

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM
PRESENT
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE MOHAMMED NIAS C.P.

Monday, the 10th day of March 2025 / 19th Phalguna, 1946
WP(C) NO. 20902 OF 2017(K)

PETITIONER:

KERALA ELECTRICITY EMPLOYEES CONFEDERATION (INTUC) REGISTRATION
NO.01-04/87,AFFILIATION NO.10485,V.P.MARAKKAR SMARAKA
MANDIRAM,AMBUJAVILASOM ROAD, THIRUVANANTHAPURAMREPRESENTED BY ITS
GENERAL SECRETARY

RESPONDENTS:

1. KERALA STATE ELECTRICITY BOARD LTD REPRESENTED BY ITS CHAIRMAN AND
AMANAGING DIRECTOR VYDUTHI BHAVAN PATTOM, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM
PIN-695002
2. THE CHIEF ENGINEER HRM KERALA STATE ELECTRICITY BOARD,VYDUTHI
BHAVAN, PATTOM, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-PIN-695002

Writ petition (civil) praying inter alia that in the circumstances
stated in the affidavit filed along with the WP(C) the High Court be
pleased to issue an interim order, directing the respondents not to
initiate any disciplinary action against the employees of 1st respondent
for approaching a Court of law, pending final disposal of this case.

This petition coming on for orders upon perusing the petition and
the affidavit filed in support of WP(C) and upon hearing the arguments of
SRI. G S REGHUNATH, Advocate for the petitioner and of
SRI.S.P.ARAVINDAKSHAN PILLAY, Advocate for the respondents, the court
passed the following:

MOHAMMED NIAS C. P. , J.

=====

W. P. (C) No. 20902 of 2017

=====

Dated this the 10th day of March, 2025

ORDER

The challenge in this writ petition is against Ext.P1 order which directed the employees, in their disputes on service matters, to approach the statutory avenues in the administrative hierarchical foundations of the KSEBL and also, threatened disciplinary action against them if anybody approaches the Court without exercising the options available in the hierarchy. Though the threat of disciplinary proceedings cannot be sustained, the direction of the Board to the employees, to first bring their grievances on service matters before the hierarchy of officers, cannot be said to be wrong in any manner and in fact, is laudable. However, as rightly pointed out by the learned counsel for the petitioner, there is no time limit indicated for considering such grievances.

In view of the above, the KSEBL is directed to take a fresh decision on the issue indicating timelines for consideration by the

W. P. (C) No. 20902 of 2017

..2..

administrative hierarchy and also, by deleting the threat of disciplinary action indicated in 'clause (iii)'. The Board shall consider the same, with notice to the petitioner, and pass a fresh order within two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. In case the Board has passed subsequent orders to the above effect, fresh consideration will not be required and it will be open to the Board to produce the same before this Court.

Post on 8.4.2025.



Sd/-

MOHAMMED NIAS C. P.,
JUDGE

MMG

APPENDIX OF WP(C) 20902/2017

EXHIBIT P1:

**TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER DATD 6.6.2017 ISSUED BY 1ST
RESPONDENT**

