

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Letters Patent Appeal No.1022 of 2016

Vinay Prakash Son of Dhruva Narayan Singh resident of Mohalla - Belbanwa Shivpuri, Police Station Motihari Town, District East Champaran at Motihari

.... Appellant

Versus

1. The Bank of India through the Zonal Manager, Bank of India, Zonal Office, Pankaj Market Saraiyaganj, Muzaffarpur, P.S. Muzaffarpur Town, District Muzaffarpur
2. The Zonal Manager, Bank of India, Zonal Office, Pankaj Market Saraiyaganj, Muzaffarpur, P.S. Muzaffarpur Town, District MMuzaffarpur
3. The Branch Manager, B.O.I. Motihari Branch, P.S. Motihari, District - East Champaran
4. The Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Patna

.... Respondents

Appearance :

For the Appellant : Mr. Vaidehi Raman Pd. Singh,
Mr. Mrityunjay Kumar, Advocates

For the Respondents

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HEMANT GUPTA

And

HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VIKASH JAIN

ORAL JUDGMENT

(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HEMANT GUPTA)

Date: 18-11-2016

The challenge in the Letters Patent Appeal is to an order passed by the learned Single Bench on 30th of March, 2016 in CWJC No. 23639 of 2013 whereby the writ application has been allowed against the award of the Industrial Tribunal, Patna dated 7th of December, 2012 and the compensation in lieu of reinstatement was enhanced from Rs. 1,25,000/- to Rs. 3,00,000/-.

2. The argument of the learned counsel for the appellant is that the workman had worked for 20 years and, therefore, the compensation awarded to the appellant is inadequate.

3. We have heard learned counsel for the appellant and find no reason to interfere with the order passed by the learned Single Bench. The appellant was appointed at the rate of Rs. 15/- per day in the year 1988 which rate was enhanced to Rs. 70/- per day in 2008 when his services was terminated. The job assignment of the appellant was to supply water and tea to the staff of the Bank and carry the documents, ledgers, cheques, pay-in-slip, vouchers and other documents from one desk to another.

4. We find that the order of the learned Single Bench is based upon the judgments of the Hon'ble Supreme Court wherein the compensation in lieu of the reinstatement of the workman has been found to be justified.

6. We do not find any error in the order passed by the learned Single Bench which may warrant interference by this Court. The Letters Patent Appeal is accordingly dismissed.

(Hemant Gupta, J)

B.T/-

(Vikash Jain, J)

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	N.A.
Uploading Date	23.11.2016
Transmission Date	N.A.