

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-22046-2013 (O&M)

Date of Decision:-26.10.2017.

Rangeela

.....Petitioner

Versus

Municipal Council, Mandi Gobindgarh and another

.....Respondents

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

Present: Mr. Vishal Gupta, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Indresh Goel, Advocate for respondent No.1.

P.B. BAJANTHRI, J. (Oral)

Petitioner has challenged the validity of the award dated 06.12.2012 (Annexure P-4) by which his reference has been rejected.

Petitioner is stated to have been appointed as a Tubewell Operator during the period from 2.5.2002 to 14.9.2004. The Labour Court proceeded to decline the petitioner's claim on the score that his services were engaged through contractor.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that similarly situated persons' dispute has been decided in favour of the workman while extending the benefit of reinstatement without continuity of service and without back wages. In view of the order passed in ***CWP No.15604 of 2012***

(Municipal Council Gobindgarh and others Vs. Industrial Tribunal,

Patiala and another) of even date, petitioner is not entitled to reinstatement

with continuity of service. At the best, he is entitled to compensation of ₹ 1.5 lacs within a period of 3 months from today. If the compensation is not paid within the stipulated period, in that event, the petitioner is entitled to interest @ 6% per annum from today.

Petition stands disposed of.

(P.B. BAJANTHRI)
JUDGE

October 26, 2017.

sandeep

Whether speaking/reasoned:-

Yes / No

Whether Reportable:-

Yes / No.