

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

CWP No.66 of 2018

Date of Decision:09.01.2018

Executive Engineer, Haryana Urban Development Authority, Sonipat

... Petitioner

Vs.

Azad and another

... Respondents

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

Present : Mr. Deepak Balyan, Advocate for the petitioner.

P.B. BAJANTHRI J. (Oral)

In the instant writ petition, petitioner has challenged the award dated 7.3.2017 (Annexure P-3) passed by the Labour Court.

Respondent-workman was working with the petitioner as Tubewell Operator during the period from 26.6.2002 to 31.8.2012. His services were stated to be terminated illegally on 01.09.2012. Labour Court has recorded that termination of the respondent-workman was contrary to provision of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (for short "ID Act"). In fact number of documents have been relied in para-15 and 16 to show that respondent-workman has discharged the duties of the post of Tubewell Operator. Therefore, there is no infirmity in the award passed by the Labour Court dated 7.3.2017. Hence, no interference is called for.

Accordingly, petition stands dismissed.

09.01.2018
rajeev

(P.B. Bajanthri)
Judge

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No