

**By Contibution**

## **Employment Relations in Automotive Industry:Indian Experiences**

**P.Sreenivasan & Manas Ranjan Tripathy**

---

*The forces of globalization and marketization of the economy have shifted the scale in favor of employers. The changing patterns of work and nature of employment coupled with not so employee friendly judgments have an abiding impact on the psychological contract at workplace. The issues which are most pertinent in employment relations raise certain questions which needed to be probed and analyzed. Is recognition of union a factor that affects the employment relations? Is compliance of statutory requirements not given the required thrust? In search of answers to these questions, incidents happened in five industries were investigated. The outcome illustrates declining compliance to statutes and unfair practices.*

*P.Sreenivasan* is Chief Manager (HR), Power Grid Corporation & Research Scholar, Indira Gandhi National Open University, New Delhi. E-mail: psree@powergridindia.com. *Manas Ranjan Tripathy* is Faculty Member in HRM Area, IBS, Hyderabad.E-Mail:mrtripathy@ibsindia.org

### **Introduction**

The scope of employment relations has witnessed many changes including pro labor judgments, pro management judgments, recognition of unions, alignment and realignment of unions, cause of contract labor etc. These changes have taken place because of a variety of reasons including HR practices, political factors and economic realities and constraints.

Barring Minimum Wages Act, 1948 and Unorganized Workers Social Security Act 2008, existing labor laws are not providing required relief to employees representing unorganized sector. The employees representing unorganized sector are in large numbers. However, we are witnessing more problems from the organized sector. This is mainly because two sets of employees doing same job with different sets of employment conditions at the same place which is not only

**Two sets of employees doing same job with different sets of employment conditions at the same place which is not only discriminatory but also crude oversight.**

discriminatory but also crude oversight of the conscientious approach.

Building sensitivity to people issues within organizations requires a concerted effort. Very often with the emotions running high among fellow managers, the task of an HR Manager to re-build sensitivity and relations is next to impossible if the top management does not effectively champion it. While dealing with the union which takes up the grievances of employees, management normally look for the factor of recognition, though there is no provision under the Industrial Disputes Act or Trade Union Act, prohibiting the management from negotiating, discussing or entering into settlement with the unrecognized union. The Trade Union Act confers certain rights on the registered unions to ventilate the grievance of the members of its union. In a well settled case, it was held that the management is obliged to hear the union and resolve its disputes as far as possible without resorting to the conciliation and adjudicatory process. Though the management is not obliged to recognize the union, it cannot refuse to hear the grievances voiced by it in respect to service conditions of its members.

### **Methodology**

Our analysis is based on the secondary sources though we discussed the perspective of employment relations with various stakeholders. We concentrated on the chronology of events happened in the recent past involving five automotive industries in pan India locations. The information was collected through interac-

tion with union leaders and union members, public utterances, newspaper reports and reports in the media. Recognition of union, unfair practices, non-compliance of statutory requirements, and violence were mentioned as common factors in these industries. Out of these five cases, three of the industries have been cited as best employers by various independent surveys.

The objectives of the study are:

- a. To understand the issues pertaining to employment relations in Indian automotive industries.
- b. To analyze the reasons for workplace aggression witnessed in recent times.
- c. To draw lessons and implications from the cases cited.

### **Graziano, Greater Noida, 2008**

Oerlikon Graziano India, a 100% subsidiary of Graziano Italy, specializes in making gears and transmission systems for vehicles. It was set up in 1998 and commenced commercial production in 2000. The plant is located in Greater Noida on 15 acres of land (60,000 sqm) having 26,700 sqm covered area with fully capitalized power (6875 KVA PLC controlled generators).

The company employed 650 workers out of which 150 were contract workers. Graziano employed workers mostly from the eastern parts of Uttar Pradesh, Uttarakhand and Bihar. It was alleged that local people were employed mainly to confront and hold back the workers from put-

ting up resistance. The conflict at Graziano had been going on since December 2007, when the workers first came up with the demand for higher wages. It was alleged that CCTV cameras were installed at the workplace preventing workers from taking even a moment of rest and fans were switched off which led to terrible heat in the hall. Long working hours to the tune of twelve hours a day and seven days a week were made compulsory. The second major issue was the unionization of the plant which the registrar of unions refused them thrice. During May 2008, the management started to lock out workers from the factory after they tried to defend their rights by the means of strike action. The workers initiated “go slow” tactics in May simply because the management had decided at the end of a six-month training program that five out of as many as 70 trainees did not deserve to be offered regular employment. The rejection rate worked out to be less than 10% of the trainees, a fair proportion by any standards. However, it was alleged that the management tried to replace the five trainees with contract workers. There was also a complaint to the police against the workers for disturbances caused by the local muscleman of the contractor. The efforts of DLC (Deputy Labor Commissioner) to convince one external union leader in explaining that they could not resort to strike for the confirmation of trainees became futile. Since the strike continued despite the intervention of the Labor Department, the management suspended 27 workers a week later on May 19 on the charge of “serious misconduct” and asked them to participate in a domestic inquiry in keeping with the prescribed procedure. The workers, however boy-

cotted the inquiry, which was therefore conducted ex parte as provided in law. It was as a result of this inquiry against the 27 suspended employees that, two months later on July 15, the management terminated the services of 15 of them while reinstating the rest. While the reinstated members resumed duty the next day, the striking workers demanded that the terminated ones should also be taken back. The fight for the terminated employees in turn affected a settlement concerning 250 other workers who had meanwhile been subjected to a “lockout”. Under the settlement brokered by the Labor Department on July 8, the locked out workers were then being re-inducted in three phases. Though the lockout was due to be lifted in the second phase for a batch of 55 workers on 21<sup>st</sup> July, none of them reported for duty on that day as an expression of solidarity with the 15 terminated employees. In the subsequent talks on 6<sup>th</sup> August, it was the turn of the management to walk out as the terminated employees insisted that they would continue to represent the workers. Three days later, the government representatives submitted a report to the district magistrate of Noida recommending that a reference be made to the Labor Court to decide the legality of the strike as well as the lockout.

As the stalemate dragged on for another month, the management returned to negotiations on 16<sup>th</sup> September. CEO (Chief Executive Officer) in the presence of DLC (Deputy Labor Commissioner) and the union leader informed that, other than the 15 terminated employees (except for those 15 who had played a key role in the struggle), he would take back all those locked out workers if they gave

individual undertakings to maintain discipline and productivity i.e. not to resort to any strikes. Since it did not yield on the issue of terminated employees, the response of the striking workers to the 16<sup>th</sup> September settlement was poor. By the last day, the management received only eight applications and DLC had received another seven, out of some 250 locked out workers. The deadline to sign or to accept dismissal was the fateful day of 22<sup>nd</sup> September. It was alleged that some goons were hired by the management to repress the workers by violent means on the same day who were not willing to sign.

**It was alleged that some goons were hired by the management to repress the workers by violent means on the same day who were not willing to sign.**

According to Graziano employees, the sacked workers rushed into the premises around 12.20pm when the gates were opened to let in a car. "They smashed each one of the approximately 20 cars inside the compound. Hearing the commotion, CEO came out to the building entrance. He was abused while trying to reason with the protesters. When he objected, they beat him to death with a hammer. He was rushed to nearby hospital, where doctors declared him brought dead. The violence left at least 50 executives and workers of the unit injured. Of the 44 staffers taken to hospital, 34 of them were discharged at night. Of these, 10 executives of the company remained in the intensive care unit. (TOI,

2008). Some other senior executives had also sustained serious head injuries. Their skulls had fractured and they had to be operated upon. Huge damage was caused to the unit by the rioters, who used heavy steel rods to attack personnel and destroy property. Five Italian technical consultants, who were visiting the unit, barely managed to escape injuries. Some of them had to plead with the raiders to spare them.(TOI, 2008)

About 150-odd permanent workers who were suspended by the company were accused of taking part in the attack that killed the former managing director. While over 100 were in judicial custody, the rest have gone underground. After a week of the incident, Italian company Graziano Transmission reopened its Greater Noida facility amid tight security. Employees said about 100 workers, mostly hired on contract, arrived in the vehicles of their contractors in the morning and left by 6 pm. Work was confined to a single shift unlike earlier when it used to go on till night. Apart from these workers, about 200 office staffers also worked (Outlook, 2008). The Uttar Pradesh police was posted in the premises and outside (Business Standard, 2008).

### **Pricol, Coimbatore,2009**

Pricol was doing extremely well virtually in all the auto instruments including two wheelers. Pricol had facilities in the Western as well as Northern regions. Besides having a plant in Pune, the firm had also set up another unit at Uttarakhand and Manesar in Gurgaon. The company's three plants in

Coimbatore contributed in excess of 50 percent of its revenues.

The Company had 1,500 permanent employees and an equal number of temporary workers in Kuniyamuthur, Coimbatore. About 1,000 permanent workers were associated with the union. As many as six workers who formed the Kovai Mavatta Pricol Labor Trade Union and Kovai Mavatta Pricol Employees Trade Union were transferred and the workers protested against it a couple of years ago. Though the workers were ready for talks, the management said they should not be part of the particular trade union. About 1,500 workers who were not made permanent for the last 20 years lost their jobs for forming the union, two unions affiliated to the All-India Council of Trade Unions went on strike in 2007 demanding recognition and withdrawal of transfer orders. The new product development had to be stalled resulting in the increasing rate of rejection, thus affecting the production and further stunting its growth. Pricol transferred some workers to its Uttarakhand plant and dismissed 42 workers at its Kuniyamuthur unit for "indiscipline". While the company said the need for experienced hands at the new unit had prompted the move, workers alleged that a few were being targeted as they had tried to form a union. The labor strife had continued ever since, the capacity utilization at the Coimbatore plants dropped to 33% while units in north had been operating at more than 70% of their capacities. Among other basic things, a key demand of Pricol workers had been for the recognition of their unions which enjoyed the support of the

overwhelming majority of workers while the management had been constantly pressurizing workers to withdraw from the road of struggle and severe ties with the Marxist-Leninist leadership. Labor unrest at Coimbatore-based auto instrument maker, Pricol, took an ugly turn on Tuesday 22<sup>nd</sup> September 2009 with the company's vice-president (human resources) Roy J George succumbing to injuries he sustained after he was allegedly assaulted by a section of the agitating workers by using iron rods and wooden sticks. Roy had suffered multiple head injuries due to the attack. He died at a private hospital. Four staff members were also injured. Twelve members of the All-India Central Council of Trade Unions (AICCTU) were arrested in connection with the murder of Roy George, vice-president (Human Resources) of Pricol Limited.

The Government of Tamil Nadu had repeatedly censured the Pricol management. Violation of labor laws, court verdicts and government orders had been alleged on the Pricol management. Refusal to engage in collective bargaining in good faith with majority union, illegal partial lockouts, illegal deduction of wages and incentives, stoppages of increments, break in service orders, employment of apprentices and contract labor contrary to certified standing orders and the CLRA 1970, dismissal of 44 workers without any domestic enquiry are some highlights of Pricol's track record as alleged in the arena of industrial relations. It was also alleged that the management declared a differential bonus formula for different groups. While

**It was also alleged that the management declared a differential bonus formula for different groups.**

the majority workers in the union were unilaterally offered the statutory minimum bonus of 8.33%, the minority loyal workmen represented were offered 20% bonus and gifts. In almost all these issues the State Government had intervened under sections 10 (1), 10 (3) and 10 B of the ID Act 1947. The State Government had issued three advices, passed one government order (GO) prohibiting the continuance of lockout, passed three GOs ordering references, passed two orders under section 10B of the ID Act 1947.

### **RICO, Gurgaon, 2009**

Rico auto incorporated in 1984-85 started its commercial operation from 1986. Aluminium HPDC plant was set up in Daruhera 40 km from Delhi. In 1992 Ferrous casting and machining plant was set up. Second aluminum HPDC plant and machining was also set up in Gurgaon in 1998. Rico has the largest high pressure die casting capacity in India.

In the disputed plant in Gurgaon, Rico had 3,600 permanent workers and around 1,500 casual workers. There were 500 workers as management staff. Around 76 workers were women. The salary structure of the employees was relatively low. Permanent employees with 2-6 years' experience are paid Rs 4,500 a

month, whereas the casual workers with same experience are paid Rs 3,800- 4,000 per month. The permanent workers with 6 - 9 years' experience get Rs 6,500 monthly, and those with 9-10 years get Rs 8,000- 10,000. The conflict involved demands for higher wages etc., but by end of September 2009 the official point of tension was the demand for registration of a trade union affiliated to the All India Trade Union Congress (AITUC). Production since September 2009 had dropped 40-50 per cent in Rico. Rico reacted by suspending sixteen workers as they were going slow. In order to control the situation, management was forced to look for a head-on collision. The suspension of sixteen union representatives was a means to provoke reaction and to get the 'trouble-maker' out of the plant.

Workers at Rico went on strike on 21 September 2009 after 16 of their colleagues were expelled on disciplinary grounds. They alleged that their expelled colleagues had been victimized for helping to form a trade union. Around 5,000 employees had to sit outside the company gate, since the company said it was on lockout from 21 September 2009 as alleged by Rico employees. The employees came to know about this undeclared lockout only on the same date, when the first batch of around 1,500 workers had gone to work at 6 am. The security guards at the gate did not allow the workers to go inside. When they refused to listen, the police lathi-charged the workers. The Haryana Government termed the strike illegal on 1<sup>st</sup> October 2009 after conciliation efforts between the workers and the company management failed.

The state government referred the matter to the labor court. Agitating workers were attacked by 'bouncers' employed by the factory management and a young worker succumbed to injuries sustained in the attack" ( Sehgal, 2012). Subsequently, nearly a lakh workers in the entire Gurgaoin-Manesar belt observed a general strike in response to the strike called by the AITUC workers. The workers' strike was called for delay of the Police to arrest the goons responsible for the death of the worker.

### **MRF, Arakonam, 2009**

Tyre major MRF as an organisation had crossed Rs 5000 cr in the Year 2007. Arakonam Plant is one among the seven plants of the company having workforce strength of more than 2000 (1500 regular and 500 contract workers). MRF had helped in improving life style of the local community by not only providing well meaning jobs but also medical facilities, education etc.

UWU (MRF United Workers Union), one of the unions which was formed in 2003 which was said to have the majority of membership. The UWU had approached the management many times to make it the sole bargainer of the workers by recognizing it. However, the management was alleged to be least bothered about finding the majority union and recognizing. The UWU had also accused the company of taking anti-union actions against its members. They alleged that the union members were unjustly removed from work and there were many disciplinary proceedings on false

grounds. On May 5th 2009, MRF signed a wage agreement with the MRF Arakonam Workers Welfare Union (AWWU), its recognized union. The settlement envisaged substantial benefits to the workmen, including raise in house rent, washing, attendance, shift and conveyance allowance. With the settlement, some of the employees would receive up to Rs. 5,000 as increase in their total monthly pay packet. Many of the long-pending issues were also sorted out. Each workman also received an ad-hoc payment of Rs. 15,000 as agreement benefit. The retirement age, which was earlier 55, had been increased to 58 years.

**MRF United Workers Union (UWU) accused the company of underpaying the employees and lacking transparency.**

The other union, MRF United Workers Union (UWU) accused the company of underpaying the employees and lacking transparency. From May 9th 2009 onwards, the UWU went on a strike, demanding reinstatement of 250 workers. Most of them were dismissed for unionization, activities related to recognition and discussion of the salary revision. The strike was supported by the workers at MRF Puducherry. On May 17th 2009, MRF management announced a lockout. The union moved the High Court (HC) seeking a solution. On May 19<sup>th</sup> 2009, the HC directed the two unions UWU and AWWU and the MRF management to maintain the status quo subject to the management taking a decision on a recent wage settlement agreement. The

lockout was lifted on May 28th 2009. However, the workers did not return to work and remained stern on their demands. UWU soon filed a petition in Supreme Court (SC) stating that the HC should have given an injunction along with status quo. The union also wanted the court to direct MRF and Labor Department to implement International Labor Organisation's (ILO) directions about recognition of the majority union. On June 8th 2009, the bench at SC refused to intervene in view of the petition coming up for hearing in the HC on June 9th 2009. The counsel said in the court that there were no laws regarding the recognition of trade unions in Tamil Nadu and the court also expressed its concern.

The strike continued throughout July and August, reducing the production at MRF considerably. MRF blamed the strike at Arakonam on militant unionism. The management of MRF was of the opinion that the misled workmen, the general public and the government agencies should not be influenced by vilification campaigns. The company also said the strike had cost it more than Rs 1,000 crore.

On September 9th 2009, the HC directed the State Labor Commissioner to verify the membership of the unions. The court also asked the MRF management to approve whichever union proves the claim. Eventually, the union won as the management had to recognize it. After an ordeal of 125 days, neither the company would get its lost business, nor would it be easy to gain back the workers trust.

It was observed that MRF workers had tried to establish the legitimacy of their chosen union through a secret ballot in 2006, but the representatives thus chosen were asked to resign by the management, and a pro-management union was then "given the facility of deduction of membership fees from the wages of the workmen." On September 8, 2009, the First Bench of the Madras High Court passed orders in the writ petition. It is held that "...the desirability to have a truly independent and representative union of workmen to represent their cause cannot be lost sight of. A management may think that the leadership of a particular trade union is militant, yet even such a union when it obtains a recognized status, it has to act within the four corners of law and discipline. ... the question as to who should be the representative of the workmen is an aspect which has to be decided by the workmen themselves. It cannot be left to the management that it will recognize a particular union which it considers to be representative of the workmen. The Trade Unions Act, 1926, which is an Act to provide for the registration of Trade Union, is there on the statute book for the last over 80 years. It is no longer permissible nor possible for any management to disregard a trade union registered under the Act, and having a large following. If it does so, it would be at its own peril."

**It is no longer permissible nor possible for any management to disregard a trade union registered under the Act, and having a large following. If it does so, it would be at its own peril.**

### **Maruti-Suzuki, Manesar, 2012**

Maruti Suzuki was earlier launched in 1981 as a joint venture between the government of India and Suzuki Motors of Japan to produce people's car. After 2000, Suzuki took 51% share and is having full control on the Company. Maruti Suzuki Workers Union registered in 2011 for the strong unity of permanent and contract workers submitted their charter of demands to the management of Maruti Suzuki in April 2012 and the process of negotiation for wages and other demands was underway. However the management questioned the legitimacy of the union. "On 4<sup>th</sup> June around 2000 workers of Maruti's Manesar based Plant went on tool down strike and left the shop floor. The workers alleged that they were harassed after they moved the Labor Department to form a separate union for the workers of Manesar Plant. The workers felt that the existing union for both Gurgaon and Mansar Plants were hand in glove with the management and was not working for the welfare of the Manesar colleagues. There had been no production in the plant with a capacity of 1200 since 4<sup>th</sup> June. On 6<sup>th</sup> June Maruti terminated the services of 11 striking workers. Agitating workers got the support from AITUC as well as other unions from automobile companies such as Hero Honda, Honda Motorcycle, RICO, Lumax etc. Mediation of Labour Department failed as the workers stuck to the demand of a separate union. The police were deployed and the State Government referred the dispute to the Labor Court which termed the strike illegal. The management also said that there

was no question of recognizing another union" (Hindustan Times, 11.06.2012)

It was reported that on the afternoon of 18<sup>th</sup> July, a supervisor in the shop floor abused and made casteist comments against a dalit worker of the permanent category, which was protested by the worker. Instead of taking action against the said supervisor, the management immediately suspended the worker concerned without any investigation as was demanded by the workers (TOI dtd 20.07.2012). The workers' union was demanding reinstatement of a worker. While negotiations were on with the senior management, the first act of violence by the mob was to forcibly shut the main gate and prevented managers from leaving the premises after working hours. The union side observed that the management called in the entry of hundreds of bouncers on its payroll to attack the workers. The workers also added that it was completely an illegal vindictive action in the spirit of conspiracy to corner workers into submission even as their demands and methods were legitimate. In the process Awanish Kumar Dev, General Manager (HR) at Manesar Plant was burnt to death by the mob. The mob also ransacked offices, broke glass panes and indulged in wanton damage of property. Finally the mob set the office on fire.

Anger at the plant had been building up for months over the management's refusal to recognize an elected union; workers were increasingly frustrated over their inability to exercise their constitutional rights and the demand of equal

pay for equal work was falling on deaf ears (Sehgal, 2012)

**Anger at the plant had been building up for months over the management's refusal to recognize the elected union.**

Did Maruti's Manesar plant go out of control because of a lack of timely intervention by seasoned IR hands? The HR policy followed from the overall company strategy, focusing on recruitment, talent acquisition and personal development within the organization. Industrial relations, on the other hand, is about collective bargaining, fairness in treatment, including in salaries and perks and labor laws relating to freedom of association (unions, in other words). After all, the inherent nature of industrial relations is pluralistic. Apart from employee-employer relationships, the IR manager also had to look at relationships between the company management and union representatives, interact with government bodies and so on. (Business World, 2012)

Maruti COO(Chief Operating Officer) was emphatic "there was no scope to retain workers who were involved in the assault and violence at the Manesar Plant to ensure that morale stays high within the factory once production starts" (TOI 24.07.2012)

Various events would seem to indicate that Maruti Suzuki India Limited was unable to handle its human resources and unions in the context of change manage-

ment. Starting from 2000 right up to 2011, the company has faced labor trouble, strikes, work stoppages and disruptions from time to time (Sen, 2011)

### **Analysis & Discussion**

Saini (2006) had noted that managements were violating labor laws at a large scale in the industrial belt of Panipat another industrial town in Haryana, where even medium firms with nearly 500 workers have been violating most labor laws with impunity; nor are union leaders operating in that region able to unionize the workers in the Panipat handlooms exports sector.

We could understand the following trend from the employment relations of the above said industries:

- The industrial unrest (strike/lock-out) have mainly took place in fast growing automobile and auto ancillary units located away from Bengal and Kerala.
- All these events have happened within a period of five years
- Many of the issues were related to union recognition or management shying away from the unions.
- Inappropriate handling of 'collective relations' by the management
- The problems generally emanated from management insistence on written undertakings of good conduct and not adhering to the understanding reached

- The entire developments in the above said industries depict workers resorted to or instigated violence. At some places instigated employees indulged in violence either knowingly or unknowingly
- Workers were not treating the HR man as messenger of the management
- Proactive HR policies were not in place
- Similarly management's cold reaction to workmen's emotions led to crisis as mentioned in these cases. The workers who demand their rights were brutalized either by police or directly by people hired by the companies
- Settlements reached through understanding were being reopened before the time period
- Not adhering to the settlements reached
- Interest of the contract and casual labor had not been paid required attention
- The Haryana Government's approach provoked unions to enlarge company disputes into industry wide movements (Sen, 2011)

Unfair labor practices perpetuated either by employer or by trade union are not a welcome sign. Both the parties are expected to follow "the law of the land". Both the parties should strive to reach settlement through discussions across the table, instead of resorting to un-ethical tactics. The ordeal of lock-out or strike

benefits neither the company nor the workers. The company would not get its lost business, nor would it be easy to gain back the workers trust. Similarly workmen in either case lose earnings and income.

**The ordeal of lock-out or strike benefits neither the company nor the workers.**

### **Limitations**

The chronology of events as shown in these cases mostly relied on secondary sources in general and newspaper reports in particulars. The cases were limited to automotive industry only. The authors admit that neither they have visited the places where incidents took place nor obtained any firsthand experience from the people affected. Though the issues were discussed with some of the union leaders, the descriptions are mostly journalistic interpretations. The uses of certain superlatives were meticulously avoided though in certain cases it may look biased towards workers. The reports available in the cases seem to have overlooked the management's point of view. The authors tried to enlist the reports which were commonly used or agreed upon in available reports. The authors have tried to overcome the limitations in the analysis though the reliability and validity of references and interpretations need to be tested.

### **Conclusion**

Employers and workers need to recognize and respect each other's rights and

obligations. In the post-July 25, 2005 scenario, the management of HMSI started sending managers to attend management development programs (MDPs) in areas such as inter-personal skills; team-building, negotiation, and conflict management. It decided to appoint a Senior Manager-IR. Union office-bearers were given training by the HR department on building cooperative IR (Saini, 2007). The organization cannot operate in isolation. Each institution is having a key role. If every institution functions effectively, efficiency of organization is bound to go up. The above cases suggest that any representative structures within firms should not be seen as imposed by the management rather need to be natural having full support of the majority of employees. It should not be top driven which may be losing its respect and shy away from developing meaningful dialogue and trust between the management and the unions. For unions functioning with majority support with uncertainty on registration/recognition create an environment of strong union organization and representation at workplace level. Similarly unions also need to change their outlook and should be relevant to the changes. Indeed work stoppages by unions will force the employer to shut the business or shift the operation from that place. The organization should strive for transparent HR policies and practices for all type of employees. Even after Industrial Disputes Act 1947 made it compulsory for the establishments employing more than 20 employees to set up the grievance redressal machinery, many of the industries are not giving enough attention to this aspect.

Organizations should avoid employing two sets of employees for the same job. Further decent work conditions and decent pay has to be provided to all sets of employees.

**Organizations should avoid employing two sets of employees for the same job.**

In one of the settled cases Madras HC has cited that under Section 25-U of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947 (as cited by Madras HC verdict of 8 September 2009) provides that “any person who commits any unfair labor practice shall be punishable with imprisonment for a term which may extend to six months or with fine which may extend to one thousand rupees or with both.” Unfair labor practices as defined by this Act include “threatening workmen with discharge or dismissal, if they join a trade union,” “threatening a lock-out or closure, if a trade union is organized,” other forms of coercion or intimidation of workers for forming a union, and “refusal to bargain collectively, in good faith with the recognized trade union.” Unions should upgrade the quality of participation of rank and file in union activities to regain their influence (Srivastava, 2001),

The management needs to look at employee empowerment, through getting the workers to take responsibility for shop-floor decisions over quality, safety, productivity and material use as a strategic option to develop strong industrial relations (Ramaswamy & Schiphorst, 2000). Both employers and unions need

to secure settlement of disputes through negotiations conducted with integrative strategies and maintain business discipline.

## References

- Business Standard* (2008), "Graziano's Greater Noida Facility reopens" 30<sup>th</sup> September
- Business Standard* (2009), 21<sup>st</sup> October
- Business Standard* (2009), 14<sup>th</sup> May
- Business Standard* (2012), 29<sup>th</sup> August
- Business Standard* (2012), 10<sup>th</sup> October
- Business World* 2012, "Labor Pains" 21<sup>st</sup> November
- "Indian Airlines Vs Indian Airlines Technical Assistant Union APHC" (75) FLR 489 (1997); IILLJ 961 AP (1998)
- Live Mint* dated 19<sup>th</sup> October (2009) MRF United Workers Union Vs MRF, Mad HC Sept 2009
- Outlook India* (2008), "Graziano Transmission reopens Greater Noida Plant" 29<sup>th</sup> September
- Ramaswamy, EA & Schiphorst, F.B (2000). "Human Resource Management, Trade Unions and Empowerment: Two Cases from India", *International Journal of Human Resource Management* 11(4):664-80
- Saini, Debi.S (2006), Management Case: "Flaxo Exports: Managing People in an SME," Management Development Institute, Gurgaon, Mimeo.
- Saini, Debi.S (2007), "Declining Labor Power & Challenges before Trade Unions: Some Lessons from a Case Study at Private Sector Trade Unionism," *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations* 42(4):652-777
- Sehgal, Rakhi (2012), "Maruti Workers Are the Villains: Truth or Prejudice", *Economic and Political Weekly*, XLVII(31), August
- Sen, Ratna (2011) "Industrial Relations at Maruti-Suzuki", *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 47(2):191-205
- Sen, Ratna, (2011), "Multi-Nationals and Industrial Relations in India", *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 46(3):367-83,
- Srivastava, D.K (2001). "Trade Union Situation in India: Views of Central Trade Union Organizations (CTUOs)", *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 36(4): 463-78. 2001
- The Economic Times* (2009), 20<sup>th</sup> May
- The Economic Times* (2012), 30<sup>th</sup> August
- The Financial Express* (2009), 28<sup>th</sup> May
- The Hindu* (2009), 28<sup>th</sup> May
- The Hindu* (2009), 23<sup>rd</sup> September
- The Hindu* (2009), 21<sup>st</sup> October
- The Hindustan Times* (2012), "State bans maruti stir: Stalemate worsens" 11<sup>th</sup> June
- Times of India* (2008), 6<sup>th</sup> October
- Times of India* (2008), "Dismissed Employees beat CEO to death" 23<sup>rd</sup> September
- Times of India* (2008), "136 arrested in Graziano violence" 24<sup>th</sup> September
- Times of India* (2008), 23<sup>rd</sup> December
- Times of India* (2009), 23<sup>rd</sup> September
- Times Of India* (2012), 27<sup>th</sup> August
- Times of India* (2012), 11<sup>th</sup> October,
- Times of India* (2012), "How the clock ticked":11, 20<sup>th</sup> July
- Times of India* (2012), "Maruti likely to see large scale layoffs" :13, 24<sup>th</sup> July
- The Tribune* online edition dated 16<sup>th</sup> April 2012
- The Tribune* online edition dated 7<sup>th</sup> May 2012
- Accessed [www.indlaw.com](http://www.indlaw.com) on 29<sup>th</sup> August 2012
- Accessed [www.kafila.org](http://www.kafila.org) on 29<sup>th</sup> August 2012

Accessed [www.marxist.com](http://www.marxist.com) on 30<sup>th</sup> August 2012

Accessed <http://sanhati.com/articles/4846/> on 27<sup>th</sup> August 2012

Accessed [www.mrftyres.com](http://www.mrftyres.com) on 10<sup>th</sup> October 2012

Accessed [www.oerilicon.com](http://www.oerilicon.com) on 10<sup>th</sup> October 2012

Accessed [www.ricoauto.com](http://www.ricoauto.com) on 10<sup>th</sup> October 2012

Accessed [www.sanhati.com](http://www.sanhati.com) on 10<sup>th</sup> October 2012

Accessed [www.scribd.com](http://www.scribd.com) on 11<sup>th</sup> October 2012