

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Letters Patent Appeal No.231 of 2015
IN
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 16742 of 2010

=====

M/S Energetic Engineering & Co., Represented Through Khursid Alam
Site Incharge And Partner Of The Company, H.O. Rupaspur, P.O.- Bor,
P.S.- Barauni, Distt.- Begusarai

.... Appellant

Versus

1. The Union Of India Represented Through The Secretary To The Govt.
Of India Null Ministry Of Labour, Shram Shakti Bhawan, Rafi Marg,
New Delhi-1
2. Deputy Chief Labour Commissioner (Central) Kendriya Sadan, Sector
9-A, Chandigarh
3. Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) Chandigarh, Office Of The
Deputy Chief Labour Commissioner (Central), Kendriya Sadan,
Sector 9-A, Chandigarh
4. Mr. Roopchand, Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) Office Of
The Deputy Chief Labour Commissioner (Central), Kendriya Sadan,
Sector 9-A, Chandigarh
5. Labour Enforcement Officer (Central) Kothi No.32, Bank Colony,
Karnal

.... Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Appellant : Mr. Birendra Kumar Jha, Advocate
For the Respondents : Mr. Rabindra Kumar Sharma, CGC

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY KUMAR TRIPATHI
And
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD
ORAL JUDGMENT
(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY KUMAR TRIPATHI)

Date: 21-06-2017

Heard learned counsel for the appellant and
learned counsel for the State.

Perused the order dated 19.12.2014 passed
by the learned Single Judge. The learned Single Judge
has committed no error in dismissing the writ application
holding that the Patna High Court had no territorial
jurisdiction over a decision of the Regional Labour



Commissioner (Central), Chandigarh, which may have been conveyed to the present appellant by the Labour Enforcement Officer (Central), Karnal. The compensation has been awarded by the said authority in adjudication made at Chandigarh. If the appellant had any grievance against the said order, they should have knocked at the doors of the Punjab & Haryana High Court challenging the correctness or otherwise of the said decision. The Headquarter or registered office of the appellant Company does create territorial jurisdiction as to the cause of action.

Thus, we find no merit in this Letters Patent Appeal. It is, accordingly, dismissed.

(Ajay Kumar Tripathi, J.)

(Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J.)

Rajeev/N.A.F.R.

U			
---	--	--	--

