

January 2019

Master of Business Administration (MBA) Examination

(Full Time) (New) Third Semester

FT-303H : INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS AND LABOUR LAW

Time 3 Hours]

[Max. Marks 80

**Note : Attempt any four questions from Section A. Each question carries 15 marks.
Section B is compulsory and carries 20 marks.**

Section A

1. 'Rapid industrialization in India is heavily dependent on harmonious industrial relations.' Discuss.
2. Define Globalization. What impact does the emerging socio- economic scenario have on Industrial Relations ? Discuss.
3. Why did the Trade Unions in India often failed to achieve their objectives ? (Trace history) What measures should be taken for successful functioning of Trade Unions ?
4. Define Grievance. Describe the Grievance Procedure in detail and also discuss how Grievance can be managed in Indian Industry,
5. Define the term Workers Participation in Management. What are the causes for the limited success of WPM ? Suggest the measures to improve their performance.
6. Write short notes on any two of the following : <http://www.davvonline.com>
 - (a) Conflict Model Vs Collaboration Model.
 - (b) A brief note on Negotiation, Arbitration and Mediation.
 - (c) A brief note on Labour Court, Industrial Tribunal and National Tribunal.
 - (d) Productivity Bargaining and Gain Sharing.

Section B

CASE STUDY

A nationalized road transport corporation introduced an incentive scheme for the bus crew (staff) so as to provide better transport facilities to the maximum number of passengers as there was no other transport agency operating on the same route. Moreover, this would increase the revenue of the corporation. In accordance with this scheme, the corporate fixed a certain amount of the level of revenue to each route as base revenue. If the revenue earned by a particular trip was equal to the base revenue, the conductor and the driver of that bus would be eligible to receive the incentive amount of one percent of the base revenue. If the revenue exceeded the base amount the conductor and driver could get higher per cent on incremental revenue as incentive bonus.

In a bid to take advantage of this incentive scheme, the bus conductors of almost all the routes started to overload the buses exceeding double the seating capacity (i.e., 49 seating capacity plus 49 standing passengers). This scheme had been functioning successfully, benefitting the passengers, the bus crew and particularly the corporation, as the cost of operation of the bus did not increase in proportion to the increase in revenue. <http://www.davvonline.com>

Mr. 'A' had been working as a conductor in 'Z' depot of Road Transport Corporation. He was on duty on 19th September '83 on a route (R to K passenger bus). (He had overloaded the bus almost a double of the seating capacity. Mr. X - a passenger of that bus did not purchase a ticket despite repeated enquiries of the conductor, because the heavy overloaded condition of the bus and his illness. The conductor was unable to count the passengers because of the overload. In this state, the ticket officers stopped the bus, verified the tickets of all the passengers and found that Mr. X had not purchased a ticket. They blamed the conductor for not issuing the ticket and the passenger for not buying the ticket. Then Mr. X in a written appeal to the checking staff stated that he had not purchased the ticket despite repeated enquiries by the conductor because he was ill and bus was heavily overloaded. He requested, therefore, not to take any action against the conductor.

The ticket checking staff collected the ticket fare and penalty from Mr. X and suspended the conductor ignoring the written request made by Mr. X. Moreover, the repeated requests made by the co-passengers of that bus was not paid any heed to.

The suspension of the conductor created uproar among all the bus crew of the depot (Z). The operating staff (Conductors and Drivers) held a meeting on 19th September itself and resolved to limit the intake of passengers to the seating capacity. This decision was implemented with immediate effect. Consequently, most of the commuters were unable to leave for their destination. Passengers of almost all the routes experienced many difficulties while travelling. Average revenue per day of 'Z' bus depot declined to Rs. 75,000 from Rs. 1,00,000 between 20th and 27th September. The suspension of Mr. A at 'Z' bus depot served as the potential "fuel" for the staff, working in other depots to launch a work-to-rule agitation. Viewing the situation, the officials of the corporation re-examined the whole case and withdrew the suspension order served on Mr. A on 27th September 1983.

Questions : <http://www.davvonline.com>

1. Was the conductor guilty of negligence of duty ? Why ?
2. Should a genuine mistake call for the drastic punishment or suspension ?
3. Show the disciplinary rules be applied for the sake of mere discipline or should they contribute to goals and objectives of a corporation ?

<http://www.davvonline.com>

Whatsapp @ 9300930012

Your old paper & get 10/-

पुराने पेपर्स भेजे और 10 रुपये पायें,

Paytm or Google Pay से