

**FIRST LABOUR COURT, KOLKATA**

**AWARD**

**DATED 4<sup>th</sup> DAY OF DECEMBER 2024**

**SHRI MADHUSUDAN PAL**

**JUDGE**

**(J.O. Code :- WB 00925)**

**CASE NO. 12/2018 / U/S 17(2) OF THE WORKING JOURNALISTS AND OTHER  
NEWSPAPER EMPLOYEES (CONDITIONS OF SERVICE) AND MISCELLANEOUS  
PROVISIONS ACT, 1955**

**BETWEEN :**

Smt. Mou Chakraborty,  
daughter of Late Pinaki Ranjan Chakraborty,  
residing at 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor,  
146/8D, Lake Gardens,  
Kolkata – 700 045.

**.....APPLICANT**

**(REPRESENTED BY RANANEESH GUHA THAKURTA, LD. ADVOCATE)**

**/VERSUS/**

M/s. H.T. Media Ltd.  
having their registered office  
at Hindustan Times House,  
18-20 Kasturba Gandhi Marg,  
New Delhi – 11 001  
and also having their Kolkata Office  
at DLF IT Park-I,  
Tower-1, 12<sup>th</sup> Floor, Block-AF,  
8, Major Arterial Road,  
New Town, Rajarhat, Kolkata – 700 156.

**.....O.P./COMPANY**

**(REPRESENTED BY VARUN KEDIA, LD. ADVOCATE)**

### **Judgement**

This industrial dispute has been referred to before this Ld. Court by the Government of West Bengal, Labour Department Order No. Labr/289/(LC-IR)/Estt/TRIB./1L-24/17 dated 23.04.2018 read with Corrigendum being no. Labr/462/(LC-IR)/Estt/TRIB/1L-24/17 dated. 28.06.2018 for adjudication of dispute between the parties above-named regarding demand for payment of arrears to be paid by the O.P./Company to the applicant/claimant for the period from 11.11.2011 to 08.01.2017.

#### **Applicant's contention**

1. That the applicant/ claimant was a journalist by profession. She worked at O.P./Company as journalist as Special Correspondent with the Kolkata Edition of Hindusthan Times Newspaper since February 2005 till 8<sup>th</sup> January 2017 which is a product of H.T. Media Ltd. i.e. the O.P./Company having over Rs.1000 crores annual turnover.
2. Applicant was a holder of State Government Accreditation Card issued by Government of West Bengal (commonly known as "Press Card") which was issued to the applicant by Government of West Bengal, after H.T. Media Ltd. recommended her name to Information and Cultural Affairs Department, Government of West Bengal.
3. That on 09.01.2017 applicant was forced to resign by signing a pre typed resignation letter along with some other employees on payment of two months' salary as compensation by O.P./Company depriving him the benefits of Majithia Wage Board Recommendations which was given effect from 11.11.2011.
4. That Central Govt. used to form Wage Fixation Commission for working employees in newspapers from time to time as The Majithia Wage Board recommendations were given effect from 11.11.2011.
5. That as per the report of the chartered accountant, the applicant is entitled to receive a sum of Rs.42,69,854/- only as arrears from the O.P./Company as per such recommendations of Majithia Wage Board.
6. The applicant has prayed for an order from this Court thereby directing the O.P./Company to pay such amount to the applicant/claimant along with interest at the rate of 18% per annum.

#### **Contention of O.P./Company**

1. That the Claimant was lastly employed as Special Correspondent in Multimedia Content Management Division. She was employed in managerial and administrative capacity which is explicit from the Role Sheets and Appraisal Records submitted before this Court by the O.P./Company.
2. Her role included to ensure that stories by team members were well written to assign beats and ensure that the stories were filed on time, to drive implementation of HT's

digital first vision, to lead teams in producing collective briefs, to guide and mentor junior colleagues. Her work also included planning and creating using faculty of mind, monitoring layouts and releasing time which is given to only higher level employees, leading teams, guiding and mentoring junior colleagues. She was responsible for timelines which is very incumbent for nature of work of present management and could be delegated to only higher level employees, adding value to stories etc. She was also required to co-ordinate and communicate with editors, photographers, designers and reporters to identify opportunities for collaborative work and packages.

3. That the claimant was not a working journalist within the meaning of working journalist Act. The claimant does not fall under the category of employees upon whom the recommendation of Majithia Wage Board will apply. The claimant opted for CTC and benefits given to him were more than those prescribed by the Wage Board which was in the line with the provisions of Section 16 of the Working Journalists Act.
4. That during her tenure of employment applicant never disputed her wages and benefits. The Majithia Wage Board was notified in 11.11.2011 and the claimant never raised any demand or claim till her resignation on 09.01.2017.
5. That the claimant was working with H.T. Media Limited and was lastly employed with Multimedia Content Management Division which is not a part of any newspaper establishment. In fact it was a part of non newspaper business like Radio, Event Management, Internet Business. These facts are evident from the Service Contract dt. 30.09.2015. From Appraisal Report it can also be discerned that claimant was engaged in managing online mobile and web based content. The said division does not qualify as newspaper establishment as defined under Section 2(d) of The Working Journalists Act . That Division neither prints or publish any newspaper nor conduct any news agency or syndicate. Consequently the recommendation of Majithia Wage Board does not extend to such multimedia content management division of H.T. Media Ltd.
6. The claimant served her resignation vide letter dt. 09.01.2017 voluntarily. The claimant post her resignation wilfully, which severed the relationship between her and the respondent company and she cannot be allowed to raise any claim whatsoever against the company thereafter.
7. That the claimant has wrongfully claimed the O.P./Company as Class-I Establishment as per Majithia Wage Board Recommendation. Without prejudice to the fact that the unit/division wherein the claimant had been employed last was not a 'newspaper establishment', if the claimant is assumed to had been associated with 'newspaper' establishment as per the classification of news agency as contained in Section II(6) of Chapter XIX of the Majithia Wage Board Recommendations, the Kolkata newspaper establishment of the O.P./Company, having average annual revenue of Rs.4.87 Crore during the relevant period, falls under Class VII. The revenue of the Kolkata unit for the relevant years are as follows “-

2007 – 08	Rs. 4.72 Cr.
2008 – 09	Rs. 4.84 Cr.
2009 – 10	Rs. 5.05 Cr.

The same would be evident from the financial records of the O.P./Company for the relevant years.

In terms of provision to Section II 3(ii) of Chapter XIX of the Majithia Wage Board Recommendations, notwithstanding clubbing of different departments, branches and centers of newspaper establishments on basis of gross revenue, the Kolkata unit of the Respondent which is under Class VII, cannot be stepped up by more than two classes i.e. Class V. The claimant in any event was being paid higher wages than the prescribed for employees working in a Class V newspaper establishment.

8. That applicant joined the company with effect from 23.02.2005 vide agreement dated 11.03.2005 entered into with the company. She specially opted /agreed not to be governed by any Wage Board machinery under this service agreement as she herself negotiated her salary before joining the company. In terms of Clause 4 of the agreement dated 05.11.2012 and Clause 5 of the agreement dated 30.09.2015 she had categorically agreed not to have any claim to a grade prescribed or may be prescribed by any wage fixation machinery. The claimant by agreeing to and enjoying a CTC pay and special benefits thereunder, is estopped from claiming benefits under recommendation of wage board if at all applicable.
  9. That issuance of accreditation card by the Govt. of West Bengal is irrelevant to this adjudication since it does not disclose the specific duties being discharged by the claimant while she was engaged with the Multi Media Content Division of the O.P./Company.
  10. That the claimant was paid the sum of Rs.81,961/- towards the full and final settlement of dues, gratuity amount of Rs.96,051/-.
- As the company already paid more than the recommendation of Majithia Wage Board, so payment of arrear does not arise.
11. That the Labour Commissioner of West Bengal submitted compliance affidavit on behalf of State of West Bengal in Contempt Petition no. 411/2014 in WP(C) 246/2011 based on the directions given by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India. In the said compliance affidavit the names of the newspaper establishment who did not implement the recommendations of Majithia Wage Board were listed. However the name of H.T. Media Ltd. was not included therein.

As usual the written statement of the O.P./company ends with prayer for dismissal of the instant proceedings with cost upon claimant. The claimant is not entitled to receive any alleged arrear as such due from the O.P./Company.

### Evidences on Record

To prove this case, applicant Smt. Mou Chakraborty examined herself as P.W.-1 and Sri Subhodeep Kanjee was examined as P.W.-2. Copy of Order dated 23.04.2018 issued by Dy. Secretary, Labour Department, Govt. of West Bengal referring the instant matter to this Ld. Court along with annexed copy of report and a corrigendum dated 28.06.2018 issued by Dy. Secretary. Labour Department, Govt. of West Bengal (Six pages) were marked as **Exhibit-1 (Collectively)**, photocopy of Identity Card issued by Department of Information and Cultural Affairs, Government of West Bengal was marked as **Exhibit-2**, copy of acceptance of resignation dated 09.01.2017 signed by the authorised signatory of H.T. Media Ltd. was marked as **Exhibit-3**, copy of letter dated 23.05.2016 issued by Shaad Saxena, Executive Director, Operations & H.R. along with one page annexure was marked as **Exhibit-4**, copy of letter dated 01.02.2017 issued by Nabin garg, Chief Human Resources Officer of H.T. Media Ltd. was marked as **Exhibit-5**, copy of the statement with break up of applicant's salary and other allowances including gratuity, provident fund together with 2 months' notice pay. The applicant had received the said statement on 06.03.2017 and put her endorsement was marked as **Exhibit-6**, copy of Advice given to the applicant by H.T. Media Ltd. regarding the amount credited in the name of the applicant against her Gratuity was marked as **Exhibit-6/1**, copy of H.T. Media Certificate of Achievement dated 21.05.2014 issued by Hindusthan Times was marked as **Exhibit-7**, copy of H.T. Media Certificate of Achievement issued in June 2013 by Hindusthan Times was marked as **Exhibit-8**, copy of H.T. Media Certificate of Achievement issued in June 2013 by Hindusthan Times was marked as **Exhibit-9**, copy of completion certificate of a course in better reporting writing in New Delhi in May, 2017 of Hindusthan Times was marked as **Exhibit-10**, copy of service contract arrangement dt. 30.09.2015 between the company and applicant (four pages) was marked as **Exhibit-11**, copy of service contract arrangement dt. 05.11.2012 between the company and applicant (four pages) was marked as **Exhibit-12**, copy of letter dated 27.01.2011 issued by Sharmila Ghosh, Vice President HR of H.T. Media Ltd. addressing to the applicant was marked as **Exhibit-13**, copy of letter dated 26.02.2008 issued by Sharmila Ghosh, Assistant Vice President HR of H.T. Media Ltd. addressing to the applicant was marked as **Exhibit-14**, copy of service contract dt. 11.03.2005 between the company and applicant (two pages) was marked as **Exhibit-15**, copies of Annual Performance Review for the period 2015-2016 (five pages) was marked as **Exhibit-16**, copy of letter dated 18.05.2014 along with one page annexure regarding salary of the applicant break-up issued by Sharad Saxena, Executive Director, Operations & H.R. of H.T. Media Ltd. was marked as **Exhibit-17**, copies of Annual Performance Review for the period 2013-2014, 2011-2012, 2010-2011, 2009-2010 (sixteen pages) was marked as **Exhibit-18 (Collectively)**, copy of letter dated 10.05.2007 along with one page annexure regarding salary of the applicant break-up

issued by Sharad Saxena, Executive Director, Operations & H.R. of H.T. Media Ltd. was marked as **Exhibit-19**, photocopies of published articles of the applicant was marked as **'X' for identification**, photocopies of Annual Report of H.T. Media Ltd. obtained from the official website of the company was marked as **'Y' for identification**, copy of pre-typed resignation letter dated 09.01.2017 given by the applicant addressing Mr. Rajib Bagchi was marked as **Exhibit-20 (Objected to)**, copy of acceptance of resignation letter signed by authorised signatory of H.T. Media Limited was marked as **Exhibit-21**, copy of relieving letter dated 01.02.2017 was marked as **Exhibit-22**, copies of certificate of arrear salary for the period 11.11.2011 to 09.01.2017 as per The Majithia Wages Boards Recommendation" prepared and signed by K.L. Chattarath & Co., Chartered Accountants was marked as **Exhibit-23 (objected to)**, copy of Role Sheet of Mou Chakraborty was marked as **Exhibit-A**, the file number Comp 57/17/EL containing 50 pages was marked as **Exhibit-24**. They were fully cross-examined.

O.P./Management examined Arghya Sengupta as O.P.W.-1. He was fully cross examined.

#### **Rulings cited by applicant**

Reliance is placed on 1969 FLR 186, ABP(SC),  
 1980(41) FLR 156, Waman Ganpat Raut(Bom DB), para 9, 10  
 1985(II) LLJ 401, Arkal Govind Raj(SC), paras 8, 11, 12 and 16  
 1988(56) FLR 148, National Engineering(SC)  
 2006(111) FLR 581, Anand (SC), para 12 to14  
 2007(114) FLR585, C.Gupta(SC), para 20  
 1996(II) LLN 871, FCI(SC) @ para-15, (2014) 3 SCC 327, ABP  
 Limited  
 1978(1) LLJ 322, KCP(SC),

#### **Rulings cited by O.P./Company**

**Ref No. 31/2018 (Old I.D. No. 113/2017)** before the Presiding Officer, Principal Labour Court, Bengaluru between NiranjanSingh Shekawat – vs The Management of H.T. Media Ltd.

**2019 SCC Online All 4536 : (2020) 164 FLR 1046: (2020) 2 LLJ 750 : (2020) 3 ALL LJ (NOC 109) 43 : (2020) 1 CLR 872**

**(2024) 4 S.C.R. 100 : 2024 INSC 265 M/S Bharti Airtel Ltd. Vs A.S.Raghavendra SCC 1994 Supp (3) Supreme Court Cases 126 M/s. P.K. Ramalah and Company vs Chairman & Managing Director, National Thermal Power Corpn.**

**2017 SCC Online All 4957 : (2017) 3 CLR 647 : (2017) 155 FLR 391 Hindustan Media Ventures Ltd. – vs State of U.P. and 3 others**

### Decision with Reasons

Let me begin my exegesis by drawing attention to particulars of facts and laws ---

Record reveals vide letter No. Labr/289/(LC-IR)/Estt/TRIB/1L-24/17 dt. Kolkata 23.04.2018 of Labour Department, Govt. of West Bengal, reference was made from Labour Department, Govt. of West Bengal for adjudication of the Industrial Dispute between Smt. Mou Chakraborty and M/s. H.T. Media and this Court was also directed to submit its Award to State Government in terms of Sub-Section (2A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947 (14 of 1947) subject to the other provision or provisions of the said Act. So, plea of the O.P./Company that as the Labour Commissioner of West Bengal submitted compliance affidavit on behalf of State of West Bengal in Contempt Petition no. 411/2014 in WP(C) 246/2011 based on the directions given by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India and in the said compliance affidavit the names of the newspaper establishments who did not implement the recommendations of Majithia Wage Board were listed but not the name of H.T. Media Ltd., and as such there cannot be any need for adjudication as to claim of arrear from O.P./Company cannot be accepted.

Thus, first of all it is pertinent to decide whether applicant is a working journalist within the meaning of The Working Journalists and Other Newspaper Employees (Condition of service) and Misc. Provisions Act 1955.

According to **Section 2(f)** of The Working Journalists and Other Newspaper Employees (Conditions of service) and Misc. Provisions Act 1955 **Working Journalist** means a person whose principle avocation is that of a journalist and [who is employed as such, either whole time or part time, in, or in relation to, one or more newspaper establishments], and includes an editor, a leader writer, news editor, sub-editor, feature writer, copy tester, reporter, correspondent, cartoonist, news photographer and proof reader, but does not include any such person who

- (i) is employed mainly in a managerial or administrative capacity, or
- (ii) being employed in a supervisory capacity, performs, either by the nature of the duties attached to his office or by reason of the powers vested in him, functions mainly of a managerial nature.

According to **Section 2(d)** of The Working Journalists and Other Newspaper Employees (Conditions of service) and Misc. Provisions Act 1955 **Newspaper establishment** means an establishment under the control of any person or body of persons, whether incorporated or not, for the production or publication of one or more newspapers or for conducting any news agency or syndicate [and includes newspaper establishments specified as one establishment under the Schedule.

Explanation.- For the purpose of this Clause , -

- a) different departments, branches and centres of newspaper establishments shall be treated as parts thereof;
- b) a printing press shall be deemed to be a newspaper establishment if the principal business thereof is to print newspaper;

Usually alternative titles for a journalist job include Reporter, press officer, features writer. Newspaper or magazine journalist write articles and stories for local, regional, national and online publications.

However there is difference between a journalist and a content creator

While a journalist can easily expand his or her work to include content creation, a content creator cannot easily play the role of journalist. Anyone can be a content creator, but not anyone can be a journalist. Journalism is a profession. There are laws and code of ethics guiding the practice of journalism.

Multimedia content is information containing more than one form of data including text audio, image, animation, or video- in a single presentation. Multimedia content provides a powerful means to simplify complex, concepts through visualizations, animations, and alternative elements, making them more understandable and digestible for the audience. Higher conversion rates: Multimedia content has the potential to drive higher conversion rates.

Multimedia Authoring or development is the process of creating content which includes multiple forms of media. For example a CD can contain audio, video, pictures, etc. Presentations are rich with multimedia and often include visuals, text, audio and video.

7 multimedia contents are seven types of multimedia content which are text, images, audio, video, animation, interactive content and virtual reality. Even type serves a unique purpose and can be used in different ways to enhance communication and engagement.

Multimedia content creators create video media content that aligns with a brand's marketing objectives. They may also create and maintain social media content and ensure that a university's web pages are visually appealing and up-to-date.

Content creators can work as independent contractors or as salaried employees. They can charge by the project, by the hour, or by the month.

Content creators and journalists have different roles and goals:

Content creators focus on personalised, niche content across various platforms to build a dedicated audience.

Journalists work for established media outlets to deliver news and information to a broader audience. They emphasize accuracy, objectivity and public interest.

Multimedia content creators can work for a variety of organizations, including newspaper, and can have different roles depending on the organization.



However Multimedia Journalists Write or narrate news storied, reviews, or commentary for print broadcast or other media outlets, such as newspapers, magazines, radio or television. They may collect and analyze information through interviews, investigations, or observation.

Now from materials on record more particularly from Exhibit 11, 12, 15 service agreements, role sheet (Exhibit A) and Annual Performance Review (Exhibit-18) it is evident that applicant Mou Chakraborty as Special Correspondent and staff writer in HT Editorial Department had to do such duties and responsibilities as may be assigned by the company to her from time to time. She used work under and in close coordination with Resident Editor, HT Editorial, Kolkata. Duties and functions of Mou Chakraborty was to administer and coordinate the news gathering and news coverage activities for the Hindustan Times. Mou Chakraborty had to undertake such other assignments as may be entrusted to her by the Editor/Management. Mou Chakraborty was responsible for maintaining highest standards of quality and efficiency. Mou Chakraborty had to maintain the highest ethics and quality during her tenure and had to ensure full coordination with other departments.

**Exhibit-12** also revealed that Mou Chakraborty during work in Multimedia Content Management Division, Kolkata. Duties and functions of Mou Chakraborty was to administer and coordinate the newsgathering and news coverage activities for the Hindustan Times. Mou Chakraborty had to undertake such other assignments as may be entrusted to her by the Editor/Management. Mou Chakraborty was responsible for maintaining highest standards of quality and efficiency. Mou Chakraborty had to maintain the highest ethics and quality during her tenure.

As per Role Sheet (**Exhibit-A**) she also to had a Digital First approach to news and file early copies for the net, reporting live from the scene such as press conferences etc. via digital platform and/or Social Media, to use Social Media to source, track news, generate ideas, tip-offs and leads and encourage the team to do so as well, to use superior domain knowledge and a very strong network or sources to produces newsworthy stories that were well researches, accurate and balanced, to ensure that stories by team members were well written, well structured and need minimal editing, assign beats and ensure stories were filed in time by all for multiple platforms, to ensure that no spot stories are missed by the team and be tenacious in following up stories from other publications, to add value to stories with context, perspective and suitable visuals, propose and initiate special stories, features and packages to enhance reader engagement across multiple platforms, to attend reader feedback sessions, to maintain a bank of ideas and features and to have the ability to balance spot news with assignments from a medium to long term diary, to seek opportunities for multiplatform coverage of content, to contribute to

such changes that strengthen HT's news coverage, contribute to changes in processes and systems that make news flow more efficient,

She was given further responsibility of drive implementation of HT's Digital First Vision among team members, work with page editors, reporters, photographers and designers to identify opportunities for collaborative work and packages, help in implementation of programmes/processes for better team work, lead teams in producing collective briefs, proactively guide and mentor junior colleagues.

However, by way of cross examinations O.P./Company fails to shake Exhibit 2 to 18 which rather proves her working as staff writer/reporter/ Special Correspondent at O.P./Company.

It is trite law that a working journalist with further responsibility of some supervisory work, do not become herself a supervisor or management cadre person. Record does not reveal that applicant concerned had any capacity to grant leave to any employee or to appoint any one or to dismiss anyone or to punish anyone in any way including drawing of departmental proceedings etc. against any one.

This court accordingly holds applicant Mou Chakraborty a working journalist within the meaning of section 2(f) of The Working Journalists and Other Newspaper Employees (Conditions of service) and Misc. Provisions Act 1955 and not a person belonging to supervisor or management cadre.

Admittedly H.T. Media Ltd. used to publish newspaper along with other activities. The service contracts (Exhibit 11, 12, 15) all were entered in between the applicant Mou Chakraborty and H.T. Media Ltd., New Delhi 110001 with all over India posting liability. No service contracts were entered in between the applicant and H.T. Media Ltd., Kolkata Unit. So applicant was an employee of H.T. Media Ltd. New Delhi posted at Kolkata and not an employee of H.T. Media Ltd, Kolkata Unit as a separate organisation or entity, and it stands proved that at least upto 08.01.2017 applicant was an employee of H.T. Media Ltd. posted at Kolkata.

Consequently for the purpose of fixing class of the O.P./Company it is to be considered as per overall Annual Turnover Report of the H.T. Media Ltd. New Delhi, not as H.T. Media Kolkata Unit, as a separate entity.

Now record reveals in spite of several opportunities and directions O.P./Company did not produce Annual Turnover Reports concerned, for reasons best known to it. There cannot be any doubt that O.P./Company concerned was the best person to produce them and also custodian of all such Annual Turnover Reports. Thus this Court is constrained to take adverse inference against the O.P./Company. Besides evidence of the applicant/witness that O.P./Company comes under Class-I category as per recommendations of Majithia Wage Board, remains unshaken by cross examinations of O.P./Company. Thus this Court holds O.P./Company concerned as a Class-I establishment.

Now it is to be decided whether applicant is entitled to Majithia Wage Board Recommendations in spite of receiving benefits under contract with O.P./Company. Ld. Lawyer for O.P./Company argued for **Principles of Acquiescence** and argued that when applicant accepted his wages as per service agreement / contract without any protest and also received all payments from O.P./Company as per O.P./Company's calculation on resignation without any objection, applicant is estopped from claiming any more benefit as per Majithia Wage Board Recommendations.

It is trite law that Indian Evidence Act is not applicable in stricto sensu to industrial disputes, proceedings. In proceedings under Industrial Tribunal and Labour Courts only principles thereto are to be adhered. A wage board is a committee that reviews an Industry's capacity to pay and states what should be the minimum wages. The Wage Board is made up of representatives of workers, employers and independent persons. The purpose of Wage Board is to resolve wage related disputes and making decisions on minimum wages, cost of living, adjustments and other issues. Majithia Wage Board for working journalists and non journalists newspaper employees are also for the said reasons. Govt. of India constituted Wage Boards, (Majithia Wage Board) one for Working Journalists and other for Non Journalists Newspaper Employees in 2007, under the Chairmanship of Justice Majithia.

The Majithia Wage Board's recommendations inter alia included wage increase, variable pay, dearness allowance increase etc. Hon'ble Supreme Court uphold the constitutional validity of Majithia Wage Board in 2014. Hon'ble Court directed newspapers establishments to pay their employees in accordance with that recommendations starting from April 2014. However arrears were to be paid in four instalments starting from November 11, 2011.

Considering golden threads of principles of law laid down by Hon'ble Apex Court in **Ramdev Food Products (P) Ltd. vs Arvindbhai Rambhai Patel & Ors.** (2006) 8 SCC 726, any cases involving equity of justice the conduct of parties has also to be considered to be a ground for attracting the background of Estoppel by acquiescence of waiver for infringement of their rights. Acquiescence is sitting by or allowing another to invade the rights and spending money on it. It is a course of conduct inconsistent with the claim for exclusive rights of claimant. It implies positive acts not merely silence or inaction such as involved in laches. Therefore acquiescence is one facet of delay. If the plaintiff stood up by knowingly and let the defendants build up an important trade un-till it had become necessary to crush it, then the plaintiff would be stopped by their acquiescence. If the acquiescence as the infringement amounts to consent it will be a complete defence.

Here O.P./Company took the plea of acquiescence in relation to Section 16 of the The Working Journalists and Other Newspaper Employees (Condition of service) and Misc. Provisions Act 1955 and argued that benefits in the service contract with the

O.P./Company for the applicant was more beneficial than Majithia Wage Board Recommendations and as such applicant availed the same. However by cogent evidences O.P./Company has failed to prove the same that benefits accorded to the applicant in service contract (Exhibit-12, 12, 15) were more beneficial than that of recommendations of Majithia Wage Board Recommendations. Besides there cannot any person who after getting better benefits than the wage board recommendations through a service contract will sue the company concerned afresh for benefits under Majithia Wage Board Recommendations. Again Majithia Wage Board was established to meet up requirements of minimum needs of the working class. By way of service agreement / contract such beneficial provisions cannot be snatched away by any person from the applicant. It was opined by Hon'ble Apex Court in above referred ruling that the defense of acquiescence thus would be satisfied only when the plaintiff assents to or lays by in relation to the acts of another person and in view of that assent or laying by and consequent acts it would be unjust in all the circumstances to grant the specific relief, which is not in this case. Hence this Court holds that applicant is entitled to Majithia Wage Board Recommendations benefits from 11.11.2011 to 08.01.2017 and ruling cited by Ld. Lawyer for O.P./Company are not applicable here in the facts and circumstances of this case, as because,

Ruling cited by Ld. Lawyer for O.P./Company reveals that -----

In **[2024] 4 SCR 100 : 2024 INSC 265** Claimant concerned himself described his position as a member of Senior Manager cadre, in charge of supervising the Accounts Managers. There he was also assessing manager of his team having car hiring charges, petrol and maintenance, Driver's salary etc. So, I am of view that facts and circumstances of present case and that of in **[2024] 4 SCR 100 :** are different and this ruling is not applicable here in my view.

In **209 SCC Online AII 4536 : (2020) 164 FLR 1046**

Reference was made to Labour Court with regard to the legality/validity of the termination of workman, in my view which is not similar to the facts and circumstances of present case and this ruling is also not applicable here in my view.

**Regarding 1994 Supp (3) Supreme Court Cases 126**, I am of view that therein moot question was whether there was subsisting contract for reference after acknowledgement of final measurement and acceptance there of and also whether claim was barred by limitation, which are different from facts and circumstances of this case and such ruling is not applicable in my view in present facts and circumstances of this case.

Regarding **2017 SCC Online AII 4957 : 2017 3CLR 647** I am of view that there in the question was whether amount directed to be paid by Asstt. Labour Commissioner may be described as 'due under this Act' for the purpose of S.17(1) of the Act or whether it was a claim made by the employees of the petitioners that requires prior adjudication through reference procedure in accordance with S.17(2) of the Act, which are in my

view different from facts and circumstances of this case and this ruling is not applicable in the present facts and circumstances of this Case.

**Award of Presiding Officer, Principal Labour Court, Bengaluru dt. 30<sup>th</sup> September 2019** in Reference No.31 of 2018, in my view cannot help the O.P./Company being different in facts and circumstances from this case, and also having no binding force on this Labour Labour Court, Kolkata, West Bengal.

**RELIEF**

In view of aforesaid discussions, this Court holds that this applicant / workman is entitled to following relieves :-

- i. O.P./Management is directed to pay the applicant **Smt. Mou Chakraborty** due wages including Dearness Allowance amounting to Rs. **18,59,121.00 (Rupees eighteen lakh fifty-nine thousand one hundred twenty-one) only** for the period from 11.11.2011 to 08.01.2017 within four (4) months from the date of this order particulars of which have been set down in the schedule supplied herewith.
- ii. From kind observations of Hon'ble High Court, Calcutta in its Judgment on **10.09.2014** in **M.A.T. 1661 of 2013 with CAN 10733 of 2013** it can be safely hold that following the principles of law as laid down in Hon'ble Supreme Court in **case of S.K. Dua Vs State of Haryana and another** reported in **2008 (3) SCC** in spite of absence of statutory rule or guideline or administrative instructions or absence of any provision of Industrial Disputes Act for payment of interest, in consonance with **part III** of the constitution relying on **Article 14, 19, 21**, an employee can get simple interest at the rate of **10% per annum** from the date of filing this proceedings **U/S 33C(2)** of The Industrial Disputes Act 1947 till the date of actual payment thereof.

Thus following such principles of law, O.P./Company shall also be liable to pay 10% interest on total due wages Rs. **18,59,121.00 (Rupees eighteen lakh fifty-nine thousand one hundred twenty-one) only** from the date of filing of this proceedings U/S 17(2) of The Working Journalists and Other Newspaper Employees (Conditions of Service) and Miscellaneous Provisions Act 1955 till the date of actual payment.

Accordingly this proceedings is **allowed on contest but in part** and without any cost.

**AND**

**This is my Award.**

Let a certified copy of this Award U/S 17AA of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947 be given free of cost to the parties and also a copy of the same be sent to Department concerned of Government of West Bengal for necessary action.

The Government is directed to publish the award in such manner as it thinks fit within a period of 30 days from the date of receipt of the same.

The Award shall become enforceable on the expiry of 30 days from the date of its publication.

The Government is directed to intimate the publication of award to all the parties to the case by registered post with acknowledgement due, without fail.

**Announced in open court on 04.12.2024.**

(Typed to my dictation directly by the Judgment Writer and Stenographer, corrected and then signed by me on this the 4<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF DECEMBER 2024)

**MADHUSUDAN PAL  
JUDGE  
FIRST LABOUR COURT  
KOLKATA, WEST BENGAL  
04.12.2024**

**SCHEDULE**

**Arrear wages including Dearness Allowance of Mou Chakraborty 11.11.2011 to 08.01.2017**

Particulars	Amount (Rs.)
From 11.11.2011 to 31.03.2013	4,41,693.00
From 01.04.2013 to 31.03.2014	3,39,397.00
From 01.04.2014 to 31.03.2015	3,44,321.00
From 01.04.2015 to 31.03.2016	3,48,387.00
From 01.04.2016 to 08.01.2017	3,85,323.00
<b>Total Arrear wages including Dearness Allowance</b>	<b>18,59,121.00</b>

Interest @10% to be added on the aforesaid amount of Rs. **18,59,121.00 (Rupees eighteen lakh fifty-nine thousand one hundred twenty-one) only** from the date of filing this proceedings U/S 17(2) of The Working Journalists and Other Newspaper Employees (Conditions of Service) and Miscellaneous Provisions Act 1955 till the date of actual payment thereof.

I/594351/2025

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

No. Labr/ 37 /(LC-IR)/22015(16)/7/2025

Date : 08.01.2025

**ORDER**

WHEREAS an industrial dispute existed between M/s. H.T. Media Ltd. having their registered office at Hindustan Times House, 18-20 Kasturba Gandhi Marg, New Delhi – 11001 and also having their Kolkata Office at DLF IT Park-I, Tower-1, 12th Floor, Block-AF, 8, Major Arterial Road, New Town, Rajarhat, Kolkata – 700 156 and their workman Smt. Mou Chakraborty, daughter of Late Pinaki Ranjan Chakraborty, 3rd Floor, 146/8D, Lake Gardens, Kolkata – 700 045, regarding the issues, being a matter specified in the second schedule to the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) ;


AND WHEREAS the 1<sup>st</sup> Labour Court, Kolkata has submitted to the State Government its Award dated 04.12.2024 in Case No. 12/2018 on the said Industrial Dispute Vide e-mail dated 18.12.2024 in compliance of u/s 10(2A) of the I.D. Act, 1947.

NOW, THEREFORE, in pursuance of the provisions of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Governor is pleased hereby to publish the said Award as shown in the Annexure hereto.

**ANNEXURE**

( Attached herewith )

By order of the Governor,

  
Assistant Secretary


to the Government of West Bengal

No. Labr/ 37 /1(5)/(LC-IR)/ 22015(16)/7/2025

Date : 08.01.2025

Copy with a copy of the Award forwarded for information and necessary action to :-

1. M/s. H.T. Media Ltd. having their registered office at Hindustan Times House, 18-20 Kasturba Gandhi Marg, New Delhi – 11001 and also having their Kolkata Office at DLF IT Park-I, Tower-1, 12th Floor, Block-AF, 8, Major Arterial Road, New Town, Rajarhat, Kolkata – 700 156.
2. Smt. Mou Chakraborty, daughter of Late Pinaki Ranjan Chakraborty, 3rd Floor, 146/8D, Lake Gardens, Kolkata – 700 045.
3. The Asstt. Labour Commissioner, W.B. In-Charge, Labour Gazette.
4. The OSD & EO Labour Commissioner, W.B., New Secretariat Building, 11<sup>th</sup> Floor, 1, Kiran Sankar Roy Road, Kolkata – 700001.
5. The Deputy Secretary, IT Cell, Labour Department, with the request to cast the Award in the Department's website.


  
Assistant Secretary

No. Labr/ 37 /2(3)/(LC-IR)/ 22015(16)/7/2025

Date : 08.01.2025

Copy forwarded for information to :-

1. The Judge, 1<sup>st</sup> Labour Court, N. S. Building, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, 1, K.S. Roy Road, Kolkata - 700001 with respect to his e-mail dated 18.12.2024.
2. The Joint Labour Commissioner (Statistics), West Bengal, 6, Church Lane, Kolkata - 700001.
3. Office Copy.

  
Assistant Secretary