowing a Writ Petition held that if something is not received well, is inappropriate, and felt as an unwelcome behaviour affecting other sex namely women, it would be 'sexual harassment' .

The Bench observed, "The respondent who has got his corporate experience should have known to execute his functions without making the women employees embarrassed or frightened due to his actions. The complainants did not state something in the air but have given details of the incidents and have also stated how it was felt by them. If something is not received well and it is inappropriate and felt as an unwelcome behaviour affecting the other sex namely the women, no doubt it would fall under the definition of "sexual harassment.

The Bench further reiterated that in disciplinary proceedings especially the proceedings taken in pursuant to the charges of sexual harassment, the Courts should not be carried away with insignificant discrepancies or hyper- technicalities and the appreciation should be comprehensive.

The High Court noted, "Regarding the appreciation of materials in the charges of sexual harassment, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held in Apparel Export Promotion Council Vs. A.K. Chopra reported in AIR 1999 SC 625, that the Court cannot overlook the ground realities and ignore the conduct of the respondent against his junior also observed. female employees. In the instant case also the complainants are juniors or subordinate to the respondent and the respondent is expected to conduct himself in such a manner that he does not cause a feeling of discomfort embarrassment. "

"There is no misunderstanding in the mind of the complainants before giving the complaints against the respondent. Their statements and the materials placed on record would show that in the name of performing duty the respondent had put the complainants in an embarrassing and an uneasy position. No doubt such kind of gestures either physical, verbal or non verbal, are unwelcome ones" , it added.

Furthermore, the Court elucidated that the definition of 'sexual harassment' as it is seen from the PoSH Act has given significance to the Act than the intention behind the same and in the event such actions are reported as criminal offence then the prosecution may be expected to prove the intention also. "It is the fundamental discipline and understanding with which the employees of different gender are expected to interact with each other where decency is the yardstick and nothing else. While speaking about the decency it is not the decency which the respondent thinks within himself, but how he makes the other gender to feel about his actions" ,

it also observed. The Court said that the ICC appears to be sensitive and reasonable in its approach during the process of inquiry and had formulated its own method of ensuring fairness in giving opportunities to both the Complainant and the Respondent. It added that the strict rules of evidence has got no application to the type of inquiry that is being made by the ICC on the charges of sexual harassment against the women employees.

"Not yielding to hyper- technicalities even when the respondent pulled the inquiring authority, can also be considered as a feature of fairness during inquiry. The Labour Court ought not to have given much significance to the non-furnishing of CCTV footage to the respondent. The nature of the complaint, the constitution of the ICC, the course of inquiry and the findings of the ICC are seen to be interlinked with each other and the committee did not wander over and beyond the scope of inquiry with any malicious intention against the respondent" , it concluded.

Accordingly, the High Court allowed the Writ Petition and quashed the Labour Court's Order. [HCL Technologies Ltd. v. N. Parsarathy]

**[Click here to read Judgement](#)**

If there is no provision under Industrial Disputes Act to redress grievance of workman, doors of Civil Court are always open: Madras HC.

The Madras High Court has held that the Civil Courts have the jurisdiction to redress grievances of workmen when there is no provision under the Industrial Disputes Act to redress such a grievance. The Court allowed a Petition under Article 227 of the Constitution filed by the Secretary of the Vellore District Dr. Ambedkar General Workers Union, challenging the return of their plaint by the District Munsif Court which held, "As per representation, the suit to be filed before the Labour Court. " The High Court set aside the endorsement made by the District Munsif and directed it to number the case and decide on its merits.

The bar of jurisdiction of civil Court with respect to Industrial Disputes Act arises, when there is a mechanism available under the Industrial Disputes Act, to redress the grievance of a workman or a Union. If there is no provision under the Industrial Disputes Act, the doors of the Civil Court are always open to a party to knock on. The Industrial Disputes Act, as it stands today, does not contemplate the Tribunal to grant any interim order. There is no provision for a party to initiate a suit before the Industrial Tribunal or Labour Court for the injunctive reliefs. Injunction can only be granted by the Civil Court, unless and until the said power is specifically denuded from the Civil Court and granted to any Special Court or Tribunal. [M. Nagappan v. The Management]

**[Click here to read Judgement](#)**



Employer cannot withhold Gratuity without initiating recovery proceedings for alleged misappropriation: Karnataka High Court.

The Karnataka High Court ruled that an employer is not entitled to withhold or forfeit an employee's gratuity on the grounds of alleged misappropriation unless formal proceedings have been initiated to recover the losses caused by the employee's actions.

The Bench observed that no formal proceedings had been initiated by CWC to recover the alleged losses. The Court emphasized, "Whenever any employee was to be dismissed on account of misappropriation or causing losses to the employer, it is always available for the employer to initiate proceedings for recovery of the losses, which have been caused to the employer as also the amount misappropriated from the employer. Suspension from service and later on dismissal from service, would not in any manner retribute the losses caused to the employer. "

The Court further explained that the employer is obligated to follow due process in such cases, which includes initiating recovery proceedings. During these proceedings, the employer may also seek to withhold or adjust any amounts owed to the employee, such as gratuity. However, in the absence of such proceedings, any claims of financial loss remain unverified and cannot justify withholding the employee's gratuity. [Central Warehousing Corporation v. G.C. Bhat & Anr.]

**[Click here to read Judgement](#)**

## Employee can't exclude his wife or children from receiving family Pension on his death by making an application in this regard: Kerala HC.

The respondent, S.Sathikumari Amma, is the wife of the late Gopalakrishna Pillai, a retired Postal Assistant. Late Gopalakrishna Pillai had availed Voluntary Retirement Scheme from service in 2003 and died in the year 2013. Pillai was receiving pension and at the time of his retirement, he expressed his intention not to include the applicant-respondent as a family member. A request was also raised to strike off the name of his wife Sathikumari Amma and daughter from his service book. He had also filed another application stating

that he had divorced his wife. Referring to the judgments of the Apex Court in Jodh Singh v. Union of India (1980) and Smt. Violet Issaac and others v. Union of India and others (1991), the Bench said, " ...it is clear that family pension is not an estate or property of the employee. Therefore, an employee cannot make a representation that his legally wedded wife or other dependants are not entitled to claim the family pension. Family pension unlike the other pensionary benefits like provident

fund, gratuity etc, could not be a subject matter of testamentary disposition by the employee during his lifetime. In other words, an employee cannot bequeath his family pension in favour of another nor he can nominate some other person for receiving family pension other than the one who is entitled to it. An employee cannot exclude his wife or children from receiving the family pension on his death, by making an application in this regard. " [Union Of India v. S. Sathikumari Amma]

**[Click here to read Judgement.](#)**

## Labour Court's jurisdiction under section 33(C)(2) limited to executing pre-existing rights, not determining new claims: Gujarat HC.

A Single Judge Bench upheld the Labour Court's rejection of a recovery application under Section 33(C) (2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. The court held that without a pre-existing right, claims for additional wages, bonus, and rent were not maintainable under this provision. It explained that Labour Courts cannot adjudicate new claims under Section 33(C)(2), as their jurisdiction is similar to that of an executing court. In the instant case, Jayanti Ishwarbhai Parmar was employed by Sabbir Mohammed Zubair since February 2002, until he was terminated in December 2013. He challenged his termination before the Labour Court, which partially allowed his claim. It directed Sabbir Mohammed Zubair to pay him 25% of his wages from May 31, 2014, to May 31, 2016, along with other benefits.

Following this, Parmar filed a recovery application before the Anand Labour Court, seeking Rs. 3,03,750. This included back wages, bonus, holiday wages, salary increments, and rent. However, the Labour Court rejected this application on the ground that there was no pre-existing right for the claimed benefits.



Aggrieved, Parmar approached the Gujarat High Court under Articles 226 and 227 of the Constitution of India. Thus, the court dismissed the petition. It affirmed the Labour Court's order. [Jayanti Ishwarbhai Parmar v. Sabbir Mohammed Zubair]

**[Click here to read Judgement.](#)**

## Only one claim petition maintainable for a single cause of action; all dependents must be impleaded together: Himachal Pradesh HC

The Himachal Pradesh High Court held that only one claim petition is maintainable for a single cause of action, requiring all dependents or legal representatives of the deceased to be impleaded together, with no separate applications allowed under the Employees Compensation Act. The widow and the daughter of a deceased truck driver had filed a compensation claim under Section 22 of the Employees Compensation Act. The claim was settled with a compensation award by the Insurance Company. Later, the deceased's mother and father also filed a separate claim Petition under the same Act. The Petition was allowed by the Commissioner for Employee's

Compensation, granting compensation to the parents as well. The same was challenged before the High Court. "Any application claiming compensation, either under the Motor Vehicles Act or under the Employee's Compensation Act where death has resulted from the accident, even if preferred by one of the legal representatives/dependents is on behalf of all the legal representatives/dependents of the deceased," the Court explained. The widow and daughter of the deceased were deemed dependents as defined under Section 2(d) of the Employees Compensation Act. The Bench stated that the mother, who was not impleaded in the initial

petition, should have sought redress through appropriate legal remedies instead of filing a separate claim. "Thus, this Court cannot interfere with the award dated 23.06.2015 passed by learned Commissioner in favour of respondents No. 4 and 5, i.e. the widow and daughter of deceased Raju, since the same is not under challenge before this Court," it stated. Consequently, the Court held that "the subsequent petition filed by parents of the deceased is not maintainable and the impugned award passed in favour of the mother of the deceased Shibi Devi deserves to be quashed." [Tata AIG General Insurance Company Ltd. v. Shibi Devi & Ors.] [Click here to read Judgement.](#)

## Didn't mend ways, remained lethargic and irresponsible: Delhi HC upholds punishment of employee for repeated mistake.

The Delhi High Court while upholding the punishment granted to an employee in the form of reduction of salary for repeated mistake observed that the same is not disproportionate as he didn't mend ways and remained lethargic and irresponsible even after getting punished earlier. The Bench observed, ".....In spite of the punishment and only around three months thereafter, in the present case, he was again found negligent of the same offence. The Appellant Authority, therefore, came to the opinion that in spite of the imposition of the punishment in the earlier instance, the petitioner has not changed or mended his ways and has remained lethargic and irresponsible on duty.

Despite the same, the Appellant Authority reduced the punishment awarded to the petitioner for the present incident to now to be lowering of his pay by two stages for three years with cumulative effect in the existing scale of pay.....Given the above facts, we do not find the punishment awarded to the petitioner to be



disproportionate and as warranting any interference of this Court in exercise of its power of judicial review." [Babrey Singh vs. Union Of India & Ors.] [Click here to read Judgement.](#)



## Employee's Writ Petition against Private Company seeking continuation in service not maintainable: Madhya Pradesh HC.

The Bench emphasized, "The right to continue in service cannot be held to be a fundamental right. The service conditions of an employee is governed by the Service rules and violation of service rules would not come within the purview of violation of discharge of public functions and, therefore, any action taken by a private institution against his employee would not come within the judicial scrutiny of this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, "

The Bench noted that the petitioner who was working as a Workman with respondent No.4 is a private company and is seeking relief for continuation in service upto 60 years of age. This cannot

be held to be an action relating to public duty of the respondent No.4. The same cannot be held to be a breach of public duty by the respondent No.4. Reference was also made to the judgment in St.Mary's Education Society and Ors. Vs. Rajendra Prasad Bhargava and Ors. (2023) wherein it has been held that the action impugned before the writ court has no nexus with the public element, even though the private body in question may be discharging public functions, the writ jurisdiction cannot be invoked in such a case.

"Thus, it is held that a writ petition against a private company challenging the order of

premature retirement and claiming to be continued in service is not maintainable" , the Bench concluded while dismissing the Petition. [Vikram Singh v. Union of India and Others]

**[Click here to read Judgement.](#)**

## Piece-rated worker not getting any graded scale of pay can't claim parity with regular employee for grant of Pensionary benefits: J&K&L HC.

Through the medium of writ petitions, the petitioners were seeking a direction upon the respondents to grant in their favour the pensionary and retiral benefits on parity with the employees of various units of the Jammu and Kashmir Industries Limited, J&K Handloom Silk Weaving Factory and J&K Handloom Development Corporation. The Bench noted that the petitioners were, admittedly, holding the posts of Piece Rated Workers belonging to the J&K Handicrafts (S&E) Corporation. The Piece Rated Workers are paid their wages according to their earning per day as per the market rate.

**[Click here to read Judgement.](#)**

"Therefore, a Piece Rated Worker of the respondent Corporation was not getting any graded/regular scale of pay and, as such, cannot be equated with an employee of the said Corporation who was on its regular establishment" , the Bench observed. [Mohammad Yousuf Mir & Ors. V. Ut of J&K and Others]





# LATEST FROM THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT

## Circular regarding simplification of joint declaration process – EPFO.

In order to simplify the process of Joint Declaration, EPFO has issued certain directions which are as follows:

1. On basis of classification of members, the process has been simplified in following manner:

a. In case of member ID linked with UAN generated based on Aadhaar from 1st Oct, 2017- JD request shall be submitted online.

b. In case of member ID linked with UAN generated prior to 1st Oct, 2017 wherein Name, Dob, Gender, Aadhaar validated by UIDAI- JD request shall be submitted online.

c. In case of member ID having

UAN but not Aadhaar validated by UIDAI or without any UAN or belonging to deceased members- JD request shall be submitted in physical mode by member/claimant.

2. The level at which the change can be executed has been revised. Also, the facility of uploading documents through digilocker will be introduced shortly and documents which can be submitted by the member through Digilocker are specifically listed by the EPFO under the Circular.

3. In all cases where the JD request cannot be filed online by the member, the employers can file the request online including the

case of deceased members by duly uploading the physical JD.

4. In cases of closed establishments, the physical JD request duly attested by any one of the authorities who are authorized to attest the claim along with the relevant documents can be submitted to the PRO in the format provided by the EPFO under the Circular.

5. In case of deceased member, the physical JD format can be signed by any one of the claimants eligible vide Para 70 of the EPF Scheme, 1952 and matching with Aadhaar data will not be required.

**[Click here to read Circular.](#)**

## Notification regarding de-linking of erroneously linked Member IDs from UAN- EPFO.

In order to empower the members to delink any erroneous Member ID in their UAN which had been linked without their knowledge, it has been decided by the EPFO to provide a facility to the members to De-link such wrongly linked MID from their UAN. A detailed User manual for guidance of the members about the process of delinking has also provided by the EPFO.

**[Click here to read notification](#)**



Circular regarding simplification of transfer of Provident Fund Account- EPFO.

In order to simplify the process of transfer of Provident Fund Account of a member on change of employment, the present requirement of routing the online transfer claim through either the past or the present employer has been dispensed with in the following transfer cases with a view to expediate the transfer:

- a. Transfers between Member IDs linked with the same UAN, where the UAN was allotted on or after
- c. Transfers between Member IDs linked with the same UAN, where the UAN was allotted prior to 01.10.2017, is linked with Aadhaar, and the name, date of birth (DOB)

01.10.2017 and linked with Aadhaar.

- b. Transfers between Member IDs linked with different UANs, where such UANs were allotted on or after 01.10.2017 and linked with the same Aadhaar.
- c. Transfers between Member IDs linked with the same UAN, where the UAN was allotted prior to 01.10.2017, is linked with Aadhaar, and the name, date of birth (DOB) and gender are identical across the

Member IDs.

d. Transfers between Member IDs linked with different UANs, where atleast one of the UANs was allotted prior to 01.10.2017 is linked with the same Aadhaar, and the name, DOB and gender are identical across the Member IDs.

[Click here to read notification](#)

LATEST FROM THE STATE GOVERNMENTS

LIST OF HOLIDAYS FOR THE YEAR 2025 LIST OF HOLIDAYS FOR THE YEAR 2025

Few states have released the List of Holidays for the year 2025. Click on the links below for the complete list of holidays.

S. NO.	STATE	CLICK HERE TO VIEW NOTIFICATION
1	U.T. of Dadra & Nagar Haveli & Daman & Diu	<a href="#"><u>Government Notification</u></a>
2	Chandigarh	<a href="#"><u>Government Notification</u></a>
3	Uttarakhand	<a href="#"><u>Government Notification</u></a>
4	U.T. of Andaman & Nicobar Islands	<a href="#"><u>Government Notification</u></a>
5	Manipur	<a href="#"><u>Government Notification</u></a>

Order under Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act, 2013.

Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act, 2013 is a Central Act intended to ensure a safer work-place and for providing easy access to redressal mechanism. Section 4 of the said Act provides that every employer employing 10 or more employees shall constitute an Internal Complaint Committee, which is mandatory and non-compliance of the same shall attract penalty. It is also informed that the Ministry of Women and Child has instituted ‘She-Box Portal’ for online complaint registration and the employers in public and private sectors can also register themselves with the She-Box Portal.



[Click here to read notification](#)

Notification of the Meghalaya Factories (Amendment) Rules, 2025.

The Government of Meghalaya has amended the Meghalaya Factories Rules, 1980 thereby making amendment under sub-rule (2) of Rule 6 and sub-rule (2) of Rule 8 namely:

1. The existing sub-rule (2) of Rule 8 shall be substituted as: "Every license granted or renewed under this chapter shall remain valid or be in force for a minimum period of one year to a maximum period of 10 as applicable. The license so granted or renewed shall remain valid up to end of the tenure period.

2. The existing sub-rule (2) of Rule 8 shall be substituted as: "Every application for renewal of a license shall be applied online, and shall be made not less than 2 (two) months before the date on which the License expires, and if the application is so made, the premises shall be held to duly licensed for a validity period of 1 (one) year and may be extended to 10 (ten) years on a case-to-case basis as applicable with the approval of the Chief Inspector. "

[Click here to read notification](#)

REVISED MINIMUM WAGES

S. NO.	STATE	W.E.F.	CLICK HERE TO VIEW NOTIFICATION
1	Meghalaya (Scheduled Employment)	01.01.2025	<a href="#"><u>Government Notification</u></a>
2	Tripura (Brick & Kiln Workers)	01.01.2025	<a href="#"><u>Government Notification</u></a>
3	Chandigarh	01.10.2024	<a href="#"><u>Government Notification</u></a>

Notification of the safety and security conditions for employment of women in night shifts in Factories.

The Government of Meghalaya has issued conditions in respect of all factories who apply for exemption for employing women in factory during night shift i.e., between the hours of 7PM to 6AM, in respect of their safety and security, which are as follows:

- a. No women shall be subjected to sexual harassment at any workplace in the factories;
- b. The Provisions of Sexual Harassment of Women at

Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition & Redressal) Act, 2013 shall be complied with by the Occupier of the factory;

- b. The Occupier shall provide proper lightning and CCTV cameras at all places where the female workers may move out of necessity in the course of her work;
- c. Sufficient women security guards shall be provided;
- d. Declaration/Consent from each

women worker shall be obtained;

- e. The provisions of Factories Act, 1948 and Rules of other statutory provisions and all other Labour Legislations shall be followed by the Occupier of the factory;
- f. All other conditions as notified under the notification and as may be specified by the Central or State Government from time to time in this regard.

[Click Here](#)

Notification of the Kerala Factories (Amendment) Rules, 2025.

In the Kerala Factories Rules, 1957, for APPENDIX-I, a new APPENDIX-I shall be substituted namely as Maximum number of persons to be employed in any day during the year; and for APPENDIX- III, new APPENDIX-III namely Schedule of fees prescribed under the Kerala Factories Rules, 1957 other than the fees prescribed in Appendix- I shall be substituted.

[Click Here](#)

Notification of the Karnataka Labour Welfare Fund (Amendment) Act, 2024.

In the Karnataka Labour Welfare Fund Act, 1965, in section 7A, in sub-section (2) for the words “twenty rupees, forty rupees and twenty rupees” , the words, “fifty rupees, one hundred rupees and fifty rupees” shall respectively be substituted.

[Click Here](#)



[www.plutusco.com](http://www.plutusco.com)

Disclaimer: This document is prepared and furnished for information and knowledge enhancement of all interested. You may choose to reproduce or redistribute this document for non- commercial purposes in part or full to any other person with due acknowledgement of the author. The opinions and analysis expressed herein are entirely those of the author. Even though the content of the document has been extracted or analysed from the government notifications, orders, circulars, news reports etc., it is not to be taken as complete and accurate in all respects.