

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No.1691 of 2016
Date of Decision:- 21.4.2016.

Lal Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court-1, Gurgaon
and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE P.B. BAJANTHRI

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. Abhishek Yadav, Advocate for the petitioner.

P.B. BAJANTHRI, J.

1.) In this petition, the petitioner has questioned the award dated 26.7.2012 passed by the Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court-I, Gurgaon.

2.) The petitioner is stated to be appointed in the second respondent Organization. The same was disputed by the second respondent before the Industrial Tribunal. The petitioner has not led any evidence showing that he was appointed by the second respondent and he was working under the said organization. Therefore, question of employer and employee relationship between the petitioner and the second respondent do not exist. Except some

gate pass entries, no relevant record has been produced. On the contrary, it was shown that the petitioner was appointed through contractor, namely, M/s Veer Enterprises, therefore, the question of interference with the award dated 26.07.2012 passed by the Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court-I, Gurgaon do not arise.

3.) Accordingly, the petition is dismissed.

(P.B. BAJANTHRI)
JUDGE

April 21, 2016.

sandeep sethi