

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

CWP No.6254 of 2013 (O&M)
Date of decision : 23.07.2015

M/s Manu Gas Service & anr.

...Petitioners

Versus

Commissioner Workman Compensation and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

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

Present: Mr. Vipin Yadav, Advocate and
Mr. Shubham Kaushik, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. B.S. Dhillon, Advocate for the respondent No.2.

AMIT RAWAL, J. (Oral)

Challenge in the present petition is to the order dated 14.08.2012 (Annexure P-1) passed by Commissioner Workmen's Compensation, deciding the claim petition of the workman.

Learned counsel for the respondent No.2 submits that the order passed by the Commissioner is appealable under Section 30 of the Employees Compensation Act and by availing the remedy of appeal, the entire amount of compensation alongwith interest has to be deposited with the Commissioner.

This Court while issuing notice of motion directed the petitioners to deposit 50% of the compensation as ordered by the Commissioner.

It has been brought to the notice of this Court that sum of ₹2,65,500/- has been deposited by the petitioners in favour of workman-respondent No.-2-Ashok Kumar s/o Charan Dass and the same has been withdrawn by him.

Since the order passed by the Commissioner is appealable.

Writ petition is accordingly not maintainable and, therefore, dismissed.

However, the petitioner shall be at liberty to challenge the order of Commissioner by filing statutory appeal and seek condonation of delay by taking the provision of Section 14 of the Limitation Act in accordance with law.

23.07.2015

pawan

**(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE**