

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

109

**CWP No.11207 of 2017 (O&M)
Date of Decision: July 17, 2017**

Ram Bilas

....Petitioner

vs.

State of Punjab and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA

Present: Mr. P.P.S. Tung, Advocate
for the petitioner.

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA, J. (Oral)

The instant petition has been filed by raising an innocuous prayer for directing the respondent-authorities to take a final decision on the representations dated 18.05.2015, 11.04.2016 and 23.01.2017 (Annexures P-4 to P-6 respectively).

Counsel for the petitioner has been heard at length and the case paper book has been perused.

In the considered view of this Court, the present petition is wholly misconceived.

Pleadings on record, would indicate that the petitioner, who had earlier in point of time been engaged under the Punjab State Power Corporation as a helper, had approached Labour Court, Bathinda, against the action of the respondents for having terminated his services. The relief sought before the Labour Court

was to declare his termination as illegal and to reinstate him with all back wages.

Labour Court passed an award dated 11.09.2008 and against the petitioner.

Petitioner impugned the Labour Court award dated 11.09.2008 by filing CWP No.3123 of 2009.

Such writ petition was disposed of in the light of order dated 30.03.2010, passed by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court at Annexure P-1.

Perusal of such order clearly reveals that counsel representing the petitioner, chose not to press the writ petition and rather sought liberty to move a representation to consider the request of the petitioner for fresh appointment on the basis that work is now available with the respondents. Accordingly, writ petition was disposed of with the directions that if representation is made by the petitioner, the same would be considered sympathetically and within a period of four weeks from the date of submission of the representation.

Apparently, petitioner approached this Court a second time over by filing CWP No.25106 of 2014, seeking identical relief and which was also withdrawn on the request made by counsel with liberty to approach the respondents by filing representation.

The present petition is the third attempt made by the petitioner raising the same very prayer.

Counsel has raised a contention that the Labour Court while passing an award against the petitioner and declining relief has not considered the experience of the petitioner, of 310 days, as would be reflected in the experience certificate placed on record at Annexure P-3, issued by the Executive Engineer, Heavy Machinery, GNDTP, Bathinda.

Such submission is being noticed only to be rejected. The validity of the Labour Court award dated 11.09.2008 is not a subject matter of consideration before this Court. The Labour Court award had been challenged by filing CWP No.3123 of 2009 and the same was not pressed by counsel representing the petitioner and which would be apparent from the order dated 30.03.2010, passed by this Court at Annexure P-1.

It is not open for the petitioner to file repeated writ petitions seeking identical relief.

No interference in the matter is called for.

Petition is dismissed.

(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE

17.07.2017

anju rani

Whether speaking/reasoned : **Yes/No**
Whether reportable : **Yes/No**