

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

139

**CWP No. 6962 of 2018
DATE OF DECISION :- March 20, 2018**

BHARAT BHUSHAN

...Petitioner

Versus

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-
CUM-LABOUR COURT ROHTAK AND ANR**

...Respondents

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

Present:- Mr. Sandeep Singal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

P.B. BAJANTHRI, J. (ORAL)

The petitioner has challenged the award passed by the Labour Court dated 20.09.2017 (Annexure P-6).

2. Perusal of para 13 of the award, it is evident that petitioner has created nuisance in the respondent-Company. It was contended that on 13.05.2011, petitioner's services have been terminated. If it is so, petitioner has not stated in the demand notice to the extent that he has reported for duty on 13.05.2011. Consequently, respondents refused to accept his duty report. In the absence of such statement in the demand notice, one cannot draw inference that petitioner's services have been terminated. On the other hand, respondents have contended that from 13.05.2011, petitioner remained absent. In view of the misbehavior incident occurred on 12.05.2011 with the respondents, it is a clear case of remaining absent on behalf of the petitioner pursuant to the incident on 12.05.2011 after consuming the liquor. Thus, no ground is made out to interfere with the award passed by the Labour Court dated 20.09.2017 (Annexure P-6).

3. Accordingly, present civil writ petition stands dismissed.

**(P.B. BAJANTHRI)
JUDGE**

March 20, 2018
neeraj

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether Reportable

Yes/No