

Karnataka State Road Transport ... vs B.S. Hullikatti on 22 January, 2001

Equivalent citations: AIR 2001 SUPREME COURT 930, 2001 AIR SCW 593, 2001 LAB. I. C. 740, 2002 AIR - KANT. H. C. R. 644, (2001) 2 JT 72 (SC), 2001 (1) UPLBEC 829, 2001 (3) SRJ 27, 2001 (2) JT 72, 2001 (2) SCC 574, 2001 (3) SERVLJ 188 SC, 2001 (1) SCALE 373, 2001 (1) LRI 165, 2001 LAB LR 259, 2001 (1) ALL CJ 518, 2001 SCC (L&S) 469, (2001) 98 FJR 359, (2001) 1 GUJ LH 796, (2001) 88 FACLR 912, (2001) 1 LABLJ 725, (2001) 1 LAB LN 893, (2001) 2 MAD LJ 7, (2001) 1 SCT 787, (2001) 2 SCJ 195, (2001) 1 SERVLR 781, (2001) 1 UPLBEC 829, (2001) 1 SUPREME 342, (2001) 1 SCALE 373, (2001) 1 UC 396, (2001) 1 CURLR 699

Bench: B.N. Kirpal, Ruma Pal

CASE NO.:

Appeal (civil) 784 of 2001

PETITIONER:

KARNATAKA STATE ROAD TRANSPORT CORPORATION

RESPONDENT:

B.S. HULLIKATTI

DATE OF JUDGMENT: 22/01/2001

BENCH:

B.N. KIRPAL & MRS. RUMA PAL

JUDGMENT:

JUDGMENT 2001 (1) SCR 487 The following Order of the Court was delivered :

Special Leave granted.

In the instant case, the respondent was a Bus Conductor working with the appellant-Corporation. A domestic inquiry was held in which it was alleged that he had collected at a particular trip of the bus Rs. 2.25 from each of the 35 passengers but had issued tickets of the denomination of Rs. 1.75 only.

As a result of the domestic inquiry, the respondent was dismissed from service. Reference was made to the Labour Court which came to the conclusion that the domestic inquiry was not fair or proper. Opportunity was given to the appellant to produce evidence which it did.

After recording the evidence, the Labour Court by the impugned award came to the conclusion that the allegation that the Conductor had issued tickets of Rs. 1.75 instead of Rs. 2.25 was proved but it had not been proved that he had collected the amount of Rs. 2.25 from the passengers. The Labour Court set aside the punishment of dismissal and directed reinstatement with full back wages. On a writ petition being filed by the appellant- Corporation, the Single Judge dismissed the same after noting that the Labour Court had awarded 50 percent of the back wages with reinstatement. Realising that this was a mistake, the Single Judge rectified the same and ordered reinstatement with full back wages, the letters patent appeal was dismissed. Hence, this appeal by special leave.

On the facts as found by the Labour Court and the High Court, it is evident that there was a short-charging of the fare by the respondent from as many as 35 passengers. We are informed that the respondent had been in service as a Conductor for nearly 22 years. It is difficult to believe that he did not know what was the correct fare which was to be charged. Further-more, the appellant had during the disciplinary proceedings taken into account the fact that the respondent had been found guilty for as many as 36 times on different dates. Be that as it may, the principle of *res ipsa loquitur*, namely, the facts speak for themselves, is clearly applicable in the instant case. Charging 50 paise per ticket less from as many as 35 passengers could only be to get financial benefit by the Conductor. this act was either dishonest or was so grossly negligent that the respondent was not fit to be retained as a Conductor because such action or inaction of his is bound to result in financial loss to the appellant-Corporation.

It is misplaced sympathy by the Labour Courts in such cases when on checking it is found that the Bus Conductors have either not issued tickets to a large number of passengers, though they should have, or have issued tickets of a lower denomination knowing fully well the correct fare to be charged. It is the responsibility of the Bus Conductors to collect the correct fare from the passengers and deposit the same with the Company. they act in a fiduciary capacity and it would be a case of gross misconduct if knowingly they do not collect any fare or the correct amount of fare.

In our opinion, the order of dismissal should not have been set aside, but we are informed that in the meantime the respondent has already superannuated. We, therefore, on the special facts of this case, do not set aside the order of reinstatement, but direct that the respondent would not be entitled to any back wages at all but he would be entitled to the retiral benefits.

The appeal is disposed of in the aforesaid terms.