

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

RA-CW-515-2017 in
CWP-10242-2013 (O/M)
Date of decision : 14.12.2017

Abhinav Singh and another Petitioners

Versus

Corporation Bank and another Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. Vikas Chatrath and Ms. Shalini Verma, Advocates,
for applicants-respondents.

1. Whether the Reporters of local newspaper may be allowed to see the judgment ?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not.
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest ?

-. -

-. -

KULDIP SINGH J. (ORAL)

Heard.

The learned counsel for applicants-respondents states that this Court, while passing order dated 24.5.2017 in CWP-10242-2013, had taken the view that the undertaking given by deceased father of petitioners is not binding, which is contrary to Section 37 of Contract Act, 1872. Further, it is contended that it was observed in the said order that respondents have not shown any rule/authority under which payment of leave encashment could be withheld. The learned counsel for applicants-respondents contends that now they have come across circular dated 29.12.2000, under which in case of compulsory retirement, the payment of leave encashment could be withheld.

I am of the view that there is no error apparent on record.

Whatever documents were produced before this Court were considered.

RA-CW-515-2017 in
CWP-10242-2013 (O/M)

After the decision of case, applicants-respondents cannot be allowed to bring more documents on file and seek review of the judgment. If applicants-respondents are not satisfied with the view taken by this Court, it is always open for them to challenge the same before the higher court. There is no ground to review the order dated 24.5.2017, passed by this Court in CWP-10242-2013. Therefore, review application is dismissed.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

14.12.2017
sjks

Whether speaking / reasoned : Yes

Whether Reportable : No