

Complaint – Takko Fashion – Bangladesh

Status: Closed

FWF is responsible for setting up a complaints procedure in production countries where FWF is active. The complaints procedure allows third parties to make complaints about the working conditions or the way the Code of Labour Practices is implemented in factories which supply FWF members.

The responsibility of FWF includes investigating the complaint, verifying whether the agreed corrective action plan is implemented and public reporting. This complaint report gives an overview of a complaint filed to FWF, the investigation and agreed corrective action plan as well as how the outcome is verified. For more information on the complaints procedure see the FWF website. FWF also publishes an overview of complaints received in its annual reports.

1. Affiliate involved

Takko Fashion

2. Accused party

A factory supplying to Takko Fashion in Bangladesh

3. Date of receipt complaint

27 October 2013

4. Filing party

A worker that has been recently fired by the factory.

5. The complaint

The complainant claimed that he was fired by the factory unjustly. He has worked in the factory as a knitting supervisor for 1.5 years. He had taken approved leaves to visit his hometown. He was one day late when he returned to the factory. He was informed by the management that he was fired and he did not get any compensation.

He found it unfair. According to the Bangladesh law, a worker is entitled up to three days of unauthorised leave. The law also stipulated that without any official warning and official investigation process, workers can be dismissed for the above reason.



6. Admissibility

FWF decided that the case is admissible since it is concerning an active supplier of a FWF member. The case is relevant to the following elements of the FWF Code of Labour Practices:

- Legally binding employment relationship.

7. Investigation

FWF informs Takko Fashion about the case. Takko Fashion contacted the factory through an agent on the issue. The agent responded that the worker was fired because he was absent frequently and the retrenchment compensation was made according to the law.

FWF complaint handler tried to contact the complainant to start the investigation. However the worker has not responded to the call since then.

The factory was previously audited by FWF. The audit did not find similar issues linked to this complaint..

8. Findings and conclusions

The case will not be further investigated because the complainant was out of reach.