

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

466

FAO No.693 of 1997 (O&M)

Date of decision: 17.04.2018

Bachan Lal and Another

...Appellants

Vs.

United India Insurance Co. Ltd. and Others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY TEWARI

Present: Mr. Puneet Jain, Advocate
for Mr. Rakesh Gupta, Advocate
for the appellants.

Mr. Rajesh K. Sharma, Advocate
for respondent No. 1-UIIC.

AJAY TEWARI, J.(ORAL)

This appeal has been filed by the employee against the award of compensation to respondents No. 2 to 6. The case of respondents No. 2 to 6 was that the deceased was working as *Mason* with the appellants when a wall that he was plastering collapsed and he died. The case of the appellants was that the deceased was not their employee at all and in fact they had awarded the contract for construction of building to one Jagdish Singh and the deceased was of the employee of Jagdish Singh. The Commissioner noticed that the appellants did not produce any document which would corroborate their assertion that they had given the contract to Jagdish Singh.

Learned counsel has argued that the Commissioner erred in not relying on a copy of the writing of Jagdish Singh (marked as RW-2/B). It transpires that this was a photocopy and that is why the Commissioner did not take it into consideration.

I find no reason to take a different view.

This appeal is dismissed.

April 17, 2018

Poonam (II)

**(AJAY TEWARI)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No