4M1022

Roll No.

Total No of Pages: 3

## 4M1022

M. B. A. IV Sem. (Main / Back) Exam., April - May 2017
M - 430 Employment Laws
(Major - I)

Time: 3 Hours

**Maximum Marks: 70** 

Min. Passing Marks: 28

Instructions to Candidates:

- (i) The question paper is divided in two sections.
- (ii) There are sections A & B. Section A contains 6 questions out of which the candidate is required to attempt any 4 questions. Section B contains short case study / application based question which is compulsory.
- (iii) All questions carry equal marks.

1. NIL

2. NIL

## SECTION - A

- Q.1 Discuss the recommendations of labour commissions to improvise labour law in India.
- Q.2 Discuss the role of International Labour Organization. [14]
- Q.3 Discuss the Unfair Labour Practices and Penalties in India. [14]
- Q.4 Discuss the provisions of Workman's Compensation Act 1923. [14]
- Q.5 What are the different authorities under the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 for settlement

of industrial disputes? Critically examine them.

[14]

[4M1022]

Page 1 of 3

[880]

- Minimum Wages Act 1948
- Equal Remuneration Act, 1976 (b)
- Standing Orders Act, 1946
- Factory Act, 1948

## SECTION - B

Q.7 Read the following case carefully and answer the questions given at the end:

Mohanlal, the lineman (electrical), was working in the power supply group of electrical maintenance sections of the Mines Department. He had 15 years of experience of repair and maintenance of high tension (6.6 KV) and low tension (440V) overhead electric lines. From the beginning of the mines operation, he was engaged for the erection of electrical lines in the quarry area of the mines. During his service, he acted as leader of the crew whenever the charge man was absent. One day at 1.00 p.m. à message was received in the Mine Control Center that Mohanlal had fallen from a low – tension pole. He was shifted to the mines hospital where he was declared unfit for 6 weeks due to injuries on his shoulder, legs and hands. On preliminary inquiries from his co-workers, it was gathered that he was sent to attend the fuse complaint from the union office in the camp area. He was assisted by two persons. The helpers, who were at the site, said that Mohanlal checked the electrical circuit of the premises and upon finding everything in order, concluded that the supply was disconnected from the service lines on the pole near the office. He climbed the pole, but before he

[4M1022] Page 2 of 3 [880] could attend to the fault, he fell down from the height of about 6.5 meters and sustained physical injuries. He stated in the hospital that as he climbed the pole, his elbow, made contact with some metallic and that he felt some sensation in the nerves due to which he could not hold pole firmly. In addition, the grip of one of his legs was lost. Consequently, he lost balance and fell down. On interrogation, as to why he did not use a ladder and safety belt, he replied that he had not assessed this to be a job of line repair work, further, he had been doing such repairs many times earlier without the ladder and the safety belt. He also pointed out the non-availability of transport and manpower for carrying the tools and tackles to the accident site. He also confirmed switching off the main supply feeding that area.

- (i) What are the issues in this case study? [5]
- (ii) Should Mohanal be given paid leave and compensated as per Workmen's Compensation Act? [5]
- (iii) Should he be penalized for his negligence or violation of safety regulations, if any?

[4M1022]