

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

322

**CWP-20159-2005 (O&M)
Date of decision:01.09.2017**

Nagar Council, Barnala through its Executive Officer

....Petitioner

Versus

The Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Patiala and others

.... Respondents

(2)

CWP-20192-2005 (O&M)

Nagar Council, Barnala through its Executive Officer

....Petitioner

Versus

The Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Patiala and others

.... Respondents

(3)

CWP-20193-2005 (O&M)

Nagar Council, Barnala through its Executive Officer

....Petitioner

Versus

The Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Patiala and others

.... Respondents

(4)

CWP-20399-2005 (O&M)

Nagar Council, Barnala through its Executive Officer

....Petitioner

Versus

The Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Patiala and others

.... Respondents

(5)

CWP-20400-2005 (O&M)

Nagar Council, Barnala through its Executive Officer

....Petitioner

Versus

The Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Patiala and others

.... Respondents

(6)

CWP-20415-2005 (O&M)

Nagar Council, Barnala through its Executive Officer

....Petitioner

Versus

The Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Patiala and others

.... Respondents

(7)

CWP-20170-2005 (O&M)

Nagar Council, Barnala through its Executive Officer

....Petitioner

Versus

The Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Patiala and others

.... Respondents

(8) **CWP-20161-2005 (O&M)**

Nagar Council, Barnala through its Executive Officer

....Petitioner

Versus

The Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Patiala and others

.... Respondents

(9) **CWP-20164-2005 (O&M)**

Nagar Council, Barnala through its Executive Officer

....Petitioner

Versus

The Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Patiala and others

.... Respondents

(10) **CWP-20168-2005 (O&M)**

Nagar Council, Barnala through its Executive Officer

....Petitioner

Versus

The Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Patiala and others

.... Respondents

(11) **CWP-20167-2005 (O&M)**

Nagar Council, Barnala through its Executive Officer

....Petitioner

Versus

The Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Patiala and others

.... Respondents

(12)

CWP-20160-2005 (O&M)

Nagar Council, Barnala through its Executive Officer

....Petitioner

Versus

The Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Patiala and others

.... Respondents

(13)

CWP-20172-2005 (O&M)

Nagar Council, Barnala through its Executive Officer

....Petitioner

Versus

The Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Patiala and others

.... Respondents

(14)

CWP-20173-2005 (O&M)

Nagar Council, Barnala through its Executive Officer

....Petitioner

Versus

The Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Patiala and others

.... Respondents

(15)

CWP-20191-2005 (O&M)

Nagar Council, Barnala through its Executive Officer

....Petitioner

Versus

The Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Patiala and others

.... Respondents

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr. Justice P.B. Bajanthri

Present: Mr.P.M.Kansal, Advocate for the petitioner in all cases.

Mr. B.S.Sewak, Addl. A.G. Punjab.

Mr. H.S.Dhindsa, Advocate for respondents
in CWP Nos. 20172, 20399, 20400, 26173, 20193 of 2005.

P.B. Bajanthri, J. (Oral)

This order shall dispose of the aforementioned 15 petitions. However, for convenience and clarity, facts are being taken from petition bearing No. 20159 of 2005.

In this writ petition, petitioner has questioned the award passed by the Labour Court dated 18.07.2005 (Annexure P1). The Labour court passed the following relief:-

“Relief:

I determine the compensation of workman as Rs.60,000/-. It is also announced that in case payment of aforesaid amount is not made within 6 months then applicant will also be entitled to 6% per annum simple interest on said amount from today to till its payment.”

During pendency of this petition, the respondent-workman was stated to have been extended benefit of 3 years monetary benefits with reference to claim period from 01.01.1989 to 2005 and various period in respect of other petitioner's. In view of the later development, respondent-workmen is not disputing relating to implementation of the award. Since both the counsels submitted that in view of the later development that respondent-workman has been extended monetary benefits with reference to

calculation for a period of 3 years therefore, petition do not survive for consideration.

Accordingly, CWP stands dismissed.

It is made clear that respondent-workman has no right to claim any monetary benefits during the period which was subject matter before the Labour Court.

01.09.2017
pooja saini

(P.B.BAJANTHRI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasons

Yes/No

Whether Reportable:

Yes/No