

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP No.335 of 2012 (O&M)
Date of Decision: April 09, 2015

Tilak Raj

...Petitioner

Versus

Punjab State through Secretary to Government Punjab, Forest Department,
Chandigarh & others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL, JUDGE

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?
2. To be referred to the Reporters or not?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

Present: Mr.Jasbir Singh, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr.L.S.Virk, Addl.A.G.Punjab,
for the State.

AMIT RAWAL, J. (Oral)

Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner contends that the petitioner had approached the Civil Court for claiming regularization of the services. In appeal, the judgment and decree was modified and the Regular Second Appeal filed in this Court was dismissed as withdrawn with liberty to approach the Labour Court.

Learned counsel for the petitioner further contents that inadvertently the petitioner, for the same relief, sought a reference and the reference was sent to the Labour Court and the Labour Court declined the relief. He submits that during the pendency of the writ petition, services of

the petitioner have been terminated.

I have heard the learned counsel for the petitioner.

The petitioner would be at liberty to challenge his termination order by issuing a demand notice, much less, raising reference.

It is made clear that the finding of the Labour Court qua the identical relief would not come in the way of the petitioner for seeking relief of his alleged termination.

The writ petition is disposed of accordingly.

In view of the above, CM No.2446 of 2015 is rendered infructuous and is disposed of as such.

April 09, 2015
ramesh

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE