

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

CWP-2269-2018

Date of Decision: 02.02.2018

M/s Grand Legacy

... Petitioner

Vs.

Presiding Officer and another

... Respondents

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

Present : Mr. Prateek Sodhi, Advocate for the petitioner.

P.B. BAJANTHRI J. (Oral)

In the instant petition, petitioner has challenged the award passed by the Labour Court dated 1.7.2016 (Annexure P-3).

Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that respondent is employed elsewhere. Therefore, Labour Court has failed to appreciate the said factual aspect. It is to be noted that as and when an employee is terminated, he cannot sit idle at home. For his livelihood, he has to earn. If after his termination, workman is working elsewhere that does not take away the right of the employee in pursuing the dispute relating to termination. Labour Court in para-13 has recorded that how the termination of the respondent-workman is illegal. Accordingly, petitioner has not made out a case so as to interfere with the award passed by the Labour Court dated 1.7.2016 (Annexure P-3).

Accordingly, petition stands dismissed.

02.02.2018
rajeev

(P.B. Bajanthri)
Judge

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No