

CNR No: PHHC011507722026

2026:PHHC:128639



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT  
CHANDIGARH**

**104**

**CR-6830-2026**

**Date of decision :11.09.2026**

**M/S PRP PROFESSIONAL EDGE ASSOCIATES PVT. LTD. AND**

**OTHERS**

**... PETITIONERS**

**VERSUS**

**SHALINI SADAVARTI AND ANOTHER**

**...RESPONDENTS**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PARMOD GOYAL**

Present: Mr. K.K. Goel, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

\*\*\*\*

**PARMOD GOYAL, J. (ORAL)**

1. The present revision petition has been preferred under Article 227 of the Constitution of India by the respondent-employer against the impugned order dated 17.07.2026 (Annexure P-5), whereby the Authority under the Payment of Wages Act, 1936, Circle-4, Gurugram, dismissed the application preferred by the respondent for forensic examination of the signatures on affidavit furnished by the claimant-workman along with his reply dated 21.04.2026.

2. The learned Authority under the Payment of Wages Act, 1936, duly considered the facts and circumstances of the present case and concluded that the signatures are not required to be compared, as the claimant had undergone serious neurosurgical disorder and treatment. As per the discharge summary issued by Fortis Memorial Research Institute, Gurugram, it was found that the

claimant-employee was suffering from deficits in motor functions, including hand coordination and grip. Therefore, keeping in view the medical condition of the claimant, the learned Authority held that forensic comparison of the signatures was not required and accordingly, dismissed the application. I find reason given by learned Authority to be based on material on record

3. Moreover, apart from the aforesaid reason, I find the present revision petition as well as the application preferred by the respondent to be without any basis as comparison of signatures on affidavit has no bearing on the merits of the case. It is not the case of the respondent that after filing his affidavit, the claimant has resiled from the same or has denied his signatures thereupon. Rather, the claimant is relying upon the affidavit filed by him and, therefore, once the claimant is admitting his signatures, there was no reason for the respondent to seek forensic comparison thereof. The learned Authority under the Payment of Wages Act, 1936, has rightly concluded that the present application was an attempt to delay the proceedings and, therefore, the same has rightly been dismissed. I find no ground to interfere with the impugned order. Consequently, the present revision petition is dismissed.

4. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, also stand(s) disposed of accordingly.

11.09.2026  
manoj

(PARMOD GOYAL)  
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned  
Whether reportable

Yes  
Yes/No