

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-3006-2015 (O&M)
Date of Decision:-26.10.2017.

Jagtar 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 23.9.2014 (Annexure P-2) by which tribunal ordered to pay compensation of Rs.45000/- within 45 days of the publication of award, failing which respondents were ordered to pay interest @ 6% from the passing of award till its realization.

Petitioner is stated to have been appointed as a Tubewell Operator during the period from 04.06.2000 to 18.12.2002. The Labour Court proceeded to decline the petitioner's claim for reinstatement on the score that he does not possess essential qualification to the post of Tubewell Operator viz., diploma in Electrical trade.

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.