

***Law Audience Journal, Volume 4 & Issue 4, 28th November 2022,
e-ISSN: 2581-6705, Indexed Journal, IF 5.381, Published at
<https://www.lawaudience.com/volume-4-issue-4/>, Pages: 149 to 152,***

***Title: “Bijoy Cotton Mills vs. State of Ajmer”, Authored By: Vanshika
Chaudhary, School of Law, University of Petroleum & Energy Studies,
Dehradun,***

Email Id: vanshikasahu2k@gmail.com.



Cite this article as:

VANSHIKA CHAUDHARY, “*Bijoy Cotton Mills vs. State of Ajmer*”, Vol.4 & Issue 4, Law Audience Journal (e-ISSN: 2581-6705), Pages 149 to 152 (28th November 2022), available at <https://www.lawaudience.com/bijoy-cotton-mills-vs-state-of-ajmer/>.

***Law Audience Journal, Volume 4 & Issue 4, 28th November 2022,
e-ISSN: 2581-6705, Indexed Journal, IF 5.381, Published at
<https://www.lawaudience.com/volume-4-issue-4/>, Pages: 149 to 152,***

***Title: “Bijoy Cotton Mills vs. State of Ajmer”, Authored By: Vanshika
Chaudhary, School of Law, University of Petroleum & Energy Studies,
Dehradun,***

Email Id: vanshikasahu2k@gmail.com.

Publisher Details Are Available At:

<https://www.lawaudience.com/publisher-details/>

Editorial Board Members Details Are Available At:

<https://www.lawaudience.com/editorial-board-members/>

| Copyright © 2022 By Law Audience Journal |

(E-ISSN: 2581-6705)

*All Copyrights are reserved with the Authors. But, however, the Authors have granted to the Journal (Law Audience Journal), an **irrevocable, non-exclusive, royalty-free and transferable license to publish, reproduce, store, transmit, display and distribute** it in the Journal or books or in any form and all other media, retrieval systems and other formats now or hereafter known.*

No part of this publication may be reproduced, distributed, or transmitted in any form or by any means, including photocopying, recording, or other electronic or mechanical methods, without the prior written permission of the publisher, except in the case of brief quotations embodied in critical reviews and certain other non-commercial uses permitted by copyright law.

*For permission requests, write to the publisher, subject of the email must be **“Permission Required”** at the email addresses given below.*

Email: lawjournal@lawaudience.com, info@lawaudience.com,

Phone: +91-8351033361,

Website: www.lawaudience.com.

Facebook: www.facebook.com/lawaudience

Instagram: www.instagram.com/lawaudienceofficial

Contact Timings: 5:00 PM to 9:00 PM.

Law Audience Journal, Volume 4 & Issue 4, 28th November 2022,
e-ISSN: 2581-6705, Indexed Journal, IF 5.381, Published at
<https://www.lawaudience.com/volume-4-issue-4/>, Pages: 149 to 152,

Title: “Bijoy Cotton Mills vs. State of Ajmer”, Authored By: Vanshika
Chaudhary, School of Law, University of Petroleum & Energy Studies,
Dehradun,

Email Id: vanshikasahu2k@gmail.com.

DISCLAIMER:

*Law Audience Journal (e-ISSN: 2581-6705) and Its Editorial Board Members do not guarantee that the material published in it is 100 percent reliable. You can rely upon it at your own risk. But, however, the Journal and Its Editorial Board Members have taken the proper steps to provide the readers with relevant material. Proper footnotes & references have been given to avoid any copyright or plagiarism issue. Articles published in **Volume 4 & Issue 4** are the original work of the authors.*

*Views or Opinions or Suggestions **(if any)**, expressed or published in the Journal are the personal point of views of the Author(s) or Contributor(s) and the Journal & Its Editorial Board Members are not liable for the same.*

While every effort has been made to avoid any mistake or omission, this publication is published online on the condition and understanding that the publisher shall not be liable in any manner to any person by reason of any mistake or omission in this publication or for any action taken or omitted to be taken or advice rendered or accepted on the basis of this work.

All disputes subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of Courts, Tribunals and Forums at Himachal Pradesh only.

Title: "Bijoy Cotton Mills vs. State of Ajmer", Authored By: Vanshika Chaudhary, School of Law, University of Petroleum & Energy Studies,
Dehradun,

Email Id: vanshikasahu2k@gmail.com.

BIJOY COTTON MILLS VS. STATE OF AJMER:

The trade and its workers square measure at odds during this case owing to the salary. The constitutionality of the salary act was challenged on the grounds that it desecrated workers' basic rights. In general, the case revolves around a dispute between the trade and its workers over the salary for staff.

I. INTRODUCTION:

The appellants within the current case are Ram Nath Singh and 4 alternative people, and therefore the respondent is that the State of Ajmer. In 1954, India's highest court, the Supreme Court of Asian country, detected and set the case. the liberty of trade and commerce is protected by Article 19(1)(g) of the Constitution. during this case, it had been debatable whether the government's determination of pay rates obligatory cheap constraints on contract freedom.

II. BACKGROUND OF THE CASE:

In a notice dated Gregorian calendar month one, 1950, the Ajmer government referred a hike dispute between the corporate associated its staff to an industrial court. On November twenty-seven, 1951, the court dominated that *"the factory's current getting limit precludes the award of upper wage rates and better costliness allowance."* staff filed associate charm with the appellant court in a trial to possess the choice reversed. throughout the investigation of this mystery, the Chief Commissioner of Ajmer created progress toward his obsession of raising the state's pay for textile staff in accordance with the Minimum Wages Act. A board was fashioned on January seventeen, 1952, and its report was delivered on Oct four, 1952, as antecedental expressed. On Oct seven, 1952, many textile organizations, as well as the petitioner organization, filed writs difficult the notice establishing the pay rates. Finally, a notice outlining pay rates was revealed on Oct seven, 1952. within the meanwhile, no matter it had been, company staff went regarding their business as was common whereas documenting the intrigue flowering before the appellant court.

Title: “Bijoy Cotton Mills vs. State of Ajmer”, Authored By: Vanshika Chaudhary, School of Law, University of Petroleum & Energy Studies, Dehradun,

Email Id: vanshikasahu2k@gmail.com.

The appellat court remanded the case to the economic court for any thought, and therefore the Industrial court issued its call on Gregorian calendar month eight, 1955. The court rejected the premise that light-emitting diode the Chief Commissioner to work out a pay of Rs.35, instead setting the pay at Rs.35, as well as the price allowance, during this award.⁵⁶ In its charm, the organization claims that if such wages are needed to keep up its current level of profit, it'll be unable to operate. The organization additionally claims that the Ajmer State Government's minimum wages are utterly unaffordable.

Similarly, on Gregorian calendar month one of an equivalent year, the corporate closed all of its factories. there have been more or less 1500 staff engaging at the company's plants. it's claimed that starting in January 1954, many of those staff approached their supervisors and expressed a want to figure for Rs.35 per hour in accordance with the economic Tribunal's wage call. They allegedly went up to the supervisors and told them to open the factories. The organization is unable to open the plants thanks to the pay Act, that makes failure to pay the statutory pay a criminal offense. Despite the very fact that the overwhelming majority of staff were happy with the economic Tribunal's wage choices, this is often matters. As a result, the corporate is unable to start operations at the plants. The charm was eventually forwarded to the Supreme Court of Asian country for judgment when being detected by each court within the country.

III. FACTS:

In 1950, the corporate and its workers engaged in an exceedingly labour dispute over pay raises. The Ajmer government referred the case to associate degree industrial court for review. throughout the hearing of the attractiveness, the Chief Commissioner of Ajmer appointed a committee to ascertain the state's earnings for textile business workers in accordance with the Minimum Wages Act. within the interim, the appellat court remanded the case to the commercial court for additional investigation. the commercial court unnoticed the Chief Commissioner's justification for rupees because the earnings in its final ruling. ⁵⁶; but the earnings supported costliness allowances was set at

Title: “Bijoy Cotton Mills vs. State of Ajmer”, Authored By: Vanshika Chaudhary, School of Law, University of Petroleum & Energy Studies, Dehradun,

Email Id: vanshikasahu2k@gmail.com.

Rs. The Chief Commissioner's authority to line the earnings was additionally upheld by the appellat court. the corporate claimed in its petition that the imposition of a earnings by the govt would build it not possible for it to continue operations. in step with the corporate, the basic provisions of the earnings Act don't constitute clause (6) of article 19(1)(g) of the Constitution, that protects employers' and employees' elementary rights. As a result, the corporate claims that they're violating the constitution and exceptional their legal authority. the corporate claimed that the Constitution protects these elementary rights.

IV. ISSUES:

“The issue concerned within the case was whether or not restrictions obligatory upon the liberty of contract by the fixation of minimum rate of wages, though' they interfere to some extent with freedom of trade or business warranted below Article 19(1)(g) of the Constitution, either affordable or otherwise. The provisions of Section three, four and five of the Minimum Wages Act (XI of 1948) empower the suitable Government to repair the minimum rate of wages in an industrial dispute between the leader and the used and it's a criminal offence to not pay the wages so mounted below the Act. The company alleged that the provisions of the Minimum Wages Act are bootleg and puts unreasonable restrictions upon the rights of the leader within the sense that he's prevented from resuming his trade or business unless he's able to pay the minimum wages to the employees. The rights of the workers are restricted, in the maximum amount as they're disabled from operating in any trade or business on the terms in agreement to between them and their employers. it's noted that the provisions regarding the fixation of minimum wages are unreasonable and discretionary. the supply conflicts with basic rights of the employers and the used warranted below article 19(1) (g) of the Constitution which they're not protected by clause (6) of that article”.

V. RELATED PROVISION:

Aside from the provisions of the Indian Constitution, the case targeted on many sections of the remuneration Act. Article 19(1)(g) of the Indian Constitution was challenged within

Title: “Bijoy Cotton Mills vs. State of Ajmer”, Authored By: Vanshika Chaudhary, School of Law, University of Petroleum & Energy Studies, Dehradun,

Email Id: vanshikasahu2k@gmail.com.

the case involving the constitutionality of Sections 3, 4, and five of the Minimum Wages Act. Article 19(6) was essential within the future scenario. ***These articles state the following: to follow any profession, or to hold on any occupation, trade or business;*** Nothing in sub clause (g) of the aforementioned clause shall “*affect the operation of any existing law in to date because it imposes, or forestall the State from creating any law imposing, within the interests of the final public, affordable restrictions on the exercise of the correct presented by the aforementioned sub clause, and, above all, nothing within the aforementioned sub clause shall have an effect on the operation of any existing law in to date because it relates to, or forestall the State from creating any law relating to*”.

VI. JUDGEMENT:

The restrictions on contract freedom obligatory by the imposition of a salary don't seem to be unreasonable and are obligatory within the public interest and with the intention of protective workers' rights, despite the fact that they impede the liberty of trade or business bonded by Article 19(1)(g) of the Constitution to some extent. this is often thanks to an intensive examination of the historical context and also the terribly nature of jurisdiction. despite what Section 3(1)(a) says, the "appropriate government" cannot set the salary for planned work that employs fewer than one,000 individuals at a time across the state. However, the salary rate are determined once it's determined that a minimum of one thousand such workers exist.

VII. CONCEPT HIGHLIGHTED:

In this case, the wage Act and therefore the Indian Constitution stood out. The controversial parts of the said act, on the opposite hand, treated everything from setting the wage to setting the wage. Sections three through five comprised this cluster. In general, 2 articles—specifically, Article 19(1)(g) and Article 19—were in hand during this case. These articles lined the liberty of profession and trade still because the limitations on elementary rights. during this case, each article nineteen and paragraph 19(1)(g) were in competition.