

**JABALPUR BIJLIGHAR KARAMCHARI
PANCHAYAT**

v.

JABALPUR ELECTRIC SUPPLY CO., LTD. & ANR.

August 9, 1971

[G. K. MITTER AND P. JAGANMOHAN REDDY, JJ.]

*Industrial Law—Bonus—Principles for awarding festival bonus—
Available surplus for distribution—Principles for calculation of.*

The employees of the respondent claimed bonus on two counts : (1) festival bonus at 10% of their total earnings as an implied term of the contract of employment and as an established practice of payment from 1940-41 without any break; and (2) bonus out of the profits quantified at 50% of the said total earnings. The Industrial Tribunal rejected the claims. In appeal to this Court,

HELD : (1) The criteria to be considered when a question of customary or traditional bonus arises are: (a) whether the payment was uniform and has been over an unbroken series of years; (b) whether it has been for a sufficiently long period, the length depending on the circumstances of each case (the period may have to be longer to justify an inference of traditional and customary festival bonus than in the case when the claim for festival bonus is based on an implied term of employment); (c) Whether it was connected with a festival; and (d) it must be shown that the payment was made even in a year of loss, that is, it was not a bounty depending on the earning of profits. [67 G-H; 68A. 70F-G.]

In the present case, it was proved that the payment of bonus was made at 10% for a large number of years and at 11% for an intervening period. But the payment was not related either to any festival or to an implied term of employment between the parties. In fact, for the years from 1940-41 to 1945-46 there was no claim for the payment of either customary bonus or festival bonus. On the other hand, the express claim was made for war bonus. The major part of the entire period was covered by awards and excepting in one of those awards there was no reference to any festival bonus. The intervening period was covered by an express agreement between the parties. Further, the rate was not uniform. Consequently, the claim made by the employees that they should be paid 10% either as festival bonus or under an implied term of employment could not be accepted. [71A-D]

Ispahani Ltd. Calcutta v. Ispahani Employees Unions, [1960] 1 S.C.R. 24, *The Graha Trading Co. (India) Ltd v. Its Workmen*, [1960] 1 S.C.R. 107, *M/s Tulsidas Khimji v. Their Workmen*, [1963] 1 S.C.R. 675, *Vegetable Products Ltd v. Their Workmen* A I R 1966 S.C. 1449 and *Management of Churkulam Tea Estate (P) Ltd. v. The Workmen* [1969] 1 S.C.R. 930, followed.

- A** (2) The amount of bonus must be computed in terms of the Full Bench formula as accepted by this Court in the case of *Associated Cements Co. Ltd. v. Its Workmen*, [1959] S.C.R. 925. [71D-E]
- (i) In the present case, in calculating the net profits the Tribunal should have included the following three items, in the gross profits.
- B** (a) The cost of coal and fuel shown in the 'summary of technical and Financial Particulars' for the year, prepared under r. 26(3) of the Indian Electricity Rules, 1937 was less than the figure shown by the respondent in its revenue account. The respondent had failed to explain the discrepancy. Therefore the amount of difference between the two figures should have been added to the gross profits in the revenue account. [71H,72A-B,H;73A-B]
- C** (b) There was no proper explanation supported by accounts for the large amount for repairs to furniture as shown in the revenue account. Therefore the much smaller amount suggested in the oral evidence should alone have been taken into account. The difference between the two figures should also be added to the gross profits. [73F-H]
- (c) Although the statutory contingency reserve fund investments are not to be taken into account in the statement of surpluses and deficiencies of profits, the interest earned was included by the respondent in the statement of net profits for the calculation of the managing agents' commission. If the managing agents were entitled to claim a share of it the workers were equally entitled to claim its inclusion in the revenue account. The result is that the gross profits of the company would have to be augmented by this sum also. [74D-G]
- D**
- E** (ii) The employees' contention regarding the following four items should be rejected.
- (a) The rebate to the consumers is not to be utilised by the Electric supply company. Therefore if the respondent could not have the benefit of it, neither could the employees ask for a share and claim its inclusion in the 'gross profits. [75F-G]
- F** (b) The respondent claimed that the normal depreciation for the year as per the assessment order of the Income-tax Officer and double shift allowance should be allowed in computing the net profits. The employees contended that it was only the lesser amount towards depreciation shown in the respondent's profit and loss account that should be allowed. But according to the formula pronounced by the Full Bench of the Labour Appellate Tribunal in *U.P. Electricity Supply Co. Ltd. v. Their Workmen*, [1955] 2 L.L.J. 431 and approved in the *Associated Cement Companies* case and in *T.T.E. Supply Co. Ltd. v. Its Workmen*, [1960] 3 S.C.R. 68 and in *Ahmedabad Miscellaneous Industrial Workers Union v. Ahmedabad Electricity Supply Company Ltd.*, [1962] 2 S.C.R. 934 the respondent's claim should be upheld. [75G-H;76A-D E-G]
- G**
- H** *Hamdard Dawakhana Wakf v. Its Workmen*, [1962] 2 L.L.J. (S.C.) 772, followed.
- (c) According to the Full Bench formula to arrive at the available surplus it is not the income-tax actually paid by the respondent that

should be deducted but the amount computed notionally at 45% after making the appropriate deductions from the gross profits. In the present case, the amount of income tax so calculated would be greater than the amount allowed by the Tribunal because the gross profits would be enhanced by items (i), (a), (b) and (c). [77F-H] A

(d) According to the Full Bench formula return at 6% of the working capital should also be deducted to arrive at the available surplus for distribution. The employees contended that the working capital should be computed in accordance with Schedule VII of the Electricity Supply Act. But according to the *T.T.E. Supply Company* case, and the *Ahmedabad Miscellaneous Industrial Workers Union* case even with respect to an electric supply undertaking in the field of industrial relations it is not proper to inject therein, the provisions contained in the Seventh Schedule to the Electric Supply Act. [78C,E-F;79A-B] B

In the result the amounts in item (i) (a), (b) and (c) had to be added to the gross profits. The amount in item (ii) as was not to be so added. Depreciation including double shift allowance was to be deducted as also the notional amount of income-tax at 45% after making the appropriate deductions from gross profits. So far as rating on working capital was concerned the computation should be in term of the Full Bench Formula and not in accordance with Schedule VII of the Electricity Supply Act. In the instant case even ignoring the said section on working capital there was no surplus left in terms of the Full Bench Formula. The question of payment of bonus did not arise. [79E-H; 80 A-B] C

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION : Civil Appeal No. 752 of 1967. D

Appeal by special leave from the Award dated January 30, 1967 of the Industrial Court, Madhya Pradesh, Indore in Reference No. 6/MPJR/1961. E

M. N. Phadke, Gulab Gupta and Vineet Kumar, for the appellant. F

M. C. Chagla, D. N. Mukherjee and M. M. Sapre, for respondent No. 1.

The Judgment of the Court was delivered by

Mitter, J. This appeal arises out of an award dated January 30, 1967 of the Industrial Court of Madhya Pradesh (hereinafter referred to as the 'Tribunal'). The term of reference to the Tribunal was: G

"Whether the employees of Jabalpur Electric Supply Company Ltd., have a case for payment of bonus for the year 1960-61 and what should be its quantum and terms of payment?" H

A The claim for bonus was made under two heads : the first was for bonus out of the profits quantified at 50% of the total earnings of the employees; and the second was for festival bonus at 10% of the said total earnings which was claimed as an implied term of the contract of employment and as an established practice, having been paid irrespective of profits or losses before Diwali every year continuously from 1940-41 without any break. The Tribunal found itself unable to hold in favour of the employees under either of the heads. The appeal to this Court is by special leave.

B

C We propose to take the two heads under which bonus was claimed in the order in which the arguments were advanced before us. The first head of bonus canvassed for was the second mentioned above *i.e.* at 10% of the total earnings. So far as this claim is concerned, we are not on uncharted seas as the question cropped up in the past in numerous cases before this Court wherein certain well defined principles were formulated. But before we apply the principles, we have to take note of the relevant facts and circumstances relating to this claim.

D

E It cannot be disputed that the employees had been receiving at least 10% of their earnings from the company from 1940-41 onwards. This period can be conveniently split up into several parts to mark off the claims made from time to time and the settlements by mutual agreement or payments under awards of industrial courts or even made voluntarily. The first period relates to the years 1940-41 to 1944-45. The Provincial Government made a reference arising out of a dispute which led to the award of the Labour Commissioner of C. P. and Berar in regard, *inter alia*, to (a) claim by the employees to a bonus equal to three months' wages for the year ending 31st March, 1946, and (b) war bonus equal to six months' wages. The adjudicator decided that.

F

G

H “(1) The company should pay to each of its employees 1/10th of his total earnings including dear food allowance during the year ending 31st March 1946 by way of bonus; and (2) The Company should also pay to each of its employees as bonus 1/10th of his total earnings including dear

food allowance in respect of each of the years 1940-41, 1941-42, 1942-43, 1943-44 and 1944-45 against the claim for War bonus." A

It has to be noted that there was no mention of any festival bonus at that time and so far as the years 1940-41 to 1944-45 are concerned, it was given on the footing that it was a War bonus. B

The next period relates to the years 1946-47 to 1949-50. Admittedly, the payment for these years was made under an agreement between the parties as found by the Tribunal. The finding of the Tribunal is that a consolidated amount of Rs. 74,850/- was paid by the company on 25th January 1951. The Tribunal observed that there was C

"abundant documentary evidence (Exs. D-1/A to D-1/F wherein workers agreed to accept the bonus offered as voluntary payment of bonus as a compromise of their claim of 25% of the Company's profits for the period ending 31st March, 1951." D

The claim for the years 1951 to 1956 was covered by an award conveniently described as Mujumdar Award. The opening paragraphs of the award show that the employees had claimed that payment of 10% of their total earnings by way of bonus had come to be included in their wages and had been paid for about 12 years in the past, that there had been agreement between the employees of the company to refer the dispute regarding bonus to Government and thereafter for subsequent years 10 per cent of their total earnings of the year was accepted by the employees and finally on the failure of negotiations and conciliations, following service of notice under s. 32 of the Industrial Disputes Act, the matter had been referred by the Government, the employees having pressed for at least 33-1/8 per cent of their total earnings for the year by way of bonus. E F G

The concluding paragraph of that award, a copy of which has been placed before us, shows that in the view of the Majumdar Tribunal : H

"In addition to the 10% bonus already paid the Party No. 1 (the company) can easily pay

A additional 20% of the earnings of the year of each
 employee as bonus to him. Similarly for the year
 1951-52 Party No. 1 can pay easily additional 10 per
 cent of the earnings of the year as bonus to each of
 the employees. For the year 1952-53 no surplus
 B amount is left with Party No. 1. According to the
 Full Bench formula and the bonus already paid *i.e.*
 10 per cent of the annual earnings of each of the
 employees was sufficient payment for that year.
 C For the year 1953-54 5 per cent of the earnings
 of the year can easily be paid in addition to
 the 10 per cent already paid. For the year 1954-55
 20 per cent of the annual earnings can easily be
 paid to each of the employee by way of bonus
 and for the year 1955-56 though I only have been
 D able to get the account for the first six months I
 have absolutely no doubt that taking the average
 of all these years, the Party No. 1 could be able
 to pay at least 10 per cent as additional bonus."

E The said Tribunal further recorded that as the employees
 had not received even the 10 per cent usual bonus for
 1955-56 the same should be paid in full before 31st October,
 1956.

F For the year 1956-57 payment was made under an
 interim award of Mr. Kher, Judge, Industrial Court.
 For the years 1957-58, 1958-59 and 1959-60 payment was
 first made under an interim award of Justice Bhat who
 finally passed an award accepting the claim of the Union
 for payment of Diwali bonus. This award was the subject
 matter of an appeal before this Court and on 11th March
 1956 the parties to that appeal arrived at a compromise
 and it was agreed without prejudice to their respective
 G contentions that the company should pay to the employees
 one per cent in addition to the bonus already paid by it
 for the years 1956-57, 1957-58 and 1958-59 but the company
 should not pay any additional bonus for the year 1959-60.
 It was expressly recorded before this Court that as the
 H point of dispute between the parties which had been decided
 by the said Tribunal had not been argued before this
 Court it would be open to them to raise their respective
 contentions in future should the occasion arise

The above statement of facts makes it amply clear that although the employees received at least 10% of their total earnings by way of bonus for the years 1940-41 to 1959-60 there was no consistency in the claim to bonus throughout this period, nor was there any uniformity either in the amounts paid or the grounds under which the several awards of bonus came to be made. The only award which indicated that the bonus was to be regarded as a Diwali bonus was that of Justice Bhat for the period 1957-58 to 1959-60. For the period 1940-41 to 1956-57 the Company never paid bonus as a festival bonus on the occasion of the Diwali. The amount was mostly paid under awards but in between the awards there was a period when it was paid by express agreement between the parties.

Strong reliance was placed on the fact of payment of at least 10 per cent by way of bonus from the year 1940-41 to 1959-60 by learned counsel for the appellant in support of his argument that as payment had been made for this long period, it had become an implied term of the contract of employment and it was to be regarded as a festival bonus. In our view, this contention cannot be accepted on the face of a long series of decisions of this Court to some of which alone we propose to refer.

In *Isphani Ltd. Calcutta v. Isphani Employees' Union*⁽¹⁾ this Court had to deal with the claim of the workmen to puja bonus for the year 1953. Referring to *The Mill-owners' Association, Bombay v. The Rashtriya Mill Mazdoor Sangh, Bombay*⁽²⁾ it was said that the claim for puja bonus in Bengal could be based on either of two grounds. It may either be a matter of implied agreement between the employers and employees creating a term of employment for payment of puja bonus, or, (secondly) even though no implied agreement can be inferred it may be payable as a customary bonus. On the facts it was found that "the workmen when they were in the employ of Messrs M. M. Isphani Ltd. (the predecessor-in-interest of the appellants) always used to get puja bonus at the rate of one month's wages. This was asserted by the workmen in their written statement and the company did not deny it in its reply.

(1) [1960] 1 S.C.R. 24.

(2) [1950] L.L.J. 1247.

A It was found as a fact that the appellant had been paying bonus ever since it came into existence in 1948 up to 1952 without any break at the rate of one month's wages and it was paid even in the years when the company suffered loss. It was observed by this Court :

B “In the circumstances, it was established in this case that (1) the payment was unbroken and (2) it was not paid out of bounty due to profits having arisen, for it was paid in some years of loss also.”

C As to what would be a sufficiently long period to justify the inference that it was an implied term of employment for payment of bonus, this Court held that the appellant had paid it continuously since its birth and therefore the facts warranted the finding of an implied term of employment to that effect.

D A similar claim arose in the case of *The Graham Trading Co. (India) Ltd. v. Its Workmen*⁽¹⁾. According to this Court the practice of payment of bonus of the appellant “began in 1940 and was unbroken up to 1950. In between there was an adjudication in 1948 in which the company was a party”. In regard to the year 1948 the company had admitted before the relevant tribunal of having paid bonus in the past and had no intention of discontinuing the practice and thereupon the Tribunal did not adjudicate on it. The payment was continued from 1949 to 1951. In 1952 after some dispute bonus was paid to all the workers. It was in this case that the Court laid down certain criteria which the Industrial Tribunals would have to consider when a question of customary or traditional bonus arose, namely,

G (i) whether the payment has been over an unbroken series of years;

H (ii) whether it has been for a sufficiently long period through the length of the period might depend on the circumstances of each case; even so the period may normally have to be longer to justify an inference of traditional and customary puja bonus than may be the case with puja bonus based on an implied term of employment.

(1) [1960] 1 S.C.R. 107.

(iii) The circumstance that the payment depended upon the earning of profits would have to be excluded and therefore it must be shown that payment was made in the year of loss.

After laying down the tests, the Court observed that :

“In dealing with the question of custom, the fact that the payment was called *ex gratia* by the employer when it was made, would, however, make no difference in this regard because of proof of custom depends upon the effect of the relevant factors enumerated by us; . . . the payment must have been at a uniform rate throughout to justify an inference that the payment at such and such rate had become customary and traditional in the particular concern.”

In *M/s. Tulsidas Khimji v. Their Workmen*⁽¹⁾ the Union of workmen claimed profit-sharing bonus at the rate of six months' wages and traditional or customary bonus at a rate which was not clear but which might be said to be either three months' wages or one month's wages plus dearness allowance on the occasion of the Diwali festival. The claim was rather nebulous as observed by this Court. According to the Tribunal the workmen had proved that bonus had been paid at a uniform rate of one month's basic wages plus dearness allowance on the occasion of the Diwali festival throughout the period *i.e.* 15 years commencing from 1940-41 to 1956-57. Referring to the argument advanced on behalf of the appellant company that the four circumstances mentioned above in *Graham Trading Co.'s* case had not established it was remarked:

“. . . what is more important to negative a plea for customary bonus would be proof that it was made *ex gratia*, and accepted as such, or that it was unconnected with any such occasion like a festival as laid down by this Court in the case of *B. N. Elias & Co. Ltd. Employees Union v. B. N. Elias & Co. Ltd.* (2).”

(1) [1963] 1 S.C.R. 675.

(2) [1960] 3 S.C.R. 382.

A In *Vegetable Products Ltd. v. Their Workmen* (1) "the
 B case of the workmen for payment of puja bonus was that
 it had become either an implied term of employment
 between them and their employer or customary". The
 Tribunal came to the conclusion that payment of one
 C month's wages before puja as customary bonus had been
 established through it apparently did not accept the claim
 that payment of puja bonus as an implied condition of
 service had been proved. The Tribunal further found that
 the circumstances mentioned in *Graham Trading Co.'s*
 case (2) had been satisfied. Examining the evidence
 this Court found on the facts (see p. 1501) that :

D "... the Puja bonus was paid for the first time
 on the eve of the Puja festival in 1964 at the rate of
 10 days' wages. In 1955 it was paid at the rate
 of 20 days' wages. From 1956 to 1961 the
 E payment has been made before Puja at 30 days'
 wages. ... from 1956 to 1958 payment was
 made without any dispute and without conditions.
 But in 1959 a dispute arose as to payment of Puja
 bonus for that year and was settled before the
 conciliation officer by a settlement between the
 F appellant and its workmen. The first term of that
 settlement ... runs thus :—

"... 30 days' wages will be paid as bonus
 (ex gratia) for the accounting year 1957-58 to all the
 workmen who will have completed 240 days' work
 by the day of payment and will be on the rolls of the
 company on that date."

It was observed that the payment for the 1959 was *ex gratia* and accepted as such by the workmen. According to this Court :

G "This is not a case where the employer made a
 unilateral declaration that the payment was *ex gratia*.
 This was a case where the appellant said
 that the payment was *ex gratia* and the workmen
 accepted the payment as *ex gratia*. Besides there
 was a further condition that the payment would be
 H made to those workmen only who had completed
 240 days work by the day of payment."

(1) A.I.R. 1965 S.C. 1499.

The evidence further showed that although for the year 1960 and 1961 payment had been made at the rate of 30 days' wages the workmen had given a receipt in terms which stated that the payment was made as advance to be adjusted against profit bonus for the previous year. In these circumstances, this Court found itself unable to hold that there had been payment for an unbroken series of years before the dispute was referred to the tribunal and the finding of the tribunal that payment of customary traditional bonus on the occasion of the Puja festival was established was set aside.

Lastly, we may refer to *Management of Churkulam Tea Estate (P) Ltd. v. The Workmen & another* (1). In this case there was at first an agreement in the year 1946 relating to bonus for the years 1947, 1948 and 1949. The agreement was extended also for the years 1950 and 1961. A fresh agreement was entered into in 1955 for payment of bonus for the years 1952, 1953 and 1954 and there were subsequent agreement also. There was no controversy that the appellant had paid bonus for nine years and it was not at a uniform rate. So far as the year 1952 was concerned the appellant's case was that it had not paid any bonus as such, but on the other hand it had made an *ex gratia* payment of Rs. 3 to each worker; but the tribunal did not accept this plea and held that the said payment must be treated as one having been made towards bonus. This Court came to the conclusion that the Tribunal was wrong in holding that an inference could be drawn for payment of bonus as an implied condition of service, in the circumstances of the case, when the payment admittedly was not uniform and was not connected with any festival. The Court also negated the plea of the workmen to treat the bonus as a customary or traditional bonus because, apart from the fact that it was not connected with any festival, one of the essential ingredients *viz.*, that the payment should have been at a uniform rate through was admittedly lacking in the case.

The above decisions all go to negative the claim of the appellant before us. The only fact about which there can be no doubt is that payment was made at the rate of 10 per cent for a large number of years with an

(1) [1969] 1 S.C.R. 930.

- A intervening period when it was made at the rate of 11 per cent. The facts do not warrant any conclusion as to the payment being related either to any festival or under an implied terms of employment between the parties. It will be noted that for the very first period *i.e.* the years from
- B 1940-41 to 1945-46 there was no claim for the payment of either customary bonus or a festival bonus. On the other hand, the express claim was made for War bonus. The major part of the entire period was covered by awards and excepting in one of these awards, there was no reference to any festival bonus. There was an intervening period which,
- C as already noted was covered by an express agreement between the parties. The rate too, as already shown, was not uniform. Consequently the claim made by the appellant's that they should be paid 10 per cent either as festival bonus or under an implied term of employment cannot be accepted.
- D With regard to the second claim there is no dispute that bonus must be computed in terms of the Full Bench formula as accepted by this Court in the case of *Associated Cement Companies Ltd. v. Its Workmen* (1). Learned counsel for the appellant was prepared to accept the gross profits for the adoption of the Full Bench formula as shown
- E in the balance of the revenue account for the year ending 31st March 1961 subject to certain exceptions. This figure as shown in Schedule F to the profit and loss account was Rs. 8,88,598.29. This was however subject to the qualification as to several figures of expenses incurred
- F during the year. The first related to the figure in the revenue account where the cost of coal and fuel was shown by the company as Rs. 21,12,875.97. According to the appellant, the document Ex. P-13 prepared by the Managing Agents of the company and certified as correct by their chartered accountants on September 28, 1961 showed that
- G the fuel consumed was 54,962 tons at an average cost of Rs. 35.68. This according to the appellant was a solemn document inasmuch as it had to be prepared and submitted under sub-rule (3) of Rule 26 of the Indian Electricity Rules, 1937. The statement is headed "Summary of Technical and Financial Particulars for the year ended 31st March,
- H 1961." If the figures with regard to the quantity of coal

(1) [1959] S.C.R. 925

and the average cost in Ex-P-13 be taken into account, instead of the figures Rs. 21,12,875·97 in the revenue account the correct figure would be Rs. 19,55,447/- which would swell up by the gross profits by the difference between the two amounts, viz., Rs. 1,57,428/-.

It was seriously contended before us by learned counsel for the respondent that we should accept the figure given in the balance sheet as the same is supported by certificates of the same firm of chartered accountants, and their letters addressed to the Managing Agents of the Company. According to the letter Ex. D-28 dated 20th September 1961 the books and records of the Jabalpur Electric Supply Company Ltd., for the period 1st April, 1960 to 31st September, 1960 showed the average cost of coal delivered to bunkers during the period to be Rs. 37·81 per ton or Rs. 37·21 per tonne (metric). The letter Ex. D-29 which is similarly worded shows that for the period 1st October 1960 to 31st March, 1961 the average cost of coal delivered to bunkers during this period was Rs. 39·09 per ton or Rs. 38·47 per tonne. These two figures were sought to be supported by the certificates of the chartered accountants dated 18th April, 1963. The above will show that there was considerable discrepancy as to the value of the coal consumed as reported to the Government and as reported to the Managing Agents of the Company by the accountants. This was sought to be explained in the oral evidence of one L. S. Mcleod who stated that the statement prepared under the Electricity Act was on the basis of the record maintained by the Head Office but the total consumption of the coal during the year was 54,962 tons and the average cost of coal per ton was Rs. 35·58 per ton. Oral evidence was also adduced of one B. Chatterjee, an Assistant in the Electricity Department of Martin Burn Ltd. Calcutta who stated that the rate shown in Ex. P-13 *i.e.* Rs. 35·58 per ton was the estimated value of coal received per ton and that this figure has been arrived at the Power House Jabalpur purely on estimates and that the estimate did not take into account certain liabilities *i.e.* certain suppliers' bills which were accounted for and audited at the Head Office at Calcutta. In our view, the attempted explanation cannot be accepted as Ex. P-13 was made under the provisions of an Act. It was prepared in Calcutta long after the period to which it related. It was submitted some time

- A after the Directors' reports to the shareholders dated 4th September 1961 accompanying the balance sheet and the profit and loss account. It was for the company to explain exactly how the discrepancy arose and their failure to explain, in our opinion, should lead to the grossing up of the amount of difference already mentioned with the gross profits as per the revenue account.
- B

- The next disputed item relates to the amount of Rs. 85,887.63 as shown in the revenue account towards "miscellaneous expenses." The item reads "miscellaneous expenses including Rs. 3,025.16 for wages and Rs. 4,128.74 paid to Martin Burn Ltd. as guarantors' commission." The Company was asked to furnish particulars of the items which added up to Rs. 85,887.63. According to Ex. P-18 the said figure was made up of the following: Rs. 34,584.11 as cost of printing, stationery and advertisement, Rs. 12,648.18 as travelling expenses, Rs. 7,207.80 as general charges, Rs. 6,206.57 bank charges, Rs. 4,128.74 as guarantors' commission and Rs. 21,112.23 as repairs to furniture etc. It was this last figure which was challenged by the appellant. Schedule E to the balance sheet for the relevant year (fixed capital expenditure) shows that the original cost of furniture and equipment up to 31st March 1960 was Rs. 38,377.78 and that additions, sales and adjustments during the year was Rs. 5,498.76 and the total depreciation written off to 31st March 1961 was Rs. 29,915.23. It is difficult to appreciate how furniture the total cost of acquisition of which was Rs. 43,876.54 as shown in schedule E would require repairs to the extent of Rs. 21,000.00 in one year as shown in the particulars supplied. Mr. L. S. Mcleod admitted that he could not trace any expenditure having been shown in respect of repairs of furniture in the summaries of receipts and monthly expenditure and that his estimate of the amounts spent for repairs would be less than Rs. 500/-. Mr. B. Chatterjee said the amount also included the hire charges of the office equipment. He did not refer to any books of account to support the statement. In the absence of proper explanation supported by the books of account of the company, the figure of Rs. 21,112/- ought not to be accepted and taking into account Rs. 500/- as stated by Mr. Mcleod as having been spent for repairs to furniture a sum of Rs. 20,612/- should be added to the gross profits.
- C
- D
- E
- F
- G
- H

The third item to be added to the gross profits according to the appellant was the figure of interest Rs. 16,645.53 shown in schedule F for computation of net profits in accordance with s. 349 of the Companies Act, 1956 with details of calculation of Managing Agents' remuneration for the year ended 31-3-1961. This amount according to the appellant should have found a place in Ex. D-11 being a "Statement of surplus/deficiency of profits for the year ended 31st March 1961" *i. e.* the working sheet compiled by the company. This interest accrued to the company out of the statutory investments as shown in Schedule C to the balance sheet. Schedule C gives the statutory contingencies reserve fund investments, the book value thereof being Rs. 2,30,880.37 quoted on the stock exchange, besides Rs. 50,031.25 which was not so quoted, the total coming to Rs. 2,80,911.62. Although the statutory contingency reserve fund investments are not to be taken into account in "the statement of surpluses and deficiency of profits" it was included in the statement of net profits for the calculation of managing agents' commission and we see no reason why the same should be left out of account in Ex. D-11. Mr. Chagla contended that the workers had done nothing during the year of account *i. e.* 1st April 1960 to 31st March 1961 which entitled them to claim the benefit of this amount of interest. While it is true that their claim cannot be rested on any work done by them for the company during the year of account there can be no question that the interest accrued to the company out of the efforts of the workers in the past which had not been taken into account in calculating bonus. The managing agents had done nothing in the year of account to entitle them to take into account the amount of interest which accrued to the company during the year of account. If they were entitled to claim a share of it the workers were equally entitled to base their claim for its inclusion in Ex. D-11. The result is that the gross profits of the company as shown in Ex. D-11 would have to be augmented by the sums of Rs. 1,57,428, Rs. 20,612 and Rs. 16,645.53.

On behalf of the appellant dispute was also raised to the deduction of several items in Ex. D-11 namely, (1) rebate to consumers Rs. 17,046.00 (2) depreciation to the extent of Rs. 3,55,755, as also double shift allowance of Rs. 95,256 (3) income tax at 45% as per Finance Act *i. e.* Rs. 1,07,052

A and (4) return of 6% on working capital which was quanti-
 fied at Rs. 8,25,243/-. According to the Tribunal, it was
 not necessary to consider the other two items, return at 6%
 on other reserves employed in the business *i.e.*
 Rs. 55,38,296/- and rehabilitation reserve of Rs. 30,15,202
 B as in his view even without taking these two last figures
 the working sheet Ex.-D-11 showed a negative balance,
 that is to say absence of any surplus resulting out of which
 the workers could claim anything by way of profit bonus.

C With regard to rebate to consumers it was argued
 before the Tribunal that it was never paid to the consumers
 as the Sixth Schedule to the Electricity Supply Act, under
 paragraph II(1) went to show that:

D “If the clear profit of a licensee in any year of
 account is in excess of the amount of reasonable
 return, one-third of such excess, not exceeding five
 per cent of the amount of reasonable return, shall be
 at the disposal of the undertaking. Of the balance
 of the excess, one half shall be appropriated to a
 E reserve which shall be called the Tariffs and Divi-
 dends Control Reserve and the remaining half
 shall either be distributed in the form of proportional
 rebate on the amounts collected from the sale of
 electricity and meter rentals or carried forward in the
 accounts of the licensee for distribution to the con-
 sumers in future, in such manner as the State Govern-
 ment may direct.”

F This goes to show that the rebate to the consumers is not
 to be utilised by the company except for distribution to the
 consumers as may be directed. If the company cannot
 have the benefit of it, it stands to reason that the worker
 cannot ask for a share and the claim of the appellant for
 G inclusion of this sum must be rejected.

H It was next argued on behalf of the appellant that the
 Tribunal should not have allowed depreciation in excess
 of the figure which was shown in the profit and loss account
 of the company, *viz.*, Rs. 2,51,405.80. The Tribunal
 accepted the depreciation to the extent of Rs. 3,55,755
 but disallowed the claim with regard to double shift
 allowance. The judgment of this Court in *The Associated
 Cement Companies* (supra at P. 959) shows that this Court

accepted the formula propounded by the Full Bench of the Labour Appellate Tribunal in *U. P. Electric Supply Co. Ltd., v. Their Workmen* (1). In *U. P. Electric Supply Co.*'s case the Full Bench of the Labour Appellate Tribunal had stated (see p. 440) that:

“Upon a careful consideration of the matter we are of the view that only normal depreciation, including multiple shift depreciation, but not initial or additional depreciation, should rank as a prior charge in applying our Full Bench formula.”

This case came up for consideration again in *T.T.E. Supply Co., Ltd. v. Its Workmen* (2) and *The Ahmedabad Miscellaneous Industrial Workers Union v. The Ahmedabad Electricity Co. Ltd.* (3) and was approved of in both. That Rs. 3,55,755/- was the normal depreciation for the year is amply borne out by the assessment order of the Income-tax Officer for the relevant year which is Ex.D-20 in this case. The company further filed statements of depreciation in respect of each of the assets from 1948 to 1961 and the totals of the figures add up to the exact sum of Rs. 3,55,755/-.

With regard to the claim of double shift allowance Mr. B. Chatterjee, the Company's witness, stated that the amount of Rs. 95,256/- represented the double shift allowance but they did not claim it in the income-tax assessment inasmuch as if they had done so in the year of account, this would have increased their burden of tax in the subsequent years and it was to regulate the stability of profits that they did not claim double shift in the income-tax returns. We see no reason to reject the evidence of Mr. Chatterjee. The fact that in the balance sheet the company showed only Rs. 2,51,405.80 was not conclusive on the question. What amount of depreciation the company will claim under the Income-tax Act in order to allow some profits to be distributed among the shareholders is a concern entirely of the company, so long as they do not claim anything more than what the law allows. It is significant to note that this Court pointed out in *The Ahmedabad Miscellaneous Industrial Workers' Union* case (supra) that the Income-tax Rules should be applied in

(1) [1955] 2 L.L.J. 431.

(2) [1960] 3 S.C.R. 68.

(3) [1962] 2 S.C.R. 934.

A calculating depreciation under the Full Bench Formula
 in preference to the provisions of the Seventh Schedule to
 the Electricity Supply Act as this would work for uniformity
 in all industrial concerns. A contention similar to the
 one put forward by the appellant in this case was rejected
 B by this Court in *Hamdard Dawakhana Wakf v. Its Workmen*
 (1). The notional normal depreciation there claimed by
 the employer and which would be allowable under the
 Income-tax Act was Rs. 2,22,867 but the Tribunal allowed
 only Rs. 1,06,785 as this figure had been shown by the
 appellant in its profit and loss account. This Court
 C observed that:

“In the profit and loss account, it is the actual
 depreciation that would be shown and not the
 notional normal depreciation and so, the fact that the
 former depreciation has been shown in the profit
 and loss account can not be held to be a factor against
 D the appellant.”

It was also remarked that the accountant of the appellant
 had produced the figures of depreciation in various exhibits
 and his statement had not been challenged in cross-
 examination and therefore there was no reason to dis-
 E allow the claim of depreciation of Rs. 2,22,867/-.

On reasoning similar to the above it was argued on
 behalf of the appellant that there was no justification for
 the Tribunal's disregarding the income-tax actually paid by
 the company as per the assessment order, *viz.*, Rs. 53,896.80.
 F But this in our opinion cannot be accepted as the available
 surplus has to be found out by working on the Full Bench
 formula of the Labour Appellate Tribunal. There can be
 no question that income-tax has to be notionally computed
 at 45% after deduction from the gross profits, the expenses
 shown in Ex. D-11 ending with notional normal depre-
 G ciation and double shift depreciation. The Tribunal
 allowed Rs. 1,07,052 but the result of the addition to the
 gross profit of Rs. 8,88,598 (1) the difference in the value of
 the coal consumed, (2) the amount disallowed out of
 the furniture repairs and (3) the interest amount of
 Rs. 16,645/- the income tax to be allowed in the
 H working sheet would be Rs. 1,94,435/- in place of
 Rs. 1,07,052/-.

(1) [1962] 2 L.L.J. 772.

The last item disputed by the appellant was the return on working capital which was shown as Rs. 8,25,243/- in Ex. D-11. The evidence given on this head was that of Mr. B. Chatterjee. He referred to various exhibits viz., D-22 to D-27 in this connection. Ex. D-22 was a statement compiled for showing reserves available as working capital. Exs. D-24 and D-25 went to show that at the relevant period, the company was borrowing moneys from the United Bank of India Ltd. The Tribunal accepted the company's case that Rs. 8,25,243/- should be taken to be the working capital of the company for the relevant year and return at 6 per cent should be deducted to arrive at the available surplus for distribution. The evidence on this head was furnished by B. Chatterjee who said that the sum had been calculated as shown in Ex. D-11 in accordance with clause xvii (e) of the Sixth Schedule to the Electricity Act, and this sum being the lesser of the two was incorporated in Ex. D-11. The details of the requirement of liquid funds to run the undertaking was given in Ex. D-16. In his cross-examination Chatterjee said that besides the item shown in Ex. D-22 (statement of reserves) and other funds which had been used as working capital, the company had to take the loan in spite of these reserves which were already employed in the business as working capital.

Mr. Chagla contended that the working capital as computed in accordance with Schedule VII of the Electricity Supply Act being a statutory computation could be taken into account even for the working out of the Full Bench Formula of the Labour Appellate Tribunal. In our view, this is not the correct position in law. In *T. T. Supply Company's* case (1) the question considered by this Court was whether the Full Bench Formula should be applied to an electric supply undertaking in preference to the provisions of the different clauses of paragraph xvii of the Sixth Schedule to the Electricity Supply Act and this Court concurred with the view expressed by the Labour Appellate Tribunal that even in such a case the Full Bench Formula should be applied. In the *Ahmedabad Miscellaneous Industrial Workers' Union's* case (2) where one of the questions before this Court was whether depreciation should be calculated according to the provisions of the income-tax Act and the rules framed thereunder or accord-

(1) [1960] 3 S.C.R. 68.

(2) [1962] 2 S.C.R. 934.

(A) ing to the provisions contained in the Seventh Schedule
 the Electricity Supply Act, it was held that the rates pre-
 scribed under the rules framed under the Income -tax Act
 lay down the proper measure of depreciation to be allowed
 as in the view of this Court the field of industrial relations
 B in connection with which the Full Bench Formula was
 evolved, it was not proper to inject therein the provisions
 contained in the Seventh Schedule to the Electricity Supply
 Act.

C There can be no dispute that a good portion of the
 reserves must have been utilised in running the company
 inasmuch as it was obliged to borrow moneys from the bank
 and pay interest thereon. It is highly unlikely that a com-
 pany which had reserves as disclosed by its balance sheet and
 profit and loss account would borrow moneys from a bank
 unless it was utilising the reserves for some other and more
 D remunerative purposes. The balance sheet and the profit
 and loss account negative such a view and no evidence
 which throws light on the question was recorded.

E We are however not called upon in this case to come to a
 finding as to how much of the reserves were utilised as
 working capital in view of the fact that even without taking
 this item into account, there is no available surplus left in
 terms of the working sheet which forms the basis for deter-
 mining the available surplus.

F The working sheet according to us should be altered as
 follows: To the figure Rs. 6,88,905 shown as surplus in
 Ex. D-11 after the deduction of various items of expenses
 should be added three figures *i.e.* (1) coal and fuel
 Rs. 1,57,428/- (2) furniture account Rs. 20,612 and (3) interest
 Rs. 16,545/- making a total of Rs. 8,83,490/- as gross
 profits. From this will have to be deducted Rs. 4,51,011
 G being the sum of notional normal depreciation of
 Rs. 3,55,755 and double shift depreciation Rs. 95,256/-. This
 leaves a balance of Rs. 4,32,479. From this will have to be
 deducted the income-tax of 45% which in view of the addi-
 tion of the items regarding coal, furniture and interest should
 be Rs. 1,94,615 in place of Rs. 1,07,052 as shown in Ex.
 D-11. Deducting this from Rs. 4,32,479 the balance left is
 H Rs. 2,37,864. From this has to be deducted the statutory
 contingencies reserve and the statutory development reserve
 and 6 per cent on the share capital of Rs. 22,49,850/- there

being no dispute as to these figures. The result is that from the figure of Rs. 2,37,864 there has to be deducted a sum of Rs. 2,38,585 which leaves a negative balance of Rs. 721. The case of the appellant for showing an available surplus for distribution therefore disappears. ^A

In the result, the appeal fails both on the point of customary or festival bonus or implied term of the contract or profit bonus, and will be dismissed with costs. ^B

V.P.S.

Appeal dismissed