

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-25301-2014 (O&M)

Date of Decision:-26.10.2017.

Navdeep Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

Municipal Council, Mandi Gobindgarh and another

.....Respondents

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

Present: Mr. H.S. Dhindsa, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajinder Sharma, Advocate for respondent No.1.

P.B. BAJANTHRI, J. (Oral)

Petitioner has challenged the validity of the award dated 7.5.2013 (Annexure P-2) by which his reference for reinstatement has been rejected.

Petition is stated to have been appointed as a Tubewell Operator during the period from 5.1.2002 to 20.12.2002. The Labour Court proceeded to decline the petitioner's claim for reinstatement on the score there was no vacancy for temporary post of the work of Tubewell Operator.

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***

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 ₹ 75,000/- within a period of 3 months from today as he worked for a period less than one year. 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.