

The learned Court below has threadbare discussed the evidence available on record about the abandonment of job by respondent no.2-workman in para 11 of the award. Counsel for the petitioner has failed to dislodge the said findings because if respondent no.2-workman was

CWP No.14350 of 2015

[2]

absenting himself, the petitioner should have served a letter/notice to him to join the duties, but there is no evidence in this regard.

In view thereof, there is no reason for this Court to interfere in the award of the Labour Court.

Dismissed.

August 04, 2015
vinod*

(Rakesh Kumar Jain)
Judge