

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No. 361 of 2016
Date of Decision : 23.05.2016

Prem Chand Pandey

...Petitioner

Versus

M/s Devgiri Exports and another

...Respondents

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

- 1) *Whether Reporters of the 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. Rajesh Bansal, Advocate for the petitioner.

P.B. Bajanthri, J.(Oral)

In the instant writ petition, the petitioner has questioned the validity of order dated 23.12.2013 (Annexure P-1) and order dated 01.07.2015 (Annexure P-2) respectively.

The petitioner is stated to have employed with the respondent No. 1 establishment on 04.04.2003 as a Quality Controller. Claim of the petitioner is as follows :-

- | | |
|--|-------------------|
| 1. <i>Salary of May, 2010</i> | : ₹5225/- |
| 2. <i>Overtime of 2 hours per day
(09.00 a.m. to 08.00 p.m.)</i> | : ₹5590/- |
| 3. <i>Arrear of Overtime from
01.01.2009 to 01.12.2009</i> | : 13416/- |
| 4. <i>Earned Leave of 31 days
till 16.07.2010</i> | : 5225/- |
| 5. <i>Bonus (20%) of year 2010-2011</i> | : 3500/- |
| <i>Total</i> | <i>: 32956/-"</i> |

The petitioner's claim has been rejected with reference to the fact that the petitioner has signed papers for full and final settlement on 06.07.2011. Thereafter he has raised dispute by approaching various authorities that he is entitled to the above mentioned claims. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that at the behest of the respondents, the petitioner has signed blank papers, the same had been misused by the respondents for full and final settlement or the petitioner's claim. In other words, the respondents have misused the petitioner's signatures.

The petitioner has not produced any material to show that he has raised dispute about his claim during the period from May, 2010 to 06.07.2011. For the first time, he raised claim in the month of September, 2011 in the absence of necessary documents. Regarding claim of the petitioner, authorities as well as Court rightly held that the petitioner is not entitled for his claim. There is no infirmity in the decision of the authorities as well as Court.

Accordingly, the petition stands dismissed.

May 23, 2016.
kanchan

(P.B. BAJANTHRI)
JUDGE