

The National Transport Corporation



Brand: Mehta Solutions

Product Code: case118

Weight: 0.00kg

Price: Rs500

Short Description

The National Transport Corporation

Description

The National Transport Corporation CAST STUDY solution

. Read the case given below and answer the questions given at the end.

The National Transport Corporation (hereinafter referred to as NTC), a leading transport organization with a fleet strength of 200 vehicles, is engaged in Parcel Services in South India. The NTC has its headquarters at Madras, and has branches in important locations in Tamil Nadu and other southern states. Madhavan, a loadman of NTC at Salem, was transferred from Salem to Madura, for long absence from work in the beginning of 1985, though the corporation could have discharged him from service for long absence without

permission, for a period of two months. The Branch Manager of Salem, NTC requested the Head of the Human Resources Division to transfer the employee to another location, to enable the employee to correct himself in future. Madhavan was in NTC from the beginning of 1982. Madhavan reported for duty at Madura, and again after six months of service, started absenting from work as before. The Branch Manager of Madura counselled him several times, MS-2 2 but Madhavan did not show any real change in his attitude. A written warning was given to him in October 1985. He again absented himself from duty on 17th December, 1985 for ten days, and after joining duty on 15th January, he was again absent for 10 days. Disciplinary action followed. At the departmental enquiry held in February 1986, Mr. Madhavan pleaded that he was suffering from jaundice and that he rushed to his village near Salem for taking Ayurvedic treatment and rest. No medical certificate was produced. He admitted his mistake in not applying for leave, to the enquiry officer and requested for mercy. Based on the admission of the misconduct, the enquiry officer gave the findings that he was guilty. The Branch Manager, Madura was informed about the findings. He recommended dismissal (for provisions refer to Annexure-A). The Chief Executive of NTC, the punishing authority, took the decision that the delinquent was not willing to work regularly. He however, again directed a transfer to Madras, rather than passing an order of dismissal. This was done, once again, to enable the employee to correct himself. Before issue of orders, Mr. Madhavan approached the Chief Executive of NTC and requested for mercy. He was not in favour of changing the order of transfer. He, however referred the matter to the Manager of the Human Resources Division for proper disposal.

Before the Manager (HRD)

The Manager HRD, asked Madhavan, the reasons for absence. He asked Mr. Madhavan how a company would tolerate such absenteeism. He was asked why he failed to produce medical certificates, if he was really sick ? Was he not given an opportunity twice to correct himself, once by the Branch Manager, Salem and later by the Branch Manager, Madura ? Madhavan had no answer to these questions. He however, requested the Manager to give him one last chance. He had no complaints against the Branch Managers. The management assured support to him if his version was convincing. Madhavan then narrated his family background. Madhavan's Family Background He was born to Gundappan and Palaniammal. He had two elder sisters, four elder brothers and another brother younger to him. His sisters and two brothers were living separately after marriage. He got the job as a loadman in NTC in 1982 at Salem, through his brother-in-law, another senior loadman at NTC. Another unmarried brother of his, aged 33 was employed in a hotel and was living separately. He was living with his parents, a disabled brother aged 35 and his younger brother at Kamandapatti (Please refer Annexure-B) till the end of 1984 in the family house. He was the bread winner of the family. Madhavan was now living at Omalur, with his wife Madhavi aged 22. Madhavi's tale was a tragic one. A native of Taramangalam, 10 kms from Omalur, her father was in the military, and

was now no more. MS-2 4 She was married in 1983 to her father's sister's son Gopal. However, she was ill-treated by both her in-laws and her husband and deprived of her ornaments. Disillusioned, she applied for a divorce and got an alimony of Rs. 20,000. This helped her to establish a small grocery shop at Omalur and settling down with her sister's family. Here Madhavan developed intimacy with Madhavi much to the dislike of her sister, and another Gunapalan, a person known to Madhavan. Gunapalan wanted to marry Madhavi. But Madhavi had no interest in him. Gunapalan in this background posed serious problems to Madhavi especially after Madhavan's transfer to Madura. Gunapalan was determined to win her hand. He told her twice that she will have to forget Madhavan, or else she will have to blame herself for the consequences. Threats followed. Madhavan got a letter from Madhavi. She wanted real protection. She had antagonised Gunapalan and could not completely rely on her married sister. They should marry - she wrote to him. Madhavan reached Omalur to see that Madhavi's shop was burgled by unknown persons. There was a rumour in the air that Gunapalan was behind everything. Madhavan decided to marry Madhavi. He married her from the Madura Temple and later went on a pilgrimage for a fortnight. He however, did not inform the NTC officials and employees about his marriage. He never applied for leave as well during the marriage on 6th January, 1986. What followed was the disciplinary action against Madhavan and his entreaty against transfer..

The HRD Manager's Decision

Madhavan gave a definite undertaking to the Manager that he would be diligent in the work in future and that the management could terminate his services, upon any complaint in future. The Manager (HRD) contacted the Branch Managers of Madura and Salem and took them into confidence. The family background was fully explained to both the Branch Managers. It transpired that Madhavan had never explained his problem to either of them. Both Managers agreed to abide by the decision of the Manager (HRD) to help the employee concerned. Both promised to counsel Madhavan as well, if he was posted either at Madura or Salem. The Manager (HRD) taking into account his family background passed an order transferring the employee to Salem.

Questions :

(a) How would you approach this issue as the Head of HRD Division to correct the employee ?

(b) Do you think that the employee cannot be corrected and that sympathy shown to him will amount to a premium on indiscipline, adversely affecting the corporate image of the organisation and the employee ?

(c) Do you subscribe to the view that it is possible to correct him by the theory of

constructive discipline and if so, how ?

(d) Would you subscribe to the view that if you transfer him to his home town, Salem, Madhavan would prove himself to be a good performer as he will be in a position to discharge his duties as an employee and as a sincere family member

Annexure - A

Provisions in Standing Orders

Habitual absence without leave or absence without leave for more than 10 days.

Habitual late attendance

Punishment - An employee who is found guilty of a misconduct may be punished as provided herein, depending upon the gravity of the misconduct committed by the employee.

(a) Fine, up to 2% of monthly salary

(b) Warning

(c) Demotion

(d) Stoppage of increment

(e) Suspension for 30 days

(f) Discharge or dismissal

The management has the right to transfer employees from head office to branches and vice versa for exigencies of service.

Details

1. Case study solved answers

2. pdf/word in 24-48 hrs

3. Fully Solved with answers