

22 June, 2026

The National Stock Exchange of India Limited  
Exchange Plaza, Plot No. C/1,  
G-Block, Bandra- Kurla Complex,  
Bandra (E), Mumbai- 400 051.

**NSE Symbol - TIMKEN**

BSE Limited  
Phiroze Jeejeebhoy Towers,  
Dalal Street, Fort,  
Mumbai 400001

**Scrip Code- 522113**

Dear Sir/Madam,

**SUB: ORDER PASSED BY HON'BLE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD**

Pursuant to Regulation 30 of Securities and Exchange Board of India (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations, 2015, we hereby inform about an Order passed by Hon'ble High Court of Gujarat at Ahmedabad in the matter of Antifriction Bearings Corporation Limited (amalgamated with Timken India Limited) V/s Anil Ambalal Modi, details of which are given below:

Name of the Authority passing order	High Court of Gujarat at Ahmedabad
Details of the violation(s)/contravention(s) alleged to be committed	Mr. Modi was terminated from employment of Antifriction Bearings Corporation Limited in the year 1995. Since conciliation between parties could not be arrived at then, dispute was referred to the Labour Court.  Labour Court in 2005 decided that termination was illegal and awarded back wages to the extent of 65% and ordered to reinstate Mr. Modi in employment.  Appeal was filed against aforesaid Labour Court's Order.
Nature and details of the action(s) taken, initiated or order(s) passed	Hon'ble High Court of Gujarat at Ahmedabad has upheld Labour Court's Order. Further, Hon'ble High Court of Gujarat at Ahmedabad also directed to pay regular wages to Mr. Modi from 2005 till the

	date he attained the age of superannuation.
Date of receipt of direction or order /demand notice	22 June, 2026
Impact on financial, operation or other activities of the Company, quantifiable in monetary terms to the extent possible	The Company is in process determining financial impact which will take some time. The Company is likely to file appeal against present Order.

You are requested to take note of the above.

Yours faithfully,

For **TIMKEN INDIA LIMITED**

MANDAR  
MOHANIRAJ  
VASMATKAR

Digitally signed by  
MANDAR  
MOHANIRAJ  
VASMATKAR  
Date: 2026.06.22  
17:30:48 +05'30'

**Mandar Vasmatkar**  
**Company Secretary**  
**& Chief - Compliance**

**sIN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD**

**R/LETTERS PATENT APPEAL NO. 110 of 2016**

**In**

**R/SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION/7072/2005**

**With**

**R/LETTERS PATENT APPEAL NO. 338 of 2016**

**In**

**R/SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 14818 of 2005**

=====  
**ANTIFRICTION BEARINGS CORPN. LTD.**

**Versus**

**MODI ANIL AMBALAL & ANR.**  
=====

=====  
**Appearance:**

**MR VARUN K.PATEL(3802) for the Appellant(s) No. 1**

**MR MS MANSURI(1033) for the Respondent(s) No. 1**

**RULE SERVED for the Respondent(s) No. 1,2**  
=====

**CORAM:HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE N.S.SANJAY GOWDA**

**and**

**HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE J. L. ODEDRA**

**Date : 17/06/2026**

**ORAL JUDGMENT**

**(PER : HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE N.S.SANJAY GOWDA)**

1. Both the management as well as the workman are in appeal.
2. Admittedly, on 22.11.1995, the service of the workman was terminated by the management. Admittedly this termination was not preceded by any inquiry.
3. The workman, being aggrieved with the termination, initially sought for conciliation, but since the same was not fruitful, the Government referred the dispute to the Labour Court.

4. Before the Labour Court, the management sought to substantiate the termination by adducing evidence in support of the termination. The management principally contended that the workman had instigated the other workers to undertake a go-slow and this had resulted in a drastic fall of production for which the management was justified in terminating the services of the workman. The Labour Court, on consideration of the evidence adduced by the management, has come to the conclusion that the termination was not justified and was not lawful.

5. The Labour Court has recorded a finding of fact that out of the four witnesses who were examined by the management, three were the managerial staff, while one- the remaining witness was a Timekeeper. It has found that all these four witnesses have basically stated that the workman had instigated the other workers, but their evidence did not indicate in what manner the workman had instigated them.

6. In fact, the Labour Court as well as the learned Single Judge have noticed that the assertion of the witnesses was only to the effect that the workmen were sitting in the tent, which had been erected outside the factory premises, and slogans were being shouted during the strike.

7. It may be pertinent to state here that the workman was only an Account Clerk and there must, therefore, be clear and direct evidence indicating the manner in which an Account Clerk could instigate the workers on the factory floor. The Labour Court, in our view, has rightly come to the conclusion

that there was no evidence to justify the assertion that the workman had instigated the other workers to go on a go-slow.

8. The learned Single Judge has examined the entire evidence that was adduced and has affirmed the finding recorded by the Labour Court.

9. In our view, since both the Labour Court and the learned Single Judge have clearly come to the conclusion that there was absolutely no evidence to substantiate the assertion that the workman had instigated the other workers to go on a go-slow, the award of reinstatement granted by the Labour Court cannot be found fault with.

10. The Labour Court has also taken into consideration that the termination was illegal. It has observed that as a matter of fact, several employees were dismissed from service on 22/23.11.1995. It has also taken note of the fact that there was a settlement arrived at in the writ petition that had been filed before this Court and all of them were taken back. Though the Labour Court has not accepted the say of the workman that he was also entitled for the benefit of this settlement since there was a clear assertion in the memorandum settlement that all employees who were dismissed on 22/23.11.1995 will be taken back to duty, the fact remains that the management had terminated a group of employees, obviously, because of the strike / go-slow. If the management had entered into a settlement in respect of 12 workers and had reinstated them and taken into consideration that they had also been terminated without holding any

inquiry, it becomes rather obvious that the Labour Court was right in awarding back wages.

11. The Labour Court has only granted 65% back wages. This grant of 65% back wages is because the evidence adduced and material on record indicated that the workman's father owned a shop and it was admitted by the workman that his father had not engaged any person to assist him in running the shop and the shop was the only source of income for the family. The Labour Court has, therefore, come to the conclusion that the workman would have obviously worked along with his father and was at least gainfully employed to a certain extent and therefore, grant of 100% back wages was incorrect and it has proceeded to grant back wages at the rate of 65%.

12. It must be stated here that merely because the father of the workman was running a shop, it cannot be assumed that the workman by assisting his father was earning sufficient amount of money to maintain the family.

13. The fact that he asserted and the Labour Court believed this assertion that the income of the shop was the only source of livelihood would clearly indicate that the income of the family was not in any way increased significantly because of the appellant's assistance to his father.

14. Be that as it may, when the Labour Court has taken into consideration the fact that the termination of the workman without holding any inquiry on the assumption that he had

instigated the workers was illegal and the evidence adduced before the Labour Court also did not in any way indicate that he had instigated other workers to go on strike or go-slow, the award of 65% back wages cannot be found fault with that.

15. It may be pertinent to state here that the allegation of the management regarding the appellant-workman instigating the other workers to go-slow would be untenable. This is because the management contended that the appellant-workman was an office bearer of the trade union. If the appellant-workman was indeed an office bearer, the settlement that had been arrived at in respect of the other workmen would also have included the appellant-workman. The fact that the management argued before this Court that the settlement could not apply to the appellant-workman would also indicate that he could not be an office bearer of the trade union and, therefore, the assertion that he was instigating the other workers because he was an office bearer would become doubtful.

16. The Learned Single Judge has taken note of all these factors and has rightly come to the conclusion that there was no merit in the writ petition filed by the management. The Learned Single Judge has also come to the conclusion that the award of back wages to the extent of 65% was just and proper. In our view, this reasoned order of the Learned Single Judge does not call for any interference and hence, both the appeals filed by the management as well as by the worker are DISMISSED.

17. Before parting with the case, it is necessary to state that the Labour Court had passed an order of reinstatement on 18.01.2005. It was stated at the bar that initially, the management refused to reinstate the workman and instead chose to pay the last drawn wages as contemplated under section 17(B) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 from January 2005 and it was only in September 2016, the workman was reinstated.

18. Since the award of reinstatement is being affirmed, the management is directed to pay the regular wages to the workman from January 2005 till the date he attained the age of superannuation.

19. The management is directed to pay the same salary that the Accounts Clerks were being paid in the establishment. The management is, however, entitled to deduct the 17(B) wages that it had paid and also the wages that it had paid from September 2016.

20. It is made clear that the workman is deemed to have been reinstated in January 2005 and the salary that an Account Clerk was entitled to from January 2005 till the workman attained the superannuation will be paid after taking into consideration all the increments and enhancements that have been made to regular Account Clerks.

21. The back wages shall also be paid in terms of the salary that the workman was drawing as on the date of his

termination and shall also contain the increases during the period the workman was out of service, i.e. from 1995 till 2005.

22. The due amount shall be computed and made over to the workman within a period of SIX WEEKS from the date of receipt of the copy of this order.

Sd/-  
**(N.S.SANJAY GOWDA,J)**

Sd/-  
**(J. L. ODEDRA, J)**

OMKAR

Original copy of this order has been signed by the Hon'ble Judges.  
Digitally signed by: OMKAR CHHAGANLAL MAHAWAR(HC00201), PRINCIPAL PRIVATE SECRETARY, at High Court of Gujarat on 19/06/2026 14:47:31