
Noorul Islam Education Trust Vs Assistant Labour Officer

Writ Petition No. 3947 of 2007

Court: High Court Of Kerala

Date of Decision: Dec. 6, 2007

Acts Referred:

Kerala Shops and Commercial Establishment Act, 1960 " Section 2(15), 2(4), 2(8),
5#Maternity Benefits Act, 1961 " Section 2, 2(1)

Citation: (2008) 117 FLR 533 : (2008) 1 ILR (Ker) 97 : (2008) 2 LLJ 774

Hon'ble Judges: K. Balakrishnan Nair, J; A.K. Basheer, J

Bench: Division Bench

Advocate: P.N. Ravindran, Preethi Karunakaran, A. Meena, M.R. Mini and K.S. Jayakar, for
the Appellant; R. Lakshmi Narayanan, for the Respondent

Final Decision: Dismissed

Judgement

K. Balakrishnan Nair, J.

The petitioner is a Trust, which is running a self-financing Dental College at Aralummoodu in Neyyattinkara

Taluk. As part of that college, there is a Dental Hospital also. The question raised in this Writ Petition is regarding the applicability
of the provisions

of various labour laws to the said hospital.

2. The brief facts of the case are the following. The petitioner runs a Dental College, after getting all the requisite
sanctions/permissions/affiliation

from all the statutory authorities. It is also registered under the provisions of the Kerala Municipality (Registration of Private
Hospitals and Private

Para-medical Institutions) Rules, 1997, as a private hospital. While so, the Assistant Labour Officer, Neyyattinkara issued Exhibit
P-5 inspection

note, calling upon the petitioner to produce certain registers to be maintained under various labour laws, before him. The petitioner
filed Exhibit P-6

objection, stating that the Government of Kerala have exempted private hospitals and allied institutions from the provisions of the
Kerala Shops

and Commercial Establishments Act, as per the notification G.O.(Rt) No. 2885/2005/LBR dated October 19, 2005, for a period of two years.

So, it was prayed that further action pursuant to the said notice may be dropped. But, the Assistant Labour Officer replied by Exhibit P-7 notice

dated February 25, 2006, stating that the provisions of various labour laws are applicable to private hospitals also. So, the petitioner was directed

to appear before him along with the registers on March 1, 2006. The petitioner again submitted Exhibit P-8 reply, Later, Exhibit P-9 inspection

note was issued to the petitioner, pointing out the violations of certain labour laws committed by it. This Writ Petition is filed, challenging Exhibit P-

9.

3. According to the petitioner, by virtue of the aforementioned notification issued by the, Government u/s 5 of the Kerala" Shops and Commercial

Establishments Act, 1960 on October 19, 2005, all the provisions of the Kerala Shops and Commercial Establishments Act have been exempted,

as far as private hospitals are concerned. In view of the said exemption, it is contended that the provisions of the Maternity Benefit Act, 1961 are

also not applicable to private hospitals. In support of the said submission, the petitioner relied on the decision of this Court in Thomas Eapen v.

Asstt. Labour Officer 1993-II-LLJ-847. It is a decision wherein learned single Judge of this Court held that the provisions of the Maternity Benefit

Act are not applicable to private hospitals.

4. The 1st respondent has filed a counter-affidavit, supporting the impugned action taken by him in issuing Exhibit P-9 inspection note. The learned

single Judge, who heard the matter found it difficult to follow the decision in Thomas Eapen v. Asstt. Labour Officer (supra), and therefore,

referred the Writ Petition to the Division Bench,

5. Heard. Section 5 of the Kerala Shops and Commercial Establishments Act empowers the Government to grant exemption to any establishment

from all or any of the provisions of the Act, if the same is required in public interest. In this case, it is not in dispute that there was an exemption

order issued by the Government on October 19, 2005 u/s 5 of the Act. The said notification reads as follows:

S.R.O. No. 978/2005:--In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 5 of the Kerala Shops and Commercial Establishments Act, 1960 (Act

34 of 1960) the Government of Kerala being satisfied that public interest so requires, hereby exempt the following establishments from the

provisions of the said Act for a period of two years from the date of publication of this notification in the Gazette, namely:

1. Doctors consulting rooms.

2. Dispensaries attached to Doctor"s consulting rooms.

3. Nursing Homes, Hospitals and other allied institutions for the treatment or care of the sick, the infirm, the destitute or the mentally unfit.

6. The provisions of the Maternity Benefit Act, 1961 are applicable to all shops and establishments within the meaning of any law for the time being

in force in relation to shops and establishments in a State, in which ten or more persons are employed or were employed, on any day of the

preceding twelve months. Section 2 of the said Act, which deals with the applicability of the provisions of the Act, reads as follows:

2. Application of Act.--(1) It applies, in the first instance:

(a) to every establishment being a factory, mine or plantation including any such establishment belonging to Government and to every establishment

wherein persons are employed for the Exhibition of equestrian, aerobatic and other performances;

(b) to every shop or establishment within the meaning of any law for the time being in force in relation to shops and establishments in a State, in

which ten or more persons are employed, or were employed, on any day of the preceding twelve months:

Provided that the State Government may, with the approval of the Central Government, after giving not less than two months notice of its intention

of so doing, by notification in the Official Gazette, declare that all or any of the provisions of this Act shall apply also to any other establishment or

class of establishments, industrial, commercial, agricultural or otherwise.

The main part of the above sub-section was amended by Act 61/1988 with effect from January 10, 1989. It appears, earlier, there was no express

provision making the provisions of the Act applicable to shops and commercial establishments. Instead, the State Government made the provisions

applicable to such establishments by a notification issued under the proviso to Sub-section (1) of Section 2. Now, with effect from January 10,

1989, by j virtue of Clause (b) of Section 2(1), the provisions of the Maternity Benefit Act are applicable to all the ""shops"" and ""establishments"" in

the State of Kerala as those terms are understood under the provisions of the; Kerala Shops and Commercial Establishments Act, 1960, provided

ten or more persons are employed in them as stipulated. Section 2(8) of the Kerala Shops and Commercial Establishments Act defines an

establishment as follows:

"establishment" means a shop or a commercial establishment.

A shop is defined u/s 2(15), which reads as follows:

"shop" means any premises where any trade or business, is carried on or where services are rendered to customers, and includes offices, store

rooms, godowns or warehouses, whether in the same premises or otherwise, used in connection with such trade or business but does not include a

commercial establishment or a shop attached to a factory where the persons employed in the shop are allowed the benefits provided for workers

under the Factories Act, 1941 (Central Act 63 of 1948)"". Commercial establishment is defined u/s 2(4), which reads as follows:

commercial establishment" means a commercial or industrial or trading or banking or insurance establishment, an establishment or administrative

service in which the persons employed are mainly engaged in office work, hotel, restaurant, boarding or eating house, cafe or any other

refreshment house, a theatre or any other place of public amusement or entertainment and includes such other establishments as the Government

may, by notification in the Gazette, declare to be a commercial establishment for the purposes of this Act, but does not include a factory to which

all or any of the provisions of the Factories Act, 1948 (Central Act 63 of 1948) apply.

It is not in dispute that a hospital is an establishment for the purposes of Section 2(8) and that is the reason why the Government exempted it from

provisions of the said Act, by issuing a notification u/s 5. But, by virtue of Section 2(1) of the Maternity Benefit Act, private hospitals continued to

be covered by the provisions of the said Act, notwithstanding the exemption of private hospitals from the operation of the provisions of the Kerala

Shops and Commercial Establishments Act, 60. Therefore, the decision in Thomas Eapen v. Asstt. Labour Officer case (supra) does not lay down

the correct legal position. Accordingly, it is overruled.

7. The applicability of the provisions of other labour enactments mentioned in Exhibit P-9 is not seriously disputed by the petitioner. Since we do

not accept the contention of the petitioner that the provisions the Maternity Benefit Act are not applicable to private hospitals, the challenge against

Exhibit P-9 fails. Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed.